

ADVOCACY  
FOR THE ARCHIVES AND HISTORY OFFICE OF THE SLAC  
NATIONAL ACCELERATOR LABORATORY:  
STAGES AND METHODS

Jean Marie Deken

*Stanford Linear Accelerator Center  
Stanford University  
2575 Sand Hill Road MS66  
Menlo Park CA 94025*

Invited talk presented at  
*Future Proof V*  
6-8 May 2009  
Barcelona, Spain

**Abstract**

Advocating for the good of the SLAC Archives and History Office (AHO) has not been a one-time affair, nor has it been a one-method procedure. This paper covers some of the advocacy efforts undertaken to date, and discusses their various outcomes.

ADVOCACY  
FOR THE ARCHIVES AND HISTORY OFFICE OF THE SLAC  
NATIONAL ACCELERATOR LABORATORY:  
STAGES AND METHODS

## **Introduction**

Advocating for the good of the SLAC Archives and History Office (AHO) has not been a one-time affair, nor has it been a one-method procedure. It has required taking time to ascertain the current and perhaps predict the future climate of the Laboratory, and it has required developing and implementing a portfolio of approaches to the goal of building a stronger archive program by strengthening and appropriately expanding its resources.

Among the successful tools in the AHO advocacy portfolio, the Archives Program Review Committee has been the most visible. The Committee and the role it serves as well as other formal and informal advocacy efforts are the focus of this case study

My remarks today will begin with a brief introduction to advocacy and outreach as I understand them, and with a description of the Archives and History Office's efforts to understand and work within the corporate culture of the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory. I will then share with you some of the tools we have employed to advocate for the Archives and History Office programs and activities; and finally, I will talk about how well – or badly – those tools have served us over the past decade.

## **Advocacy & Outreach Philosophy**

In attempting to secure resources and survival for an archival program, it is critically important to understand and be able to work within the prevailing culture of the larger organization. It is also critically important to persist in your efforts – even in the face of apparent indifference. Persistence should take the form of continuing to use tools that you believe in, and in trying and adapting different tools as circumstances allow.

## **Understand The Organizational Culture -- SLAC**

SLAC is owned by the United States government, and is operated for the US Department of Energy by Stanford University. Although it got its start studying elementary particles, SLAC has developed into a multipurpose laboratory for astrophysics and for photon science, as well as for its original accelerator and particle physics research. Six scientists have been awarded Nobel Prizes for work carried out at SLAC, and the future of the Laboratory promises to be just as extraordinary as its past.<sup>1</sup>

Dubbed "The Stanford Linear Accelerator Center" in August of 1960, the Laboratory was renamed "SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory" (SLAC) in October 2008.

The Laboratory occupies 426 acres of Stanford University property near the intersection of Sand Hill Road and US Interstate 280 in northern California, uphill from and three miles west of the main university campus. In fiscal year 2002, SLAC's budget was \$209 million: it employed a staff of 1,467 (full-time equivalents); and hosted 3,000 users from a variety of institutions, including universities (147), industry (46), government laboratories (30), and foreign countries (162).<sup>2</sup>

In short: it is a highly creative organization, run by two fairly distant entities – one three miles away and one thousands of miles away.

## **Understand The Organizational Culture – Archives and History Office**

The SLAC Archives and History Office began its life in February 1986 as the "SLAC History Project." Impetus for the SLAC History Project can be traced to several converging influences. The 1980's were marked by high interest in the history of particle physics both generally in the United States, and more locally at Stanford University. Early in the decade, the American Institute of Physics (AIP), working on contract with the US Department of Energy (DOE), completed a study of the records management and archives programs at several DOE contract laboratories. A final report and several guides for the selection and preservation of permanent records at physics laboratories resulted from this study.<sup>3</sup> Following the completion of their DOE project, the AIP then initiated a much larger research project, called the "Study of Multi-Institutional Collaborations."

Joan Warnow-Blewett of the American Institute of Physics had been advocating for the establishment of an archival program at SLAC even before the Institute undertook its study of multi-institutional collaborations. Warnow-Blewett corresponded with and encouraged Bill Kirk and Louise Addis, as well as two successive SLAC Directors – W. K. H. Panofsky (Director from 1962-1984) and Burton Richter (1984-1999) – to take steps to preserve SLAC's documentary history. Warnow-Blewett also began encouraging Stanford University Archivist Nilan to take an active interest in the history of SLAC, and to do what she could to support Kirk and Addis in their efforts. Up the hill from the main campus, awareness was growing among SLAC's senior management that the Laboratory was beginning an important transition period as the founding generation reached retirement age. Further motivation for the SLAC History Project was provided in 1982, when Peter Galison, Stanford University professor of philosophy and of physics, began conducting research on problems in the history of physics at Stanford, including the history of physics at SLAC.<sup>4</sup>

SLAC's History Project officially became the "SLAC Archives and History Office" (AHO) in the Fall of 1989, when Nilan began a year's sabbatical from her job on the main campus and came to SLAC to establish the new office to "evaluate, gather and make available" SLAC historical materials.<sup>5</sup> Nilan also continued to work as SLAC's and Stanford's representative on the AIP multi-institutional collaboration study. She was

succeeded as head of the AHO by Robin Chandler, who served as SLAC Archivist from 1990 to 1995.<sup>6</sup> Throughout this period, Nilan, Chandler, Addis and Kirk made significant contributions to the first phase of the AIP's multi-institutional collaborations research by conducting oral histories, collecting data for a sociological census study, and supporting Galison's related work on the history of the discovery of the J/Psi particle at SLAC in 1974.<sup>7</sup> A number of publications produced in this era – including a volume entitled Big Science – focused on the evolution and history of SLAC.<sup>8</sup>

The period of 1993 to 1995 was difficult for the Archives and History Office. When Chandler arrived at SLAC in 1990, it was to accept a full-time professional archivist position in the AHO, which then reported to the SLAC Director's office. At that point the AHO had 1.5 full-time equivalent positions (full-time equivalents, or FTE) at the professional level, and by early 1991 a .5 FTE para-professional position (temporary) had been added. By 1992, however, Chandler's position in the AHO had been reduced to half-time: although still employed full-time, half of her time was re-allocated to a Reference Librarian position in the SLAC Research Library. This staffing reduction was the beginning of a major organizational shift.

In 1993 the AHO was moved down on the Lab's organization chart. No longer reporting to the Director's Office, it was placed in the SLAC Research Division, in a newly formed group called "Technical Information Services" (TIS). The same year that it was moved into TIS, the AHO lost its .5 FTE paraprofessional position; the following year one of the two .5 FTE professional positions was eliminated as well. The deterioration of staffing, support and standing within the organization made the siren call of other available positions irresistible, and Chandler gave notice of her intent to leave SLAC employments in March of 1995.

## **The Chandler Report**

Official reaction to Chandler's was a management request that she prepare a detailed report before her departure, stating her view of the requirements of a first-class archival program at SLAC, and outlining the conditions necessary to attract and retain a professional of her caliber as head of the Archives and History Office. Her subsequent report to management thoroughly documented the history of the archival effort at SLAC to that point in time, and provided a detailed analysis of the requirements for a robust, high-quality archival program at the Laboratory.

The three pages of recommendations Chandler listed in her report included determination of the scale and scope of the archival program at SLAC through long-range planning; establishment of an internal AHO Advisory Committee; clarification of staff reporting lines and evaluation procedures; hiring a full-time professional archivist and an at least half-time permanent assistant archivist; provision of adequate and proper storage for collections with appropriate temperature and humidity controls; sufficient annual budget to support the program; and ongoing institutional support in the form of release time and travel expenses for professional activities on the part of the archivist.

The combined effects of Chandler's departure, her thorough report on the Archives and History Office's present and future needs, the awarding of SLAC's third Nobel Prize in Physics (to Martin Perl, in November, 1995),<sup>9</sup> and the ramping up of SLAC's historic BaBar / B-factory collaboration experiment,<sup>10</sup> galvanized Laboratory management around the issue of the future of the AHO in a way that had not seemed possible only months before. In retrospect, it is difficult to say if more energetic advocacy for the Archives and History Office prior to this confluence of events would have borne fruit so dramatically. However, soon after her departure, Laboratory management took decisive steps to implement Chandler's recommendations regarding staffing, storage facilities, and budget requirements. Two job announcements were posted in the fall of 1995, and in April of 1996 I was hired as the Laboratory's permanent full-time archivist. Later that same year I hired Laura O'Hara to fill the newly-created permanent half-time archives assistant position.

Chandler's comprehensive recommendations regarding storage space requirements were treated as specifications, and they guided the Lab's remodeling work on a dedicated 2400-cubic-foot capacity state-of-the-art archival storage area in an existing building's basement, adjacent to a scanning electron microscope lab. Remodeling work was initiated in 1995, and completed in April of 1996 – I toured the nearly completed construction site when I came to SLAC for my job interview.

### The Leith Innovation

After I had been on board at the Laboratory for several years, and after the Archives and History Office had taken possession of and begun filling the remodeled archives' storage space, the question of what to do about instituting an advisory committee for the AHO was raised. The discussion was initiated by Professor David Leith, then-Director of SLAC's Research Division.

Leith reasoned that, at SLAC, a "Program Review Committee" is "the coin of the realm." The Program Review Committee process is an established feature of SLAC's culture – in fact, it is an integral part of the culture of many scientific disciplines, as well as of government agencies, and of some archival repositories.<sup>11</sup> External review methods, requirements and goals are well known and well respected. Program Review Committees in science are typically composed of experts in relevant disciplines, as well as funding agency representatives, and a sampling of other stakeholders. All proposed new science projects or experiments at SLAC go through extensive review by such committees: the committees meet at regular intervals and their reports and recommendations guide the project's planning, funding, and actions over the long term. Because the AHO, in particular, was a relatively new and definitely novel undertaking at SLAC, Leith's thinking was that the best way for it to establish and maintain its credentials and credibility within the community of the Laboratory, and to place it on a more equal footing with other projects and endeavors, would be to have it go through the same kind of rigorous review and report process that each proposed and ongoing science project regularly undergoes.

Although I was more than a little intimidated at the prospect, I agreed to initiate a Program Review Committee for the AHO, and to schedule the first meeting for April of 1999. Because very few staff really understood the role and functions of an archive, many managers saw the Archives and History Office as “extra help,” available to them to assist on whatever emergency projects arose. Although requests for assistance were sometimes completely appropriate to our mission, there was steady pressure to involve ourselves in tasks that took us away from our archival appraisal, processing and reference duties.

## **Program Review**

By 1999 I had also been at SLAC long enough to know that, in its culture, nothing at the Lab truly “existed” until it had some form of presence on the World Wide Web. This being so, as my first order of business I set about establishing a web page for the AHO Program Review Committee (<http://www.slac.stanford.edu/history/progre.html>). Leith and Pat Kreitz (TIS Director) recruited Professor Richard Blankenbecler, a SLAC theoretical physicist and former Chair of the SLAC Theory Department, to be the AHO Program Review Committee Chair. Blankenbecler, a veteran of many science Program Reviews and a thoroughly unflappable, deep-thinking individual, set me to work writing the charge for the Committee:

The SLAC Archives and History Office Program Review Committee is a standing committee charged with advising SLAC management on the goals, policies, and activities of the SLAC Archives and History program. While the Committee's emphasis may change over time, its initial effort will include the following areas:

- Review the current archives and history program and assess how well it is fulfilling its mission and meeting Department Of Energy requirements.
- Evaluate SLAC's near-term (1-2 year) archival needs and recommend needed changes.
- Evaluate SLAC's longer-term (8-10 year) needs and strategy.
- Review and comment on the Office's mission, goals, policies, and activities.
- Prepare a report on these points and any other subject which may arise during the Committee's deliberations.<sup>12</sup>

I posted the Charge on the Committee web page, and then began recruiting candidates for the Committee. Being a complete novice at this process, I was surprised to learn from Blankenbecler that it was his intention to give me a great deal of autonomy in the selection of the committee members and in the shaping of the Committee's agenda. With his advice and encouragement, I established a goal to have the Committee membership drawn from the Archives and History Office's major internal and external constituencies, with a few members who were subject matter experts on science and

government archives. At my recommendation, letters of invitation were sent out by the Director of Research (Leith) to the six individuals I had previously recruited: two SLAC staff (one from the Business Services Division, and one from an Experimental Group); an external science archivist; a historian of science; an archivist from another Department Of Energy laboratory; and the current Stanford University Archivist.

Committee members agreed to three-year terms, except for the Experimental physicist, who could only commit to one year, but whose input we were eager to have, since he was then spokesperson for the largest then-running experiment at SLAC, the BaBar collaboration<sup>13</sup>. The initial plan included annually scheduled meetings, with a promise that, once the review process had been well established, the period between meetings would be lengthened. The Committee would hear presentations on the AHO program, and prepare a report for Leith, the Director of Research.

The first meeting, held April 23-24, 1999, lasted one and a half days. I structured it to follow a schedule typical of most of the Laboratory's review committees' meetings: it was taken up with presentations on review procedures; an overview of the Archives and History Office's operations to date; benchmarking with archives operations in other laboratories; and ideas on future directions for the AHO. The day also included a guided tour of the AHO facility, a presentation by the Lab Records Manager on the activities of her office, and a report from a committee member on the conclusions of the recently completed American Institute of Physics Study of the Records of High Energy Physics. The following morning the committee first met with staff to ask questions and clarify points that had been made the previous day; they then went into executive session to formulate and discuss their recommendations.

This pattern was repeated for the next 3 reviews (in 2000, 2002, and 2004) with some minor variations. Based on suggestions made by committee members, after the first meeting I created a statistical summary handout for them – and thereafter eliminated the statistical recitation portion of my first-day overview presentation. Because I view the meetings as a valuable opportunity to educate committee members on important aspects of archiving, I have incorporated one or two briefings by internal and external archival partners at every meeting. To date these have included the SLAC Records Manager, SLAC Communications Task Force Co-Chairs, SLAC's Lead Web Wizard Paul Kunz, a representative of the American Institute of Physics Center for the History of Physics, the Pacific Region Administrator for the National Archives and Records Administration, and the Archivist for CERN—The European Organization for Nuclear Research – a counterpart laboratory.

Between the second and third meetings of the Review Committee, as I was approaching prospective candidates for about-to-be-vacated positions, it occurred to me that there are certain stakeholders that should always have a representative on the AHO review committee. These include the Stanford University Archives, the AIP Center for the History of Physics, and the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). All three organizations are patrons of, overseers of, and to some extent partners in AHO activities.

Because it is a Department Of Energy contract laboratory, records created by SLAC belong to the government, and are handled, as a matter of best practice, in conformance with DOE and NARA records regulations. In addition, many SLAC scientists are Stanford University faculty, so their papers are a mix of University and government records, and the AHO coordinates handling of such records with the Stanford University Archives. The American Institute of Physics Center for the History of Physics' stated mission is

... to preserve and make known the historical record of modern physics and allied sciences. Through documentation, archival collections and educational initiatives, the Center ensures that the heritage of modern physics is safeguarded and its story accurately told.<sup>14</sup>

As recounted earlier in this chapter, the American Institute of Physics Center for the History of Physics staff was directly instrumental in the creation of SLAC's Archives and History Office. More generally, AIP provides ongoing support to physics archives throughout the world through their archival processing grant program, their International Catalog of Sources for the History of Physics and Allied Sciences (ICOS), and their online exhibits and other programs.

For these reasons, I asked the currently serving representatives of the three organizations if they—or their designees—would be willing to serve on the Committee on an ongoing basis. To my great delight, all three organizations agreed to provide *Ex Officio* members to the committee.

The SLAC Archives and History Office Program Review Committee's activities and reports have been consistently complimentary, encouraging, and useful. They have been a key instrument in promoting the AHO's priorities and goals, and have provided clear guidance on achieving them. They have amply fulfilled the goal stated in the 1999 report:

This annual review process can offer the opportunity to refine the program and to establish a clear sense of priorities which the SLAC management and the archive staff can share...<sup>15</sup>

The reports have been extremely helpful in protecting the archives' resources for use on archival work and archival priorities. Both in the beginning, and on an ongoing basis, as successive generations of managers have cycled through the laboratory, there has been a recurring lack of clarity about the proper role of the archives and the best use of its resources. The laboratory has traditionally run very lean on support staff and because of this, program and support staff from other areas of the laboratory are

constantly looking to supplement their own meager resources by offloading assignments and duties to other units in the organization.

Before we had the published Program Review reports, the Archives and History Office had many demands made on our time and efforts that had little to do with our mission. To some extent this was the result of genuine confusion and inexperience on the part of other units in the laboratory, which had only a vague notion of what an “archives” is and what it does. It was also, in part, the result of opportunistic maneuvering. Having the Program Review Committee’s reports published and available on the web has greatly assisted in clearing up confusion about our true mission and priorities and in deflecting efforts to co-opt the time of AHO staff.

The review process has also provided an opportunity for the AHO to advocate to the SLAC faculty and staff. By educating the faculty and staff representatives on the review Committee, we are creating advocates / ambassadors for our program to the rest of SLAC. I actively use the review process in this way, and I encourage the archivist members of the committee (from Stanford and from other science laboratories) to join me in taking every opportunity to open and deepen discussions with the scientist and management members of the committee about archival issues and needs in general, and the AHO’s needs in particular.

For example, at my instigation the review committee archivists have discussed with other committee members the vital importance of allocating resources to process the Archives and History Office’s backlog, emphasizing how lack of knowledge of our own holdings is hampering the writing and dissemination of the history of the laboratory, and limiting our efforts to celebrate and publicize the lab’s achievements. Also, with my encouragement, they have lobbied the other committee members to support strong emphasis by the Archives and History Office on the collection and preservation of SLAC’s historical record; that this priority must take precedence over publicity and research activities best handled by and assigned to the SLAC Office of Communications. These discussions have resulted, over time, in the transformation of several onsite committee members and their colleagues into archives “cheerleaders” and “scouts.” In their cheerleader capacity, they speak up on our behalf at budget and program planning meetings. In the scout capacity, they alert the AHO staff when records of possible archival interest appear to be in danger of estrangement or loss.

Reports from the Program Review Committee have added weight and meaning to the AHO’s resources requests: they legitimize our goals and place our projects on equal footing with other activities at the Lab when funding decisions are being made. In an era of tight budgets, the stabilization of the AHO’s funding has been a major accomplishment, wrought in part by the advocacy provided by its Program Review Committee.

### **Other Advocacy Tools – Projects**

Committee member insights and input have helped shape the activities of the Archives and History Office in ways that have improved its services to its constituencies, and conserved and expanded its resources. Conversations with the American Institute of Physics representative on the review committee begun at the formal meetings and continued offline have led to three successful AHO funding proposals for archival processing projects in the past 13 years. Encouragement by the Committee to continue to emphasize efforts to archive the electronic records of SLAC's scientific collaborations led the AHO to seek participation in the National Archives and Records Administration-National Science Foundation-funded Persistent Archives Testbed (PAT) project (2003-2006) to test new technological approaches to the persistent archiving of historically important electronic records.<sup>16</sup> These externally funded projects have advanced the goals of the AHO, assisted us in completing priority projects, and enhanced our credibility and standing with SLAC decision makers and resource allocators.

Besides the Program Review Committee, the SLAC Archives and History Office has other tools for lobbying resource allocators and decision makers, and we make full use of them. These advocacy efforts have been primarily directed outside of Technical Information Services, at the SLAC community as a whole, and at SLAC laboratory upper management.

For example, I use the budgeting process to lobby for projects that will advance awareness and preservation of SLAC history. When I make my budget request each year, I typically propose 1-3 short-term projects of finite duration and limited funding that will advance the preservation and usefulness of the SLAC archival record. Some years such projects have been initially proposed and endorsed by the AHO Program Review Committee, at other times they are based on ideas generated by the AHO staff.

Types of projects that we have proposed have included: preservation microfilming of early SLAC technical publications (funded); an online exhibit, "First Web Site in U.S.," on SLAC's web site (suggested by a Review Committee member and funded by SLAC); collaborative Stanford-SLAC photograph scanning project; online SLAC Anniversary history exhibit; First and Second SLAC Directors' papers processing projects (both funded—with outside grants and with SLAC funds); backlog processing project (funded with outside grant and with SLAC funds—multiple years); electronic records archiving research (funded—with outside grant and SLAC funds).

I find that these short-term project proposals are a way of getting my objectives "onto the radar" of the resource allocators at SLAC, and of getting them thinking about the types of projects that the Archives and History Office can and should accomplish. Also, because of the persistence of these proposals year after year, members of top management at SLAC have begun to approach me with their own archival and historical project proposals. In 2002, the Director's committee on the SLAC 40<sup>th</sup> Anniversary approached me about preparing a photo history of SLAC for publication, and in 2006 our first Director asked me to co-author his autobiographical memoir, which was published by Springer in 2007.<sup>17</sup>

I have also found that sometimes an amount of money that looks very large to me – which represents a substantial increase in the Archives and History Office budget and which could make a considerable difference to the program – is seen as a not very large sum at all to the top management of the laboratory. Even in years of funding cuts, I still make my proposals, and I have seen some of my most valued projects funded in otherwise very lean budget years. For example, the “First Web” processing and online exhibit project, a photo digitizing project, and a backlog processing project, have all been funded in otherwise tight budget years.

Additionally, the success of our completed projects is a very valuable lobbying tool in gaining funding of new projects. Our experience has shown that the key to success is to propose something limited and do-able, and when funding is obtained, to deliver the final project result as promised – on time and within budget.

### **Advocacy Tools – External Funding**

We are in an interesting situation organizationally. As previously mentioned, we are a very small unit of a Stanford University contract laboratory. The contract is with the US Department of Energy, so we are federally funded, and conform with Department of Energy and NARA rules and regulations as they relate to records. Our ability to do external fund-raising is limited both by our status as a federal contractor, and by the Archives and History Office’s small size in relation to the other much larger Stanford University units who are also seeking external funding. Within these constraints, we have successfully applied for and received external funding for the processing of two of our collections of Director’s papers, for research into the archiving of electronic records, and for processing of our legacy backlog of archival collections. (See Figure 1 for details.)

I have written all of our external funding proposals to date, with the advice and assistance of knowledgeable Program Review Committee members. The Archives and History Office’s external funding proposals are formally reviewed by the SLAC Business Services Division and by the University’s Office of Sponsored Projects, who ensure that we have followed laboratory and university protocols, but who play no role in identifying or approaching possible sources of funding for us.

### **Advocacy Tools – Internal Advocacy**

A major focus of our internal advocacy efforts has been to cultivate a very good relationship with our laboratory Office of Communications and its predecessor, the Public Affairs Office. These efforts have included writing historical articles for them on a regular basis, providing timely and enthusiastic reference service to them, and reaching out to them to encourage the submission to the Archives and History Office of SLAC-produced communications materials. We also produce occasional articles for the high-energy physics journal, *symmetry* and its companion blog, *symmetry breaking*.<sup>18</sup>

Other advocacy efforts to our SLAC constituency begin with new employees: we have a brochure about the Archives and History Office that is included in new employees' orientation packets, and we make a presentation about SLAC's history (and get in a plug for the AHO!) at the regular monthly new employees' orientation training. Also at that training session, I make a point of taking the opportunity to acquaint new staff with our online glossary, "SLACSpeak."<sup>19</sup> Maintained by the AHO, SLACSpeak is open to the world, and is a heavily used resource (2000 hits/month average). We encourage all staff to alert us when, in the course of their work, they encounter an acronym or term that is not included in the glossary. Most new terms are added within one work day.

We have also had pencils made that are printed with the statement "SLAC Makes History Every Day" along with the URL for the AHO website. These are given out at the new employee orientation, and I also bundle up a few in a gold ribbon and send / give them to staff who have done the AHO an exceptionally good turn, usually when an individual has uncovered/discovered important records and turned them over to us.

Other advocacy / outreach efforts that we sustain include:

- Inviting selected recent retirees to become Archives and History Office Departmental Associates, so that they can continue to maintain computer privileges at SLAC, in exchange for assisting us with processing collections from their area of expertise. To date we have two departmental associates, a long-time computing services staff member who is assisting us in archiving our early web site records, and an engineer who is an expert on our seismic safety records.
- Conducting archival exit interviews with long-time staff to encourage them to turn over records to the Archives and History Office. These interviews often cause quite a stir within the exiting staff member's department, as the interest of the AHO is seen as a compliment to the individual. We sometimes find that the event of the interview stimulates others in the department to think about their own historical legacy, to seek out further contact with the AHO, and to remember us when they encounter records stashed in filing cabinets, desk drawers, in closets, and on hard-drives or other electronic storage media.
- Putting frequently requested materials / information on our web site. We have found that providing "self-service" access to frequently requested materials and information through our web site (<http://www.slac.stanford.edu/history>) has had the effect of reducing the resources we need for reference service while simultaneously raising the profile of the AHO (both within the laboratory community, and in the world at large) and providing the much-sought-after materials to our various publics on a 24-hour, 7-day-a-week basis.
  - In a section that we have called "Short Features" ("Frequently Asked Questions" or FAQs on historical topics) we have provided succinct online

encyclopedia-type illustrated essays on prominent staff, significant science activities and equipment, and on historically important laboratory events. We regularly analyze our reference requests for recurring topics that are suitable candidates for new “Short Features” items.

- As mentioned previously, at the suggestion of a Program Review Committee member and with SLAC Research Division funding, in 2001 we prepared and mounted an online exhibit about the SLAC web site, first in the U.S. and first outside of Europe. This exhibit, still online in 2009, averages 1200 hits per month, and keeps the SLAC AHO “brand” in active circulation on the web<sup>20</sup>. It was recently the sole source used by the SLAC Office of Communications to prepare an article marking the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the World-Wide Web.<sup>21</sup>
- Probably the most popular and most heavily used of our online resources have been the thumbnails of our most requested photographs. These were added to our PhotoIndex web interface as part of a project proposed by the AHO and funded by the SLAC Research Division. Prior to this project, the PhotoIndex database provided information about images held by the AHO, but there was no online access to electronic versions of any of the images. After completing a multi-year project to update and improve the database, and with encouragement from the Program Review Committee, we proposed a “Top Pix” project. The goal of Top Pix was to identify our 200 most requested images, to scan them, and to provide thumbnails of the images on the PhotoIndex database. The thumbnails can be clicked on to access larger, but still low-resolution versions of the Top Pix images. As we had hoped, this project led to a dramatic decrease in demands on Archives and History Office staff-time for assistance with image retrieval, while simultaneously increasing use of the AHO image collections.

## **Advocacy Tools -- External Advocacy**

Archives and History Office staff professional activities outside of the Laboratory have proven to be a subtle but highly effective form of advocacy for the AHO program. In the contest of a Laboratory culture highly attuned to benchmarking itself with its counterparts worldwide, the fact that archives’ professional staff are active, respected and recognized contributors to their profession has enhanced the internal reputation and status of the program.

Our attendance at and participation in professional organization meetings such as the Academy of Certified Archivists (ACA), the Society of American Archivists (SAA), the Society of California Archivists (SCA), and the Cooperation on the Archives of Science in Europe (CASE) meetings has enabled us to stay informed on the latest developments in archival practice, and on new and revived funding opportunities for archives. It has also enabled us to share information with colleagues on activities of mutual interest. In particular, at the meetings of the Science, Technology and Healthcare

Roundtable and the Electronic Records section of the SAA, and at the biennial meetings of CASE, I have been able to connect and network with colleagues who share my day-to-day challenges and whose outlook and activities closely mirror my own. These meetings have provided opportunities to raise the profile of SLAC's archival program with in the profession, to gather valuable benchmarking data on our progress relative to other comparable archives, and to brainstorm solutions to common challenges.

Archives' staff personal contacts made through professional activities have not only led to improved data gathering, they have also allowed us to widen the community of individuals we can call on to participate in our Program Reviews, whether as committee members or as one-time presenters. The sum internal effect of our professional activities has been, we hope, to firmly establish in Laboratory management's eyes a professional context for the SLAC Archives and History Office program, and to place its activities well within the boundaries of accepted, and even exemplary practice. Our standing as Certified Archivists, and as contributing members of our professional organizations advocate for us within the Laboratory for its continued support of its professionally recognized program and staff.

## **Advocacy Outcomes**

### Funding And Resources

The successes of our advocacy efforts to date can be measured by the yardsticks of funding and resources; by Archives and History Office-favorable policies that have been adopted by the lab; and by the relative strength of our relationships and influence.

Some tangible progress has been made toward the goal of building a stronger archive program by strengthening and appropriately expanding its resources. The Archives and History Office's permanent staff has been increased by .5 FTE since the most recent Program Review committee meeting, and our storage capacity, in an era of general footprint downsizing onsite, has been increased by 12%.

Encouragingly, even though there were major Department of Energy and SLAC funding cutbacks and layoffs in fiscal year 2008, the Archives and History Office staffing was not reduced. In fact, we successfully made a case for the addition of a two-year temporary Archives Assistant position to work on processing of the legacy backlog. I attribute this surprising development directly to the Program Review process and to the Committee's 2007 meeting. A study of the AHO backlog was recommended by the Review Committee in 2004, and at the next meeting in 2007, we reported on the results of our completed study. At its closeout session, the Review Committee made recommendations for further action based on our study results,<sup>22</sup> among which was the immediate undertaking of a project to significantly reduce the long-term backlog in anticipation of SLAC's 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary in 2012. Even though the 2007 Review Report has not yet been completed, SLAC management found this recommendation sufficiently compelling to immediately fund the project.

Project funding in the SLAC Archives and History Office has fluctuated from 1998 to 2009, but the general trend has been upward. At its highest level to date, in 2002, the AHO expended \$58K on projects, some of which was funding allocated to the SLAC 40<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Committee and spent by the AHO on the anniversary photo book research and production. Excluding both outside grant funding and the anomalous 2002 expenditure, the average amount per year allocated to Archives and History Office projects has been approximately \$19K.

### Favorable Policies

Archives-favorable policies that have been adopted over the past decade indicate a growing institutional recognition of the importance of the services and activities of the Archives and History Office. These have included, as detailed above, the allocation of funding for archives projects when funding has been available.

They have also included the integration of the Archives and History Office into the Human Resources Department's employee on-boarding and separation procedures. After many years of campaigning to be included in employee orientation sessions, we now regularly present a training module on SLAC history to new employees as part of the one-day orientation workshop. Similarly, we have been added to the list of offices that receive prior notification of all pending employee separations and retirements. This allows the Archives and History Office ample time to remind the separating employee of his or her responsibility to retire records to the archives, and to arrange for an archival exit interview, if warranted by the individual's history with and service to the Lab. In addition to providing us important access to new and departing employees, these changes signal a welcome recognition on the part of Human Resources staff of the importance to SLAC of its archival program.

Progress has been made another area as well. Based on one of the recommendations of the 1995 Chandler report, SLAC has adopted a policy of funding travel by the two professional archivists on staff to one or two archival meetings each year, so long as use of travel funds for a given year has not been restricted by the Department of Energy. SLAC has also begun routinely paying a limited number of professional society membership dues for the two professional archivists on staff.

### Relationships and Influence

In the past few years the Laboratory has gone through what sometimes feels like a "perfect storm" of changes. On top of the normal and expected rate of change in personnel, facilities and operations, SLAC has: undergone a major transition from a single-purpose to a multi-purpose laboratory; experienced an almost 100 percent turn over of its highest-level managers; inaugurated several new shared on-site institutes with Stanford University affiliates; experienced the largest staff reduction in its history due to 2008 Federal budget cutbacks; undergone two major lab-wide reorganizations (with more

promised in the near future); mourned the passing of its charismatic and ubiquitous first Director, W. K. H. “Pief” Panofsky; and – in a surprisingly divisive and complicated process – had its name changed (from the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center to SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory)!

The flurry of major changes has impacted all of the Lab’s operations, including the Archives and History Office. The new activities and new high-level staff at SLAC present a distinctly novel set of challenges to the Archives and History Office. To some of the newly established units and individuals, the Archives and History Office’s record of past success may initially seem irrelevant, and for this reason we continue the work of developing methods of reaching out to representatives of the new programs in order to raise their awareness of the AHO’s value to them, and to educate them on the proper care and preservation of the records they are creating now – and which will form SLAC’s future archival collections.

The loss of daily contact with the “founding generation” of the Laboratory, due to deaths, retirements, and layoffs, has been a difficult change for the Archives and History Office staff. We have had to let go of our status as protégés of long-time directors and managers who had inside information on all of the important developments in the Lab’s history – because they had been active participants at the time – and who were often eager to take time to share their knowledge, stories and insights.

On the plus side, one benefit of the recent changes is that our over ten-years’ tenure at the Lab means that the SLAC archivists now find ourselves in the position of having more experience with and knowledge of SLAC’s history than any of the present Directors (and even some of the group managers). This fact – along with our track record of successfully completed projects, and our information-filled web site – has bolstered the AHO’s status in the reconstituted organization, has increased our value as partners, and has afforded us the new role of mentors to less knowledgeable staff.

## **Conclusion: Lessons Learned**

There is a normal waxing and waning of the relative influence of an organization’s archives as the interest of management in its own history ebbs and flows. At present the new management of SLAC is fully occupied with successfully transitioning its new staff, new institutes and new departments to successfully functioning operations. The challenge for SLAC’s Archives and History Office is to adapt to the changing Laboratory context even as it maintains its long-established services and activities.

As we acclimatize to our altered organization, the body of work generated by the Archives and History Office’s Program Review Committee provides ongoing, solid evidence of the continuing the importance of our efforts. Committee reports and recommendations are readily available to the Laboratory’s new management, and have

already positively influenced fiscal decisions on both preserving existing staffing levels and funding the backlog-reduction project.

In all of our advocacy work, including the Program Reviews, it has been essential for us to recognize and understand the overarching culture and practices of the laboratory, and to find ways to fit ourselves into that framework in order to advance the goals of the Archives and History Office. In the past, the Program Review Committee itself has been a prime example of such a successful adaptation to the larger laboratory culture. However, because new management often avails itself of new tools and procedures, it may very well be that time of usefulness of the Archives and History Office Program Review process has passed, and that other advocacy efforts should be emphasized in its stead.

As we adapt to our changed environment, the Archives and History Office is making a strong effort to align itself with the newly expanded SLAC Office of Communications, working with their writers and photographers to raise awareness of archival and records issues arising from or impacting their work. This has already resulted in increased coverage of the AHO in the SLAC employee newsletter, and in better communication between our two offices about work planning and priorities. It has also resulted in a new project to ensure that digital photographs created by Communications staff are transferred to the archives in a timely and appropriate manner.

While keeping our eyes on the changing laboratory climate, and on the priorities of the Archives and History Office, we plan to utilize every existing advocacy tool in our repertoire, and to develop new tools as inspiration and opportunities arise. As we look forward, it is helpful to remind ourselves that simply maintaining the existence of the Archives and History Office in such a fluid organizational environment has been no small achievement, and that it has been accomplished through our successful efforts to nurture a network of internal and external supporters brought to the archives as a result of the valued services we provide, and through the variety of new and long-standing advocacy efforts we employ.

---

### Acknowledgements:

Work supported by Department of Energy contract DE-AC02-76SF00515. I would like to thank Larry Hackman, as well as Louise Addis, Pennington Ahlstrand, Richard Blankenbecler, Robin Chandler, JoAnne Hewett, Laura O'Hara, Roxanne Nilan, James Reed, and Kathy Restaino for their comments on and contributions both to this manuscript, and to the SLAC Archives and History Office advocacy efforts.

I also wish to thank Peter Harper (National Cataloging Unit of the Archives of Contemporary Science), Xavier Roqué and Jordi Sequero (Universitat Autònoma de

Barcelona) for organizing Future Proof V, the conference at which this version of the paper is being presented.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY:**

Addis, Louise and William Kirk. "The SLAC History Program." AIP Center for the History of Physics *Newsletter*. Volume XIX, No. 2, December 1987.

The Birth of particle physics: Lectures and round table discussions. Edited by Laurie M. Brown, Lillian Hoddeson. (International Symposium on the History of Particle Physics, Batavia, Ill., May 28-31, 1980). New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Bridges, William. Managing Transitions: Making the Most of Change. Cambridge, Perseus Books, 2003 (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition).

Chandler, Robin. "Future of the Archival Program at SLAC." [Unpublished report] March 1995.

Chandler, Robin. "SLAC and The History of The J/psi Discovery." SLAC, *The Interaction Point*, April 1991.

Galison, Peter and Bruce Hevly (editors). BIG SCIENCE: the growth of large - scale research. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992.

Hackman, Larry J. "With a Little Help from my Friends": External Advisory and Oversight Bodies in the Development of Archives. *Archivaria*, *Archivaria* 39, Spring 1995, p. 184-195.

Neal, R.B., General Editor. The Stanford Two-Mile Accelerator. New York: W. A. Benjamin, 1968.

O'Hara, Laura. "Analysis of the costs of a backlog project in response to recommendation 2 of the 2004 Archives and History Office Program Review Committee report." (SLAC TN-07-030, December 2007) at <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/cgi-wrap/getdoc/slac-tn-07-030.pdf>

Pions to quarks: Particle physics in the 1950s: Based on a Fermilab symposium. Edited by Laurie M. Brown, Max Dresden, Lillian Hoddeson, May West. (International Symposium on Particle Physics in the 1950s, Batavia, Ill., May 1-4, 1985). New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

The Rise of the standard model: Particle physics in the 1960s and 1970s: Proceedings. Edited by Lillian Hoddeson, Laurie Brown, Michael Riordan, and Max Dresden. (International Symposium on the History of Particle Physics: The Rise of the Standard

Model, 3rd, Stanford, Calif., 24-27 Jun 1992). New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Warnow, Joan et al. A Study of Preservation of Documents at Department of Energy Laboratories. New York: American Institute of Physics, 1982.

Wolff, Jane. Files Maintenance and Records Disposition: A Handbook for Secretaries at Department of Energy Contract Laboratories. (DOE Report No. C00-5075.A000-16) New York: American Institute of Physics, 1982, Revised 1985.

## REFERENCES:

<sup>1</sup> 1976: Burton Richter (shared with Sam C.C. Ting) for the discovery of the J/Psi particle. 1990: Jerome Friedman, Henry Kendall and Richard Taylor "for their pioneering work in the discovery of a heavy elementary particle of a new kind." 1995: Martin Perl (shared with Frederick Reines) for discovery of the Tau Lepton. 2006: Roger Kornberg for his studies of the molecular basis of eukaryotic transcription" (determining how DNA's genetic blueprint is read and used to direct the process of protein manufacture). A significant portion of his research was carried out at the Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Laboratory (SSRL).

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/slac/media-info/glance.html> (3 April 2003).

<sup>3</sup> Guidelines for Records Appraisal... (1982); Warnow, et al. (1982); Wolff (1985).

<sup>4</sup> Meanwhile, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory (Fermilab) in Illinois was sponsoring a series of international symposia on the history of particle physics. The first two, *The Birth of Particle Physics* (1980) and *Pions to Quarks* (1985), had been held at Fermilab; the third was co-sponsored by SLAC and Fermilab, and held at SLAC on June 24-27, 1992. Participants in the third symposium, *The Rise of the Standard Model: Particle physics in the 1960's and 1970's* included five SLAC staff members.

<sup>5</sup> R. Nilan, undated essay, 02-026, box 1; Chandler (1995); Stanford Historical Society *Sandstone & Tile*, Summer 1990 p. 12.

<sup>6</sup> Roxanne Nilan was with the AHO from 1989–1991 (full-time 1989-1990). Robin Chandler was on the AHO staff from 1990-1995 (full-time, 1990-1993).

<sup>7</sup> Chandler (1995) and (1991).

<sup>8</sup> Galison and Hevly (1992)

<sup>9</sup> 11 October 1995 The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences has decided to award the 1995 Nobel Prize in Physics for pioneering experimental contributions to lepton physics with one half to Martin L. Perl, Stanford University, Stanford, California, USA for the discovery of the tau lepton and with one half to Frederick Reines, University of California, Irvine, California, USA for the detection of the neutrino. Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences Press release.

([http://nobelprize.org/nobel\\_prizes/physics/laureates/1995/press.html](http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/physics/laureates/1995/press.html)). Previous Nobel Prizes in Physics were won by Burton Richter (1976) and by Jerome E. Friedman, Henry Kendall, and Richard Taylor (1990).

<sup>10</sup> The SLAC B-Factory, with its BaBar detector, studies the violation of charge and parity (CP) symmetry in the decays of B mesons, looking for an answer to the question, "What has happened to anti-matter?" (Experiment home page: <http://www-public.slac.stanford.edu/babar/Default.htm>) Results from BaBar and a parallel experiment, Belle, at the Japanese high-energy physics lab KEK led to the awarding of the 2008 Nobel Prize in Physics to Makoto Kobayashi, Toshihide Maskawa, and Yoichiro Nambu.

<sup>11</sup> Hackman (1995).

<sup>12</sup> From the AHO Program Review web page, 1999: <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/history/progrev.shtml>

<sup>13</sup> See note 17.

<sup>14</sup> American Institute of Physics, Center for The History of Physics web site, <http://www.aip.org/history/> (March 13, 2009).

---

<sup>15</sup> Archives and History Office Program Review Committee 1999 Report

<http://www.slac.stanford.edu/history/progrev/progrevreport1999.pdf>

<sup>16</sup> See the AHO PAT project page, at <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/history/era.shtml>.

<sup>17</sup> Panofsky, Wolfgang K. H. Panofsky on Physics, Politics and Peace: Pief Remembers. W. K. H. Panofsky (Author), Jean Marie Deken (Contributing Editor). New York: Springer, 2007.

<sup>18</sup> For example: [Voices: Milestones vs. History --Looking Forward, Looking Back: An Archivist's Perspective](#). symmetry: dimensions of particle physics, Volume 3, Issue 5, June/July 2006, p. 8-9.

<sup>19</sup> <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/history/slacspeak/index.shtml>

<sup>20</sup> SLAC Archives and History Office Special Collection: First U.S. Web Site: Documentation of the Early Web at SLAC. <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/history/earlyweb/index.htm>

<sup>21</sup> Tuttle, Kelen. "Happy Birthday, Dear Web" SLAC Today, March 13, 2009 (<http://today.slac.stanford.edu/a/2009/03-13.htm>)

<sup>22</sup> O'Hara, Laura. (2007). Note: AHO Program Review Committee 2007 Report has not yet been published.