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ABSTRACT

First started in 1959, the Seminar for Historical Administration now has graduated more than 450 individuals, most of whom hold leadership positions in the historical agencies throughout the United States and Canada. Sensing a paucity of well trained staff in America's historical agencies and sites, the Seminar's originators intended their program as a recruitment tool. Their audience was the young graduate student and their promise was that they would introduce this person to the "rapidly expanding field of historical agency administration." As enticement, stipends were offered. A peripheral objective of the Seminar was that it would act as an in-service training opportunity for several people each year who were already actively employed in the field.

Over the years, however, the Seminar's objectives have been completely inverted. Since the program's founding, the number of historical agencies in America has grown from 1,500 to 6,000 and, concurrently, scores of museum studies programs have been developed to help meet the needs of this field. Today we are in the midst of what many call a "no-growth" period for historical agencies. Over the years the Seminar has shifted its objectives from those that have attempted to affect change to those that simply now adjust to change. Presently the Seminar is primarily for in-service personnel and there are no longer stipends. In fact, for many young professionals today, it's difficult for them to imagine a day when people were recruited into this field.

This thesis will demonstrate that the Seminar's original objectives have been met. Furthermore, it will illustrate how a study of this program's evolution can contribute to a broader understanding of the development of the historical agency field during these past twenty-five years.
THE SEMINAR FOR HISTORICAL ADMINISTRATION:

A COMPANION TO CHANGE
INTRODUCTION

A recent issue of History News, the journal of the American Association for State and Local History (AASLH), carried the following announcements:

"The Winedale Seminar on Administration and Interpretation for Museums . . . Seminar participants meet with expert faculty . . . Scholarships for tuition, room, and board are provided . . .

and,

"The Center for Museum Studies at John F. Kennedy University announces its schedule of 1984 seminars for museum professionals."

and,

"March 5 is the deadline for submitting applications for AASLH's seminar on 'Collections Care and Conservation . . . ''

These opportunities appeared among many others listed on a page entitled, "History Update." As any History News reader knows, opportunities for professional development are numerous. In fact, today more than fifty short courses are offered regularly for individuals actively employed in historical agency administration. In addition, college and university programs for future historical administrators have developed logarithmically during these past 25 years.

Seminars and short courses, by their nature, prepare people for the future. But in our haste to grow professionally, we have neglected to cast a backward glance over this fascinating landscape
of change which is the emergence of the historical agency field. This is ironic because as curators of our past we should be more compelled to do such studies. Recently, a number of attempts to review the growth of the historical agency "profession" have been attempted. The most comprehensive studies have been done by Edward Alexander, past Director of the Museum Studies Program at the University of Delaware, and a primary figure in this thesis.3

Many similar analyses are sure to follow, as each year is marked with a proliferation of articles and conference sessions, publications, and grant applications which address some aspect of this history of historical agency work. This paper is a modest contribution to that growing corpus of scholarship. It is an analysis of a particular aspect of historical agency development. It studies a professional training opportunity that has been available for 26 years: The Seminar for Historical Administration (S.H.A.).

What is the S.H.A.? It is the country's preeminent short course for historical administrators. Since its beginning in 1959, it has been offered in Williamsburg, Virginia and traditionally has been administered by representatives of the National Trust for Historical Preservation (Trust), the American Association of Museums (AAM), the AASLH, and the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation (CW). Each summer for four weeks, 18 young professionals (1-3 years experience) attend the program, which is overseen by a resident coordinator and taught by no fewer than 25 faculty holding positions of leadership in various historical agencies, universities, and businesses throughout the United States. Today it has more than 450 alumni, a large number of whom hold
key positions in historical agencies in the United States and Canada. 
Presently, the National Museum Act (NMA) funds the Seminar. There is 
no tuition or registration fee. Students stay in housing provided by 
the College of William and Mary, and classes convene in a building in 
Colonial Williamsburg's historic area.

Most classes are taught using a lecture-discussion format. 
The low student-faculty ratio has always been conducive for 
discussions. Throughout the month, various study trips to other sites 
in the Tidewater Virginia area are planned. In addition, the 
participants usually have worked on various assigned projects which 
have been designed to help synthesize much of the information 
transmitted during the formal program. Once a student completes the 
S.H.A., he has had an exposure to "the special nature of historical 
agencies" as well as to the skills required to plan, manage, and 
evaluate the programs of such organizations.

We will investigate the evolution of this program in much the 
same way that a dendrochronologist might study the growth of a tree. That is, while the annual rings of a 200 year old oak tell him of the organism's response to the changing environment, so too will we learn similar lessons from our study of the Seminar's annual growth patterns. We will find that, although the S.H.A. has been offered for 26 years, today's participants have little in common with their early alumni counterparts. We will find that, although the original objectives of the Seminar have been met, newer objectives have been superimposed to accommodate larger changes in the field.

Why study S.H.A.? There are two key reasons to study S.H.A.:
duration and sensitivity. The Seminar has accompanied the field's growth for more than a quarter of a century. For such a new field, this makes the Seminar a relic of sorts. Secondly, a short course which intends to prepare people for history agency work necessarily remains sensitive to the changing needs of the field. Thus, this program serves a barometric purpose as we attempt to understand the larger climates of professional change.

Traditionally, the Seminar's curriculum has been divided into four parts: background, administration, research, and interpretation. The Seminar's founder, Dr. Alexander, reflects on these traditional components:

"Background lectures: were devoted to the history of informal education, preservation projects and the National Trust for Historic Preservation, history museums and the American Association of Museums, historical agencies and the American Association for State and Local History, and historical parks in the National Park Service."

Administration topics have included membership and trustee relations, the director and staff relations, finance, fundraising, and federal assistance, the role of libraries and archival institutions and public relations and special events.

Research has dealt with studies in state and local history and archaeology and architecture, conservation and preservation of materials, and curators and collections.

Interpretation has included exhibits and installations, visitor orientation and guide service, junior programs and publications and audiovisual projects6."

The above recollections appeared in Museum News in 1968, when the Seminar was entering its 10th year. Much has changed since that
issue appeared, but the four categories still remain the program's "quadrivium." This study will examine the changing curriculum over time.

As we analyze the Seminar, in fact, we will be concerned with four indicators of growth: the brochures which announce the program; the students; the curriculum; and the faculty. Each object of our observation yields particularly revealing clues about the program's evolution. In order to chart this growth six annual core samplings will be taken and data from each will be compared: 1959, 1962, 1969, 1975, 1976, and 1983. We have chosen 1959, of course, because it was the program's initial year. Nineteen sixty-two, 1969, 1976, and 1983 have been chosen because they are at seven-year intervals. Finally, we study 1975 because it is a pivotal year in the program's development and will serve as a vivid contrast to the subsequent year.

In the beginning there were three objectives for the S.H.A.:

1. To recruit promising young graduate students into the historical agency field as potential historical administrators.

2. To convey an understanding of the purposes and activities of historical agencies to promising young graduate students who, even though they may choose to remain in academic work, will appreciate the worth of historical agencies, use agency resources to improve their teaching and research, and direct potential historical administrators towards this new profession.

and,

3. To provide in-service orientation for a small number of promising young administrators who have already entered the field.

These objectives had served the Seminar well for many years, but - as we shall now see - in the mid-seventies, the "profession" had
grown to such an extent that it was time to redefine the purposes of this program.
In Medias Res: 1975

The most crucial moment in the history of the course was in 1975 in Washington at Trust headquarters. In attendance were the Seminar's founder, Edward P. Alexander, the current Seminar coordinator, Lawrence Henry, who was employed by the state of Delaware, William Murtagh of the National Park Service, James Short of CW, Russell Keune, Richard Haupt, and Phillip Spiess, all of the Trust. The meeting was held at Trust headquarters. For a seminar that had already graduated many now gainfully (and historically) employed students, the topics on the agenda were surprisingly ominous ones. Among them:

A. Should the Seminar continue?
B. What should be the current purpose of the Seminar?
C. What should be the format of the Seminar? 8

Most of the men who surrounded the conference table that day had grown with the program for the past 15 years. William Murtagh was the program's first resident coordinator. Henry, Kuene, Haupt, and Short all had contributed a great deal of time and effort to its coordination, also. Yet, 1975 simply had not been a successful year. The field had changed since the above-stated objectives had been written. And, in effect, the Seminar was suffering partially from the results of its own success. The "new profession" that Dr. Alexander had been striving to develop with the training program had grown to such an extent that the need for recruitment was diminishing, while the need for more in-service training was increasing. While once the
Seminar was the only opportunity for recruitment training, it was now among a growing galaxy of programs developed for new and experienced museum workers. Nevertheless, by this seventeenth session (1975) the Seminar had an impressive record. There were now 298 graduates. Of them, 162 (54.4%) were working in historical agencies; 72 (24.4%) were teaching; 44 (14.7%) were in graduate school; 10 (3.4%) were housewives; 8 (2.6%) had assumed other occupations; and, 2 (.07%) were deceased.

Russell Kuene, an alumnus, opened this meeting which was called to assess the "past and future directions of the Seminar in light of changes and new developments in the field." Dr. Alexander then commented on the evolution of the Seminar. He stated that, in his view, the Seminar had been "successful, but the field had changed and perhaps the program should be restructured." "Two to three years ago," he said "there were few university courses leading to an M.A. or Ph.D. degree in museum studies, and today there are several." Others added that recent Seminar graduates were representing a "broader spectrum of historical agency work" than the traditional preservation agencies and historic house museums. Furthermore, William Murtagh added that not as many historic houses were opening now as in the past.

Dr. Alexander then spoke about the evolution of co-sponsorship. He stated that in 1959 CW and the Trust started the Seminar: each contributing $5,000 per year. In 1960 the AASLH became a co-sponsor. And, in 1962 the AAM joined the co-sponsors. In 1969 the first grant was given by the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and the co-sponsors contributed $2,500 each. An appeal was made
to the NEH to pay for an increase in the number of students during the height of the baby-boom years. Accordingly, the Seminar was increased from 18 to 24 students. When the AAM could not pay any longer (approximately 3 years later) the Seminar was restructured for 18 students.\textsuperscript{11}

Mr. Haupt added that 50-60\% of the applicants were now already employed in museum work and that therefore not as many announcements should continue to be distributed among colleges and universitites. Recruitment needs were becoming a thing of the past. Although there were more "gateways" into the field now, they were all beginning to close slowly.

Dr. Alexander recalled that during his first years in the program the Seminar was composed of 12 graduate students and 6 in-service administrators. However, three years ago (1972) there was a change in policy, and half of the participants were taken from the field. Consequently, it was decided that "both types of people should continue to be involved in the Seminar, but that the ratio of young professionals to graduate students should be higher."\textsuperscript{12}

In addition, Mr. Short of Williamsburg suggested that the Seminar "be restructured to stress the administrative aspects of historical agencies." He suggested more sessions in "budget preparation and control, personnel policy, administration, conservation and curatorship, legislation, and governmental interaction, and educational program administration." Everyone agreed that administrative aspects should be stressed because although there was a proliferation of new training programs, not many of them were stressing
the more concrete aspects of administering sites and agencies. It was concluded that "the Seminar should concentrate on historical agency administration, rather than upon an overview of the entire field which had characterized it in the past."  

When the meeting adjourned, what was once called the "Seminar for Historical Administrators" was now more professionally and administratively entitled, the "Seminar for Historical Administration." What was once a six week recruitment tool was now a four week in-service training opportunity. What once provided students with an overview of the field, now delved more into the "art and mystery" of the administration of historical agencies. Along with its formerly expressed aspirations for recruiting new talent, went the seminar's fellowships for students. A new breed of participant was arriving at the gate, one who had already experienced the challenges of administration and one who now wanted a practical forum for discussion apart from the workplace.  

Although the Washington meeting was the most eventful one in the history of the program, like all changes these were neither sudden nor unexpected. The pressures had been mounting. Each year's in-service participants were becoming more vocal about their "professional" thoughts. For example, the following complaints were delivered to James Short, one of the coordinators of the 1975 program. They were signed by ten of the 24 participants:
"Dear Mr. Short,

We the following members of this year's historical administrators seminar feel compelled to direct to you... this statement on the needs and concerns of the historical agency profession:

-That a sense of professional belonging or identity is lacking for those who work in historical museum... That we sense a search for collegiality within the field.

-That unless a "sense of profession" takes greater root, trade unionism will become an increasingly common facet of historical agency life.

-That both AAM and AASLH have a history of being heavily weighted in favor of a select group of individuals... That there seems to be little self analysis of the profession's 'raison d'être'.

It is important to note that the word "profession" is mentioned often during this short memorandum. This letter is but one of many indications that students were concerned with developing a more sophisticated sense of professionalism. We will discuss this briefly later on in the paper.

Such changes in the Seminar's constituency and tuition, coupled with an increasing professional awareness, cause us to conclude that today's Seminar graduates are quite different from their earlier counterparts. So, there are really two seminars under study here: There is the proactive period (beginning to 1975) and the reactive period (1976 - present). The first period attempted to develop a profession; the latter strove to adjust to the environment it helped to create.

We will now investigate chronologically the Seminar's evolution through an analysis of core samplings. Specifically, we will
analyze the changing Seminar announcements, student body, curriculum, and faculty. The exercise is similar to viewing the Brooklyn Bridge today. Now dwarfed by a landscape that it helped to create, the bridge (we try hard to imagine) once stood alone, towering over the Manhattan scene. To see the bridge as it was, we need to look at photographs taken in 1883. To view the Seminar in its original light, let's now reconstruct its beginnings in the late 1950s.
Peopling A Profession, The First Phase:

The idea came from Williamsburg. Dr. Edward P. Alexander was then Vice President, Director of Interpretation, when he began thinking about a way to meet the growing need for trained professionals at preservation agencies and historic sites throughout the United States and Canada. To start, he wrote an impressive proposal entitled, "Training Interpreters of America's Heritage" in January of 1957.

Carlisle Humelsine, then Secretary of the Foundation (and Alexander's superior) wrote to President Kenneth Chorley:

"The more I have thought about this seminar, the more I think it is something we should support, which we should insist on getting off to a good start, but in which we should not plan to be involved on a long term basis."

Though favoring the thought, he did not believe that it fit into the mission statement of Colonial Williamsburg.

"Training Interpreters of America's Past" was written at a time when Williamsburg had completed virtually all of the physical restoration it would do. And now that it was completed, Chorley thought (as early as the late 40s), that it was time for foundation management to begin developing interpretive programs. Obviously the interpretive momentum at Williamsburg was now carrying over into Dr. Alexander's wishes to change historical interpretation everywhere. His proposal outlined the need for America's historic sites to have trained professionals directing them:

"With the recent tremendous growth of interest in America's past and the corresponding increase in the number of facilities devoted to interpreting that past, there has developed
a critical shortage of adequately trained personnel in the field of historical interpretation.

"At the same time, there exist no formal programs for training the personnel to staff these enterprises. If historical museums, restorations, or other facilities are to retain their integrity, they must rest on a solid foundation of authenticity which in turn must be the product of trained scholarship. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance to the future of the whole promising field that some plans be made to assure an adequate supply of personnel equipped with both sound scholarly training and an understanding of the problems, techniques, and potentialities of presenting history through other media than the book and the lecture.

"Colonial Williamsburg would provide a superb setting for offering such a training course. Possessed of an unsurpassed range of facilities and a multi-dimensional program and staffed by outstanding experts, it is in a unique position to make a large contribution toward the training of 'interpreters of America's heritage.'

Therefore, Alexander proposed that the Trust, the AASLH and CW take the lead in developing a plan for recruiting personnel for this field. He proposed that "the sponsors should enter into negotiations" with a selected group of "Universities" having large graduate programs in American History and American Studies, to the end that a limited number of such students would be offered the opportunity to "spend the summer in formal study and actual work in Williamsburg."

Alexander was not vague about the universities he first wanted to approach: Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, Minnesota, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Virginia, Wisconsin, and Yale. "Each university would be invited to nominate one or two students for the program." Although preference would be given to the more advanced
students, "candidates should have at least one year of graduate study leading to a doctorate in American History or American Studies." (Note that this is still in a period when many doctoral programs were lasting approximately three years.)

"Once at Williamsburg," Alexander continued, "the students would "be given such training and experience as would orient them to the general field of historical interpretation." The emphasis was then so much upon interpreting the past that the program was called "The Seminar for Historical Interpretation" throughout this proposal. Soon, when more attention was paid to administration, it would be changed to "The Seminar for Historical Administrators." He added:

"No less important than the training would be the opportunity to recruit for this emerging profession, students who would normally have no other goal than college teaching. They will have to be aroused to the potentialities of interpretive work."

The proposed eight week curriculum was organized in a "series of seminars".

"In these seminars the principal aspects of the field could be considered, including planning, research, collection of library and museum materials, physical restoration, architecture, interpretive techniques, special events, media public relations, finance and administration."17

What exactly Dr. Alexander meant by "administration" in the last line is unclear, since all of the aspects which preceed it seem to contribute to administration. Its peripheral use in this list, however, is interesting to observe here.

The teaching was to be done by "Williamsburg personnel and visiting experts." It was even suggested that arrangements be made
with the cooperating universities to offer college credits for S.H.A. Even though such arrangements were never completed, this desire is a significant indication of how much the Seminar's founder wanted to align his program with the academy. Similarly, there would be "required" readings, projects, a three hour final examination, and an "hour quiz at the end of every two weeks."

Alignment with the traditional academic format was important. Equally important was the specific academic company one kept. When creating a new (and extra-curricular) breed of professionals, healthy academic phenotypes are crucial ingredients in a successful program. Alexander describes his idea of a perfect transfusion:

"Every effort must be made to give the program high prestige. . . by limiting the scholarships to candidates from the foremost graduate schools by having schools nominate the candidates by offering a generous stipend."18

The Seminar's first coordinator, William Murtagh, later expanded on the dream. As a result of the Seminar, he felt that

"Williamsburg's standards of authenticity in interpretation and varied techniques of accomplishing them will spread throughout the land. Just as Johns Hopkins University will always be remembered with respect and affection in the field of medical education, so will Colonial Williamsburg be known among historical agencies."19

One cannot fault Alexander for his interest in drawing talent, credentials, and implied endorsements from America's "foremost" institutions of higher education. Yet, in so doing, he was creating a precedent of "sponsored mobility" in historical agency work, a precedent which probably had an influence on various other professional
training programs which followed in the Seminar's wake. Faculty were asked to recommend their best students and whomever the highly respected faculty recommended usually became a member of the Seminar. Later we shall see how much more "contested" the mobility became in the selection process.

One way to gain a sense of how selective this new program was to be is to study a later draft of Alexander's proposal. Within the four page piece we find the following words, phrases, and sentences that outline the extent of its exclusiveness: "A selected group of universities"; "the program might be restricted to Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Princeton, Pennsylvania, and the University of Virginia"; "Actually, this consideration (of granting credits) is more important for prestige reasons than it is in practice, for credit hours are not a major factor in graduate instruction"; Fellowships should have a distinctive name (perhaps Rockefeller Scholar)"; "Foremost graduate schools", this "high level" program at Williamsburg, "Schools should nominate candidates", candidates of "high quality would be enlisted" and finally, "awards would be announced in April."22

Once endorsed by CW, the Trust and AASLH (in principle), Alexander's proposal was forwarded to "key professors at designated universities for their comment." The various responses Alexander received lend a splendid personality to this already fascinating first chapter in the Seminar's history. Oscar Handlin of Harvard, Edmond Morgan of Yale, John Kraut of Columbia, and Wesley Frank Craven of Princeton all received the following letter, or a slight variation thereof:
"Dear ________:

I enclose the prospectus on the Historical Interpretation seminar which I had the pleasure of discussing with you recently. I value your advice greatly and I shall appreciate any comments or suggestions you have on this more formal statement.

Sincerely,

Edward P. Alexander
Vice President and Director
Division of Interpretation"

Alexander's plan consistently impressed the historians as a "sound one." John Kraut's response was characteristic: "With the increased activity in regional historical societies and in connection with the historical work associated with various national monuments, I am sure there will be more demand for expert personnel in the field." Craven and Handlin agreed but worried about professors sending less capable students. Similarly, Walter Johnson, of the Department of History, University of Chicago, added his concern that although he would be happy to send "first rate candidates" to Williamsburg, "the future is going to be tougher in terms of getting qualified people into this area that you mention since the teaching job situation is improving so rapidly." (Years later, Dr. Alexander would reminisce that in these early years of his career he, himself, was approached by several university department heads in regard to available positions at major universities: "But the museum career won out in both cases.")

The academic reviewers' active concerns for history outside of the university was commendable. Edmund Morgan's reasons for being interested are clearly spelled-out:"

"
Dear Ed:

Your memorandum on "Training Interpreters of America's Heritage" reached me this morning. It seems to me to be admirably stated and clearly thought out. I think it is most appropriate that Colonial Williamsburg should take the lead in filling a need that becomes increasingly urgent. The restoration movement is growing so rapidly that without means for training personnel we are going to be faced with a host of phony operators who will do infinite harm. I think your whole idea is excellent.

Yours sincerely,

Edmund S. Morgan

Usually, the respondents were also concerned for the interdisciplinary potential of the program, as well as for the methods of teaching to be employed. Professor Craven's response is particularly noteworthy in that it sheds further light on the graduate job market:

"June 19, 1957

Let me raise the question of whether it is advisable to draw your students exclusively from the so-called 'better graduate schools.' These are the schools that generally speaking do the best job of placement. In other schools you will have more to offer to the graduate than the graduate of Harvard, Yale, or Princeton. Apparently the thought here is that you will add prestige to the undertaking by this association. Let me suggest that
Williamsburg has its own prestige and that it may well be all you need. I think you will get takers, but I believe your best prospects will come from less well established schools."
The First Year: 1959

With the support of the sponsoring organizations and key professors in the field, the Seminar was under way. It was questionable as to whether or not the AASLH would join in the sponsorship of the program and it was decided that even if they didn't apply money to the venture that first year, the Trust and CW would then combine efforts to launch it. In fact, AASLH did not assume partial financial responsibility for the program until a year later. Even later yet, in 1962, AAM would join in on the venture.


As the first resident coordinator, William Murtagh, then Director of Education at the Trust, drew up a schedule of the first program.31 He projected the first budget at $10,000: 12 student scholarships at $600 each; 20 C.W. authorities at $500 total; 10 outside authorities at $1,000; promotional materials at $500; buses and miscellaneous at $500; and contingencies at $300. In addition, reading materials were identified and assembled, including one of the most advanced bibliographies in the historical agency field. The program included one three-hour session each day. Classes convened five days a week. This left afternoons for special activities, tours, and study periods.
A study of the first Seminar brochures is rewarding, especially as we compare it to subsequent brochures. In 1959 the brochure was sent primarily to faculty at the aforementioned universities. No information regarding in-service experience was requested of applicants. Rather, transcripts and two faculty references were required of all candidates. After all, the purpose of these initial seminars was to "introduce selected graduate students to the challenging opportunities available to them in the rapidly expanding field of historical administration." Those graduate students selected would be dubbed "National Trust Fellows."

Forty-five applications appeared. They were reviewed by a committee consisting of historical agency professionals (Murtagh, Alexander, et al.) as well as a member of the academy. Emphasis was placed on geographical distribution, and potential in the field as evidenced from references and college grades. In fact, when the roster of successful candidates was announced, only the following factors were used to describe each individual: the graduate institution, graduate major, and the names of those who sent in supportive references. So, in direct contrast to today's program, little concern was addressed to the grantee's experience in the field.

Six in-service members were admitted to this program. They were added because of the "salty mix" of practicality that they would add to the course. Not surprisingly, "Fellows" were younger (25) than the non-Fellows (29). Understandably, Fellows had more education than did non-Fellows. There were 12 M.A. holders and 6 Ph.D. candidates among the Fellows, while non-Fellows could not boast of nearly as much academic training.
Most of the participants studied history, whether it be in undergraduate or graduate school. Following the history major, English was the most common area of interest among participants. By far, the most common experience among the in-service students was as a curator in a small historical agency.

The curriculum emphasized interpretation. Topics such as guide training, A-V program development, preparing a master plan and exhibit installation were among a cadre of very specialized and practical sessions offered. The first year's students inherited many of the current ideas being discussed by Colonial Williamsburg staff. In addition, a great deal of attention was also paid this year to introductory or "background" information. Thirty-one per cent of the curriculum was devoted to this category, which included sessions on types of historical organizations, restorations vs. reconstructions, and the history of outdoor and indoor history museums.34

In contrast to the first two categories, only 14% and 17% of the curriculum was devoted to administration and research respectively. All of this indicates the orientation nature of the first seminars. We recall Professor Craven's caveat that indoctrination alone is not sufficient and that orientation does not an administrator make. What then did the Seminar coordinators intend to do to "excite" the Seminarian's interest? What efforts did they make to have participants "learn the excitement" of such work as Craven had urged?

Each Seminar participant was assigned a project early in the program. These projects were drawn from the files of the sponsoring organizations. Tenets taught during the course were applied to the
problems' solutions and a report to the rest of the class and its coordinator was given at the program's conclusion. Usually the final two weeks of the six were devoted to such presentations. For example, one project asked the seminarians to develop an interpretive program for Batsto, a New Jersey site administered by the state. Chiefly the problem had to deal with the "reconciliation of the late 19th-century iron monger's mansion with an early 19th and 18th century industrial community." Another project entailed the guiding of a neighborhood rejuvenation project on historic Church Hill in Richmond, Virginia. These projects helped focus the student's attentions on an end product, as well as awakening their interests in historical agency work from first-hand experience with real case studies. No small amount of time was spent on these projects.35

The faculty for this first seminar were chosen carefully. Heavy emphasis was placed on publications and academic credentials, as well as their position within the community of historical agency administrators. Of the 24 faculty who participated that year, a third came from Williamsburg (more than originally intended in Alexander's 1957 proposal). Twenty-two of the 24 hailed from historical agencies; one was from the academy and one came from the business sector.36 Overwhelmingly, the faculty were associated with major nationwide agencies, such as the Trust, the National Park Service, and AASLH. Those administrative faculty who were not associated with nationwide agencies represented nationally known institutions, such as the Detroit Historical Museum and the New York State Historical Association.
In conclusion, the first year of the Seminar was the result of strong "jump start" from academia. Williamsburg represented one terminal, prestigious academic institutions the other. While Williamsburg had the idea and the credibility, the academy had the talent, credentials, and energy to transmit the current. In a way it was Turnerian, in that historical agency work offered a new area of "opportunity." Alexander had pointed the way, and into the void flooded a modest number of pioneers. When the Seminar began, the nation had 1,560 historical agencies. By 1963, there would be 2,248. (Today there are more than 6,000.) On the average, an historical agency would be established every other day. The need was much greater than its solution. Yet, however humbly, Dr. Alexander's seminar had begun to people a profession. Of its 18 participants, 10 eventually worked in historical agencies; four remained in college and university teaching; one chose another career altogether; and, two married and became "housewives."
Underway: 1962

When the placard announcing the 1962 program appeared, it revealed some slight changes in policy. Although there were non-Fellows in the 1959 program, the first brochure neglected to mention that. The 1962 brochure stated, "A maximum of 6 auditors already working in the field will be admitted to the Seminar at their own expense." "Auditors" participated as actively as Fellows. The name was a misnomer.

In addition, this new brochure suggested a little more interest in one's employment record, but the coordinators of the program still seemed rather unconcerned about any historical agency employment for fellowship students, "If you are working part-time while attending graduate school, state on the reverse of this sheet the type of work in which you are engaged." Similarly, references could come from either faculty or "people with whom you have worked." Although the emphasis is still very much on the recruiting of young talent, we can already infer the concessions the coordinators were beginning to make to the in-service administrator.39

There were 12 men and 6 women in this, the fourth S.H.A. The average age of the grantees was 26. Non-Fellows were on the average 10 years older. Once again, the education level of grantees was much higher than that of their in-service counterparts. The large prestigious universities were still well represented, but growing representation was beginning to emerge from the larger western universities: Brigham Young, Illinois, Minnesota, U.C. Berkeley, to name a few. Obviously, word about the Seminar was spreading and a
lessening of the coordinators' reliance upon the selective eastern universities was beginning. Perhaps this indicates a growing confidence in the program's momentum and potential.

Although a vast majority of the participants came from history backgrounds, increasingly the successful candidates were appearing with varied preparation. For example, this class had several American Studies majors. It also had two chemistry majors! The historical agency field has traditionally attracted individuals with varied backgrounds, and we shall see evidence of this characteristic throughout this study. Perhaps this is because historical agency work is not one profession, but rather many professions working together in an interdisciplinary field. We will soon discuss this further.

The curriculum for the fourth annual Seminar shows a drastic reduction in the amount of hours devoted to "interpretation." Yet, all four areas of classroom study were well balanced in the curriculum: background (26%); administration (22%); research (26%). More time than before was devoted to the projects, a total of 84 hours during the entire program. By now, the Seminar coordinators had fully heeded Dr. Craven's advice: they had given participants twice as much project time as in previous years. As we can see by the graph in the Appendix, this abundant amount of project time remained a part of the Seminar throughout the 1960s and, to a slightly lesser extent, until the changes in the mid-1970s.

The faculty was numerous this year. Thirty-five teachers contributed to the six week program in 1962. Thirty-four were from historical agencies. Only 9 came from Williamsburg. The 1961
coordinator's evaluation stated: "Some annoyance was felt with too strong a Colonial Williamsburg line" in the presentations. This explains the drop in Colonial Williamsburg representation.40

We may see a trend developing among faculty. They are beginning to represent smaller regional sites. This trend developed slowly throughout the history of the whole program. Although many of the 1962 faculty still came from agencies like the Trust and the National Park Service, there was also representation from the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities (SPNEA), Mystic Seaport and Historic Annapolis.

There were no major revisions in the 1962 Seminar, when compared to the first program, but we may already notice several other trends developing: The age of the participants was increasing, the program was slowly becoming less reliant on "sponsored" mobility and more on "contested" mobility; more women were appearing in the classes; and finally, the geographic distribution was widening as "westward the course" of the Seminar went.

Of the 18 members of the 1962 class: ten eventually entered historical agency work; seven returned to teach in higher education; and one's whereabouts is unaccounted for. The program was serving its first two objectives well: it was recruiting and it was sensitizing future professors to the resources available in the field of "informal education." In December 1962, the statistics for the first four years of the Seminar were distributed among sponsoring organization representatives:
A. 29 graduates have committed themselves to historical agency work (41%):
   - 14 of them may be said to have been recruited
   - 15 of them have received in-service training

B. 11 graduates are teaching, chiefly in colleges and universities (15%)

C. One graduate is working in an architectural office (1%)

D. 13 graduates are still enrolled in graduate work (25%)

E. 4 graduates are married women, at present devoting themselves chiefly to their households (6%)

G. 8 graduates have careers unknown to us at the present (11%)

Total Graduates: 71
Hitting A Stride: 1969

In the 1969 brochure the language and format were taking on a managerial hue. While in the 1962 application references were requested of faculty and/or someone "under whom you have worked", in 1969 the application form appropriately (and more concisely) alluded to these people as "supervisors." Applicants were to check a box at the form's beginning denoting whether they were "Fellowship" or "non-Fellowship" candidates (the term "auditor" had been dropped in 1963. The sponsors found it an inappropriate term.) Furthermore, while the 1962 program introduced "selected graduate students to the challenging opportunities available to them in the rapidly expanding field of historical agency administration", the 1969 program invited applications from "graduate students and beginning professionals."^42

The final obvious change in format of the Seminar revealed by the brochure was that 24 seminarians would be admitted in 1969. The NEH had granted $5,500 for this program. Consequently, the sponsors offered 20 stipends at $500 each and supplemented these stipends with contributions from their own agencies.43

Thirteen men and 11 women made up this year's class. The average age of Fellows was 25, non-Fellows were 33.5 years old. The educational level was more evenly distributed between Fellows and non-Fellows. Most participants had an M.A. degree. Smaller, less prestigious schools were beginning to be represented. In contrast to the Harvard, Yale, and Pennsylvania students of the first years, now participants were as likely to be coming from Heidelberg College, Canisius, Iowa, or Kent State. Similarly, non-Fellows were more
consistently representing even smaller sites than before: Erie County Historical Society, the Stowe-Day Foundation in Hartford, the Old Gaol in Maine and Strawbery Banke in New Hampshire. The candidate's educational and work experiences were becoming more localized and diverse. Furthermore, diversity also became more of a characteristic in the academic majors. While history still headed the list, anthropology, education, and English were not far behind it in popularity. One attendee was a professional craftsman. The Seminar also had a black participant this year: a non-Fellow during selection, the coordinators' eagerness to have minority representation was soon revealed when she wrote with word of financial problems that might prevent her coming. Consequently, she was quickly awarded a stipend.

The curriculum in 1969 stressed research (35%) and background information (33%). This year 87 hours of extracurricular time was devoted to the projects. Still, only 18% of the Seminar's time was devoted to administration, and the amount of attention paid to interpretation was beginning a descent from which it has never recovered. However, trips to area sites continue to appear on the schedule. Their popularity would soon reach new high levels during the 1970s with the maturing of government granting agencies in the humanities.

It is important to hypothesize why so much time was spent on background. A glance at the schedule will show that a great deal of time during this seminar was spent allowing sponsoring organizations the opportunity to announce themselves to the students. Considerable care was taken to tell the students all about the services of the four
sponsoring organizations. Additionally, ideas for a new accreditation program were announced. This was the year of the publication of the *Belmont Report* on America's museums. This report represented the findings of a special committee of the American Association of Museums. This committee studied museums and their functions, their present condition; it made a case for federal funding, and outlined "unmet needs" of these institutions. Consequently, there was a lot of "background" to discuss. This was a period of institutional definition and reidentification of goals, a time of abundant grant giving.

Getting grants depends upon an institution's ability to say who they are, what they need, and what they hope to do with the grant. Understandably, these internal soul-searching discussions carried over into the S.H.A. in the late 1960s and early 1970s.45

There were 24 faculty at the Seminar this year. As usual, each would teach one or two sessions and then be on his way home. Forty-two per cent of the teachers worked at Colonial Williamsburg. The reasons for such nepotism are not clear. For the first time, Seminar alumni appeared on the teaching roster and networking was noticed as two former students led sessions.46 While nationwide organizations such as the National Park Service and the Smithsonian still contributed, a healthy number of state, county and city historical agencies also sent teachers: Ft. Worth Museum of Science and History, the State Historical Society of Colorado, to name two. In 1969, 23 of the faculty came from historical agencies, and only one came from an academic institution.

Alumni of the 1969 class ended up, by and large, in museum
work. Of the 24 students: 15 worked in historical agencies eventually; 5 taught in colleges and universities; 2 chose other careers; and, 2 are unaccounted for. By 1969, there were 199 graduates: 91 were working in historical agencies; 54 were teaching; 31 were still in graduate school; only 15 were following miscellaneous careers; and 8 were "housewives."47

Still, objectives one and two were strong and appropriate ones for S.H.A.
Will Rogers once said, "Even if you're on the right track, you'll get run-over if you just sit there." When 1975 arrived, the Seminar sponsors were running the risk of over-introducing themselves. Forty percent of the curriculum was devoted to "background information" and much of this information had to do with outlining the offerings of sponsoring organizations. The program seemed to have no direction.

In addition, the brochure reflected a growing confusion about the audience intended for this training opportunity: was it for the recruitment of young talent or was it intended for those who were already employed? For several years this question was becoming a larger one. But this 17th annual Seminar was what made the sponsors finally decide that an answer was needed. The brochure (like the 1969 one) announced the program as an opportunity for "selected graduate students and beginning professionals." But, the announcement was much more passive than in previous years. The field was filling with new talent. Although there were now 4,306 historical agencies (in 1962, remember, there were 1,560) many other professional training programs were developed by the mid-1970s. Workshops, as well as university degree programs, were preparing professionals to fill vacancies (we will survey this growth in a moment). Therefore, we are not too surprised to read that while in 1969 applicants were invited to consider the "rapidly expanding field" of historical agency administration, in 1975 they were only "introduced" to the "range of career opportunities in the administration of historical agencies." The hard sell was subsiding. The frontier was closing. The profession was being "peopled."
Still, thanks to the NEH and NMA, 18 stipends of $750 were awarded to as many participants. Significantly, each applicant was asked to list work experience in historical agencies. Even though a candidate was still a graduate student, it is clear from the application that historical agency experience of some sort was preferred. In addition, one's present position in an historical agency was of importance, as the questions read:

- "If employed in an active historical agency, list . . . your work experience to date and the duties performed in your present position."

and,

- "If working part-time while in graduate school, list . . . the type of work . . . and other relevant positions you have had."

In regard to student profiles, perhaps it is best to let the seminar coordinator, Larry Henry, expand:

"It was obvious that the participants in the 17th Seminar were dissimilar to those who preceded them. It is possible that the group this year represented an aberration and that next year the pool of applicants will once again be dominated by graduate students interested in a surface exploration of the field of historical administration. I rather doubt this, however, expecting instead that applicants will instead be as they were this year, people already in the field who are seeking specific training in the administration of historical agencies and are drawn by the title of the program. If this is to be the case, certain modifications in the Seminar should be considered to see that the needs of these participants are addressed by the format."

Henry continued to say that if this became solely an in-service training opportunity, four weeks was certainly long enough for this
The Seminar had grown in popularity among graduate students and professionals alike. In addition, job opportunities for graduates were diminishing. One hundred-thirty applications were received for the 1975 Seminar. Of those selected, nine were men, nine were women. The average age was 27. Virtually all students had some historical agency work experience. In addition, they possessed more responsible positions than their predecessors. Directors and curators were common among the participants, who once were composed of assistant curators and inexperienced graduate students. Significantly, no Canadians or National Park Service personnel appeared on the roster this year. The Seminar sponsors had always sought such representation, but the lack of it this year indicates the maturing of training programs both within the National Park Service (NPS) and in the Canadian Museum Association (CMA). (Interestingly, Canadian museum workers are subject to a system of individual accreditation. This is but one indication of how seriously Canadians take an individual's professional development.)

Of the 32 faculty, nine were from CW, one was from an academic institution, and two were from the business sector. This latter fact is significant because the Seminar sponsors have increasingly recognized the importance of involving successful teachers from the private business sector, particularly in the sessions dealing with technical aspects of administration, such as budgeting and planning.

In conclusion, this Seminar might be seen as an example of
how not to develop and implement a program. For the participants, the program was too long. From their accounts, we are reminded of early reports of colonial colleges as many seminarians complained of the poor dormitory arrangements (the roaches were reported to have been so big that "they caused cries of distress and outrage."). In addition, the coordinator recalls that the curriculum suffered from a lack of organization and thrust that year. Furthermore, discussions with faculty were "random and infrequent", complained one of the students. In addition, the coordinator remained rather aloof this year since his family had joined him in Williamsburg. Students were left to their own devices throughout much of the program's extracurricular hours. At least one fight broke out in the unairconditioned and infested dormitory. Of the 18 students, 17 came already employed in some capacity in historical agencies. Only one was in graduate school full time. After the program, 13 remained in historical agencies, 2 took teaching jobs in colleges, and 2 are unaccounted for.

By the time of this crucial program, there were 298 graduates of the S.H.A.: 162 (54.4%) were working for historical agencies; 70 (24.2%) were teaching at the collegiate level; 44 (14.7%) were completing graduate work; 18 (8.0%) had chosen other careers; and finally, 2 (0.7%) were deceased. 51

Regardless of the trouble that marked this final year of the six-week program, the Seminar had had an impressive record. The important meeting described at the outset of this thesis describes a moment of transition. We've now studied the context that contributed to that transition. Soon, we will analyze the other side of the
changing objectives. Before we do that, however, it is important to consider two factors: (1) the fate of so-called "collegiate level" participants, those to whom the second original objective applied and (2) the larger emerging field of historical agency administration, especially professional training which had begun to affect the Seminar's objectives profoundly.

Dinosaur Disciples

From the statistics cited above, it is clear that Alexander's first objective was being met. But, it was less clear as to whether or not the second purpose for the program was successfully addressed: "To convey an understanding of the purposes and activities of historical agencies to promising young graduate students who, even though they may choose to remain in academic work, will appreciate the worth of historical agencies, use historical agency resources to improve their teaching and research and direct potential historical administrators toward this new profession."52

In order to ascertain the degree to which progress was made in this category, the following survey was taken of a random sample of those who entered college teaching. 40 surveys were sent, 10 were returned. Here were the questions asked:

1. As a result of the Seminar, have you a better appreciation of history museums and agencies, as well as the skills required for this kind of work?

2. As a result of the Seminar, have you used historical agencies to supplement your own teaching? If so, how?

3. Have you advised qualified students to embark on non-academic careers as historical agencies offer? If so, about how many?
4. Have you encouraged any of your students to participate in the Seminar for Historical Administration? If so, how many?

5. Have you taught courses in a topic related to historical agency administration? If so, on what topics?

The findings of this survey are convincing. All respondents claim to have a better appreciation of history museums and agencies. Eighty per cent had used historical agencies in their teaching and they did this by way of field trips, personal research projects, and visiting lecturers. Ninety per cent have advised qualified students to embark on a career in non-academic, such as historical agencies represent. Surprisingly, a total of 179 students have been encouraged in such directions by the 10 respondents. The broadcasting of seeds had impressive results in this area. Sixty per cent of the academic alumni had encouraged a total of 16 of their students to apply for the Seminar, therefore helping to develop networking across disciplines. Finally, 40% had taught courses in some aspect of historical agency administration (e.g. "Neighborhood Preservation," "Historic House Restoration," "Introduction to Museum Work," or supervised interns.)

Clearly, by the early 1970s, these dinosaur disciples were a thing of the past. During the first ten years, there were 50 alumni who qualified for category two, those students who returned to academe. While between 1970 and 1976 there were only 8. Subsequently, none qualified. Concurrently, mobility within the academy was rapidly decreasing and the historical agency field was not needing the thrust it once required to get established. Thus, the need to recruit was subordinate to the importance of in-service training for those
thousands of individuals already employed. Granted, the average administrator was better prepared in 1975 than he was in 1959, thanks to the proliferation and availability of training programs. But, many would still feel a shock of recognition with Edward Alexander's following recollection:

"I now marvel at my timidity, for I had little knowledge of what museum work involved. While I had a sound background in American history, and understood to some extent research and educational activities, I knew nothing about collection documentation, conservation, and exhibition. Thus, I began to educate myself as best I could by reading the skimpy newsletter, Museum News and a few other periodicals and books I could find. Attending the meetings of the American Association of Museums and after 1940 of the newly organized American Association for State and Local History, and visiting museums to see what ideas of my peers I could adapt to my needs. All this learning on the job was extremely haphazard and wasteful."55

Professional Training:

Even though training programs were producing graduates who could develop the quality of administration in historical agencies, the state of the art in profession-wide formal communications was not yet developed. For example, how did people find jobs in the early and mid-1970s? NEH surveyor, Susan Stitt, has found:

"When we investigated how people learned of jobs at museums, we found that the grapevine of informal word-of-mouth news constituted the major effective form of information flow in the museum labor market. The grapevine information flow involves those people who normally talk to each other as friends, family, or colleagues. The system tends to give the information advantage to the kind of
As we have seen from the letter of complaint forwarded to Jim Short in 1975, this issue of "dominating the field" was becoming more and more a point of contention among Seminar participants. By 1975 the founders were the "old guard." After all, it had been 16 years since Ed Alexander (now in his 60s) had founded the program. While the Seminar was young, so too were its coordinators. Now, as it matured, there is evidence of a growing number of young professionals becoming discontented with this generation gap. For the young graduate student who attended earlier seminars, the introductory contact with historical agency professionals sufficed. However, the growing number of in-service participants were demanding more. Having paid their own dues in the field, they expected more practical help in aspects of administration and they expected to be treated not as students, but as colleagues. Both the increasing disparity between coordinator and students, as well as numerous growing indications of professionalization (as evidenced in accreditation, ethics, publications, etc.) did not help matters. Professions, by their very nature, tend towards exclusion.

Fortunately, the coordinators were responsive to the cries of the young professionals. Note Jim Short's response to the 1975 complaint letter cited earlier:

"... the field as a whole is permeated by a spirit of good will, cooperation, and mutual respect, unmatched by any other professional activity I know of. The field is further characterized by an element of conservatism that is merely a reflection of a primary function. Conservatism and conservation in
our case are quite synonymous because it is the evidence of the past that is in our care. The youthful history of the field, however, points to a conclusion that the essential conservatism is not translated into stodginess of approach or a rigidity of attitude. The Seminar for Historical Administrators was created, for example, to point up the need for a constant flow of young talented people into the field. Where else has this been done? It was young people who organized the historical agency field in the first place and it will be young people who keep it vigorous and effective. I really do not agree that there are barriers to having one's voice heard. I think, instead, you will find a general eagerness to listen to anyone with something to say.57

The coordinators were eager to listen. They listened not only because students complained, but also because the field was growing up around them, and each one knew it was time to change the objectives of the program. Larry Henry brought his appeal to the Washington meeting in December:

"In 1975 a preponderance of the participants already had professional experience in historical administration in marked contrast to former years. The content of the Seminar's program has not yet responded to this change, still reflecting a program designed to [sic] graduate students without any professional background. I think the Seminar can be a stronger force in the future by directing its program to beginning professionals who have already made a commitment to the field."

"In doing this, the Seminar should consider consolidating some of the sessions dealing with education and introduce new sessions dealing with budgetary and financial problems, fundraising and the political process. Those sessions dealing with the director and trustee relations and the director and staff relations could very well be expanded to consider other problems of equal interest to potential directors.58

As mentioned, the S.H.A. was the first short course of its
kind for future museum workers. When it began, the originators of the Seminar assumed that the training of historical administrators was something to be done outside of the colleges and universities. Yet today there are more than 300 museum studies programs in the United States and Canada. And today programs are as likely to be offered in the academy as out. Yet, the field's strength has always been in those workshops and short courses for budding professionals, such as the Seminar represents. This has been the strength because such courses offer practical assistance to historical administrators. College and university programs, at first, were not placing a premium on practical experience in their museum studies programs. Dr. William Alderson, a long term leader in the historical agency field, has lamented:

"I don't know why our graduate schools put so much of their emphasis on how we learn and so little on how to apply our knowledge for the benefit of others. But with rare exceptions that's the way things are, and so we need - and badly - the supplementary education of institutes and seminars and workshops in order to learn the skills we need to function effectively as professionals."

Today, thanks to the assistance of nationwide historical agencies, such as AASLH and AAM, minimum guidelines for such programs are stressing the importance of internship and other application experiences. We flatter ourselves, however, when we attribute such shifts in academic thinking to our own suggestions. Our advice is only part of the reason that an increased emphasis is being placed on practicality within the graduate school system. The other reason is that the history job market has changed so radically from the first days of the Seminar. Today's students are increasingly aware of the
limited mobility in the history professions. A university program offering practical work experience is likely to be seen by the young graduate student as an opportunity for employment at the end of a degree program.

In fact, the history job market is so limited lately that the Seminar has received an increasing number of applications from university professors whose departmental chairs have suggested that they attend in order to learn about historical agency administration. The idea being that upon the professor's return a related course (if not a whole program) will be offered at the university. This fact provides an interesting contrast to the earlier academics whom the coordinators of the Seminar tried to recruit. It shall be left to the reader to judge how effective a professional graduate program would be if it were designed by an historian who was sent upon a 4-6 week errand into historical agency "work" and then returned home to offer a course in it. Today, however, there are many programs that have been so engineered. Patricia McDonnell of the Western Association of Art Museums has done an elaborate study of museum studies programs, particularly short courses. She concludes that for those "who contemplate taking advantage of professional training opportunities, the task of evaluating quality, relevancy, and effectiveness remains their responsibility." Let the buyer beware.

McDonnell lists 52 regularly offered seminars and workshops for museum professionals. Every one of these opportunities began after the S.H.A.. The late 1960s and 1970s saw the development of many such programs. AASLH initiated its now expansive series of seminars
and workshops in 1967. Since then, this agency alone has offered more than 100 courses to professionals across the country. To date, more than 2,000 "beginning and advanced museum and history professionals" have had the opportunity to receive training in a variety of important areas. The AASLH team travels throughout the country bringing courses to the professionals. This is all a way of saying that since the founding of the S.H.A., the field has grown to such a state and local extent that now training opportunities have had to reach out to meet them. When the Seminar began, the faculty as well as the students hailed from a small number of well-known institutions of national repute. Today's faculty and students are drawn from much more local and diverse sources.

Before we discuss further the most crucial transition in the Seminar's history, let us take a moment to survey the growth of workshops and seminars as well as the concurrent growth of professionalism.

Being the first program of its kind for historical administrators, the Seminar had few tested formats upon which to rely for advice. Paul Sachs, a professor at Harvard's Fogg Museum, began teaching a course in the early 1920s in museum work, which was solidly grounded in art history. He invited museum directors and curators to address this class. Students visited neighboring museums and met with local antique dealers. Later it was agreed that Sach's course would serve as a model for the S.H.A. In addition, in 1958 the New York State Historical Association held its "Historic Housekeeping
Conference" designed for curators, directors, and trustees of historic houses. In the same year, the Trust held a series of 2-1/2 day workshops and conferences in St. Louis, Providence, and New York City. The emphasis here was on architectural preservation. A program also existed at Radcliffe College. The emphasis there was on archival and historical management.65

Other courses were offered in the country, but there were no other short course opportunities with the specific purpose that the Seminar claimed. This is not the place to delineate fully a history of workshops and seminars. Suffice it to say, however, that such in-service programs have become the backbone of the field. By 1977 an AAM committee was busy reviewing the "300 courses" that were being offered at graduate, undergraduate internship and in-service levels.54 Today there are about "2 dozen graduate museum programs, still following many of the principles established by professor Sachs."66

In 1975, with a new world of professional training opportunities developing around it, the Seminar was due for a major adjustment in objectives and format. Along with the training came more demanding and knowledgeable students. Bill Alderson compares yesterday's students to today's:

"We are part of a profession that has made extraordinary advances in knowledge and skills since my first encounter with professional training. In many respects, my colleagues then knew neither the questions nor the answers, while today, as I can attest from teaching them, the participant not only knows the questions, but arrives at the Seminar with many of the answers as well."67

A more knowledgeable constituency meant more progress towards
a sense of professionalism. Today the S.H.A. announcement promises to introduce "young professionals to the special nature of historical agencies." The language is foggy and it is intentionally so because a yet-to-be-resolved discussion persists in the historical agency field as to whether or not our work is a profession. And, if it is, what is its "special nature?" Many would agree that the field fits Christopher Jencks and David Riesman's definition of a profession:

"The sub-culture that shares certain values and attitudes that feels itself separate and superior to the laity and that is prepared to enforce its claims. Professional schooling is crucial to developing these attitudes (perhaps even more critical than the transmission of knowledge)."

While there are certainly many of the characteristics of a "profession" in this still emerging field (e.g. a learned literature, codes of ethics, training programs, etc.) there are still many who suggest that historical agency work is a plurality of professions consisting of many individuals who represent a great number of professions: curators, conservators, researchers, educators, and businessmen, et al. This latter stance is a much more acceptable and accurate one. In historical agency work, the artifact, the basic unit of any historical museum or agency, draws varied professionals together, all of whom concentrate on its collection, preservation, and interpretation. Yet, within the composite, there still exists a degree of professional allegiance to historical agency work, and this loyalty can do nothing but increase as agencies like AASLH, the Trust, and AAM grow. Edward Alexander expands:
"Museums are highly independent and individualistic with diverse subject matter, fields, and of varied size and financial strength. Museum workers of differing backgrounds are generalists in small museums, but highly specialized experts in larger ones: Curators, educators, designers, administrators, and many others. To weld these divergent, sometimes clashing institutions in their creative, often opinionated individuals into a profession is not easy."69

We have seen how a world of professional training opportunities and professionalism has grown up around the Seminar. We have also observed the changing demographics of the participants. As a result, the Seminar adjusted to both internal and external changes.

Regardless of the debate about professionalism, the Seminar was on the verge of a significant readjustment, a readjustment which strove to address the needs of the professional (paid) historical agency worker, rather than those of the recruit. Its participants, still coming from various backgrounds, would leave the program with a better knowledge of the "common history, philosophy, and purposes of museums, of what their chosen personal role involves, and how specialists with varied interests constitute a team that can produce an excellent and effective organization. This strong sense of common purpose and staff interdependence may be the most valuable contribution of a sound program in developing a true profession."70
The New Program: 1976

The contrast between the 17th and 18th Seminar brochures was striking (see fig. 3). While it was clear that all earlier announcements were designed to adorn graduate school bulletin boards, the 1976 brochure was unquestionably designed with the professional in mind. It has a polished and a professional look that its earlier counterparts lacked. No longer was it a program for the historical administrator; now it was a seminar for historical administration; once its sponsors searched for future administrators, now that the administrators were found, the "proper study" was administration.

Stipend support was drying up. However, the 18 participants would have travel expenses to and from Williamsburg covered. A limited amount of stipend support was available to "graduate students with a demonstrated need", but it was a far cry from the $750 gifts that each participant received a year earlier. Nevertheless, a sense of pride was revealed in some of the brochures's language: "This tuition-free seminar, first held in 1959, is the oldest short course in the field of historical agency administration." It continued by stating that, "170 of its graduates currently hold leadership positions in historical administration throughout the United States." Then it adds: "Seminar sessions will be conducted by nationally recognized authorities, with assistance by personnel from the sponsoring organizations."

Finally, a new level of professionalization is reached when the brochure announces that:
"The intensity of the schedule is such that the sponsoring organizations urge participants not to be accompanied by spouses." (Today, by the way, the wording is, "The intensity of the schedule does not permit participants to be accompanied by spouses.")

Before 1976, spouses were accommodated. All of this is to say that the language and format, as well as the policies of the program, were tending more toward a distancing and exclusivity intended to protect the experience for the more homogeneous group of entry to middle-level museum administrators. And, as we have seen, this separation is a characteristic of increasing professionalization.

The 1976 Seminar was "intended to provide an intensive overview of administration for graduate students intending to enter the field and junior staff members already employed in private and public historical societies, museums, restorations and preservation projects, historic sites and parks, and other historical agencies."

Interestingly, the same requirements are made of applicants as were made in 1975: "If employed in an active historical society, list your experience to date and the duties performed in your present position."

And, "If working part time while in graduate school, list the type of work." So, for some inexplicable reason, the brochure's wording regarding intended audience did not change simultaneously with the Seminar's objectives; and neither the archives nor oral histories have yielded the answer to this riddle, which is an especially intriguing one, given the radical change in other policies, as well as in the announcements format.

Clearly the sponsors were now in search of eager and somewhat
experienced administrators. This year fully 15 of the participants had historical agency work in their backgrounds. These 15 had stayed on their jobs longer than in-service members of previous classes. They were also, on the average, a more mature group (28-1/2 years old). Significantly, 12 were women, and 6 were men.

One of the most radical changes appeared in the curriculum; "administration" accounted for fully 58% of the class hours. "background", "research", "interpretation" were relatively equally addressed: 17%, 14%, and 14% respectively. Overall, the sessions took on a more philosophical tone as evidenced by such new courses as "The Philosophy, Purposes, and Principles of Historical Administration"; "Accomplishing Your Purposes"; "Towards Historical Agency Professionalism"; and, "Ethics". Where philosophy waned, administration was abundantly apparent in such new courses as "Management and Conservation of Historical Resources", "Financial Management", and "Institutional Organization" among others. Forty percent more curriculum time was added to "administration" in 1976. All other categories yielded to this surge, especially research. The topic of "research", once having 35% of the curriculum's attention, would by 1983 drop to only 2% -- a trend we will discuss in the conclusion of this report.

Another shift occurred in the faculty. Seminar coordinators had discussed the feasibility of fewer faculty who would teach more sessions, and thereby adding a much needed continuity to the learning experience. Consequently, only 18 faculty participated in this year's program. This intentional decrease indicates a heightened sensitivity
on behalf of the sponsoring organization representatives to the teaching styles employed in the Seminar. Once again, faculty came from historical agency experience: 16 of the 18 were in the field already; the remaining 2 teachers came to the program from the academy and from private enterprise.

Combined, these faculty represented large, well-known institutions and this is reminiscent of the beginning of the Seminar, when it was identifying and announcing itself and bidding for recognition and credibility. Faculty also tended to be more specialized: fundraisers, legal counselors, and financial administrators led many sessions. It gave the Seminar a more practical thrust. Dispersed throughout, however, were courses which reached new philosophical heights. In other words, this was the year of contrast within the renewed curriculum, one which regardless of levels of practicality was hell-bent on teaching to the converted the tenets of administration.

Of those converts, almost all were to end up employed in the field of historical administration. Even though 9 of the 18 were in graduate school in 1976, all students had some experience in historical agency work. We know of 13 of the 18 who entered the field after the Seminar; the other 5 are currently unaccounted for.

Regardless of the reinvigoration that the Seminar received, it was not a complete success this year. Larry Henry, once again its coordinator, sensed that perhaps the program was now imposing "too much symmetry." There was now a well thought-out sense of progression, but was it all too well thought out? Shouldn't there be more loose ends in which discussion and speculation arise? Yet, he concluded that the
program "gave people what they thought they anticipated getting in previous years -- the concentration on administration. Hence, there was less dissatisfaction. We did not provide stipends, hence the participants tended to be dedicated to pursuing the program, despite its rigors. We limited it to 4 weeks -- hence, exhaustion and ennui were reduced . . . I am convinced that the Seminar has, by its revised format, achieved a new usefulness that should sustain it for at least several years."
By 1983, the Seminar had experienced nearly a complete reversal in the relative importance of its 3 objectives. Now, of course, the training of professionals was its chief aim. Each announcement boasted of the program's history: "the oldest short course of its kind." This 25th annual program barely resembled its 1959 pilot and its students and very little in common with those of a quarter century earlier. The field had changed, and the Seminar had adjusted.

The brochure announced that the program "provides young professionals with a knowledge of the special nature of historical agencies." With the transition in objectives and intended audience now complete, this year there were 65 applicants. Each selected candidate (or his/her home organization) paid the necessary expenses. There was still no registration fee and no stipend. Now there were 12 women and only 6 men. In addition, the average age increased; now it was 30 years old. Also, the backgrounds of the students reveal a more varied academic preparation than in the other years studied. Only half of the class concentrated in history at college. English, communications, and business administration were the next most popular majors. Similarly, a glance at the professional positions of every student show a slightly more varied and specialized group of students than before: curators, development officers, archivists, assistant directors and educational officers all shared the same experience. This variety and specialization reflects the larger trends in the field toward the refinement of the various professions that contribute to historical agency administration. Furthermore, this class was far more familiar
with the workplace than previous classes. On the average, each participant had spent 4 years in historical agency work prior to coming to Williamsburg.

The curriculum invested even more heavily in "administration." Seventy per cent of the course was devoted to specific sessions dealing with the management of time and human resources, including an elaborate workshop led by a Colonial Williamsburg trainer (including sessions on hiring, interviewing, firing, performance appraisals, etc.). Consequently, the research component was all but removed, as only 2% of the Seminar's time was spent on such matters. Interpretation (with 13%) did not fare much better. Projects, once an important part of the Seminar experience, were eliminated and in their place, seminarians participated in selected shorter case studies in relevant topics, such as "Developing a Marketing Scheme" or "Long Range Planning."

The faculty was slightly more varied in 1983. Of the 31 teachers, 26 were from historical agencies, 3 from academic institutions, and 2 from business. Four Seminar alumni participated in the instruction (a clear indication that networking was occurring). More than a quarter of the faculty were from CW (29%) primarily because of the advanced nature of the personnel and interpretive training programs.

Of the 18 participants in the 1983 program, 18 ended up in historical agency work. These statistics are somewhat deceiving, because all of the 18 participants were already employed in historical agency work. Therefore, the Seminar had completely outlived its
usefulness as a recruitment tool. In many ways, it had come full circle since 1959. The significance of this is the subject of the final chapter.
Interpretations

From this study of change over time, we detect a number of significant trends: the average age of the Seminar's students has increased (26 years old to 30); there are now chiefly women in the program, when once there were primarily men (see fig. 4); the program attracts working professionals now rather than graduate students who were exploring career opportunities. Consequently, the students come from more diverse backgrounds and majors than before.

Concurrent with these trends has been the growth of networking among seminarians. It hasn't been unusual for alumni to hire classmates when job openings occur. This has happened in each class for the past few years. Similarly, letters such as the following have often appeared on the desks of the sponsoring organization representatives:

"It occurred to me that you or someone else might be in a position to recommend one of your seminarians as a candidate for the vacancy we now have in our department of education."74

Furthermore, evaluations of the program consistently indicate that "the most useful aspect" of the program was the informal context it allowed. As we have seen, those in this plurality of professions known as historical agency work rely greatly on word of mouth advertising when filling vacancies. Further evidence of networking appears as more and more Seminar alumni are asked to teach in the program and it is significant that when a new coordinator was chosen in 1980 only Seminar alumni were invited to apply.

The program has evolved from being proactive to reactive.
While it once tried to effect change by peopling a profession with qualified individuals, it now responds to the tendencies in the large field it helped to create. Conterminous with this is the fluctuating climate in the academic job market. Once the program sponsors sought young academic blood, and the "first rate" scholars had no scarcity of opportunity in the academic sector. However, as these opportunities have diminished, the academy has become more interested in historical agency futures. We have seen how graduate history departments have sent professors in the direction of S.H.A. in order to return with blueprints for future programs in historical agency training.

While reacting to a "rapidly growing" profession, the S.H.A. has left its interpretive roots behind. The curriculum hours now spent in those aspects which make historical agency work unique are shadowed by the speedy proliferation of sessions in "administration." Various name changes over time are telling: The Seminar for Historical Interpreters; to The Seminar for Historical Administrators; and finally, to The Seminar for Historical Administration. The attached bar graph of curriculum hours provides an indication of the momentum which has been developing in this quarter of the curriculum (see figure 2).

Similarly, the program is no longer an overview, but rather a look at specific aspects of historical administration which contribute to an efficient and successful administrator. Early courses in the "history of informal education" therefore have yielded time and importance to sessions on budgeting and fundraising for non-profits. Consequently, today's faculty member more often than not is a
specialist in his/her field, and may not have a sense of the whole.

Furthermore, the increasing age of the participants, as well as the changing sex ratio, are indications of two larger nationwide trends. Today there is much more adult education than there was 25 years ago. Today, only 30% of America's married women devote their time completely to "housekeeping." The increased age of students today is so prevalent that it is felt in the heart of the tradition-bound ivy league colleges and universities. Says Harvard's Edward L. Keenen, Jr., Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, "Today's graduate students represent an older group of people, many of whom have gone to work and done professional study before coming to graduate school. These students are quite serious about their work."

With the rapid increase of adult learners, more and more workshops and seminars are developed. As the baby boomers age, this trend will increase. Today's adult (young or old) faces a myriad of opportunities for short learning experiences. These opportunities range from Trust study cruises, to Elderhostels, from Outward Bound management training camps, to the ubiquitous part-time M.B.A. program. Patricia McDonnell expands on this:

"Professional education is a rapidly accelerating field, and this is as true in the museum profession as in any other. The genesis for the growth of continuing education is well documented by demographic studies of the American population, which indicate that the United States has a falling birth rate, maturing population, and a growing, better educated and more experienced work force supporting fewer and fewer dependents. By 1990, the largest segment of the American population will be between 25 and 45. Our general population is in the process of maturation, moving from being young to middle
age, but not yet old. In traditional university settings, a student body of 18-24 years old has fallen off rapidly as those born in the 'baby boom' years mature. In 1978, the United States Department of Education reported that 31 was the mean age of those classified as 'independent students' or 'adult learners' of whom 78% were between the ages of 22 and 40 and 15% were over 40.76

As today's Manhattan envelops the Brooklyn Bridge, so too do in-service training programs surround the young museum professional of today. But who is superintending the whole? Have we created yet another used car lot of opportunity in which it is almost impossible to distinguish the lemons from the limousines? In her study, Patricia McDonnell concludes:

"Standards for these professional programs are at best limited and at worst poor. As the number of adult learners has increased, the proliferation of every imaginal program type has occurred. This expansion transpired with little regard for establishing and attaining even minimal standards."77

Milton Stern, Dean of the University of California's extension programs, elaborates:

"The situation is confused. It may be likened to a rather murky tank of guppies -- some large, some smaller -- all darting about feeding sometimes in a frenzy of happy plenty -- sometimes ganging-up on a bigger fish and sometimes doing away with the smaller fish -- and sometimes piloting a big fish or school. There is an absence of statistics, a poverty of concept and a vacuum of policy."78

It's unlikely that any system of accreditation of short courses and seminars will develop within the field, for the field already has its hands full with the museum accreditation. It's
feasible that guidelines might be drawn up, such as those developed by AASLH and AAM, which outline the suggested curricula of university courses. In the meanwhile, referral and reputation will continue to direct the buyer.

It seems that as the baby boomers grow, the economy slows. Thus, the once "rapidly expanding field" of historical agency work is at worst retreating, and at best idling. Susan Stitt in her 1973 study was correct when she predicted:

"I find no compelling reason to expect either a large increase or sharp decrease in the numbers of professional jobs. Ours is a non-growth projection." 79

Historical agency directors, like university presidents were once eager to develop new teaching programs and hire larger staffs. Now their thoughts revolve around ways to pay oil bills and secure additional funding. Increasingly, the larger agencies have developed inside and outside administrative officer positions. The former individual oversees educational programs, the latter raises funds for the institution. Even though it is a no-growth period, constituencies expect progress. The director's job becomes more tense when placed into the vise of reality and expectations. Consequently, directors, like their academic counterparts, stay for shorter periods in these positions than before.

In such times, the premium is on effective administration. When hiring a new director, more than a few history museums across America have decided to pick their CEOs from the corporate orchards. In such times, allegiance to interpretation and research buckles under
the pressures of vulnerable budgets and rising expectations for administrative efficiency. We see this trend in the Seminar's growth: "Research" once commanded 40% of the program's time. Now, only 2% is devoted to such topics. On the other hand, "administration" expended 70% of the 1983 curriculum.

Furthermore, implied in the decrease in time in research and interpretation is the assumption that the participants at S.H.A. already have some basic understanding (or at least knowledge) of these components which help make historical administration a unique field. This is a false assumption, especially in light of the fact that today's Seminarians hail from more diverse academic and work backgrounds than they did before. In 1959 there was the reasonable assurance that the students were trained in history at some of America's best institutions of higher education.

While these trends and changes challenge the program's future, there are many aspects of continuity that still recommend the program to the field: it has always had a commitment to the strengthening of small historical agencies, it has contributed more than 400 leaders in the state and local history movement and this has helped change the popular perceptions of museums. Still, it remains the only short course which is guided by four historical agencies of national repute: AASLH, the Trust, AAM, and CW; and finally, it has been able to adjust to change. It has, in effect, been a companion to change.
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SEMIPAR FOR HISTORICAL ADMINISTRATORS, 1959

The meetings of this seminar will usually be held in the air-conditioned Hostess Room of the Information Center from 9 a.m. until noon each day. Various tours will be arranged on certain afternoons. The Coordinator for the seminar is William J. Murtagh, Assistant to the President, National Trust for Historic Preservation.

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

I. General

Mon., June 15 1. Orientation, Colonial Williamsburg
   A. Edwin Kendrew, Resident Architect, Colonial Williamsburg

Tues., June 16 2. Orientation, Colonial Williamsburg
   Edward P. Alexander, Director of Interpretation, Colonial Williamsburg

Wed., June 17 3. History of Informal Historical Education
   Mr. Alexander

Thurs., June 18 4. Types of Historical Organizations
   Ronald F. Lee, Assistant Director, National Park Service
   *Afternoon Tour of Plantations

Fri., June 19 5. Philosophy of Historical Interpretation
   Louis C. Jones, Director, New York State Historical Association

II. Evaluation and Analysis of Resources

Mon., June 22 1. Planning a Research Program
   Richard P. McCormick, Department of History, Rutgers University

Tues., June 23 2. Historical Research
   Edward M. Riley, Director of Research, Colonial Williamsburg

Wed., June 24 3. Archaeology
   Ivor Noel Hume, Chief Archaeologist, Colonial Williamsburg

Thurs., June 25 4. Architectural Research
   Abbott Lowell Cummings, Associate Director, Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities
   *Afternoon Tour of Mariner's Museum

Fri., June 26 5. Preparation of a Master Plan
   Mr. Lee
III. Development of Resources

Mon., June 29
1. Restoration and Reconstruction
   Frederick D. Nichols, Department of Architecture, University of Virginia

Tues., June 30
2. The Outdoor Historical Museum
   Frank O. Spinney, Director, Old Sturbridge Village
   *Afternoon Tour of Myers House, Norfolk

Wed., July 1
3. The Indoor Historical Museum
   Anthony N.B. Garvan, Curator, Smithsonian Institution

Thurs., July 2
4. Acquisition of Furnishings and Objects
   John M. Graham, Curator, Colonial Williamsburg

Fri., July 3
5. Auxiliary Facilities
   A. Edwin Kendrew, Resident Architect, Colonial Williamsburg

IV. Interpretation Program

Mon., July 6
1. Determination of Message and Media
   Mr. McCormick

Tues., July 7
2. Program Planning
   Clifford L. Lord, President, American Association for State and Local History

Wed., July 8
3. Preparation and Use of Interpretation Materials
   Mr. Alexander

Thurs., July 9
*4. Exhibits and Installation
   Leslie Cheek, Jr., Director, Virginia Museum of Fine Arts
   * This meeting will be held at the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts in Richmond and followed by a tour.

Fri., July 10
5. Information Centers
   John C. Goodbody, Director of Presentation, Colonial Williamsburg
   *Afternoon Tour of Jamestown and Yorktown Centers

V. Meeting the Public

Mon., July 13
1. Guide Service
   John W. Harbour, Director of Visitor Orientation, Colonial Williamsburg

Tues., July 14
2. Publications
   Barbara Snow, Antiques Magazine
   *Afternoon Tour of Richmond

Wed., July 15
3. Audio-Visual Aids
   Arthur L. Smith, Director of Audio-Visual Program, Colonial Williamsburg
Thurs., July 16  4. Children's Programs  
Agnes Downey, National Park Service

Fri., July 17  5. Special Events  
Mr. Goodbody

VI. Administration

Mon., July 20  1. Types of Management  
Richard H. Howland, President, National Trust for Historic Preservation  
*Afternoon Discussion of Critiques

Tues., July 21  2. Finance  
Henry D. Brown, Director, Detroit Historical Museum  
*Afternoon Discussion of Critiques

Wed., July 22  3. Promotion and Public Relations  
James M. Brown III, Director, Corning Glass Center  
*Afternoon Discussion of Critiques

Thurs., July 23  4. Members and Membership  
Mrs. Woodruff, Membership Secretary, Museum of Modern Art

Fri., July 24  5. Final Examination
FIGURE 2

THE CURRICULUM OVER TIME: RELATIVE PERCENTAGES OF
FOUR CATEGORIES OF STUDY


BACKGROUND
ADMINISTRATION
RESEARCH
INTERPRETATION
Contrasting brochures: The years 1975 and 1976 brought the most dramatic changes to the Seminar's format. These contrasts are demonstrated by the layout of the brochures. The 1975 announcement, like its predecessors, was designed to adorn graduate school bulletin boards -- the original recruitment centers for S.H.A. participants. By 1976 the brochure was more likely to cross the desks of young, aspiring historical agency administrators.

(See following two pages.)
18th Annual Seminar for Historical Administration

June 13-July 9, 1976
Williamsburg, Virginia

Sponsors
National Trust for Historic Preservation
Colonial Williamsburg
American Association for State and Local History
American Association of Museums

Program
This tuition-free seminar, first held in 1959, is the oldest short course available in the field of historical agency administration. More than 170 of its graduates currently hold leadership positions in historical administration throughout the United States. The seminar is intended to provide an intensive overview of administration for graduate students intending to enter the field and junior staff members already employed in private and public historical societies, museums, restoration and preservation projects, historic sites and parks and other historical agencies. Seminar participants are introduced to the full range of knowledge and practice needed for the successful administration of historical and preservation agency programs. To qualify, applicants should have at least one year of graduate training in American history, art and architectural history or allied fields.

The program will include field trips, lectures and class projects concentrating on major topic areas such as the philosophy and practice of historical administration, the management and development of historical resources, finance and budgeting, personnel practices, legal issues, the structure of internal organization and the administration and implementation of outreach programs.

Seminar sessions will be conducted by nationally recognized authorities with assistance by personnel from the sponsoring organizations. Field trips will utilize the facilities of Colonial Williamsburg as well as nearby museums, historic sites and institutions to present programs illustrative of the seminar discussions. Participants will prepare written and oral presentations on assigned case studies or projects during the seminar.

The sponsoring organizations will pay travel expenses to and from Colonial Williamsburg for each of the 18 selected applicants. Because participants gain valuable training, which in turn is beneficial to their employers, it is suggested that historical agencies continue salary payments to participants during the four-week seminar. Limited stipend assistance is available for accepted graduate students with a demonstrable need.

Participants will live in a dormitory on the campus of the College of William and Mary (room costs range from $20 to $25 per week including kitchen privileges). Meals may be taken in the William and Mary cafeteria. The intensity of the schedule is such that the sponsoring organizations urge that participants not be accompanied by spouses.

Applications must be filed by April 1, 1976. Announcements of selected applicants will be made shortly after April 15, 1976. For additional forms and further information write: Richard W. Haupt, director of education services, National Trust for Historic Preservation, 740-748 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

Application

18th Annual Seminar for Historical Administration
Deadline: April 1, 1976

Date ___________________________
☐ Staff member
☐ Graduate student

Name ___________________________
First ___________________________
Middle _________________________
Last ___________________________

Home address ___________________
Telephone _______________________
Zip _____________________________
Area code ______________________

School or business address _______
Telephone _______________________
Zip _____________________________
Area code ______________________

Address for correspondence. Home ☐ School or business ☐

Age ___________________________
Submit two letters of recommendation—either from faculty members or supervisors under whom you have worked—to the address below by April 1, 1976.

Along with this application, submit the following information on a separate sheet:

1. Any graduate scholarships or fellowships you have held.
2. If employed in an active historical agency, list your work experience to date and the duties performed in your present position.
3. If working part time while in graduate school, list the type of work, the weekly time devoted to it and how long you have been engaged in this work. In addition, list any other relevant positions you have held.
4. Any papers in the American field for which you have done research and any articles you have had published.
5. A brief statement explaining why you are interested in this program.

Send this application and the above information by April 1, 1976, to Richard W. Haupt, director of education services, National Trust for Historic Preservation, 740-748 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.
The National Trust for Historic Preservation
Colonial Williamsburg
The American Association for State and Local History
and
The American Association of Museums
announce the
17TH ANNUAL SEMINAR FOR HISTORICAL ADMINISTRATORS

June 15—July 25, 1975
at Williamsburg, Virginia

This tuition-free seminar is designed to introduce selected graduate students and beginning professionals to the range of career opportunities in the administration of historical agencies. Qualifying applicants should have at least one year of graduate training in American history, art and architectural history or allied fields. The course is also intended to provide an intensive overview of administration for junior staff members employed in historical societies, museums, restoration and preservation projects, historic sites and parks and other historical agencies.

The course of study includes such problems as the evaluation and development of resources; forms and methods of interpretation; programs of finance, public relations and publications; staff and trustee relationships; the programs of major historical institutions; and curatorial, research and administrative practices.

Seminars will be directed by authorities on various subjects, who will be assisted by personnel from the four co-sponsoring organizations. Field trips will utilize the practical facilities that Colonial Williamsburg affords and will include visits to nearby museums, historic sites and institutions where programs illustrative of the seminar discussions are in progress. Participants will prepare written and oral presentations for the seminar on assigned case studies or projects.

EIGHTEEN FELLOWSHIPS—$750 EACH

Seminar fellows will live in a dormitory on the campus of the College of William and Mary. Room costs range from $8 to $15 a week. Meals may be taken in the William and Mary cafeteria, and kitchen privileges are available in the dormitory. The intensity of the schedule is such that the sponsoring organizations urge that fellows not be accompanied by spouses.

Applications must be filed by March 14, 1975. Announcement of awards will be made shortly after April 1, 1975. For additional application forms and further information write:

Samuel G. Welsh, Conference Coordinator
NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION
740-748 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006
17TH ANNUAL SEMINAR FOR HISTORICAL ADMINISTRATORS
June 15—July 25, 1975
co-sponsored by

The National Trust for Historic Preservation

Colonial Williamsburg

The American Association for State and Local History

and

The American Association of Museums

APPLICATION

Date ____________________________

Check one: □ GRADUATE STUDENT
□ STAFF MEMBER

1. Name ____________________________ First ____________________________ Middle ____________________________ Last ____________________________

2. Home Address ____________________________ Zip ____________________________ Telephone ____________________________ Area Code ____________________________

3. School or Business

   Address ____________________________ Zip ____________________________ Telephone ____________________________ Area Code ____________________________

   Address for correspondence. Home □ School or Business □

4. Age ___________ Marital Status ___________

5. Undergraduate Education. College(s) _________________________________________________

   Year graduated ___________ Degree received ____________________________ Major field ____________________________

6. Graduate Education. Year(s) of graduate work completed by June 1975 ____________________________

   Major field ____________________________ Graduate degree(s) received, and where ____________________________

7. On reverse or on separate sheet, list any graduate scholarships or fellowships you have held.

8. If employed in an active historical agency, list on reverse or on separate sheet your work experience to date and the duties performed in your present position.

9. If working part time while in graduate school, list on reverse or on separate sheet the type of work, the weekly time devoted to it and how long you have been engaged in this work. In addition, list any other relevant positions you have held.

10. On reverse or on separate sheet, list any papers in the American field for which you have done research and any articles you have had published.

11. On reverse or on separate sheet, write a brief statement explaining why you are interested in this program.

12. Submit a transcript of your academic record and two letters of recommendation—either from faculty members or supervisors under whom you have worked—to the address below. These must arrive by March 14, 1975.

Mail this application to:

Samuel G. Welsh, Conference Coordinator

National Trust for Historic Preservation, 740-748 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006

Application, transcript and letters of recommendation must be received no later than March 14, 1975.
The schedule for the 15th Annual Seminar for Historical Administrators, June-July 1973, is set forth below. The 17th Annual Seminar, June 15-July 25, 1975, will cover similar topics on approximately the same schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Orientation (Seminar dormitory) Introduction to details of seminar: living arrangements, parking, buses, tours, student projects, swimming, etc. Distribution of student packets. Robert R. Macdonald, Seminar Coordinator and Director, New Haven Colony Historical Society, Conn. Colonial Williamsburg Resources: exhibits, films, lectures, libraries, authorities. Julia F. Davis, Research Associate, Colonial Williamsburg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Historical Education Outside the Classroom. Edward P. Alexander, Director of Museum Studies, University of Delaware, Newark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>The National Trust for Historic Preservation, James Biddle, President, National Trust Library period and individual conferences on student projects. Afternoon: Student projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Architectural Research, Paul Buchanan, Director of Architectural Research, Colonial Williamsburg. Afternoon: Student projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Manuscripts and Archives in Historical Agencies. Philip P. Mason, Director of the Archives of History and Urban Affairs, Wayne State University, Detroit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>All day, Richmond, Va. Virginia Museum of Fine Arts (lunch). Richm ond Landmarks Tour (discussion of tour afterwards). Youth Programs. Joan Hull, Assistant Director, New Jersey Historical Society, Newark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Guides and Interpreters: Their Role, Importance and Training. Patricia Black Reibel, Curator of Education, Old Economy Village, Ambridge, Penn. Federal Preservation Assistance Programs. Russell V. Keune, AIA, Director of Field Services, National Trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Jamestown Island and Jamestown Festival Park tour (discussion of tour afterwards). Washington, D.C. tour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Library period and individual conferences on student projects. Afternoon: Student projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Student projects. Curators and Collections. Graham Hood, Curator-Director of the Department of Collections, Colonial Williamsburg. 1:15 p.m. Tour of Department of Collections, Colonial Williamsburg. Mr. Hood. Afternoon: Special Area Research and Interpretation. Barnes Riznik, Vice President, Old Sturbridge Village, Sturbridge, Mass. Library period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 4

CHANGING SEX RATIOS

- MALE
- FEMALE

TIME LINE OF SEMINAR GROWTH

1957  Edward P. Alexander writes "Training Interpreters of America's Heritage"

1958  The National Trust for Historical Preservation and the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation endorse Alexander's idea. The AASLH also endorses it in principle.

1959  First Seminar offered, jointly sponsored by the NTHP and CWF. William J. Murtagh of the NTHP is first resident coordinator.

1960  AASLH joins as a sponsor

1962  AAM joins the list of sponsors

1967  Glenn Thompson succeeds Murtagh as resident coordinator.

(Coordination responsibility is shared among sponsoring organization representatives throughout 1960s, though.)

1969  NEH sponsors seminar

1971  William Seale is resident coordinator

1972  NMA and NEH jointly sponsor program

1975  Lawrence Henry succeeds MacDonald, NMA becomes sole sponsor until the present.

1976  Seminar format radically changes

1980  James R. Short of Williamsburg dies

1981  First alumni fund drive
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