

The Society of American Archivists and Graduate Education: Meeting at the Crossroads

Richard J. Cox

Abstract

The author argues that something unanticipated has occurred, graduate archival education has expanded and matured and graduate educators have assumed leadership in the continued development of this aspect of the profession. These developments create new tensions about where graduate education is heading and the role of professional associations such as the Society of American Archivists. The author considers options for how educators ought to work on nurturing graduate archival education, believing that no matter what options are selected, the future of graduate archival education rests primarily with what graduate educators deem it to be.

No one ever thought the North American archival profession might come to this crossroads. After six decades during which various committees of the Society of American Archivists led deliberations concerning the education of archivists, we are now in the interesting (intriguing might be the better word) position where individual graduate-level educators are leading or trying to lead the discussions. This is more radical than such a statement at first suggests.

Graduate archival educators have not been in such a position of leadership for very long. In the mid-1980s, I was asked to lead the subcommittee of the SAA's Committee on Archival Education and Professional Development that was drafting of new graduate education guidelines because I was *not* then an educator and "would be impartial."¹ Today, I doubt a non-educator would be

¹ I described my experiences with this task in "The Masters of Archival Studies and American Education Standards: An Argument for the Continued Development of Graduate Archival Education in the United States," *Archivaria* 36 (Autumn 1993): 221–31.

asked to lead a substantial revision of graduate education guidelines without at least a fuss being made, although given the Society's predilection for involving *all* segments of the profession in *every* activity, it probably would still happen. Educators expect to be leading discussions concerning graduate education. They might defer when it comes to continuing education, but even in this area—because of the logical connection between continuing education and graduate education—the graduate educators need to be involved more than they have been.²

Your reactions to all this might be different depending on whether you are a working archivist or an educator of future archivists (still, in my opinion, a *working* archivist). Archival practitioners may see this development as troublesome. How will they be assured that what prospective archivists are learning in the classroom will be relevant to the skills, knowledge, and attitudes needed on the job? Archival educators may be equally concerned that the students they are teaching will be unhappy with the positions, responsibilities, and salaries they are obtaining. How do educators teach their students to be as knowledgeable as possible *and* responsive to the situations faced by archivists and archival problems in the real world? Such questions seem endemic to professions like ours, even when the vast majority of educators bring extensive experience to the classroom. Debates like this have gone on since the days of Melvil Dewey in American librarianship, as well as in nursing, law, and other professions. It is precisely why commentators on higher education often single out professional education as a special problem or challenge to be dealt with within the university.³

Undoubtedly those individuals considering becoming archivists and seeking out information about where to obtain the best education and training are confused. If they find the Society of American Archivists *Education Directory*,⁴ they will find information on “programs” that consist of anything from one or two courses to full-fledged master's degrees, schools with only adjunct faculty, those with clusters of specialized faculty, and schools in both public history and library and information science.⁵ What if the interested individual happens to pick up an education directory from the Association of Records Managers and

² We have still not completely resolved the issues generated by a relationship between graduate and continuing education. I considered this a bit in my “Continuing Education and Special Collections Professionals: The Need for Rethinking,” *Rare Books & Manuscripts Librarianship* 10, no. 2 (1995): 78–96.

³ A good introduction to the tensions and stresses in professional education in the university is Derek Bok, *Higher Learning* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986), chapter three.

⁴ The current directory is readily available at the Society of American Archivists website: <<http://www.archivists.org>>.

⁵ Even within one disciplinary area, such as library and information science education, there is a vast array of potential confusion about the extent of course offerings, faculty teaching in the archives area, and related matters. A study on this topic is currently underway as part of the KALIPER (Kellogg-ALISE Information Professions and Education Reform) project; Richard J. Cox, Elizabeth Yakel, Jeannette Bastian, Jennifer Marshall, and David Wallace, “Archival Education in North American Library and Information Science Schools: A Status Report.” Forthcoming in *Library Quarterly* (April 2001).

Administrators?⁶ He or she will find very different information. What if this same individual believes the current Society's graduate guidelines and goes looking for a MAS degree program in the United States? At the moment, this would be a fruitless *and* frustrating search, as there is only one school with such a degree and it is in the process of being established.⁷ Worse, what if this person just asks around? Responses could cover an unbelievable and bewildering range.⁸

Clearly, we have reached this situation in graduate archival education because of some amazing changes in this area in North America. When I entered the field in the early 1970s, one's option for becoming an archivist was limited to patching together graduate degrees in history and library science, multi-week training institutes, one or two courses, and some sort of fieldwork or practicum. My own efforts as an educator have been directed toward ensuring that others would not have to go through such a confusing apprenticeship to enter the field. Now there are programs offering either dedicated master's degrees or specializations of over eight graduate courses in schools where there are two or three regular tenure-track faculty focused on archives and records. Now we even see programs turning out doctoral graduates who have written dissertations on archival topics.⁹ At my own school, there will be four dissertations on archival topics in just a few years—more than we would likely have seen from *all* the schools in some previous decades.

So, what is the crossroads we have reached? It is quite simple to understand, while complex to resolve. The Society of American Archivists, since its inception over sixty years ago, has been predicated on serving *all* archivists equally well; the many regional, state, and local archival organizations have often thought of themselves as even more democratic—seeing the SAA as an elitist association. Anyone who declares that he or she is an archivist, no matter what education they may have or not have, is to be equally treated and regarded. To hold to another viewpoint is to run the risk of being declared an

⁶ ARMA does not provide an on-line version of its education directory, although it does provide educational information at its website, <<http://www.arma.org/learning/welcome.htm>>.

⁷ The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee School of Library and Information Science announced shortly after the Pittsburgh education conference that it had had approved a MAS degree and posted an advertisement for a new faculty position to direct this program.

⁸ The remarkable range of possibilities of how one might be educated or trained to become an archivist is evident in the long qualifications descriptions often posted as part of job advertisements. At present, the prospective employer has to hedge his or her bets about what kind of education one might have, including absolutely no formal education to prepare a person to be an archivist. See Richard J. Cox, "Employing Records Professionals in the Information Age: A Research Study," *Information Management Journal*, 34 (January 2000): 18–33. This article examines advertisements for entry-level archives positions from 1976 through 1997.

⁹ Since the pre-conference in August 1999 I have worked on trying to compile a list of current North American doctoral students who are planning to write dissertations on archival topics and who have some interest in careers as educators of archivists. As of this revision, I have identified nearly thirty such students studying in North America, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands.

elitist, which is akin to being branded un-American. Graduate education, in its reformation of the past decade, has been directed to attract the best students to give them the best education in order to place them in the best jobs—hardly the egalitarian mission the Society has been based on. Not all schools are at this place, of course, but those who are working on more stringent requirements and more comprehensive curriculum clearly must be at odds with the historic mission of the Society and with many others in the field (after all, the regional associations are even more egalitarian). Their financial costs, entrance requirements, emphasis on theory and methodology, and often more aggressive visions for what archivists should do mean that not all archivists are created equal (different knowledge levels and different orientations ensure this). It also implies that not all can or should be archivists. I am, it appears, an elitist. By what they do, however, I think all graduate educators could also be labeled in the same fashion (whether they like it or not).

Where does this leave graduate education and the Society of American Archivists? Should graduate education stay within the Society? Should graduate educators form their own association? Should archival educators form an alliance with another association focused on the education of similar professionals, such as the Association for Library and Information Science Education (ALISE)? Ten years ago I suggested aligning with another organization, and the reception I received was immediate and clear—NO! Today, the idea may not seem so ludicrous. What are the pros and cons of educators staying subsumed completely within the Society? What are the arguments for taking the other side of the road, moving to form a very different vision for educating records professionals? Is there the need for a separate association? Or, is there the need for informal clusters of schools and educators with similar philosophies and objectives?

The reasons for staying within the Society of American Archivists may seem obvious. The SAA is the main national association dedicated to the education of archivists. It has also become more proactive in the 1990s, perceiving a stronger advocacy role for the protection of archives. The SAA is also the richest in professional and other resources of all the professional archival associations. The Society has had six decades to establish itself, and in the past three it has managed to develop a broad program in continuing education and supported a committee on professional education and training issuing and revising guidelines. It has taken on the role of the voice of the profession, especially as the voice of the National Archives seems to have grown weaker.¹⁰ Why would anyone want to pursue an educational agenda for archivists apart from the Society of American Archivists?

¹⁰ The U.S. National Archives continues to cling to an in-service training program that does not recognize graduate archival education. This half-century-old in-service program was established before the *advent* of graduate education programs. So, we face a dilemma. While the leading professional association advocates a separate master's degree, the leading archival program works at a much lower level.

Yet, re-examine each of these reasons. Yes, SAA is the main national association, but it is not the *only* national association. What about the role of the Association of Records Managers and Administrators (ARMA)? Given the complexity of modern records, we must focus on the education of *records* professionals and this includes the kind of records life cycle or continuum that ties together archives and records management (as well as other disciplines). Yes, the Society has become a stronger advocate, but this is a *relative* improvement. It has not taken on a broader public role, and the Society certainly has not taken a firm stance on using its graduate education guidelines as a means of implementing change in the nature of these educational programs.¹¹ Yes, SAA has more resources than other professional archival associations, but these resources are still very limited. Besides, there are other *records* associations with much greater resources, such as ARMA. And, the issue is whether any of these associations use their resources in an effective manner to advance the education of their members. Yes, the Society has been working for three decades in establishing educational guidelines, supporting workshops, and producing materials that can be used for educational purposes. But these efforts have not always been well-coordinated. Its workshops have often worked at cross-purposes to graduate education. The SAA's preoccupation with publishing basic manuals has both portrayed archival work at its lowest level and contributed to a "dumbing down" of the substance of graduate education because these manuals usually try to reduce *all* archival tasks to only very practical processes.¹²

This gets us to what the point of graduate archival education is as we begin a new century. We have seen many different phases in the development of North American graduate archival education. In the 1930s and 1940s, there were early efforts to define a new kind of educational program. Then, over the next few decades, there was the parallel development of graduate courses in library schools and history departments. More recently, we have seen the expansion into specific degrees or, at the least, concentrated clusters of courses supported by multiple faculty members. In this most recent phase, we have seen the divergence of philosophies in these graduate programs (as is evident in the SAA's *Education Directory*). Some are focused on educating individuals to be knowledgeable about records and recordkeeping systems and technologies, preparing students for careers across a broad array of organizations and fields. Other programs focus on the cultural dimensions of archives and historical

¹¹ The Society issued its guidelines in 1994, but it never promoted their use in any way. It was left up to individuals, including educators, to figure out how to use these guidelines.

¹² The "dumbing down" has occurred because some graduate courses only require the reading of these basic manuals. Given the richness of debate about some archival functions, such as appraisal, as well as the availability of other disciplines' materials, relying on these manuals in this fashion seems to be the worst possible use of them. The core of archival work is neither frozen to a few timeless methods nor immune from change as recordkeeping systems evolve.

records, with an emphasis on these records as source materials for the historian and other researchers. Still other schools stress very traditional archival skills, orienting their classroom and students to practical experience. Matters for future meetings or collaborations of archival educators should be how such efforts can knit together these diverse educational philosophies, whether there should be any work to unify educators, and whether educators can profitably labor on such matters under the aegis of a professional organization such as the Society of American Archivists or the Association for Library and Information Science Education. Perhaps we should just let nature take its course, allowing educators to connect with their natural or closest professional associations. Perhaps we should not debate such matters at all.

The nature of archival education has been the subject of a long debate *within* the profession. That is part of the problem. Archives, with a focus on the nature of records and recordkeeping, the technologies supporting all this, and the dual managerial and cultural purposes of archives for evidence and information, is an interdisciplinary field. This is very different from other fields. Carl Schorske argues just that.

History can only exist in a symbiotic relationship with other disciplines. By virtue of its untheoretical, associative character, it depends on them for its analytic concepts. Nor does history have a particular subject matter of its own. Virtually the only stable center of the historian's armamentarium is the simple calendar that determines what came before something, what came after.¹³

While some might argue the same for archival science or archival studies, I would argue against this—but that is not the point of this essay. The issue is that the basis of this knowledge or theory is an interdisciplinary one regardless of whether there is a core unifying knowledge or not, and that this suggests a range of possibilities for the alliance of the theorists in the field—the educators. The debate about the relationship between archival theory and education ought to cut *across* many disciplines. Archival educators could be associated with history, public history, library and information science, public administration, business, or law.

How we proceed is, as well, fraught with perils or, in a more benign way of thinking, potholes. Educators have tended to be a conservative lot. Earlier educational guidelines were often drafted to reflect what was already going on, rather than to point to where archival education needed to be headed.¹⁴ The current educational guidelines, effective for five years, do point down the road toward separate degree programs—but there has been little response as of yet

¹³ Carl E. Schorske, *Thinking with History: Explorations in the Passage to Modernism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 16.

¹⁴ This was the subject of Fredric Miller's 1983 Society of American Archivists presentation on education, published posthumously in this issue of the *American Archivist*.

from any United States program.¹⁵ This may be the result of the fact that these are *guidelines*, not *standards*—that is, voluntary not buttressed by any accreditation or other regulating body. This may also be the product of working within the Society of American Archivists. On the one hand, the Society issues stronger graduate guidelines, while on the other hand it feeds off of offering basic, rudimentary workshops that are clearly substitutes for graduate education. In the Society, there is either complacency about such things or a marvelous ability to allow a thousand flowers to bloom—depending on one's outlook about such things.

There are other factors or obstacles in nurturing archival education. There is little feedback from the employers of archivists about what such graduate programs should be teaching. Then, of course, there is the question of which employers we should seek input from for the content and structure of our education. Should we listen to the small, local historical society which is interested in having someone work with its traditional manuscript collections? Or, should we work with the Fortune 500 corporation needing someone to work as a part of a team in designing a complex electronic records system? Obviously, the advice will be very different from such vastly different sources. The Society of American Archivists wants to listen to both and respond in positive ways. The graduate educator will only scratch his or her head in disbelief at the prospect of constructing a coherent program that could do both. As graduate educators, we might consider ways of reaching individuals other than our graduate students, but such efforts may just as likely be aimed at recruiting them into the graduate program. We cannot accomplish the same thing in a workshop as we do in a graduate course. We also cannot come close in a series of workshops to what someone will be exposed to as part of a coherent cluster of graduate courses. Workshops and graduate courses have very different purposes.

It is, of course, not just a matter of blindly or mindlessly responding to the cacophony of voices from the field. Educators have usually not been willing to band together in ways that would pull up their own educational programs. Think about what happened in the first graduate archival educators' meeting in San Diego in 1996. A few educators who had been discussing some issues of mutual concern put together an invitation-only conference. The invitation-only aspect created immense ill will, even though it was directed at full-time archival educators and schools that had made a strong commitment to the education of archivists and other records professionals. Conspiracy theories circulated. Charges of elitism were made. Angry accusations followed. What began as an effort to push along graduate education caused a temporary derailment in the movement to strengthen graduate archival education.

¹⁵ In addition to the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee School of Library and Information Science MAS initiative mentioned earlier, the University of Pittsburgh School of Information Sciences now has a taskforce working on a proposal for the creation of such a degree.

There are various interpretations that could be made about what occurred in San Diego, but the only one worth considering here is that this controversial meeting was a natural outgrowth of a still relatively young aspect of our field. The youthfulness of graduate archival education is evident in other ways. Many educators believe that they can rely solely on a two-hour meeting of the Archival Educators Roundtable at the annual SAA meeting for the exchange of information and other business to help nurture the improvement of graduate education. Another indication is that educators, such as they are, continue to be in short-supply and there is only now beginning to be any real preparation of future educators in doctoral programs.¹⁶ The long-cherished idea that the future of research rests on the establishment of graduate programs and the employment of regular faculty members seems to be more myth than objective; few faculty are contributing research and few have programs engaging their students in research activities.¹⁷ Even more indicative of our youthfulness is the fact that we have done so little research about our own educational programs. Setting out a task as seemingly straightforward as doing a survey of our graduates reveals that many of us have not been keeping good records of our graduates (as the essay by Elizabeth Yakel in this issue confirms). Perhaps, we have not taken *ourselves* seriously.

There are always hopeful signs. I mentioned one of the most positive developments earlier: The creation of multiple-faculty programs reinvigorates any graduate archival education program. Prior to the arrival of the second faculty member, the educator spends considerable time not only in developing a reasonable curriculum, but also in constantly explaining how and why archives fits into the parent school's or department's curriculum. With the arrival of a partner, attention obviously shifts to developing a stronger curriculum, team-teaching, and joint advising—all to the benefit of the students. Other possibilities emerge as well. There is time for joint grant writing, collaborative research and writing, sharing of reading lists, and a more focused effort on influencing other courses to reflect archives and records sensibilities.¹⁸ There is no need to stop at "two-faculty" programs. Distance education offers the possibility of enriching curriculum and teaching, and there have been a few experiments in this. Even simpler is the banding together by educators from different schools

¹⁶ My effort cited earlier to create a roster of current doctoral students does lead me to feel somewhat better about the future of education than I did when I originally prepared my paper for the Education conference. However, I remain concerned about how many of these current students will actually choose education careers in our field.

¹⁷ The difficulties the organizers of the Education pre-conference had in soliciting research papers from doctoral students suggests that this is a real problem, and it should make us ponder what such students are being asked to do in their programs.

¹⁸ This is based on my experience over the past two academic years at the University of Pittsburgh after Elizabeth Yakel joined the faculty. It has been an invigorating experience. One wonders what it would be like to have three, four, or more faculty gathered in one department.

for informal discussions, which also possesses strong potential for strengthening graduate education.

It is appropriate to discuss one continuing effort at such informal discussions. Over the past two academic years the archives faculty of the Universities of Michigan, Pittsburgh, and Toronto have met every four months to share ideas, determine how the schools can work together, and to provide critical analysis and feedback in certain crucial activities related to their programs. What brought these three schools together was the expansion of their faculty to include two at each school, and the possession of some common critical key ideas about where graduate archival education needed to be heading. It was no fluke that this happened. A doctoral graduate from the University of Pittsburgh joined the University of Michigan. A doctoral graduate from the University of Michigan joined the University of Pittsburgh. And a doctoral graduate from the University of Pittsburgh joined the University of Toronto. They brought similar research interests and outlooks, although an analysis of the six faculty members reveals a wide array of other interests as well. Moreover, in the past year, they invited the faculty of the University of Manitoba to join their informal discussions so that they could have the perspective of those teaching within a graduate history program. Even more recently, the University of Maryland archives faculty, with the benefit of their joint degree in history and library and information science, have joined in these discussions. Now these faculty members are working on special issues of journals, a book on recordkeeping and accountability, mutual grant proposals, and conferences. The Pittsburgh conference emerged from these discussions and the faculty worked as an informal program committee in order to develop it. It is interesting to speculate, of course, as to what would have happened had this group not emerged. Would another group have organized this conference? Would SAA have stepped in to take the necessary leadership in order for this conference to materialize?

Some may think that I am being overly argumentative in my comments, but I believe it is necessary to be so in order for us to advance the cause of graduate archival education. No one else will do this for us. And the issues we face are, I believe, very critical. This is not the best time to be growing new degrees in higher education, yet there are many schools (especially in the library and information sciences) recruiting faculty to teach about archives and records management. How we define the core purposes of graduate education will influence who gets hired to teach and how extensive the educational programs will be. While many in the public sector do not understand the inner workings of archives or the profession supporting their work, records nevertheless are in the news on a regular basis. It is a good time for us to be advocating stronger standards for educating records professionals.

There are other models for educating and training archivists and records managers. Supporters of the certification of archivists, while ostensibly acknowledging graduate education, define it at a level that harks back to where gradu-

ate archival education was two or three decades ago.¹⁹ Documentary editors, with stronger political support, provide a completely different vision for the education of historical records custodians, one challenging the progress made by the archives community for educating its own. Again, we must rise to the occasion and make clear the requirements for anyone intending to work as an archivist.²⁰ New and more complex recordkeeping technology also presses us by introducing a larger group of competitors for managing records. Many organizations, policymakers, and even records professionals look to technical solutions to most, if not all, records issues. As educators, we know the need for educating individuals both to understand records and recordkeeping systems as well as the technologies supporting these systems.²¹

All of this suggests the need for us not just to be vigilant but to build a clear road ahead for where we want graduate education to be going. This is not an easy task. Laying out this path requires not only knowing where we want to go but some hard work in clearing trees, removing underbrush, and contending with sometimes difficult terrain. I believe that fundamentally important to accomplishing this is the need for archival educators to determine how and when we should work together. Here are the options for how we can proceed:

- **Return to business as usual.** We can continue to rely, as we have in the past, on the Society of American Archivists to provide the necessary forum for us. Educators can meet annually at its roundtable. Educators can participate in the work of the Committee on Education and Professional Development. Educators can allow the Society of American Archivists' Council to set the agenda for graduate education.
- **Lobby SAA for a different venue.** Another possibility for educators to work within the Society of American Archivists is to advocate for a different role and different kinds of structures. Perhaps the current Committee on Education and Professional Development needs to be supplemented by another committee composed solely of graduate educators for facilitating the more efficient development of standards and guidelines. Perhaps this new committee should replace the current educators' roundtable, a body severely limited in its ability to do more

¹⁹ At the conference, this was the only point of serious debate in the concluding session. It was suggested from the floor that archival certification has played a pivotal role in the recent development of graduate archival education. Personally, I see no evidence of this at all, although I admit I have made dramatic shifts in my views about archival certification, having moved from being a supporter to being a detractor. I describe my reasons for this change in my "Certification and Its Implications for the American Archival Profession: Changing Views, 1989 and 1996." Available at: <<http://www2.sis.pitt.edu/~rcox/pp1.htm>>.

²⁰ I have also written a position paper on this, "Messrs. Washington, Jefferson, and Gates: Quarrelling About the Preservation of the Documentary Heritage of the United States," *First Monday* 2 (August 1997). Available at <http://www.firstmonday.dk/issues/issue2_8/index.html>.

²¹ See the entire issue of the *American Archivist* 56 (Summer 1993), a special report on education and technology from the Committee on Automated Records and Techniques.

than provide a very minimal level of communication. Perhaps this new committee could become responsible for holding an annual SAA pre-conference meeting on graduate education issues.

- **Align with another professional association.** Graduate archival educators could build an alliance with another professional association. The range of options is considerable. Educators could move to an association with a stronger focus on education, such as the Association for Library and Information Science Education. Educators could work on strengthening the alliances between those who educate archivists and those who educate records managers by seeking a partnership with the Association of Records Managers and Administrators. Educators could strive to focus on records technology matters by building an alliance with the American Society for Information Science. Educators could move on all these and other fronts.
- **Establish an independent professional association.** North American archival educators could also establish an independent professional association. This independent group, which could be organized either formally or informally, could then rotate meetings among relevant professional association conferences, from those of public history to records management to regional and Canadian associations to library and information science. While current numbers of educators are small, probably no more than fifty in North America, an association could be sustained at least for the purposes of annual meetings, issuance of professional standards and guidelines, and communication networks using the Internet/World Wide Web.
- **Create informal working clusters.** Another approach is to follow the lead of the Universities of Manitoba, Maryland, Michigan, Pittsburgh, and Toronto and create informal working groups that band together because of common philosophies and objectives or in order to share resources or to work on specific projects. Clusters could form along the lines of separate master's degrees, multiple faculty programs, parent school affiliations, or small programs supported by adjuncts. Clusters could also form to work on developing distance education offerings, Web-based teaching resources, research projects, and standards and guidelines. Annual conferences could be held to enable these different clusters to report on their work.
- **Hold annual conferences.** At the least, it seems that graduate archival educators ought to meet regularly in order to work on common concerns, collaborate and share research, provide a forum for doctoral students preparing for academic teaching positions, and enable a more intensive and effective consideration of matters relating to graduate archival education. There are two issues that must be resolved for this to

happen. First, we must decide whether this annual meeting will be held in conjunction with the annual conference of the Society of American Archivists. Second, we must determine who will take responsibility for its planning and implementation.

- **Plan and hold special, focused, multi-day meetings on educational issues other than graduate education.** There are many issues of importance to education and training beyond graduate archival education. Yet, there has not been a major conference on any aspect of archival education and training since the 1987 Savannah conference and the 1991 meetings of the Committee on Automated Records and Techniques. Given the rapid development of graduate education and the development of other standards such as those for continuing education, regularly holding these kinds of meetings (such as the SAA-sponsored meeting at Savannah in 1987 and the meeting sponsored by the National Forum on Archival Continuing Education (NFACE) in April 2000) is long overdue. It is also important to have a meeting whereby all the major professional associations with a stake or interest in the education and training of archivists can play a role.

As should be obvious from this essay, I believe that the future of graduate archival education rests primarily with what graduate educators deem it to be. Surely, this future will be affected by the administrators of higher education who must approve our degrees, certificates, and specializations; by the individuals and institutions hiring our graduates; and by professional associations such as the Society of American Archivists. Yet, our faculty colleagues, deans, provosts, presidents, and chancellors must respond to *our* (the educators') requests and proposals. Employers must respond to what we are doing, either by hiring or not hiring our graduates. And the Society of American Archivists can learn to follow the lead of a new, dynamic band of graduate educators.²² The choice is ours.

²² Luciana Duranti suggested some of this in her "A Personal Vision for the Society of American Archivists," published as an insert in *Archival Outlook* (November/December 1998).