

The NHPRC/Mellon Foundation Fellowship in Archives Administration: Structured Training on the Job

JUDITH E. ENDELMAN and JOEL WURL

Abstract: Since 1985 the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, supported in part by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, has sponsored a fellowship program in archival administration designed to provide professional archivists an opportunity to develop practical administrative skills through appointments at selected archival repositories. This article traces the history of the fellowship program and analyzes its value for fellows, host institutions, and the profession as a whole.

Judith Endelman outlines the basic structure of the fellowship and chronicles its evolution. She identifies several factors crucial to the success of a fellowship experience and discusses ways in which the program might be strengthened.

Joel Wurl presents the results of a survey of the fellows and host institution project directors from the first two years. Overall, participants reported satisfaction with their experiences, but noted some structural weaknesses, including the desire, expressed by project directors, for a larger pool of fellowship applicants. Participants concluded almost unanimously that the program should continue and be supported more actively by the profession.

About the authors: Judith E. Endelman is Benson and Edith Ford Librarian and Curator of Special Collections at Henry Ford Museum & Greenfield Village. In 1985-86 she was an NHPRC Fellow in Archives Administration at the Bentley Historical Library of the University of Michigan. Endelman is author of **The Jewish Community of Indianapolis: 1849 to the Present** and co-author of **Religion in Indiana: A Guide to Historical Resources**. She has served as archivist of the Jewish Theological Seminary and librarian at the American Jewish Historical Society. Her contribution is a revised version of a paper delivered at the fifty-first annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists, New York City, 5 September 1987.

Joel Wurl is curator of the University of Minnesota's Immigration History Research Center, which hosted an NHPRC Fellow in Archives Administration in 1987-88. His contribution to this article is a revised version of a paper presented to the Society of Georgia Archivists, Atlanta, November 1987.

The authors thank the NHPRC staff for their assistance in providing information on the evolution of the program.

History of the Program and a Fellow's Viewpoint

JUDITH E. ENDELMAN

Management training and management skills are subjects of increasing interest for archivists. As the authors of *Planning for the Archival Profession* commented, "Few archivists receive training in administration, planning, development, and public relations" and "most . . . lack formal training in management."¹

Traditional management responsibilities have included decision making, planning, organizing, staffing, leading, controlling, communicating, and budgeting. Because of the large number of one- and two-person archival facilities, many archivists are responsible for most of these activities. The ideal archives manager has a knowledge of all archival functions—appraisal, arrangement and description, preservation management, and reference—as well as budgeting, planning, and personnel management. The manager must be able to combine and use these skills to ensure that the daily work gets done, and yet remain cognizant of personal and institutional long-range goals. The ability to articulate and meet long-range institutional and professional goals is one of a manager's most important tasks.

Many archivists, however, learn to be effective archival managers through trial and error. Few archival education programs teach more than basic archival skills, the foundation upon which management skills must be taught. Management skills cannot be taught in isolation nor are they useful without a thorough knowledge of archival theory and practice. The profession, however, has been slow to extend formal training beyond the introductory level.

The National Historical Publications and

Records Commission (NHPRC) Fellowship in Archives Administration, jointly funded by the NHPRC and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, is designed to help midcareer archivists improve their managerial skills. The fellowship offers the opportunity of "nine to ten months of advanced training in archival administration for persons who possess both three years archival work experience and graduate training in a program containing an archival education component."²

This advanced training occurs in archival host institutions, which apply to offer a fellow directed administrative work experience. During the fellowship period, the fellow is to be exposed to a broad range of archival administrative experience while receiving special training and direction from the host institution's administrator. NHPRC staff evaluate host institution applications to determine whether the institution is capable of providing such training. Three host institutions are selected annually and then applications for fellows are solicited.

The ideal candidate for the fellowship is an archivist who holds a position with managerial responsibilities but who lacks the necessary skills or training. Another likely potential candidate is someone who is eager to make an upward career move but needs better developed managerial skills to do so.

Ironically, the most unique aspect of the fellowship, that it is designed for midcareer archivists, was not part of the original intent of the program's founders. In fact, the original 1983 proposal for the establishment of the NHPRC archival fellowships suggested a fellowship for immediate post-

¹*Planning for the Archival Profession: A Report of the Task Force on Goals and Priorities* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1986), 18. More recently, see Paul McCarthy, "The Management of Archives: A Research Agenda," *American Archivist* 51(Winter and Spring 1988): 52-72.

²"NHPRC Archives Administration Fellowships, Application Instructions" (Washington, D.C.: NHPRC, 1985).

graduates. Nearly a decade of working with archival institutions across the country had convinced NHPRC staff of the lack of and need for experienced, qualified archival administrators. The commission staff hoped that by placing newly trained archivists with fresh but untried ideas into host institutions, a kind of cross-fertilization would occur: the older, experienced but untrained archivist would benefit from the recent training of the new archivist who, in turn, would gain real administrative experience complementing his or her education. According to the initial proposal, host institutions would be expected to provide a training program that included appraisal, budget preparation, personnel administration, training supervision, collection administration, and external affairs. A period of training at a federal repository would also be a part of the fellowship experience.³

In May 1984 the NHPRC held a small conference, the "National Invitational Colloquium on Postgraduate Archival Training," to discuss the proposed fellowship. Frank Burke, executive director of NHPRC, invited five representatives of archival education programs and five representatives from different types of archival institutions to attend.⁴ When the educators and administrators split into two subgroups to discuss the nature of postgraduate internships, the responsibilities of the host institution, and the educational qualifications of the intern, the two groups differed radically on the basic nature of an ideal fellowship program. The educators favored a postgraduate fellowship that would be available to anyone who

had completed a course on archival administration. They wanted optional time periods of five or ten months for the fellowships, noting that shorter periods would allow the program to fund more fellows per year. The educators tended to think of the program as an internship, although they wanted to use the term fellowship to "indicate a component with a challenging professional task." Some NHPRC staff were highly supportive of this position. The archival administrators at the colloquium, on the other hand, favored a fellowship for archivists with some years of professional experience. They never referred to it as an internship or as postgraduate education, as the educators did. The administrators wanted the fellowship period to be ten to twelve months. They were particularly concerned about the level of the fellowship stipend, suggesting that it match the fellow's current salary and that it include \$2,000 to cover professional travel and moving expenses.⁵

Although the NHPRC staff report of the 1984 colloquium on postgraduate archival education tended to endorse the position of the archival educators, the final form of the NHPRC fellowship followed the contours of the administrators' proposal.

While there is no model in the archival profession for the fellowship the administrators outlined, it does resemble the prestigious Academic Library Management Intern Program of the Council on Library Resources, which annually places three experienced librarians in three major academic libraries for nine months to learn managerial skills by working closely with

³Frank G. Burke, "A Proposal for the Establishment of NHPRC Archival Fellowships, Sept. 26, 1983" (Unpublished; NHPRC, 1983), p. 2; George L. Vogt, "Report on NHPRC Fellowships in Archival Education, June 1, 1984" (Unpublished; NHPRC, 1984).

⁴"Chronology: NHPRC Fellowships" (Unpublished; NHPRC, 1984). The representatives of educational institutions were Fred Stielow and David Grimsted, University of Maryland; Michael Lutzker, New York University; Philip Mason, Wayne State University; and James B. Rhoads, University of Western Washington. Representatives of archival institutions were J. Frank Cook, University of Wisconsin; Lawrence Dowler, Harvard University; Sidney McAlpin, Washington State Archives; Alice Riley, International Nickel Company; and David Van Tassel and Thomas Soaps, National Archives and Records Service.

⁵"Colloquium on Archival Postgraduate Education" (Unpublished; NHPRC, 1984).

the library's director and staff.⁶ The fellowship proposed by the educators resembled the NHPRC fellowship in documentary editing which is designed for immediate postgraduates.

The first three fellows began their program in the fall of 1985 at the Archives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Bentley Historical Library of the University of Michigan, and a consortium of three New York archives—the Salvation Army Archives and Research Center, the YMCA of Greater New York Archives, and the Friars of the Atonement Archives. During 1986–87, two institutions hosted fellows—McCain Library and Archives of the University of Southern Mississippi and Department of Archives and Manuscripts, Arizona State University. For 1987–88, fellows were based at the Immigration History Research Center of the University of Minnesota, the Archives of the State of California, and Special Collections, Louisiana State University. The 1988–89 host institutions were the Cornell University Department of Manuscripts and University Archives, the New York University Archives, and the Special Collections Unit, Bailey-Howe Library, University of Vermont.

It is difficult to characterize a program that has had both few participants—eleven—and a variety of experiences in different settings. The fellows' backgrounds have been diverse, but all seemed to share a feeling of being stuck in their careers. To each, the program appeared to offer a chance for professional advancement. One fellow had worked in a series of grant-funded projects; another had worked in a documentary editing project and wanted to shift to archival

management. One fellow had a very specialized background, having worked for eleven years preparing entries for the *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections*; he sought a more diverse work experience. All expressed a desire for administrative experience.

While sharing certain similarities, each fellowship provided a different experience due to the nature of the setting and the technical project offered. Each fellow was involved to varying degrees during the course of their fellowship year in most of the elements of archival administration. The technical projects, considered the keystone of the experience, were quite diverse. The Bentley Historical Library fellow conducted a collection analysis project leading to the development of a new collecting policy.⁷ The New York consortium fellow conducted a needs assessment study for Archivists in Religious Institutions, a group of approximately seventy-five religious archives in the New York metropolitan area. This work led to a successful application to NHPRC for a Religious Archives Technical Assistance Project. At Arizona State University, the fellow developed a plan for the consolidation of the public services components of four special collections units that were to be housed in a new library facility. Other host institutions offered a series of technical projects. For example, at the Massachusetts Archives the fellow had a leading role in the development of a subject thesaurus for a new automated descriptive system; responsibility for outreach coordination between the archives, the University of Massachusetts, and the John F. Kennedy Library; and extensive involvement in planning for the 1987 budget.

⁶“1988/89 Management Intern Programs,” *College & Research Libraries News* 48 (September 1987): 467. Following the model of the Council on Library Resources intern program, the University of Michigan Library recently received a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to establish three one-year internships in preservation management. The internships are designed for “someone at mid-career who wishes to devote his or her energies to preservation and conservation.” “Preservation Interns Sought for Univ. of Michigan Libraries,” *Library Journal* 113, no. 9 (15 May 1988): 18.

⁷For a description of the Bentley Historical Library project, see Judith E. Endelman, “Looking Backward to Plan for the Future: Collection Analysis for Manuscript Repositories,” *American Archivist* 50 (Summer 1987): 340–56.

In measuring the success of the program from the fellow's perspective, the technical project is the key element. Without the technical project, the fellowship experience could be likened to attending a large buffet dinner where the fellow views all the items on the table but does not taste any of them. Of course, a certain amount of observation is valuable. For example, the Bentley Library fellowship provided the opportunity to participate in a short-term project at the Gerald Ford Library, allowing the fellow to experience and observe a different managerial style and administrative setting—an experience shared by some of the other fellows.

As the core of the fellowship agenda, a good technical project takes the activities to a much deeper and more valuable level and allows the fellow a chance to dig into something that becomes his or her own accomplishment. Although NHPRC does not provide specific examples of acceptable technical projects in its guidelines to prospective host institutions, it does identify appraisal, budget preparation, collection development, external affairs, long-range planning, personnel administration, and training supervision as “administrative practices” to which fellows could be exposed. Presumably, the technical project should fall into one of these areas. The ideal technical project is a self-contained, concrete assignment incorporating tasks and skills commonly required of archival administrators. It does not require a long, historical knowledge of the archives, its parent institution, and their relationships; but rather, it is a project that actually benefits from someone with an objective or neutral eye. Moreover, the successful technical project enables the fellow to develop expertise that will be of future value as well as to address an important operational need for the host institution. As will be discussed further be-

low, projects involving privileged or sensitive information, such as budgeting, personnel problems, or negotiations between rival departments or units, are not suitable for a technical project.

Even the most enthusiastic supporter of the fellowship program would not call it an unqualified success. The pool of candidates for both fellows and host institutions has been inadequate. In the first year of the program, twenty-eight archivists applied for the three fellowships. The second year only ten applied. At a meeting of fellows and representatives of host institutions at the end of the first fellowship year, the small size of the stipend was identified as the biggest candidate-recruiting problem. The \$18,000 stipend (\$15,000 plus \$3,000 benefits) was raised to \$25,200 (\$21,000 + \$4,200 benefits) for the 1987–88 fellowship year, with an additional \$500 awarded to each host institution to bring in fellowship candidates for interviews.⁸ Unfortunately, this infusion of money did not raise the number of applicants. Only eleven applied for the 1987–88 fellowships. For the 1988–89 year, a lack of applicants forced the NHPRC to extend the deadline for applications to 1 July 1988.⁹

A lack of applicants for host institutions has been an even greater problem than the lack of fellowship candidates. For 1986–87, the second year of the program, the commission received only five applications from host institutions. This did increase to nine applicants for 1987–88. When there are only a small number of applications from institutions, the commission cannot be particularly selective. It cannot inquire as thoroughly as it might like into the qualifications of the host institution and its administrator. Does the host institution run an effective program? Is it considered a model in the field, an innovative or exciting institution? Is it large enough to offer a demanding ad-

⁸“Colloquium on Archival Fellowship Program” (Unpublished; NHPRC, 10 July 1986).

⁹“NHPRC News,” *Open Entry* 15, no. 2 (Spring 1988 supplement): 4.

ministrative position and a diversity of work experience?

Similarly, the commission has not seemed to pay sufficient attention to the credentials of the designated staff person who will act as the fellow's mentor. This individual is critical to the program's success. Is he or she a successful administrator? Does he or she have a distinguished reputation? Is he or she considered a leader in the field? Is he or she able and willing to spend time with the fellow discussing management issues? Perhaps some have not applied to be a host institution, intimidated by the idea of being considered a model modern manager.

Other problems with the fellowship are inherent in the nature of the beast. These involve questions of trust, of sharing privileged and confidential information. Particularly in the areas of personnel and budgeting, there is information that an administrator may hesitate to share with someone who is only there temporarily. Can the fellow be trusted not to divulge privileged information during the fellowship period or afterwards? The personal relationship that develops during the year between fellow and mentor will influence the degree to which the fellow actually learns how to handle some of the more sensitive aspects of management. This relationship is not delineated in any literature about the fellowship, yet it is central to the program's success.

The lack of sufficient applicants has prevented the program from being truly competitive and assuring a good match between host and fellow. The program has not acquired the prestige that the Council on Library Resources Academic Library Management Intern Program has in the library field, and thus it may not attract the best candidates. Perhaps the archival profession is too small to produce enough

qualified applicants for both fellowships and host institutions. Unlike academics, archivists are not attuned to the notion of taking an extended leave from a professional position, whether to do research or to learn new skills. Many archivists are simply not in a position to do so, having little support staff to assume responsibility in their absence.

The shortage of applicants for host institutions may reflect the structure of the archival profession. Perhaps there are not enough large institutions to offer a fellow the required diverse management experience. Perhaps archival management is too young for there to be a pool of individuals who feel capable of mentoring a younger archivist.

If the NHPRC fellowship were redesigned for entry level postgraduates, the pool of candidates for both fellowships and host institutions would probably expand. Many institutions are used to having graduate student employees or interns, and this would be a natural extension of that experience. A postgraduate fellow would not require the same amount and kind of commitment and involvement from the repository director or the same type of technical project. In addition, many recent graduates would welcome the chance to receive administrative training in an institutional setting before beginning their professional career.

If this were to happen, the program would probably benefit from an increased number of applicants, but it would also lose its unique character. The NHPRC Fellowship in Archives Administration is the only program that offers midcareer archivists a year of financial support to develop their administrative skills, to work closely with a successful administrator, to observe and learn in a new institutional setting, and ultimately, to earn the professional advancement they desire.

Participants' Views and a Host's Perspective

JOEL WURL

The success of the NHPRC/Mellon Foundation fellowship, obviously, must be measured against its goals. These goals are essentially threefold: (1) to provide an enriching experience for practicing archivists; (2) to inject added, helpful professional expertise into established archival repositories; and (3) to augment the archival profession's pool of well-trained administrators. The last of these will not be measurable for several more years (assuming the program continues), but the other two, more immediate objectives, relating to the direct participants, can and should be reviewed in an ongoing manner.

As indicated, the fellowship program is only into its fourth year, hardly enough time for any type of conclusive assessment. Nonetheless, in anticipation of serving as a project director for a 1987-88 host institution, it seemed potentially helpful to canvass the previous participants in a concerted, though admittedly unscientific, way. Thus, questionnaires, one for the five fellows and the other for the seven project directors,¹⁰ were distributed and collected in the summer of 1987 (see appendixes). The survey, which yielded a 100 percent return rate, attempted to elicit some objective data and candid subjective comments on the fellowship experience. The two questionnaires included several common questions intended to facilitate comparison of the host and fellow perspectives; other questions addressed concerns specific to each group, such as the fellows' impressions of the program's impact on their employability.

The survey results have been analyzed within a framework of six categories, as reflected in the following discussion. The first four categories focus on the partici-

pants' assessments of the quality of the fellowship experience from the standpoint of personal or institutional objectives, while the last two sections relate their views on the value of the fellowship for the archival profession as a whole and their recommendations for general improvement of the fellowship program.

Overall level of satisfaction in the program. Generally, the fellows and hosts were very satisfied with their experiences. On a 1-10 scale, the fellows as a group rated the experience an 8, and the hosts scored it an 8.4. This nearly identical group average reflects one of the clearest observations that can be made from the survey: the responses of fellows and hosts to common questions were very similar, both in terms of averages of the two groups and the tallies of individual fellows and their respective hosts. While participants on the whole were highly satisfied, one host and one fellow—who were not teamed together in the same fellowship assignment—answered the first question with a score well below the average.

Key factors influencing the program's outcome. The answers to the second question on each form constitute the chief exception to the comparative similarities noted above. No two sets of answers were alike. On average, both fellows and hosts considered the "relationship of fellow and project director" the most crucial factor affecting the program's success; but the fellows ranked "responsiveness of host institution to needs of fellow" second, whereas the hosts ranked this factor last. The hosts felt "extent of exposure to or experience with multiple activities" merited second priority. The technical project was low on both

¹⁰The higher number of project directors is explained by the cooperative administration of one of the fellowships by three archivists from the Salvation Army Archives, the YMCA Archives of Greater New York, and the Friars of Atonement Archives.

lists, while “degree of emphasis on administration/management” tied for second among the fellows and was third for the hosts. Although the size of the sample tempers any sweeping conclusions, it is possible to observe that responsiveness of the host and emphasis on administration were a bit more important to fellows than to hosts. Most of the fellows and hosts believed that over 50 percent of the fellowship activity could be termed “administrative,” though they were not asked if this was considered sufficient. One fellow volunteered that the experience was especially lacking in administrative activities. The fellows indicated overall high satisfaction with their host’s responsiveness (Figure A, question 7), scoring an average of 4 on a 0–5 scale.

Motivations for taking advantage of the fellowship opportunity. Answers to the open-ended question 3 on the two questionnaires were much as one might expect. All but one of the fellows remarked in some way that they were at a crossroad in their professional lives and that the fellowship appeared to provide a solution. Each emphasized that he or she anticipated the experience would be broadening or stimulating. The hosts’ responses varied a bit more. Most stressed the notion that their institution was in a position to offer an interesting, worthwhile fellowship experience. Hosts also admitted that they simply had work with which they needed help. In addition, one expected that there would be significant reciprocal educational benefits for the host institution, while another commented that increased status within the parent institution was an anticipated result.

Contribution of the fellowship to the host institutions’ operations and the fellows’ career development. The hosts gave the fellows overall high marks for their contribution to the institution. Interestingly, the fellows generally viewed them-

selves as having slightly less of an impact on the institutions than did the hosts. Perhaps a modesty factor enters in here, but some fellows also might not have considered their assignments very essential to the institution. As one explained, “life would have gone on if I’d not been there.” The fellows’ work was seen by most project directors as contributing equally to short- and long-term needs of the department, with just one host indicating that short-term needs were predominant. Responses of the hosts also were evenly mixed on the question of how closely the implemented program resembled the one originally planned; only one host claimed the program was substantially altered. In every case, however, the technical project, regardless of the extent of modification required, was completed.

It is clear that all of the fellows perceived the experience as positively affecting their professional development. Three of the five claimed that their professional development was strongly enhanced. When asked to identify the three main benefits of the experience, the fellows replied with some of the same types of phrases used to articulate their initial motivations: it broadened knowledge of archival issues, it provided exposure to a variety of activities and situations, and it furnished a needed change from previous, confining responsibilities. Some added that they appreciated the opportunity to meet new archivists and to witness closely the operation of another archival facility. Two of the five fellows returned to the institution with which they were employed before the fellowship.¹¹ Both felt that the level of their job responsibilities had not increased subsequent to the fellowship. Of the three fellows who moved elsewhere, two felt that their responsibilities grew in comparison to their prefellowship situation. Four of the five fellows saw themselves as moderately to highly mar-

¹¹One of the two who had originally returned to the institution from which he took leave has since taken a position of greater administrative authority elsewhere. This individual reportedly attributes his success in securing the new job in large part to his fellowship experience.

ketable commodities in the archival employment arena as a result of their experience.

Effectiveness of the program's structure and suggestions for improvement.

Four of the seven project directors found the candidate pool from which they chose their fellows to be inadequate in terms of quantity; three of the seven thought that the quality was also lacking. As a current project director, I echo the concern about the quantity of applicants. For 1987–88 eleven individuals applied; for 1986–87 the number was ten; and in 1985–86, the first year, twenty-eight applied. Project directors suggested four ways NHPRC could improve the situation: (1) increase the stipend, (2) provide money for interviewing expenses, (3) publicize the program more widely, and (4) communicate more thoroughly and broadly the objectives of the program and the program activities of the host institutions. Prior to 1987–88, NHPRC addressed the first two of these recommendations by raising the stipend from \$18,000 to \$25,200 and by supplying \$500 for interviewing purposes. This measure did not raise the number of fellow applicants for that year, as hoped.¹² It might, however, have contributed to eliciting more host institution applications for 1987–88 than the previous year—eleven versus five—though that number did not surpass the fourteen institutions that applied in the first year.

Fellows and project directors were asked to offer advice for prospective hosts and fellows and to NHPRC. The specific comments varied considerably, but one common strain surfaced in all responses: planning and preparation in advance of the fellowship were the keys to a successful experience for both fellows and repositories. Fellows advised their successors to ask careful questions during the interview to determine the institution's motives, the personality and style of the host, and the level of actual administrative activity

scheduled. They suggested to hosts that an element of flexibility be factored into the program, that the technical project be scheduled first to let fellows ease into the new environment, and that hosts be more conscious of the obligation to focus on administration. To NHPRC, fellows urged more vigorous program publicity, a closer examination of the host applicant's motives, closer monitoring of the programs in progress, and the establishment of links between the fellowship and academic training programs.

The hosts suggested to future counterparts that they first select fellows with whom they feel they can work and then nurture a strong working relationship; they also suggested that the goals of the year's program be determined both with specificity and a degree of anticipated flexibility, that the permanent staff be informed of the nature of the program early on, and that the appropriate extent of involvement by the fellow in sensitive internal matters (e.g., budgeting and personnel) be carefully considered. Hosts advised fellows to learn as much as possible about host institutions before deciding to accept an offer, to be prepared to adapt to the practical realities of the repository, and to steer away from internal politics. NHPRC was encouraged to promote the program more, to consider a prefellowship training workshop, and to provide better definitions and guidelines for acceptable administrative training. As one administrator stated, "At this time there is a lack of guidance and, therefore, I'm sure a very wide divergence of experiences among the various host institutions. This may be good in that it allows for flexibility and takes into account local realities. On the other hand, it is a somewhat uncontrolled educational experience."

The program's value for the profession (i.e., is it meeting NHPRC's objective of addressing the profession's need for administrative training?). The fel-

¹²Twenty-four persons applied to be fellows for 1988–89.

lows essentially disagreed with the occasionally expressed criticism that more people could be trained through other means with the same amount of money, arguing that the extended length of the fellowship made it especially valuable and impossible to replicate through other training. Fellows also stressed that the program benefits not just the fellow and host institution, but also the fellow's *subsequent* institution. The hosts also viewed the program as an asset to the profession, but were more inclined than the fellows to acknowledge the possible validity of the above-noted criticism. Some hosts stated that if they had to choose between the fellowship and workshops, they would favor the latter; but they agreed with the fellows that there was no adequate substitute for the in-depth training possible with the fellowship. Both types of approaches, they contended, should be sustained and perhaps expanded.

What, if any, conclusions can be drawn from this small survey? The participants viewed the fellowship as personally worthwhile and at least potentially advantageous to the profession, but all agreed that it could be improved. A particular weakness seems to be the lack of interest and/or awareness on the part of the profession. NHPRC is very concerned about the low number of applicants for both fellow assignments and host opportunities. As previously noted, a

low number of host applicants means that NHPRC cannot be as selective as it would like, a critical issue since the program's success depends heavily on the quality of the institutions and their training agendas. In addition, steps may need to be taken to ensure an administrative focus for the fellowship and to determine boundaries for involvement of fellows in sensitive personnel or budgeting issues. Misunderstandings in these areas between fellow and host could ruin a fellowship experience.

NHPRC has committed funds to and received funding from the Mellon Foundation for the archival administration fellowship program through 1991. The commission also has increased publicity in recent months and is presently considering adjustments, such as de-emphasizing the midcareer element, that might render the program more widely appealing.¹³ As some of the respondents reported, the fellowship has no parallel in the archival profession. Although its existence might never be justified solely by the number of participants, its value for the well-motivated archivists and progressive repositories that are selected will almost certainly remain high. The program's demonstrated potential, albeit on a small scale, as an opportunity for individual career advancement and a stimulus for institutional creativity, merits the profession's broad support.

¹³Examples of heightened publicity are Laurie Baty, "The NHPRC Archival Administration Fellowship Program," *SAA Newsletter*, November 1987, 6-7, and Becky Haglund, "A Foray into Archival Administration," *SAA Newsletter*, November 1987, 7-8.

Appendix A

NHPRC Fellowship Questionnaire (Host Institutions)

1. How would you rate your experience with the fellowship program overall? Please use a 0–10 scale, with 10 representing very high satisfaction and 0 representing extreme dissatisfaction. _____
2. Please rank the following factors in order of their importance (number 1 being the most important, etc.) in contributing to a successful fellowship program. If you strongly feel that two or more are of equal importance, you may indicate this, but please try to prioritize as best you can.
 - _____ Technical project
 - _____ Relationship of fellow and project director
 - _____ Extent of exposure to or experience with multiple activities
 - _____ Responsiveness of host institution to needs of fellow
 - _____ Degree of emphasis on administration/management
3. Why did your institution decide to apply for a grant to host a fellow?
4. Did you find the pool of fellow candidates to be satisfactory in terms of quantity? _____yes _____no; Quality? _____yes _____no
 If you found the pool of candidates insufficient in either quantity or quality, what would you suggest to NHPRC to improve the situation?
5. How closely did the program as actually carried out compare with the submitted grant proposal?
 - _____ Program was carried out almost exactly as planned.
 - _____ Program was somewhat modified as it transpired.
 - _____ Program was substantially altered from original proposal. (If you checked this one, please briefly explain why.)
6. Was the technical project completed? _____yes _____no;
 as planned? _____yes _____no
7. Was the duration of the fellowship appropriate for meeting your institution's objectives? _____yes _____no. If not, was it _____too short or _____too long?
8. What duration of time would you recommend to NHPRC as likely being of most benefit both for the fellow and the host institution?
 - _____ less than 6 months
 - _____ 6–8 months
 - _____ 9–10 months (present duration)
 - _____ 1 year
 - _____ more than 1 year (please specify _____)
9. Approximately what amount of the activity undertaken by or assigned to the fellow would you identify as "administrative?"
 - _____ Less than 25 percent
 - _____ Between 25 percent and 50 percent
 - _____ About 1/2
 - _____ Between 50 percent and 75 percent
 - _____ Greater than 75 percent
 - _____ All
10. Did the fellow's work contribute primarily to _____short-term or _____long-term needs (or _____relatively equally to short- and long-term needs)?
11. How would you measure the fellow's contribution to your overall operation on a scale of 0–10, with 10 denoting extraordinary importance? _____
12. What major point(s) of advice for a successful fellowship endeavor would you offer to prospective host institutions?
 to prospective fellows?
 to NHPRC?
13. The NHPRC/Mellon Fellowship has been criticized occasionally for not being cost effective for the profession; i.e., only a small number of individuals and institutions benefit from an amount of money that could help fund workshops or other training activities designed to reach many more people. Do you agree or disagree with this viewpoint? Please briefly explain your reasons.

Appendix B

NHPRC Fellowship Questionnaire (Fellows)

1. How would you rate your experience with the fellowship program overall? Please use a 0–10 scale, with 10 representing very high satisfaction and 0 representing extreme dissatisfaction. _____
2. Please rank the following factors in order of their importance (number 1 being the most important, etc.) in contributing to a successful fellowship program. If you strongly feel that two or more are of equal importance, you may indicate this, but please try to prioritize as best you can.
 - _____ Technical project
 - _____ Relationship of fellow and project director
 - _____ Extent of exposure to or experience with multiple activities
 - _____ Responsiveness of host institution to needs of fellow
 - _____ Degree of emphasis on administration/management
3. Why did you decide to apply for the opportunity to serve as a fellow?
4. Was the duration of the fellowship appropriate for meeting your goals and needs?
 _____yes _____no. If not, was it _____too short or _____too long?
5. What duration of time would you recommend to NHPRC as likely being of most benefit both for the fellow and the host institution?
 _____less than 6 months
 _____6–8 months
 _____9–10 months (present duration)
 _____1 year
 _____more than 1 year (please specify _____)
6. Approximately what amount of the activity undertaken by or assigned to you would you identify as "administrative?"
 _____Less than 25 percent
 _____Between 25 percent and 50 percent
 _____About 1/2
 _____Between 50 percent and 75 percent
 _____Greater than 75 percent
 _____All
7. How responsive did you feel the host institution was in addressing your needs and interests? Please use a 0–5 scale, with 5 denoting very high responsiveness. _____
8. What, if any, would you identify as the 3 main benefits to you of the fellowship experience?
9. To what extent do you feel your professional development was enhanced?
 _____Strongly enhanced
 _____Somewhat enhanced
 _____Unaffected
 _____Negatively affected
10. After the fellowship, did you return to the institution you had left?
 _____yes _____no
11. Did the level of your job responsibilities increase following the fellowship? (Please answer, regardless if you moved on to a different institution.) _____yes _____no
12. To what extent do/did you feel more employable in the archival profession as a result of the fellowship? Please use a 0–5 scale, with 5 denoting that you feel the experience made you extremely employable and 0 indicating you feel it had no effect on your competitiveness in the job market. _____
13. How would you measure your perceived contribution to the host institution's overall operation on a scale of 0–10, with 10 denoting extraordinary importance? _____
14. What major point(s) of advice for a successful fellowship endeavor would you offer to prospective host institutions?
 to prospective fellows?
 to NHPRC?
15. The NHPRC/Mellon fellowship has been criticized occasionally for not being cost effective for the profession; i.e., only a small number of individuals and institutions benefit from an amount of money that could help fund workshops or other training activities designed to reach many more people. Do you agree or disagree with this viewpoint? Please briefly explain your reasons.