

*'For they would gladly learn
and gladly teach'—
University Faculty and Their
Papers: A Challenge for Archivists*

by **FRANCES FOURNIER***

By his bed,
He preferred having twenty books in red
And black, of Aristotle's philosophy,
To having fine clothes, fiddle, or psaltery . . .
Whatever money from his friends he took
He spent on learning or another book . . .
His only care was study, and indeed
He never spoke a word more than was need . . .
The thought of moral virtue filled his speech
And he would gladly learn, and gladly teach.

Geoffrey Chaucer¹

With these words, Geoffrey Chaucer sketched a memorable picture of the Oxford cleric in *The Canterbury Tales*. The cleric was not a faculty member in the present sense of the word, but his selfless devotion to knowledge creates an appealing image that many modern academics would like to have. Today's faculty member, however, is sometimes viewed in a less exalted light as society's freeloader rather than its saviour or servant. *This Sure Beats Working for a Living*, proclaimed the pseudonymous Professor X in the title of his book, which promised to reveal *The Dark Secrets of a College Professor*.² Saint, sinner or perhaps a shrewd new breed of intellectual entrepreneur who parlays biotechnical or other expertise into a Wall Street fortune—the academic is clearly important in our society. And yet, as sociologist Burton Clark has noted,

Relatively little is known about what goes on in the profession's many quarters. What is the quality of workaday life for its varied members? How do they conceive of themselves and their lives? How autonomous are these professional workers near the end of the twentieth century, and how much are they subject to bureaucratic dictate?³

Clark's solution—an extensive survey of faculty members in the United States—offered some answers to the questions he raised. Another source of information, namely the

archives of individual professors,⁴ has been downplayed by academics themselves and by some university archivists.⁵ The commonly held view is that a few faculty members may be important individuals worthy of documentation, and the collective professoriate may deserve justice from the historical record, but that these concerns are generally overshadowed by more pressing ones.

The official institutional record must have first priority for university archivists who, after all, are institutional archivists. Their fundamental duties are to assemble, preserve and provide access to university records of enduring legal, fiscal, administrative and historical value. They should fulfil these duties within a framework of archival mandate and policy, supported by a sound records management programme. Records management programmes are not perfect, however. Faculty papers can help to fill in the gaps and give a different and vital perspective on important administrative developments. Yet this should not be the main reason for acquiring faculty papers. The primary value of these papers becomes evident when university archivists consider what they are trying to document—an institution whose nature is best understood through a study of its functions. The best documentation for some of these functions lies in the hands of the faculty members responsible for them.

It is useful to begin by defining faculty archives. Such a definition arises from the university's traditional functional triad—teaching, research and community service—and its evolution over time. Underlying the first three functions is a fourth and subsidiary one—the maintenance of an institutional infrastructure.⁶ By itself, a function remains an abstraction. To move from abstraction to practical effect, a function must be carried out by a juridical person⁷ in whom the embodiment of a function can be termed a competence.⁸ In the university setting, the professor is one such juridical person, but he or she is competent to carry out activities in pursuit of each of the four functions listed above. These activities produce documents. Faculty archives are those documents created or received by professors in fulfilment of the competences assigned to them by virtue of their appointments. Defining faculty archives within this conceptual framework emphasizes why the documents were created, places them in a suitable contextual setting, and ultimately provides for their appraisal, arrangement and description.

In order to illustrate and expand upon this definition, this article draws upon interviews and conversations with faculty members, mostly at the University of British Columbia.⁹ These discussions reveal the attitudes of professors towards record-keeping and suggest more effective strategies for archivists who wish to acquire faculty papers. These issues will be discussed later in this article.

Faculty Members: Their Work and Their Papers

It is appropriate to first consider academics in their oldest university role—as teachers. Faculty members are competent to instruct students through such means as lectures, laboratory sessions, seminars and individual tutorials. They also share knowledge with colleagues through seminars, lectures and conference presentations. As a result of teaching activities, professors may accumulate a variety of documents, such as course syllabi or lecture notes. Case studies and role-playing scripts can be another component of professors' files. Visual aids such as slides or photographs can also form part of course material. To provide background knowledge for teaching sessions, academics may have retained correspondence with colleagues, notes from other professors' courses, copies of student

papers, and even notebooks from their own university days. Lecture notes and related teaching materials do not convey the whole classroom experience, but they reflect course content and the learning climate of the lecture hall or seminar room far better than terse calendar descriptions. Such notes can indicate academic lineage, and they also sometimes contain significant ideas that the professor never published but nevertheless tested on students for their reaction.

Faculty members, however, do more than just present subject content. Their competence as teachers requires evaluative activities that are of critical importance to both teacher and student. Professors find out how well they have taught; students find out how well they have learned. For purposes of evaluation, professors may require students to complete short written assignments, term papers, tests and final examinations. Much of this material is returned to students after its evaluation, but sometimes faculty members keep copies for their own use or to evaluate the student in the future. They may also file master copies of assignments, problem sets, grading keys and old tests as a reservoir from which to draw questions.

Formal examinations indicate what the student was required to know. When accompanied by answers or a grading key, they illustrate the accepted academic standard for the time. For instance, one retired biology professor kept a complete set of the final examinations she had given over a twenty-year period. She also took each exam herself before she administered it to her students, and so we know from her record what she considered to be the right answers. Taken together with lecture notes, examinations show how teaching trends have caused one part of a subject to be stressed over another at different times. For example, in various eras and locations, calculus was taught to emphasize either its theoretical or its practical aspects. Examinations and lecture notes can also be used to determine whether larger shifts in subject disciplines occurred differently or at an earlier time than suggested by more formal publications.¹⁰

Letters of reference written by professors about students illustrate what personal and intellectual qualities were considered important for future scholars in the discipline or for employment in the field. In turn, course evaluation forms written by students show what qualities were considered worthy in a professor. The very existence of these evaluations, the changes in questions over time, and the growing degree of their importance in determining tenure and promotion make samples of this information worth preserving. Papers written by students may also occur in faculty files. For example, in one graduate mathematics class, the professor saved papers in which students had solved small problems that later became part of the course. Another example of retained student work was found in a composer's archives, which contained many tapes of his students' compositions as performed in class.

At many universities, however, it is not teaching but research that is most valued by the academic profession and by the administration at large. For this discussion, let us say that research encompasses all of those activities undertaken in the generation, discovery, preservation and interpretation of knowledge and of our intellectual heritage. Given this necessarily broad definition, it is difficult to outline a common documentary residue; however, the norms of scholarship lead to common patterns in both the activities and resulting documents.

Whatever the subject discipline, research projects begin with a problem to be solved or a general topic to be investigated. Faculty members may begin by simply producing

a series of rough notes. Often the next step is to seek outside funding, and this generates additional documentation. As data is being collected or ideas are being formulated, faculty members will keep research notes in some form. They may confer with colleagues. The profitable exchange in the departmental coffee room or at a conference luncheon may not leave a documentary trace, but correspondence with academics outside the university may remain in a research file. Professors must finally collate, synthesize and record research findings. They may keep various versions of the manuscript prior to the one submitted for publication. In addition to routine letters of transmittal, acceptance or rejection, faculty members may save more substantive correspondence, which could include excerpts from the referee's report suggesting changes or alerting the writer to additional information. After an article is published, the author may correspond with scholars who have read the finished piece. Those academics, in turn, may be motivated to begin their own research project, and thus the documentary cycle begins again.

Faculty research files raise many issues. For instance, the files of scientists can be particularly voluminous and highly technical in content.¹¹ Whatever the discipline, however, the university archivist must look for files that document the process of research, as well as the final result appearing in published form. The printed record is important but it is not the only record, and for some academics it may be too facile a generalization simply to equate 'significant' with 'published.' The published paper is a formalized presentation that conforms to a set of established conventions. For an historian or sociologist of science, or of any subject discipline, the published form is but one chapter in a rich story of complex activities and interrelationships. Research files can also be important because they contain unexploited data that can be used by other scholars. Professors are not always able to publish all before they perish. While large, complex, machine-readable files of scientific information may need to be in a data library rather than an archives, there are many examples of still usable data that can occur in a faculty member's papers. Audio tapes and interview transcripts are a good example. For instance, one academic kept the audio tapes and transcripts from the interviews conducted during his Canadian Childhood History Project, as well as tapes from extensive interviews with four now-deceased former provincial cabinet ministers. Only a small portion of this material was used by the academic for his own research.¹²

At times, professors assume a competence beyond the walls of their own institutions in fulfillment of the university's function of service, both to the scholarly community and to the community-at-large. Academics serve national or subject-discipline organizations as officers or committee members, and their files often reflect this active involvement. The group's headquarters may retain only the most basic documents needed for its business. Some committee work, for example, may not be duplicated in the official files of the organization, which delegated the matter to a committee in the first place to allow it to deal with the details. The official files may reveal the ultimate decision, but not how it was reached. Professors often exercise a competence for a subject-based organization when they referee colleagues' manuscripts for scholarly journals. This represents a critically important service to the academic community, because it allows research results to be assessed and published on the basis of an arm's-length evaluation of merit. The records of this activity contain contemporary evaluations of colleagues and show the standards and priorities of the discipline. Contemporary evaluations also occur when faculty members are awarded competences by other universities to evaluate their faculty members for promotion or tenure, or to be part of a process for reviewing one of their departments.¹³

Academics also provide service to the community-at-large. Many citizens see the university as a pool of expertise that represents the diverse interests of a research-oriented faculty. Professionals in law or medicine often consult their academic brethren on specific cases; business or industry may seek advice from university faculty concerning management or production problems; a branch of government may ask an academic to prepare a report, testify before a hearing, or serve on boards or commissions. The electorate may choose a professor for a leadership role. In all of these cases, a competence is awarded to the academic from a source outside the university, but the activities carried out on behalf of that competence also fulfil the university's function of public service. Some of the varied public-service activities reflected in the papers of Simon Fraser University's faculty members include labour arbitration, mediation in international boundary disputes, conducting the provincial Bee-Keepers' course, and serving as president of the BC Skeptics, an organization that investigates claims of the paranormal. Much of the material in these papers is not available elsewhere. Sometimes, too, community service involves exploring the relationship of one's profession to society. For example, a professor of chemical engineering believed that scientists had a special obligation to use their knowledge responsibly. He consequently wrote many letters to newspapers and academic journals and kept copies for his files.¹⁴

Within the university, each faculty member also has a recognized competence in maintaining the organization's infrastructure. This administrative involvement centres on the recruitment, retention and advancement of faculty; curriculum development; and the selection of graduate students. Evidence for many of these activities is woven into the official record, but it alone may only tell part of the story. For example, at the departmental level, the professor may serve on a committee for the development of hiring priorities. The office may retain a brief final report, but the individual faculty member may keep a file of the documents that led up to the final report. Similarly, the activities of academics in curriculum development may cause them to keep their own more detailed files, particularly if they were responsible for initiating courses.

For a young university such as Simon Fraser, which opened in 1965, faculty papers are extremely important in providing details concerning its founding and how patterns were set for the future. The individuals who helped to formulate the university's evolving policies and procedures had a variety of backgrounds—in some cases, reputations as activists at other institutions. Personal files can provide a wealth of further information.

Faculty correspondence reveals the expectations of academics negotiating to come to a university. What did they hope for in terms of curriculum development, graduate students, terms of employment, secretarial staffing, and other support? Correspondence and associated material give vivid glimpses of high optimism—and, in some cases, keen disappointment after arrival. For example, one personal file from a woman academic at Simon Fraser details the role her case played in the establishment of an appeal mechanism for denial of tenure. Her diaries and some of her other documents are not part of the official record, and would thus remain unknown if not for the survival of her personal papers.

Faculty Attitudes towards Record-Keeping and Archives

Community and university service, research, teaching—examples of professorial record-keeping in all of these areas suggest that there is material of value in faculty papers,

but acquiring this material is another issue. As a first step, it is important to understand faculty attitudes towards the papers they create. Philosophically, professors are pragmatists when they consider the documents in their offices. Mostly, academics retain what they think they need in order to get their work done. Records are not seen as being important in themselves nor, in particular, for posterity.

Record-keeping is also affected by the academic's notion of who owns the papers. There seemed to be general agreement among the faculty members interviewed that laboratory or department heads should leave their administrative office documents behind for their successors. This same notion did not hold, however, for files created by individuals on university committees. Academics most firmly expressed a notion of personal ownership when speaking of their own research documents. Comments one faculty member, an historian,

I don't think that the university owns them because the professor decides what the character of the research is going to be, and it seems to me that this is a very important principle in universities We talk a lot about independent research, and I think that one of the problems about the university now is that, as it becomes more of a vocational institute with business calling the shots . . . the idea that somebody else owns the research, if not the professor himself or herself, gains ground, and I think that is very dangerous for the university Professors have always been jealous guardians of their right to do research on what they think is important and to publish that research freely.¹⁵

Faculty members generally felt at liberty to discard whatever documents they thought they owned, and they followed no systematic method of disposal. Much material was destroyed on the premise that the "published product is the only thing that counts." Variations on this included comments such as, "I personally think that my published things are probably the most significant," or "The best stuff has really been published."¹⁶

Regarding their unpublished material, these professors generally had little sense of the possible use of their research files by others. In the elite world of the research-oriented academic, it is sometimes implied that those who can, do research; those who cannot, either teach or write about the history or the sociology of their discipline. To a successful practitioner in a subject discipline, it is far less important to tell the history of the field than to do first-rate research in the field itself.¹⁷

Faculty members tended to be relatively modest when asked what they would select to give to an archives. A biochemist's remark was typical: "I suspect I would say, well, you take what you want, and I wouldn't be surprised if you didn't want anything." An historian observed, "It's hard for me to imagine that anybody would really be very much interested in what is in there." A lawyer commented, "I'm not worthy of a biography. Few of us are famous."¹⁸ Comments such as these underscore continuing general misconceptions about archival repositories, and the role of institutional archives as institutional memory. Some academics used the terms 'archives' and 'libraries' interchangeably, or made comments such as, "There are buildings . . . filled with mathematical publications; aren't these archives enough?" Still other professors offered very broad, general definitions of 'archives': "A semi-organized place where you keep, in some semi-accessible way, records of any kind"; or "A collection of materials that is considered important in some sense to someone, either to the general public or to someone who is specializing in a particular field"; or "Ideally, in an archives you would hope

to find all the material, other than printed material, that would help us to understand where we've been, and how we got where we are, and that would cover almost anything."¹⁹

Not only are archives generally misunderstood, but university archives in particular are also not regarded as automatically entitled to faculty papers. When offered a hypothetical, subject-based repository devoted to their particular academic discipline,²⁰ some faculty members expressed approval. A librarian proposed that where archival material was "related to the development of an institution . . . it might be better to keep this . . . but I would send to the central repository material of more general interest such as courses, teaching approaches, associations, activities, and so on." This belief was supported by an historian, who admitted that although such an approach might be expensive, "Ideally it would be a good thing, and then you would have more historians writing books about historians."²¹

Faculty Papers: Some Answers—and Some Questions

Certain points are clear from the preceding sections; other issues require further analysis. First, the competences of the professor can be documented through the thoughtful acquisition of faculty archives, which constitute an interesting and extensive documentary residue. In turn, some of the functions of the university itself can be documented to a significant extent through the papers of faculty members. Second, in the absence of a clear institutional policy claiming jurisdiction over professors' papers, faculty members react intuitively to the question of ownership. Much of this reaction may be grounded in their notion of academic freedom. Although this concept has been variously defined by the university's several constituencies in different locales and in different eras, the professors documented in this study would probably define 'academic freedom' as the liberty to investigate what they pleased and to teach as they saw fit. Endorsement of this basic concept overrides any sense that the university pays professors to teach and to do research and therefore 'owns' the papers created or accumulated through such activities.²² Faculty members concede that certain administrative files (for instance, those created during a headship) do not belong to them personally, but other administrative documents are not similarly categorized. How can such notions of ownership be reconciled with a sound definition of the archives or the fonds of an individual faculty member?

As previously stated, the archives of professors include all of the documents created or received in fulfillment of the competences assigned by virtue of their appointments, and so delineated in a faculty handbook or other document. In fact, the expression "archives of . . ." embodies a relation of paternity, not a legal relation of ownership. Regarding ownership, a faculty archives could belong to the university as part of its larger fonds. Because this argument runs counter to the cherished principle of academic freedom, it is not viable. The underlying problem is the lack of a records policy consistent with the values of academic freedom and supported by the university community. At its most basic level, such a policy would define what belongs to the professor and what belongs to the university. The ideal consequence would be a university-wide records classification system, with a records schedule outlining the ultimate disposition of all official documents. If a series lay within such a scheme, it would belong to the university; if not, it would belong to the professor.²³ If official records were designated and recognized as such and regularly separated by their faculty creators from personal

documents, then university archivists might be less concerned about a subject discipline repository seeking faculty papers. Such a repository, however, would still be problematic both in theory and in practice.²⁴

These statements preface the third conclusion drawn from the faculty interviews: some academics would prefer to deposit their papers in a centralized subject repository rather than in a university archives. Indeed some faculty members feel more closely allied with their discipline than with the university. They believe that similar subject specialists can better comprehend and appreciate the nature of their research.

The archival response lies in the idea of complementarity or relatedness. On the one hand, a subject repository, such as an archives of mathematics or of physics does not violate the conceptual underpinnings of this notion. The research papers of faculty members probably have a closer affinity to those of others in the same subset of the discipline than they do to those of other faculty members in the same department, much less the same university. Scholars speak of the 'invisible college,' or network of private communication which cuts across campus boundaries, and which helps to shape a project's outcome. Through this network, many research results are made known and are analysed and criticized long before they appear in print. On the other hand, academics work in institutional surroundings. Institutional attitudes and practices may affect research priorities, and curricula developed at the departmental level will influence the professor's teaching. Centralized subject archives can therefore represent a loss in complementarity. Also, where would community service records belong? If a local query stimulated a particular line of research, then the relevant files might belong with the professor's research papers in the subject archives. The consultation, however, might have stemmed from a community problem, and then the academic's papers would be better understood in their local institutional surroundings.

Several professors suggested splitting faculty papers in various ways. In one proposal, university-related material would go to a university archives, and subject-related material to a centralized archives. Such a division could obscure the relationships that exist between and among archival documents. The organic archival bond arises out of a natural accumulation of documents, rather than an artificial sorting and regrouping of them.

It would be different, however, if the faculty member changed his or her situation significantly. For instance, a professor might accept an administrative post at another university, or take a job in industry or government. In these cases, the question is whether the material was created as one fonds or several. Did the professor close the door (and close the fonds) on old research projects, teaching activities and community service, only to begin again to fulfil competences as directed by the priorities of the new situation? If so, and the professor donated the earlier material to his or her former institution, these files would represent a closed fonds that could be retained at that university without damaging the integrity of the professor's subsequent archives. The archival bond would thus be respected. What, however, would happen if the professor simply changed universities, but continued to perform many of the same duties? Documents from the old institution would be used as the nucleus for a new set of files to reflect current activities. The fonds would still be open. If the professor had been deeply and equally involved with several institutions, a special subject repository might be a valid theoretical option, although a university archivist might wish to make a case for the institutional context

being the more immediate one. In any event, the archivist should try to emphasize the disadvantages of splitting the fonds.²⁵

The possibility of such a move does not invalidate the fourth conclusion: it is best to approach academics before retirement, concerning the deposition of their papers. Many faculty members accumulate the greatest quantity of papers during the busiest period of their professional lives, and for a short time afterwards. As retirement approaches, there is a diminution of intense, career-building activities. Perhaps with a growing sense of their own mortality, academics finally take a searching look at their files. They may ask themselves why they still keep their notes from university days. They do not need extensive outlines for teaching any more. They no longer review as many grant proposals. In fact, they may well be discarding more documents than they receive, and they may also be experiencing a certain detachment from the papers they retain. Unfortunately there is no fool-proof formula for identifying this stage in the lives of faculty members, who themselves may not be consciously aware of this transition. However, the fundamental message is clear: maximum record retention usually occurs at some point before retirement.

A fifth and final point is apparent. The identification of potentially valuable archival fonds is only the prelude to a carefully constructed educational effort which the university archivist must be prepared to develop and initiate. The educational process will be addressed later, in the context of a more general proposal for the acquisition of faculty archives. First, however, it is appropriate to review some current practices.

Faculty Papers and University Archives

Correspondence and interviews with selected university archivists in Canada and the United States revealed a variety of opinions about faculty papers. Those archivists who do not greatly value professorial archives do not seek them out, although they may accept them as gifts. Those who are more favourably inclined towards such fonds disagree on whom to approach. Some archivists periodically send letters to all faculty or to all faculty of a certain rank; others consider it better to contact all retiring faculty of whatever rank; still others use a set of criteria to approach academics selectively for their papers. Archivists also differ in the level of energy which they inject into their acquisition activities.

Two of the most active and interesting programs for the acquisition of faculty papers occur on opposite coasts of the United States—one at the University of Washington (U.W.) and one at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). Kerry Bartels, the UW archivist, usually visits faculty members as they reach the age of sixty, although he would prefer to approach them earlier. He has two main criteria for deciding which professors to contact: long service to the university—at least twenty years—and a national and international reputation in their subject disciplines. To help him determine the latter, he has an extensive, campus-wide network that includes department chairs and faculty members. He also consults with specialist librarians, who are knowledgeable about their fields and who deal directly with professors. In addition, secretaries alert him to cases where academics are about to dispose of records. As an experiment several years ago, Bartels put together an informal, small committee made up of university personnel, including former administrators. Each individual was well-informed about a different group of subject disciplines. Bartels prepared a list of faculty members over a certain age, and

then asked committee members on a one-to-one basis to indicate which professors should be approached by the archivist. He was pleased to find that twenty-four names appeared consistently on everyone's selections. He then used his faculty sources to refine the remainder of the list. In 1990, Bartels received seventy-seven accessions of faculty papers, thirty-nine of which represented new accessions rather than accruals. He is currently keeping track of about 200 other academics whom he will visit in the future.²⁶

Helen Samuels, the MIT archivist, asks the fundamental question, "What documentation do you seek that justifies your decision to collect faculty papers?" She views faculty papers within the context of an overall institutional documentation plan based on a functional approach. The first step in the plan is to describe how the general functions of the university are expressed in a particular institution. Based on this understanding, the archivist can draft documentary goals that will capture these functions while insuring that legal, financial and administrative obligations are met. These documentary goals must then be translated into a documentation plan. Administrative histories become an integral part of this plan because they are broadened from their traditional emphasis on administration to consider all the functions of the university. In the case of an academic department, for example, such a history also traces how the department fulfilled its teaching, research and public service functions. Material already under curatorial care is evaluated for completeness and value. It is then possible to draft a plan, consistent with the available resources, to fill in the gaps and address the documentary problems uncovered. The plan asks what must be sought and from whom. The best answer does not necessarily lie in official records, but may well be found in other places—for example, in the papers of faculty members.²⁷

Faculty Papers: Subject-Discipline History Centres

The role of subject-discipline history centres warrants further comment. As suggested earlier, sometimes there is no obvious repository for a professor's papers. To help resolve these placement problems, and to promote the history of the various academic disciplines, a number of history centres have been founded for subject specialties. These centres may carry on such activities as oral history and bibliography, but most importantly for university archivists, they usually encourage the deposit of faculty papers in appropriate institutional homes. In most cases these centres serve only as repositories of last resort.

The oldest such organization is the Center for History of Physics, established in 1965 by the American Institute of Physics (AIP) to succeed its history committee. This committee had first sounded the alarm that many important physicists were destroying their archival materials in the belief that their publications constituted a sufficient record of their contributions. In response to this crisis, the Center devised a strategy to identify the most productive American physicists, contact them about their archives, and find the most suitable repositories.²⁸ Ideally, these would be the local archives of the institutions where the scientists had done most of their work.²⁹ The Center set a precedent in assisting archivists to acquire faculty fonds in unfamiliar subject fields. Moreover, the Center has even offered to return papers when the appropriate home institution establishes an archives.³⁰

The Archives of American Mathematics (AAM) is another example of a subject-based centre that acquires faculty papers. The AAM began with the fonds of two prominent Texas mathematicians, Robert Lee Moore and H.S. Vandiver. One of Moore's doctoral

students, R.L. Wilder, believed that Moore's papers should form the basis of a broader collection. Although mainly associated with the University of Michigan, Wilder donated his own papers to the AAM, and encouraged other students of Moore to do the same. The Archives became the official repository of the Mathematical Association of America in 1978, and in 1984, the AAM in turn became the responsibility of the University Archives of the University of Texas at Austin.³¹ The present archivist of the AAM, Frederic Burchsted, advocates a policy similar to that of the Center for History of Physics. If he learns that a prominent mathematician has died or is retiring, he first notifies the faculty member's institutional archives. Only if that archives does not want the papers will he then approach the specific individual, departmental chair, spouse or other contact.³²

In contrast, at least two other history centres agreed with those faculty members whose predominant self-image was as a subject specialist rather than a member of the university community. The director of the Archives of the History of American Psychology wrote that those professors who see themselves as psychologists first, rather than as institutional employees, would find "knowledgeable treatment" in his archives.³³ The director of the American Institute of Pharmacy stated that he would accept donations of papers from pharmacists of "exceptional importance"; pharmacists of lesser renown would be advised to apply to their local repository.³⁴ Finally, it is instructive to note that the initial response tendered to this question by an officer of a major mathematical organization in the United States was to recommend that mathematicians deposit their papers in an archives of mathematics.³⁵ The university archivist who has a different point of view must be prepared in this case to argue his or her perspective forcefully and conclusively with faculty members.

Faculty Papers: A Proposal

The educational initiative, as suggested earlier, should be an important component of a wider program for the acquisition of faculty papers. Such a program considers professorial archives not in isolation, but in relationship to the overall documentation produced by the university. Within this context, the ideal prerequisite for the acquisition of faculty papers is the creation of a university-wide records policy. Such a policy typically contains three elements: structure, regulations and program.

The description of structure includes an organizational chart of the record-creating bodies and lists their responsibilities for records. Regulations in a records policy would address such matters as ownership, retention scheduling, tax legislation and access. The question of ownership is a significant one with regard to faculty papers, because not all competences of the professor have equal consequences regarding ownership of their documentary residue. Lecture notes and other teaching materials are best regarded as belonging to the professor. The same is true for many documents created or received in connection with research. These papers would generally not be included in a university-wide records classification and schedule. Exceptions to the recognized structure should be specified and guidelines indicated for complex cases. For instance, who 'owns' the documentation when the professor and the university are jointly involved in a commercially valuable, patentable process or invention? Who holds legal title to the documentation when the university internally funds a particular project that results in the creation of a large data base? Any statement involving the ownership of faculty papers should

be presented to the institution's faculty association in order to obtain the full cooperation of its members and to publicize the policy's existence. Finally, a university records policy might also consider the ownership of student-created material in faculty files. What rights do students have besides copyright?

The programme elements of the university records policy will include the mandate and the acquisition policy of the institution's archives. The mandate defines the essential and pivotal role of the university archives by vesting in it the authority of administering the documentation of the university. Such authority may be limited to gaining control over inactive official records, or it may include responsibility for the creation and maintenance of a records-management program. However, the mandate may also consider the archives as a body sharing the larger mission of the university to serve a broader societal constituency. The latter alternative enlarges the scope of the archivist's responsibility to include documentation of the university in its entirety—that is, the preservation of a record of the totality of its functions. The archivist is therefore laying a foundation not only for current and future legal, financial and administrative requirements, but also for replies to a variety of questions a future society may need to ask of the present university. An archival acquisition policy should draw upon both mandate and institutional regulations to identify the kinds of material that the university archives will acquire, and the methods of acquisition. An acquisition policy, however, is not a strategy that includes the steps the archivist should take to implement its goals. Mandate and policy should lead to a distinct acquisition plan. How might faculty papers fit into such a plan?

Most university archivists today probably lack the desire or the resources to contact all tenured or retiring faculty members. Widespread mailings based on self-selection are one option, but the passive nature of this method can result in a distorted record of a university's scholarly and community achievements. Many faculty members will not respond to a general appeal because they do not understand the role of a university archives or the value of faculty papers. In one professor's office, the form-letter overture from the archives was inadvertently posted on a bulletin board above the wastebasket into which the faculty member had recently discarded most of his files! Meanwhile, a personal appeal from an archivist at another repository or at a subject-discipline history centre may cause an academic to consider an archives outside his or her home institution. The successful appraisal of faculty papers for acquisition begins with the archivist as activist. The first questions are whom to approach and how.

Given that an element of subjectivity will always remain, the archivist should not be afraid to use a personal knowledge of the university when making choices. Also, some empirical measures are not without merit. Identifying professors with twenty years of service to the university seems a reasonable way of ensuring the preservation of valuable administrative material that may remain in the files of these faculty members. As well, it seems prudent for an archivist to develop a network of advisors similar to that in place at the University of Washington. A consultative committee can serve as a check on more informal sources. Samuels's functional approach, on the other hand, has the advantage of providing a context for the acquisition of faculty papers. The functionally-based administrative histories that form part of her broader institutional documentation plan support the acquisition of faculty papers and lead the university archivist to those faculty members whose papers best fulfil the documentary goals of a particular institution. In Samuels' proposal, the totality of functional documentation crosses administrative lines

rather than following them. In the case of faculty papers, however, the academic department is important as the basis of a functional history.

There are additional practical benefits from working with departments. Taking an interest in the subject field might help to convince faculty members of the archivist's good intentions and sincerity. Also, departmental approbation will foster valuable support from faculty members who would prefer to regard their papers not as stand-alone treasures, but as integral components of a worthwhile documentary effort.

After faculty papers have been acquired, the archivist must appraise them for selection. This procedure involves recognizing the links between the competences of the faculty member and the series in which the papers are grouped, either physically or intellectually. To discard an entire series would distort the picture of the record creator. The appraisal of faculty papers for selection is therefore primarily a process of weeding such items as ephemera, certain duplicates and housekeeping material. This culling must nonetheless be done with care and thought. Sensitive material should not automatically be discarded, but should instead be closed for a time, or referred to a committee responsible for determining access policies.

In the end, even when a well-conceived documentation plan exists on paper, the archivist must sit down with the academic. The approach should then be a personal one that leads to an educational and supportive partnership. An archivist soliciting faculty papers should be prepared to explain at least four things: what constitutes an archives and how archives differ from libraries; the nature of the organic archival bond and why it is better not to split an archival fonds; the desirability of keeping faculty papers within the institutional context where most of them have been created; and the use of faculty papers as a valuable complement to published material for documenting the university, the department, the discipline and academic life in general. The archivist should promise to care for the papers physically, to provide proper intellectual access, and to keep any sensitive material about colleagues or students closed or otherwise protected for a sufficient period of time. This last step is essential, even though academics may first believe that they have no files needing such restrictions.

Psychological support is essential. An impersonal letter from the university president does not have nearly the same effect as an initial visit from a sympathetic archivist who is sincerely interested in the faculty member's work and its documentation. One academic, when asked how he would respond to a letter from the university president inquiring about his faculty papers, quipped that he would rather burn them than agree to the request. If indeed many a true word is said in jest, the archivist's perceived neutrality as a separate entity distinct from the administration becomes a positive factor in the acquisition of faculty papers. Quite simply, an archivist seeking a faculty member's papers is asking for a part of that professor's life.

Rapport is strengthened when the faculty member is approached well before the trauma of retirement. Although there is a perceived slight danger of tempting academics to tamper with the historical record, the interviews conducted suggest that professors—unlike politicians—make little connection between their personal records and their reputations for posterity. Instead, they view their publications as their most important legacy. Furthermore, establishing an early bond of trust may encourage some professors to think first of the archives rather than the waste-basket when they move to new offices.

Faculty papers present significant public relations opportunities for the university archives. Comments made by many of the academics who were interviewed suggested that they had little notion of the existence of an institutional archives, let alone its mission. Direct contact between archivist and faculty members on projects of mutual interest, such as the acquisition of other professors' papers or the preparation of departmental histories, could do much to strengthen the archival presence on campus by creating an increased awareness of archival work.

Despite such inducements, however, many university archivists still give low priority to faculty papers. In theory and in practice, they are problematic by nature. Particularly if an archivist is concerned about support from administrators, a focus on university records seems to offer a more immediate payoff. The archivist who takes a broader view, however, sees faculty papers as an integral part of the documentation of the university. In this respect, it is necessary to act quickly. Many academics hired during the unprecedented university expansion of the 1960s will soon be retiring. Without an archival initiative, these professors will destroy or lose their professional archives as they relinquish their offices and gradually sever their institutional ties. In one of the first important articles on university archival practice, Father Henry Browne described the archives of a university as its official memory.³⁶ That phrase succinctly captures the essence of an institutional archives' mission, in which is understood the wisdom that derives from memory. Lest future generations accuse that memory of being afflicted with a serious case of amnesia and accordingly bereft of wisdom, today's university archivists must initiate active programs to appraise faculty papers for acquisition and selection.

Notes

* This article is based upon the author's Master of Archival Studies thesis, "Faculty Papers: Appraisal for Acquisition and Selection," (University of British Columbia, 1990). Thanks are extended to Professor Luciana Duranti, thesis adviser, and Professor Terry Eastwood for their guidance; and to Laurenda Daniells, Heather MacNeil, Jim Ross and Helen Samuels, who read and commented on an earlier version of this paper.

1 Geoffrey Chaucer, *The Canterbury Tales*, trans. Neville Coghill (London, 1951), p. 27.

2 Professor X, *This Sure Beats Working for a Living: The Dark Secrets of a College Professor* (New Rochelle, 1973). See also Martin Finkelstein, *The American Academic Profession: A Synthesis of Social Scientific Inquiry Since World War II* (Columbus, 1984). Finkelstein lists other books in the muckraking tradition (p. 2) and also provides a lengthy bibliography of more scholarly studies of the academic profession (pp. 245ff).

3 Burton R. Clark, *The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds* (Princeton, 1987), p. xxi.

4 This article makes frequent reference to the men and women who teach in institutions of higher learning. The term 'professor' has historically lacked a precise meaning. However, it will be used for the sake of variety as a synonym for 'faculty member' and 'academic' without regard to rank. As for the terms 'college' and 'university,' this article will focus on the professoriate at the latter, defined as a research-oriented, doctorate-granting institution.

5 To be sure, some archivists have written about faculty papers. See Harley Holden, "The Collecting of Faculty Papers," *Harvard Library Bulletin* 19 (1971), pp. 187-193; Frederick Honhart, "The Solicitation, Appraisal, and Acquisition of Faculty Papers," *College and Research Libraries* 19 (May 1983), pp. 236-241; and Mary Janzen, "Pruning the Groves of Academe: Appraisal, Arrangement, and Description of Faculty Papers," *Georgia Archives* 9 (Fall 1981), pp. 31-41.

- 6 For another discussion of university functions see Helen Samuels' forthcoming book, *Varsity Letters: Documenting Modern Colleges and Universities*; portions of a final draft were kindly supplied by the author for consultation in the preparation of this article. In this manuscript, Samuels expands the university's traditional mission—teaching, research and community service—into seven functions: sustaining itself, conferring credentials, socializing, conveying knowledge, advancing knowledge, maintaining culture and providing community service.
- 7 A juridical person is a collection or a succession of persons. For a fuller understanding of this concept, it is helpful to consider the legal distinction between a natural and an artificial person. The latter is also referred to as a corporation, which can be "a single person and his successors, being the incumbents of a particular office, but ordinarily consisting of an association of numerous individuals." Such an entity has its own personality and existence apart from that of the individual members which comprise it. Henry Campbell Black, *Black's Law Dictionary*, 5th ed. (St. Paul, 1979), p. 307.
- 8 A 'function' (for example, conveying knowledge) comprises a group of activities, considered abstractly, necessary to accomplish one purpose. An intermediate element is needed to link function with the activities creating the tangible documents with which the archivist deals. In other words, if a particular function is to be effected, it must be attached to one or more juridical persons. The attachment of a function to a juridical person is designated as that person's competence, i.e. the authority that person has been given to accomplish an act. Competence often coincides with responsibility, the obligation to answer for an act. However, at times one is competent to carry out an act, but not ultimately responsible. For a further discussion of competence and responsibility, see Luciana Duranti, "Diplomatics: New Uses for an Old Science. Part III," *Archivaria* 30 (Summer 1990), pp. 4-20.
- 9 Eight UBC professors were formally interviewed between October 1989 and February 1990: Joost Blom, lawyer; Stephen Chatman, composer; Stefania Ciccone, Italian scholar; Nathan Divinsky, mathematician; Norman Epstein, chemical engineer; Margaret Prang, historian; Samuel Rothstein, librarian; and Michael Smith, biochemist. These structured interviews were tape-recorded, and the tapes were transcribed. The pattern for citing these interviews in the endnotes is as follows: last name of the professor, page number of the transcript. These interviews were supplemented by numerous informal conversations with other professors. For the informal interviews, the endnotes read as follows: full name of the professor, department or school, university, date of the interview. The author's thesis, "Faculty Papers: Appraisal for Acquisition and Selection," lists the senior faculty and administrators who suggested the faculty members for the structured interviews. It also lists other interviews and/or correspondence with faculty members, librarians, archivists and other individuals. See pp. 146-149.
- 10 There is a collection of interesting essays showing how lecture notes, exams, student papers and similar material can be used with official records and publications to trace the development of university departments, and the intellectual history of subject disciplines. See Paul Buck, ed., *Social Sciences at Harvard, 1860-1920, From Inculcation to Open Mind* (Cambridge, 1965).
- 11 Joan Haas, Helen Samuels and Barbara Simmons have studied and described the activities that comprise scientific and technological research, and which effect the dissemination of knowledge in these fields. They have provided a helpful listing of the documentation created during such activities. See Haas, Samuels, and Simmons, *Appraising the Records of Modern Science and Technology: A Guide* (Cambridge, 1985).
- 12 Neil Sutherland, Department of Social and Educational Studies, UBC, 1 November 1989.
- 13 It is true that such material could be duplicated in the files of other universities, or in the offices of the various journals, if one knew with which universities and journals the professor had corresponded. However, this material would not be present in the same degree of concentration or in the same context as it exists in the professor's files. As with all sensitive material which contains personal identifiers, these documents would present problems of access and administration.
- 14 Epstein, pp. 37-40.
- 15 Prang, pp. 44-46.
- 16 Divinsky, p. 48; Ciccone, p. 46; Epstein, p. 62.

- 17 For an interesting expression of this sentiment, see G.H. Hardy, *A Mathematician's Apology* (Cambridge, [reprint 1969]) p. 61.
- 18 Smith, p. 34; Prang, p. 34; Blom, pp. 44-45.
- 19 Divinsky, p. 47; Blom, p. 52; Chatman, p. 38; Prang, p. 68.
- 20 For some subjects, thematic repositories exist in reality as well as in theory. They usually focus on types of record-creators such as the members of a minority group; on broad topical areas such as the labour movement or women's studies; or on more traditionally-defined subjects, particularly in the sciences such as physics or mathematics. These science-oriented repositories are sometimes designated as subject discipline history centres in consideration of the wide range of their work, which is not limited to the acquisition of archival material. They are discussed in more detail later in this article.
- 21 Rothstein, pp. 52-53; Prang, p. 62.
- 22 In contrast, business and industrial employers view their researchers as corporate employees. The researchers' results therefore belong to the employer.
- 23 To be sure, there would be problems in enforcing this ideal, but it could serve as a goal.
- 24 For a general discussion of special subject repositories, see Jane Wolff, "Faculty Papers and Special-Subject Repositories," *American Archivist* 44 (Fall 1981), pp. 346-351.
- 25 In the *Rules for Archival Description* (RAD), the definition of a fonds refers to individuals or corporate bodies. As an institutional archivist, this author considers the professor as a juridical person, an entity more closely aligned to the latter concept than the former. It is therefore possible for one individual to create two (or more) fonds if he or she becomes another juridical person.
- Aside from the *RAD* definition, however, one must use common sense and look at the interrelationship of the papers to see if there is more than one fonds. Does the professor just give the archives several dossiers from a set of files that he or she takes with him and that are otherwise still open and active? If so, the archives has not received a complete fonds. For practical and political reasons, the archives may accept the dossiers and even describe them at the fonds level because a note in the *RAD* glossary allows this option, but this is perhaps adhering to the letter of the law rather than the spirit.
- 26 Interviews, Kerry Bartels, 25 September 1989; 4 April 1990; Electronic mail, 22 October 1991.
- 27 Samuels, *Varsity Letters*, last chapter, final draft.
- 28 Joan Warnow-Blewett, "Towards Adequacy of Archival Documentation: A Case Study. The American Institute of Physics and the Process of Documenting Modern Physics." Talk presented at the dedication ceremony of the Niels Bohr Library of the American Institute of Physics, 26 September 1962, pp. 4-9. See also Warnow, "Preserving Documentary Materials for the History of 20th Century Physics." Paper presented at the 5th Congresso Nazionale de Storia della Fisica, Roma, 29 Ottobre/1 Novembre 1984, pp. 7-10.
- 29 The Center for History of Physics has written a brochure entitled, *Scientific Source Materials: A Note on Their Preservation* (New York, n.d.). The brochure states, "Usually it is best for a scientist's papers to be saved at the institution with which he or she is most closely associated, if it has a suitable archives. It is here that scholars will seek the papers, and here that they will find the administrative records of the institution, papers of colleagues, and related materials which will provide a well-rounded view of a scientist's work and the atmosphere in which it was effected."
- 30 Warnow-Blewett, "Towards Adequacy," p. 15.
- 31 "Archives of American Mathematics," (Austin, 1987); Frederic F. Burchsted, "Sources for the History of Mathematics in the Archives of American Mathematics," in *A Century of Mathematics in America, Part III* (Providence, 1988), pp. 667-674; and Burchsted, "Archives of American Mathematics," *Historia Mathematica* 14 (1987), pp. 366-374.
- 32 Letter, Frederic F. Burchsted, 7 February 1990.
- 33 Letter, John A. Poplestone, 13 November 1989.

Only one Canadian academic subject discipline organization with an archival programme could be located: the Canadian Psychological Association. In 1985, that organization appointed an archivist, Mary L. Wright, who conducted a survey in 1986 to study "The Preservation of Documents of Historical Value to Psychology in Canada." Concerning the "private papers of individual psychologists," 15 of 41 Canadian universities were prepared to accept such papers although not all had done so. In fact, the papers of only fifteen psychologists had been acquired by university archives at the time of a recent letter from Wright: letter, Mary L. Wright, 28 March 1990.

In Wright's survey letter to university presidents, she expressed concern that the papers of Canadian psychologists were being sought by the Archives of the American Psychological Association and some faculty fonds may therefore have "already been lost to this country." Such concerns are understandable and the thrust of this paper—generally favouring institutional over subject-based repositories—is in accord with Wright's preferences. In the absence of a suitable archives at a scholar's home university, however, the principle of subject complementarity may be a better determinant of a suitable repository than feelings of nationalism.

- 34 Letter, Gregory J. Higby, 14 November 1989.
- 35 Interview, Kenneth A. Ross, Associate Secretary of the Mathematical Association of America, April 1990.
- 36 Henry J. Browne, "An Appeal for Archives in Institutions of Higher Learning," *American Archivist* 16 (1953), p. 216.