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Abstract

This essay attempts to determine how university archives in British Columbia have developed from their origins as collections of historical documents within university libraries, and whether they exemplify the larger trend of archival development evident in Canada. An examination of the history of the National Archives of Canada provides a model of developmental stages and key elements necessary for a modern archival programme. In addition it exemplifies the Canadian tradition of "total archives". Individual case studies explore the evolution of British Columbia's three university archives, in the light of this Canadian tradition. Archival programmes located within the University of British Columbia, the University of Victoria and Simon Fraser University are examined, in order to determine how they were conceived, advanced and sustained. An examination of the administrative records of the three university archives including annual reports, correspondence, policies and committee minutes presents a historical overview of their growth and development. Following decades of progress, the emerging picture is one of an incomplete process with each institution having attained a different level of development. The conclusion compares and contrasts the three institutions and assesses their progress in the broader national context of Canadian university archives generally. The state of university archives in British Columbia mirrors that of their national counterparts and the emerging picture is one of an evolution still incomplete.
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Introduction

The purpose of this thesis is to investigate the growth and development of university archives in British Columbia and to assess their progress toward achieving effective archival programmes. The establishment of public archival institutions in Canada has emulated the experience and tradition of the National Archives of Canada. As the largest and one of the oldest institutions in the country, the National Archives has provided leadership and a pattern of development for fledgling archives. A close examination of the history of the National Archives will delineate identifiable stages of development against which the three university archives in British Columbia can be assessed.

Little has been written about the overall development of university archives in Canada. The only article produced to date which examines the state of Canadian university archives was published in 1976. Although a number of surveys have been undertaken by the Association of Canadian Archivists, most recently in 1986, their findings have not been analyzed to evaluate the progress achieved since 1976. In that study, Ian Wilson concluded that Canadian university archives are so diverse in character that it is difficult to generalize about them. He notes:

Each university has its own character and self-image, produced by a blend of tradition, faculty or curricular interests and goals, and alumni spirit. This diversity is reflected in the extent of the resources, in the mandate allotted the archivist and in the defined line between University records and private manuscripts. None of these archives are large and indeed, many of the archivists maintain rather a lonely vigil, invigorated by the close contact with faculty and students, but seldom content with the portion of limited resources allocated to archival service... Much depends on the resourcefulness and initiative of these archivists, in adapting to shifting circumstances.

Although Wilson’s article is useful as a summary of the general state of university archives it
does not identify the vital components of an archival programme. Nor does it evaluate the progress achieved in establishing certain of those components. He merely finds diversity, and does not explain in any given case how or why a particular development has occurred. In contrast, the survey results published by the Association of Canadian Archivists provide only raw data, devoid of evaluation and interpretation. Clearly, university archives represent a portion of the national archival network requiring further study and examination.

The first chapter of this study will focus on a developmental model provided through an examination of the historical evolution and experiences of the National Archives of Canada. The model will identify stages of development, as well as archival functions and components necessary to each stage. This model will provide a tool for assessing the stage of development of archival programmes at the University of British Columbia, University of Victoria, and Simon Fraser University. Chapters two through four will examine the evolution of each of these programmes. The three case studies investigated indicate that university archives often have their origins as culturally motivated initiatives within university libraries. The purpose of this study is to determine whether and how these institutions grow from such origins and if they follow the developmental pattern of the National Archives of Canada. The case studies strive to reveal how the programmes were individually envisioned, created, advanced and sustained, as well as the pattern of development each has taken.

The final chapter of the study will compare the achievements of the three programmes. It will summarize the elements necessary for a fully effective university archival programme. What will emerge is the point each institution has attained along the continuum of progress. Data available from the national surveys will provide a basis for comparing of the state of university archives in British Columbia with those in the rest of Canada.
Introduction - Endnotes


2 Ibid., 17-18.
CHAPTER ONE

The National Archives of Canada: A Developmental Model

The cornerstone of the Canadian archival system is the National Archives of Canada. For over one hundred years the National Archives has played a dual role as an essential arm of government and as an important research institution. In the former role, it is responsible for managing of federal government records and ensuring that the federal administration is fully documented to serve its own and larger societal needs. In the later role, it is responsible for acquiring from any source, archival material of national significance relating to the development of Canada. It is also responsible for providing the research facilities and services necessary to make this material available to the public. The National Archives of Canada has been recognized as unusual, if not unique. It has developed as a storehouse of all types of material, from any source, recording the history of Canada. In contrast, the conventional national archives is responsible primarily for the records of the national government. Private papers have tended to be collected by national libraries or private institutions. The National Archives of Canada’s practice of concentrating all forms of archival material of both public and private origin in one institution has received international recognition and the descriptive label, “total archives”.

Within Canada, the National Archives has served as a model for archives which have developed at the provincial, territorial, and local government levels. In addition, other publicly funded institutions such as universities, libraries, museums, historical societies and research institutes have followed the lead of the national and provincial archives. In the last forty years, Canada’s major publicly supported repositories have increasingly directed their attention to establishing themselves as full-fledged records offices for the governments and administrations they serve and have expanded their programmes to collect a wide variety of records generated by
individuals and organizations in the private sphere.\textsuperscript{2} An outline of the development of the National Archives of Canada will exemplify the role of archives in government and in society. Furthermore, since the practices of the National Archives have had such an important impact upon the development of other archival institutions, a closer examination of its historical development will also serve to illustrate first, key components of a full archival programme; second, any apparent stages of development; and finally, external factors or forces which may have influenced development. The pattern of development of the National Archives will provide a model for the analysis of the three case studies.

The impetus for the creation of the Public Archives of Canada came from the historical community. Only four years after confederation, a petition supported by the Quebec Literary Society was presented to Parliament outlining the necessity of creating a repository for historical archives. It was contended that authors and literary inquirers were at a disadvantage in Canada as compared to their European contemporaries. This disadvantage arose from being debarred from facilities of access to public records, official papers and other documents illustrative of the history of Canada.\textsuperscript{3}

At this time it was strongly believed that historiography was closely allied with the forces of nationalism. Consequently, the availability of archival material for the study of the past was one manifestation of a government's interest in fostering a national consciousness.\textsuperscript{4} History, national in scope and patriotic in character, was expected to provide the spirit and justification for the new Canadian nation.\textsuperscript{5} The government of Canada responded to the request for a public archives in 1872, when the House of Commons voted $4,000 for this purpose. Douglas Brymner, a Montreal journalist, was appointed Canada's first Dominion Archivist. Brymner struggled to acquire the basic records for the historical study of Canada. During the next thirty years, his
efforts and dedication were to prepare a solid foundation for a national Canadian archives. The Public Archives of Canada was organized primarily for cultural rather than administrative purposes. It did not develop as an extension of a government record-keeping department, but instead as a support for historical research.

In the Archives report for the year 1882, Brymner stated that the objective of his office was to “obtain from all sources, private as well as public, such documents as may throw light on social, commercial, municipal, as well as purely political history.”\textsuperscript{6} Brymner’s perception of his role is further embodied in a later comment he made to the American Historical Association, that he aimed to amass “a great storehouse of the history of the colony and colonists in their political, ecclesiastical, industrial, domestic, in a word, every aspect of their lives.”\textsuperscript{7} He applied himself to the acquisition of documents related to the activities of the British military forces in Canada, as well as copying official records and private papers in London and Paris concerning the administration of the Canadian colonies.\textsuperscript{8} Brymner’s efforts were limited by an annual budget, which never exceeded $12,000 and averaged much less, and also by the fact that the Archives’ responsibility for public government records was never clearly defined during his tenure in office.

Despite this fact, government records were not completely ignored. Shortly after Brymner’s appointment, the Secretary of State appointed Henry J. Morgan as Keeper of the Records. Morgan was responsible for the rescue of old government records housed in vaults in Montreal. Again, the Quebec Literary Society intervened and a memorial was presented to Parliament requesting that “the Dominion Government...complete the measure of progress of 1870 by providing the necessary legislation to create a Public Records Office...and take the necessary steps to have copied and gathered there the archives of Canada.”\textsuperscript{9} In 1882, $2,000 was voted for the arrangement and indexing of the records of the old colonial government.
In 1889, the issue of records retention and destruction was raised when the Post Office requested authority to dispose of useless documents of a routine nature. The subject was referred to the Minister of Finance and was later considered in Privy Council. An Order passed on July 5, 1890, provided that comprehensive schedules of destruction be prepared for each department with the collaboration of the Treasury Board and the sanction of the Privy Council. This Order was progressive in its proposal, but, unfortunately, its effects were not fully realized for more than half a century.¹⁰

In 1895, efforts were made by the Dominion Archivist to consolidate historical manuscripts and the records of government in one central repository. In response, the Privy Council appointed a Departmental Commission to report on the state of public records. The Commission's report, published in 1898, outlined the lack of uniformity and systems within departments to arrange and preserve their records. It recommended that all public records be centralized under the care of an official to be called the Dominion Archivist and Keeper of the Records. The Commission recommended that all records services be consolidated in one central agency and public repository. This was achieved in 1903, through an Order-In-Council,¹¹ which noted that:

...it shall be the duty of the said Dominion Archivist and Keeper of the Records, under the direction of the Minister of Agriculture, to keep and preserve the Archives of Canada and such other documents, records and data as may tend to promote knowledge of the history of Canada and furnish a record of events of historical interest therein.¹²

Unfortunately, Brymner did not live to witness the amalgamation of historical manuscripts and government records. He passed away before the Order-In-Council was implemented. However, he can be credited with locating and acquiring valuable records for the historical study of Canada and thereby preparing a foundation for future archival growth and development.
Brymner was succeeded by Arthur Doughty, literary critic, historian and former assistant librarian of the Legislative Library in Quebec, in May 1904. Together with his close colleague and advisor, Adam Shortt, Doughty reviewed the work of his predecessor and proposed to expand it in a systematic manner. He presented a long-range programme for the Archives, which went beyond Brymner's vision of a treasure house of Canadian history to envisage the institution as an active participant in the writing, teaching and presenting of history. Shortt was a historian and professor of political science at Queen's University. He shared with Doughty a similar view of the social and cultural importance of historical writing and the consequent need to make archival resources generally available. Shortt's views on the role of history were clearly articulated. He believed that historical study was vitally important to the development of a Canadian nation and recognized the tie between history and nation building. Such historical study required both access to archival records and the dissemination of the information they contained. Dr. Doughty's three decades as Dominion Archivist can be characterized as a period of intense archival activity. During this time the Archives moved to a more prominent position as a cultural agency of government.

In his annual reports of 1904 and 1905, Doughty indicated that he made a thorough review of all aspects of the Archives work and had given careful consideration to developing long range programmes. He stressed that to write history, historians required access to both official records of government and the private papers of individuals. Therefore, his prime concern as Dominion Archivist was to locate and make these records available. Doughty systematically expanded the acquisition of archival material by seeking out official records and private papers on both sides of the Atlantic. A second component of his programme was to produce a guide to all collections of papers relating to Canada, wherever they were located. To accomplish this objective a Historical
Documents Publications Board associated with the Archives was formed with Shortt appointed chairman.

To accommodate Doughty's expanded acquisitions programme, a new Archives building was completed in 1906. The following year, all holdings were transferred to the new building, which was organized into three divisions: the Manuscript Division; the Map Division; and the Prints Division. Even after the move, the collections continued to grow through transfers from government departments, copies from London and Paris, and the donation of private papers.\footnote{16}

In 1912, the Archives mandate was finally defined in legislation with the passage of the Public Archives Act. The chief elements outlined in the Act called for a single archival agency responsible for the care, custody and control of public records, documents and other historical material of every kind, nature and description such as were deposited in the Archives.\footnote{17} The Archives was further strengthened by its removal from the Department of Agriculture and creation as a separate department, the Public Archives of Canada. The Act specified that the Dominion Archivist was to be appointed by the Governor General in Council and was to be responsible for the care, custody and control of the Public Archives. It was within the Dominion Archivist's power to acquire by gift, purchase, or copying, historical material of every kind, nature and description in addition to receiving the records of government departments. Finally, these holdings were to be made available through indexing, publishing or copying.\footnote{18} As a policy sanctioned at the highest level, the Public Archives Act served to legitimize the position of the Public Archives in the eyes of the administrators, politicians and the general public. It included two important components designed to enshrine rights and set down obligations. First, it established the administrative structure and authority for the archival programme; and second, it outlined the basic element of that programme. By setting out the responsibilities of the archivist and the Archives, the 1912 Archives Act provided a legislative framework for archival activity, as
well as a measure of accountability in the sense that the Dominion Archivist was responsible
directly to the Secretary of State for carrying out the functions of the Archives.

Until the passage of the 1912 Archives Act, the Public Archives operated without a formally
approved mandate and collections policy. Collecting priorities were determined to a large extent
by the inclinations and philosophies of the two Dominion Archivists to date. However, despite
the absence of a formally sanctioned policy the Archives was acquiring material from both the
public and private sector. The two commonly accepted forms of acquisition are institutional and
non-institutional. Institutional acquisition involves the transfer of custody of government records
from the department of creation to the Archives, non-institutional acquisition focuses upon
acquiring through gift, bequest or purchase, material produced by individuals or organizations
outside the federal government. A formalized approval of the process of acquisition, evaluation
and selection is a key component of an archival programme.

During the same year that the Public Archives Act was passed, attention was once again
directed toward enquiring into the state of public records. Under the provisions of the 1903
Order-In-Council, many pre-Confederation records were transferred to the Archives. However,
there was great concern regarding the lack of continuing co-operation from government
departments. Consequently, a Royal Commission was appointed to examine the state of federal
records. Two years later, the Commission reported on the generally unsatisfactory care of
records more than ten years old. It recommended the establishment of a Public Records Office as
part of the Public Archives. Unfortunately, the outbreak of war canceled plans to construct a
building to house the non-current records of departments. Despite this setback, a positive result
of the Commissions work was a 1914 Order-In-Council, authorizing the transfer of historically
valuable material to the Public Archives and the institution of a requirement that the destruction of
records needed authorization of the Treasury Board. Despite this important step to regularize
destruction, no procedures were put in place to effect the order, and the Archives therefore could take no regular role in scrutinizing disposition of public records. However, during the 1920s Doughty again returned to the idea of having a simple secure records storage building constructed to house the inactive records of the federal government. Although the Dominion government recognized the record-keeping responsibilities of the Archivist, it did not provide the means for him to live up to them.

One area which did yield success was Doughty’s attempt to increase the size of the Archives. The existing building could not accommodate further growth of collections, therefore the construction of a new wing commenced in 1925. Opened in December of 1926, it provided much needed space for manuscript holdings and the growing number of researchers. It did not however, address the space requirements for the public records.21

The Depression was a period of retrenchment for the Public Archives. The policies and programmes of Doughty were crippled by the financial stringency of economic hard times. The Historical Documents Publications Board was allowed to dissolve after the death of Shortt in 1931. Regional offices were closed and the number of staff was reduced through natural attrition.22 In March of 1935, at the age of seventy-five, Doughty retired. J.F. Kenney was appointed Acting Dominion Archivist.

In Kenney’s first report as Dominion Archivist he pleaded for additional staff and space. He stated that unless further storage was provided, the Department would be unable to discharge its primary duty of preserving government records. He also noted his hope that Canada would not lose the eminence in archival circles which had been attained through the policy of preserving archival records in one building under one control.23

In 1937, Gustave Lanctot was appointed Canada’s third Dominion Archivist. A member of the Public Archives staff since 1913, his term as Dominion Archivist continued as had his
predecessors, plagued by a continuing lack of resources. During his decade as Dominion Archivist, Lanctot led the Archives into new documentary media by acquiring both motion picture film and sound recordings. In 1948, Lanctot retired and William Kaye Lamb, former Provincial Archivist and Librarian of British Columbia, became the fourth Dominion Archivist.

The years of growth and development prior to the appointment of Lamb can be regarded as a period of establishment of basic infrastructure and rescue of materials. This phase of the Archives’ history included the founding and establishment of the institution, as well as the approval of its mandate and authority to operate. Essentially, the years 1872 - 1948 were a period when the primary focus of the Archives was the acquisition of holdings mostly through various informal means for public records and as opportunity arose for private records. The goal of the Dominion Archivist during these years was to amass a collection of material, in order to encourage historical research and writing, and, thereby, to foster a national consciousness and identity for Canada. This premise is in part substantiated by Brymner and Doughty’s legendary reputations as collectors. Although efforts were made to effect regular transfer of the records of government the Archives produced only minimal success. The appointment of Lamb would mark a shift in the Archives focus and direction away from informal acquisition to the creation of a formal and more systematic means for the control and disposition of public records and is therefore a watershed between the first and second phases of development.

The period from 1872-1948 illustrates the Public Archives of Canada’s first stage of institutional development. A key element implemented during this stage is legislated authority and mandate. An institution is formally sanctioned by its parent body with the authority to exist, and to acquire, preserve and make available for study a specified holding of archival material. The specifics of which materials will be acquired and how, is clearly defined in an approved collections policy. Every archival institution needs official sanction to carry out its functions. Often, the
establishment of an officially sanctioned mandate can take some time, even after the institution has begun preserving records and delivering services. The Public Archives did not have an act giving it formally sanctioned powers until 1912, and even then its authority over the disposition of public records remained weak, and therefore it could not develop procedures and obtain support to implement a systematic acquisition policy for records of the federal government. Its acquisition of public records continued to rely on informal means of persuasion or the initiative of some sympathetic official. Thus, acquisition of both public and private records depended on initiative to identify records which were at risk or to respond to opportunities as they arose rather than as the product of a clearly articulated policy and actions to realize it. Throughout virtually all of this period, the Archives concentrated on acquiring all manner of documents, mainly pertaining to the preconfederation era, in order to support the writing of Canadian history. This task also required the Archives to establish physical facilities to house the materials and service them. Another important element established during an institution's first stage is its administrative reporting structure, or placement within the organization. Other key factors which must be addressed but continue to be relevant throughout all stages of development, are physical space, staff and monetary resources.

A number of factors would push Lamb to move the Archives into its second stage of development. This stage saw the Archives enhance its authority and develop procedures for the systematic management and disposition of public records. As well, the methods for acquiring, preserving, and making private records available were slowly improved, in particular by concentrating on records of more recent origin. The scale of government activity during World War II generated a sense of urgency regarding the proper selection and preservation of government records. Through Lamb's determination, the Archives was able to play a significant role in the development of a more systematic means for the disposition of public records.
period featured an augmentation of the Archives' role in administering government records throughout their life cycle. The magnitude of the records problem came to the attention of the Royal Commission of National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (Massey-Levesque Commission). The Massey-Levesque Commission reiterated the recommendations of the previous Commissions of 1903 and 1914 for a systematic means of disposing of public records. Lamb himself had very early on identified the need for a large half-way house to be constructed to store departmental files which were no longer required for day to day use, but not yet ready for transfer to the Archives. This need was fulfilled in December 1955, with the opening of the Public Archives Records Centre in Ottawa.26

The opening of the Records Centre was an important step in the development of a comprehensive management programme for public records. Common components of such a programme include: first, the preparation of disposition schedules identifying periods of administrative usefulness; second, the use of records centres for the storage of dormant records; third, the destruction of useless records; and finally, the transfer to the Archives of records which have enduring administrative, fiscal, legal and historical values.

In 1956, the government's Central Microfilming Unit was transferred to the Public Archives. The transfer of this records management function represented a recognition of the integral relationship between records management and archives and the central position of archives in maintaining records preservation standards through the use of technology such as microfilm. Another significant accomplishment was the creation of a separate Disposal and Scheduling Section within the Public Archives Records Centre. What was missing at this stage of development was more detailed specification of the authority or responsibility of the Dominion Archivist for all aspects of records management. This was recognized in 1959 by the Royal Commission on Government Organization. The Commission argued in favour of the essential
unity of records management to encompass the care of active and dormant records, as well as the
ccontrol of destruction and selection for permanent retention.27 The recommendations of the
Commission provided a framework for a comprehensive records management system which was
established by an Order-In-Council in 1966. The Order provided that an integrated programme of
records management be entrusted to the Dominion Archivist. The Dominion Archivist was given
complete authority, under the direction of the Treasury Board, over the scheduling, destruction
and transfer of public records. In addition, the Dominion Archivist was also responsible for
reviewing and assessing the records management practices of departments and establishing
standards and guidelines. The approval and endorsement of the Dominion Archivist’s records
management responsibilities precipitated the transformation of the Records Centre into the
Records Management Branch one year after the Order-In-Council.28

Lamb’s tenure as Dominion Archivist represented the second phase in the growth and
development of the Public Archives of Canada. This phase can be described as the stage of
“improved authority and infrastructure”. During the years 1948-1968, the Archives was able to
establish the infrastructure necessary to fulfill its mandate. This included the opening of the
Records Centre; transfer of the Microfilming Unit; creation of a Disposal and Scheduling Section;
and finally, the strengthening of the Archives authority for records management under the Public
Archives Order. The creation of this infrastructure exemplified a recognition that records
management is a significant and essential component of a successful archival programme. Only
through records management could the Public Archives fulfill its primary responsibility to
preserve the federal government’s records of enduring value.

It has been recognized that as a rule archivists generate the first initiatives in records
management in order to serve archival ends. Archivists have considered the ultimate purpose of
record management as being the permanent preservation of “historically valuable” material in an
The Public Archives of Canada has championed the "life-cycle" concept of the records management - archives relationship. This concept is based upon a recognition of eight distinct and separate stages in the life of a record. The first four stages are part of the records management phase and consist of: first, the creation of information in the form of records; second, the classification of records into a logical system; third, the maintenance and use of records; and finally, their disposition through destruction or transfer to the archives. The second or archival phase is also comprised of four stages. These stages include: first, the selection and acquisition of records by the archives; second, the description of these records in inventories and finding aids; third, the preservation of the records; and finally, the use of the records for government and research purposes. This life cycle concept evolved in order to promote a sense of order and a systematic approach to the overall management of recorded information.

A number of different elements have contributed to the complexity of administration and the consequent need for methods to manage information. These include: first, an increase in information and a greater volume of records; second, the filling of available storage space; third, a need to locate information quickly; fourth, a legal obligation to retain more and more records for relatively long periods of time; and finally, the need to retain some records permanently for historical study. The steps taken by the Public Archives to manage the records of the federal government were the result of all of these factors.

All records management programmes are comprised of a number of component elements. These include the creation, distribution and receipt of records, as well as the management of active, semi-active, in-active and vital records. Two additional elements which support these components are the records inventory and the retention schedule. An archival service responsible for maintaining the records of an administration or parent body must implement all of
these elements in order to maintain a standard of control and thereby fulfill its primary responsibility.

Within this second stage of development, the Archives acquired the authority to implement all the elements of a programme to manage the records of the federal government at every stage of their life-cycle, and in particular to work out for the first time procedures for their systematic disposition.

Following the incorporation of the records management function into the archives operation, the Public Archives entered the final stage of development. During this stage the Archives would achieve a greater degree of autonomy to manage its affairs. Management concerns would come to the fore. Upon entering this phase, the Archives was operating with a clearly defined authority, policies and procedures to allow it to manage both private and public records. It could then embark upon developing its capabilities to live up to its responsibilities and demonstrate its competence.

Lamb retired from the Public Archives of Canada in 1968. He was succeeded by the former Assistant Dominion Archivist, Wilfred I. Smith. A new building and increased resources allowed Smith to broaden the records management programme. During his term, six regional records centres opened across Canada. In addition, the collections expanded due to the growing importance of new documentary media. Initiatives to preserve moving image, sound archives, architectural records, photographic images and machine readable records were developed in the 1970s. Another important focus was the development of programmes designed to open the Archives to a wider public. Significant among these efforts was the compilation of the Union List of Manuscripts in Canadian Repositories, published to alert researchers to the potential of archival resources.
Within the final stage of development, the Public Archives of Canada illustrates the kinds of initiatives which can be undertaken to improve the institution’s infrastructure and the management of records. All components of a modern archival programme exist at this stage and the institution is a fully autonomous operation with the full range of responsibilities for the management of records.

Another important component of an archival programme which is an issue throughout all stages of development is adequate resources. These resources include such requirements as budget, staff, and storage space. Without these resources it is not possible for an institution to acquire, preserve and make its holdings available for public research. Acquiring and expanding these resources is an ongoing battle for all archival institutions. This statement is supported in the Report of the Consultative Group on Canadian Archives, published in 1980. The report noted that the portrait of Canadian archives was one in which the cumulative effects of chronic lack of funding, facilities and equipment had blighted the development of most repositories. The results of the study revealed that archives were in need of various forms of assistance, such as basic supplies, facilities, staff and access to technical facilities. All institutions are dependent upon a continuing core of funding from their parent body in order to sustain an operation with a smoothly functioning records management and reference service system. The methods for acquiring these resources vary from institution to institution; however, since their requirement expands along with the growth of collections, their need is ongoing.

The issue of resources was a constant concern for the Public Archives of Canada. Throughout its history, successive Dominion Archivists struggled to acquire the necessary funds, staff and space to house, preserve and make accessible an ever expanding holding. A brief overview of the acquisition of greater resources serves to exemplify the struggle common to all
archives and demonstrated the achievements which can be accomplished with progress and development.

When the Public Archives of Canada was established in 1872, it was located in three empty rooms in West Block of the Parliament Buildings. The Archives remained there until 1904, despite the efforts of Douglas Brymner to convince the Prime Minister that a new building was needed. Finally, in 1904, construction commenced on a new Archives building on Sussex Drive, which was completed two years later. By 1920, the pressures caused by an ever expanding holdings prompted Doughty to lobby for an expansion of the Sussex Drive building. A new wing was planned which would double the available area. Construction commenced in 1925, and the following year the Archives had an additional three floors of space. Further space was acquired in 1955, when a records centre was constructed to store the inactive records of the federal government. Sixty-three years after the construction of the first Archives on Sussex Drive, a new building opened on Wellington Street, shared by the Archives and the National Library. The new Archives provided improved facilities for the preservation of collections and reference service. Space was available to accommodate two hundred researchers, as well as facilities for exhibitions and meetings. In short, the Wellington Street building permitted a level and range of activities not previously possible.

In addition to the ongoing requirements for additional space, the Public Archives also struggled to attain the financial resources necessary to support its operation. Over the years the budget of the Archives increased as the collections, services and programmes grew. When the Archives was established in 1872, Brymner administered a budget of $4,000. By 1889, this allocation had increased to $6,000. With the opening of a new building in 1906, and the expansion of the acquisition and copying programme in Europe, the budget of the Archives increased 75%, to $20,000. The following year the budget doubled again and by 1937, when
Lanctot was appointed Dominion Archivist the budget had reached $173,435. However, with the outbreak of war in 1939, the budget was reduced to $144,410. As peace and prosperity returned the budget again increased. By 1951, the Archives operated on a budget of $206,000 and this increased to two million dollars by the end of Lamb’s term. In 1991-92, the Archives expended $5.65 million exclusive of contributions to employee benefits. The procurement of resources, namely space, budget and staff are central to the success and progress of any archival institution. The attainment of these resources is dependent upon the growth of the collections, services and programmes and of course the availability of the means to provide them. During hard economic times such as depression or war, institutions both large or small are vulnerable to measures of restraint or retrenchment. The experience of the Public Archives’ struggle for increased resources is indicative of the challenge facing all institutions throughout all stages of their development.

Throughout its history the Public Archives of Canada has had two distinct but related mandates. The first, as a national cultural institution and the second as a contributor to the management of government records. The first evidence of this dual role can be found in the Archives report of 1882, where Brymner voiced the objective of his office to obtain from all sources public as well as private, documents revealing the social, commercial, municipal and political history of Canada. This notion of collecting public as well as private records became an approved mandate in 1903, when it was resolved by an Order-In-Council amalgamating the positions of Dominion Archivist and Keeper of the Records and outlining the responsibilities of the new position. The concept of total archives was again endorsed in 1912 by the passage of the Public Archives Act. The Act authorized the Dominion Archivist to acquire historical material of every kind, as well as the records of government departments, which revealed the truth about every aspect of Canadian life. A revised mandate approved in 1982 again outlined the dual role of the Public Archives. It read as follows:
The mission of the Public Archives of Canada is the systematic preservation of government and private records of Canadian national significance to facilitate the effective and efficient operation of the Government of Canada; historical research in all aspects of the Canadian experience; the protection of rights, and an enhancement of a sense of national identity based on archives as the collective memory of the nation.37

It has been recognized that the concept of total archives as developed in Canada includes four elements: that all sources of archival material appropriate to the jurisdiction of the archives are acquired from both public and private sources; that all types of archival material may be acquired, including manuscripts, maps, pictures, photographs, sound recordings, film and machine readable records; that a repository should attempt to acquire material pertaining to all subjects of human endeavour, in accordance with its territorial jurisdiction; and that both the creator of the records and the archivist recognize the life cycle of records, in order to ensure their efficient management.38

A total archives system has been acknowledged as having certain advantages. For example, related source material is consolidated in a single repository, thus making access easier for researchers. A researcher studying a particular period or episode in Canadian history has the advantage of having to visit only one institution for sources. If a similar study were to be pursued in England, the researcher would be compelled to visit several widely separated institutions. For original manuscripts he would consult the Public Records Office; for maps, old newspapers or pamphlets and private papers he would visit the British Library; and for illustrative material he would go to the one or another of the publicly supported art galleries.39

By casting a broad net, total archives attempt to document all aspects of historical development not just of officialdom, or of a governing elite, but all segments of a community. By combining official administrative records with manuscripts and other multi-media formats all
reflecting the development of an organization or region, the total archives approach makes efficient use of limited archival resources. It also takes advantage of the economies of scale in providing proper archival facilities.40

The report of the Consultative Group on Canadian Archives comments on the development of total archives in Canada. The report notes that increasingly municipal, university, regional, corporate and theme archives are following the lead of the national and provincial archives in establishing a total archives. However, it is suggested that there does exist a disadvantage to the total archives approach. Namely, that the acquisition policies of total archives institutions could potentially overlap.41 To address the problem of competition inherent in the total archives approach, the Dominion, Provincial, and Territorial Archives have developed an annual forum for rationalizing acquisitions policies and the Canadian Council of Archives has issued guidelines to institutions for developing acquisitions policies. Given time, it is hoped that coordination and cooperation will extend to all institutions within the national archival system.42

It was proposed by the Consultative Group that generally archives in Canada have not been established in response to a clear plan. On the whole they have emerged from modest beginnings and have grown through the enthusiasm of a small number of supporters. These supporters have set objectives to meet institutional needs and have been hampered by a level of funding which has fallen short of the demand for services. The Group proposed that even the National and Provincial repositories bear this imprint of experience.43 The preceding discussion of the development of the National Archives exemplifies this statement. Despite its early beginnings the National Archives did not develop a comprehensive archival programme until the late 1960's. This represents nearly one hundred years of progress and achievement.
The impetus for the establishment of the National Archives was predominately cultural inspiration. However, in recent years this has changed with repositories being created out of administrative necessity. Despite the motivating force of their establishment, “within limited resources, each of these archives mirrors the programs of the Public Archives of Canada...” Since a strong emphasis had been placed on the National Archives as a role model for other Canadian archives, its pattern of development can be used as a model to assess the archival services which exist within university settings.

A number of surveys on university archives have been conducted in Canada and the United States. These surveys reveal that university archives are relatively young in terms of Canada’s archival heritage. It was only in the 1960’s that a few of Canada’s older universities began to appoint archivists to care for their records, namely: McGill, Queen’s, Toronto, Laval, Alberta and Montreal. Yet, by 1971, the number of universities with full-time archivists had increased to fifteen. A more recent survey conducted in 1985 by the University and College Section of the Association of Canadian Archivists revealed that of the sixty-five universities established throughout Canada, only thirty-six of these had an archives programme.

University archives represent a significant portion of the overall national archival system. Consequently, it is important to understand their development and the factors which have shaped their progress. Have university archives developed in a manner similar to the National Archives of Canada? What is the scope and character of their programmes? Do these programmes reflect the key elements as outlined in the developmental stages of the National Archives? Do they reflect any apparent patterns of development which are obvious and identifiable? Finally, are there issues, factors, or forces unique to university archives which set them apart?
The following three case studies will examine the historical development of university archives in British Columbia. Through a close examination of their progress and growth the answers to the above questions will become evident.
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CHAPTER TWO

**Case Study One: The University of British Columbia**

The first case study will examine the growth and development of the University of British Columbia’s University Archives. Established not long after the turn of the century, the University of British Columbia is the oldest of the province’s three degree granting institutions. It was not until twenty years after its founding that the first impetus for archival acquisition was initiated at the university. The following discussion will attempt to trace the growth and development of this early initiative. An examination of the history of the university’s archival programme, will demonstrate what stages of development, if any, were achieved over the sixty year period from 1929 to 1989 and the factors which were integral to the developmental process and how they have shaped it.

The predecessor of the University of British Columbia was established in Vancouver in 1906 by McGill University of Montreal. This small college ultimately led to the founding of the University of British Columbia. The university was originally located on the Fairview slopes in Vancouver and consisted of a number of temporary “shacks”. From its inception, the university housed a substantial library collection. Purchased on the instruction of University President, Frank Fairchild Wesbrook, the collection was selected in Europe by the University of Minnesota’s librarian, James T. Gerould.¹ In 1915, the library became the responsibility of John Ridington, the university’s first Chief Librarian. At that time the collection comprised 22,000 bound volumes and 7,000 pamphlets.² For the next twenty-five years Ridington shaped the direction and growth of the library’s collection.

The Ridington era can be characterized as one of restraint and difficulty.³ The library constantly scrambled for the resources to fund its objectives to support teaching and research. Collections development was made all the more challenging by the limited financial support
provided by the Provincial Government. The books and serials budget allowed only very few and carefully selected purchases. However, despite these limitations, Ridington remained buoyant in his search for books and donors. It is important to note that at this time, the library’s collecting focused entirely on published material. The notion of collecting archives or manuscripts had not yet been conceived.

In 1925, the university moved to its permanent location at Point Grey. The new neo-gothic library was built for a total cost of $525,000 and was planned to allow future expansion. The library provided reading and study space for 350 students and shelf space for 135,000 volumes.4

The affluence of the twenties came to an abrupt end with the stock market crash of 1929. During the next three years the provincial budget for the university was slashed by well over half and the survival of the university itself was in question.5 This scarcity of funds is exemplified by the reduction in the library’s book and serial budget between 1927 and 1931.6 The library had come to the worst crisis of its history. Ridington’s battle for survival is underscored by a letter he wrote to Donald Cameron at the University of Alberta in 1932:

We have been working for years to build up a collection and service of books that so far as I know is among the best of any University library in Canada...and now the prospect is starvation, retrogression. I am weary at heart and sick of soul.7

Amid these hard economic times a glimmer of hope lay in the support the Library received from the university faculty and student body. In 1929, a group of students, headed by Eric North and Dr. Sage of the History Department, proposed to “form the nucleus of an organization for collecting material relative to the history of British Columbia.”8 The group enthusiastically acquired stories from pioneers, books, manuscripts, and photographs. Although these acquisitions drew the ire of the Provincial Archivist, the Class of 1931 presented the library with a
collection which did indeed form the nucleus of the Northwest Historical Collection, now in the library’s Special Collections and University Archives Division.9

This initiative of professors and students marked the beginning of an archival collection housed in the library. Traditionally, university libraries have established manuscript collections to provide resource material for training graduate students, and also to support historical research. At many universities, professors have been the leaders of this movement. By encouraging and fostering such arrangements, faculty were ensuring the preservation of provincial heritage, while also promoting an interest in providing unique resources directly on campus for research and education.10 A number of factors have effected the growth of university archival holdings. Materials are acquired in many instances as a bid to rescue documents from destruction. Others are acquired through close ties with a region or local community, in an effort to preserve more detailed documentation located outside the sphere of public and other archives. Often, material is acquired through the generosity of graduates and benefactors and the acceptance of such donations combines the benefits of good public relations and prestige. Also, in some instances, donors prefer to entrust their personal papers or life long work to a university library closely associated with research and learning. All of these factors are significant to the development of the University of British Columbia’s historical manuscripts holding.

Small gifts and donations continued throughout the library’s lean years, but it was an agreement made in 1937 which had notable implications for future archival development. In October of 1937, Ridington reached an agreement with Judge F.W. Howay to donate his collection of Northwest Canadiana to the library under specified conditions. Included in this agreement was the stipulation that the materials be treated as a separate collection and be used only on the library premises by “serious” researchers. Up to this time the library’s “special collections” were handled in a number of different ways. All rare books and other books
considered valuable were housed in a vault and were only made available for use by special request. Other books and material were kept in the Librarian’s office to protect them from theft.\textsuperscript{11} Clearly, the library had no designated space for the storage and preservation of its rare or especially valued holdings. Nor did it have space where the public could gain access to the material under the supervision of library staff. The Howay agreement required that these deficiencies be addressed.

In 1940, Ridington retired and was replaced by Dr. Kaye Lamb, former Provincial Archivist and Librarian in Victoria. It was during Lamb’s tenure that the library’s special collections begun to flourish. In 1944, the material from Judge Howay’s collection arrived. Although Howay’s collection consisted largely of published material it expanded the library’s holding of special collections and raised issues related to security, storage and access. The expanded holding of special collections provided Lamb with the impetus to extend the holdings of published books and pamphlets to include archival material. The Howay collection was stored in a locked room and was available for use to accredited scholars and senior students under the supervision of the librarian. Although the collection was under lock and key, it was all catalogued and it became known that the materials were cared for and accessible. This knowledge was important for future acquisitions. This was the beginning of a great era in acquisition at the library. The success of the library’s acquisition of special collections and archival material during Lamb’s tenure can be attributed to Lamb’s background as a scholar, more expansive post-war budgets, and the powerful connections of the University’s new president, N.A.M. MacKenzie.\textsuperscript{12} The most important acquisition of this period was the collection of Canadiana donated by Robie Reid, a friend and fellow amateur historian of Howay.\textsuperscript{13}

It is obvious that the library’s early acquisition of special collections relied heavily upon gifts-in-kind and the generosity of donors. These donations did not conform to a set of acquisitions
plans or policy. At this time, the library was developing its archival holdings with minimal control and within a very general subject field. The hazard of this type of collecting is the introduction of an element of whim and the fact that acquisitions are subject to conditions of donation over which the library has only limited control. Archival material was acquired as part of a larger special collections and not as a distinct initiative. Therefore, early acquisitions were passively acquired in a broad area of Canadiana and primarily as a complement to the library's holdings of rare books and pamphlets.

It soon became apparent that plans for the expansion of the library building were necessary. Through Lamb's perseverance the north wing of the library opened in 1949. This additional space allowed an area formerly occupied by the catalogue department to become the home of the Howay-Reid Northwest collection.

In 1948, Lamb resigned his position at the University to become Dominion Archivist. He was succeeded briefly by David Dunlap, formerly of the Library of Congress, who only remained at the University for two years. In 1951, Neal Harlow became the new University Librarian. Harlow brought to his position a wealth of experience which included the development of the UCLA Special Collections Division. He can be credited with bringing the idea of having a full fledged Special Collections Division to the University of British Columbia Library. It was his belief that the function of such a division was essential to a maturing research library. Harlow perceived a need for an improved library and realized that to accomplish this, additional financial resources were necessary. To this end, one of his first efforts was to form the "Order of Library Friends". Its purpose was to assist with the development of a plan for the expansion of the library. For the next twelve years the Library Friends were instrumental in providing additional funds, as well as locating and acquiring important collections. Prominent among the group were such men...
as Walter Koerner, H.R. MacMillan and P.A. Woodward, each of whom made an enormous contribution to the growth of the library.16

During his years as University Librarian, Harlow's most conspicuous achievement was the addition of a south wing. According to his original idea, the wing included a new Special Collections Division. At long last, all collections which had previously been housed in the Librarian's office, the vault and the Howay-Reid Room were brought together in one location. With the creation of the Special Collections Division, it became feasible for the library to accept donations which required specialized care and security. The new south wing was officially opened in 1960.

Basil Stuart-Stubbs was appointed the first Head of Special Collections in 1961. He characterized the collections as general Canadiana, strong in source material for British Columbia, the Fur Trade, the War of 1812, the Riel Rebellion and Canadian travel and description pre-1900. The aim was to make a centre for the study of Canadian history and politics. In actual fact, however, its programme fell somewhere between the extremes of a closed "rare book" library and a busy Special Collections Division servicing faculty and students.17

With the appointment of Stuart-Stubbs as University Librarian in 1964, the Special Collections Division entered a period of expansion under the headship of Ann Yandle. The Division's stack space was doubled. Manuscript acquisitions continued and descriptions of holdings were sent to the Public Archives for inclusion in the Union List of Manuscripts.18 The Division entered a new phase in which reference service became a priority and the material which had been so diligently acquired was being used to great advantage by students and scholars.

During the Stuart-Stubbs years, a number of important and prestigious acquisitions increased the strength of the Special Collections Division. Its role expanded from passively acquiring archival material as part of large rare book collections, to an active yet adhoc undirected
acquisition of archival fonds. Such notable fonds as the C.C.F. papers, British Columbia Electric Company records, Ethel Wilson papers, and Roderick Haig-Brown literary manuscripts and papers were acquired by donation. The expansion of acquisition into the archival realm was a natural progression for a library division dedicated to promoting and supporting scholarship and research. These early initiatives later expanded in specific thematic subject areas such as labour, business, and ethnic minorities.

In addition to an increase in acquisitions, the strength of the Division was further enhanced by the addition of new staff. Originally, Special Collections was staffed by a Department Head, one reference librarian and two assistants. This changed in 1967, when a specialist in historical cartography was hired, and again in 1970 when two persons were hired to do archival work. The first was responsible for non-university archival materials and the second for the records of the university. This year has been recognized as the true beginning of the University Archives.

Although the University Archivist was not hired until 1970, there was an active interest in the archives of the university as early as 1956. At this time a President’s Archives Committee was established. This committee was active for three years, distributing suggestions to faculty and administrative staff regarding record keeping and voluntary preservation of historical materials. By 1960, the committee had lapsed, but the Special Collections Division continued to receive sporadic transfers of records and memorabilia. The accumulation of this material over the next ten years led to an appointment of a full-time archivist.

The collecting of historical university records by university libraries has been a common occurrence. Librarians have recognized the research and cultural importance of these materials and voluntarily elected to care for them. A 1966 survey conducted by the Society of American Archivists on College and University Archives in the United States and Canada, provided data in support of this trend. The survey revealed that most university archivists were in fact librarians.
who managed some institutional records as a part-time or incidental function of their other activities. Nearly all surveyed acquired both records and published materials relating to their institution. In many cases, artifacts were reported to be housed, for example, class relics or a spade for breaking ground of a new building. This rescue method of acquisition was described by the librarian of a New England institution who noted: "...the college archives could more rightly be called a morgue, documents of college records of all sorts stuffed in odd boxes and in filing cases..." As in the case of the University of British Columbia, the unbridled growth and accumulation of university records and memorabilia collected in this manner eventually necessitated attention and action.

The programme to preserve university records was administratively located within the Special Collections Division of the Library. The first University Archivist, Laurenda Daniells, reported to the head of the Special Collections. This reporting structure resulted from university records being a natural outgrowth of other archival activity within the library, rather than a conscious decision of university-wide administration. The acquisition of university records was motivated by a desire to serve cultural rather than administrative ends. The prime factor determining their acquisition and preservation was scholarship, historical research and a complementary association with other fonds not an administrative need to manage the records of the university. This experience is similar to that of the Public Archives of Canada in that the concern to preserve historical material for scholarship and the writing of histories contributed to the eventual acquisition of public records. Also, the transfer of public records resulted from random housecleaning activities in offices and not from a systematic selection process initiated by the university archivist.

The University Archivist drafted a developmental plan for university records in August 1970. The plan included a proposed acquisition policy and outline of objectives for future growth and
development. In broad terms, the plan described the role of the records programme as the collective memory of the University. Ideally, the Special Collections Division would house all records and printed material of enduring value created by the university through its daily operation. Records and transactions were to document the activities of faculty, students, administrators, as well as elected and appointed governing bodies. The plan proposed that the Special Collections Division would acquire non-active general administrative records, minutes and correspondence of the President, Registrar, Bursar, Schools, Faculties and other Divisions. It was also to acquire the personal papers of faculty and publications of students, alumni and other societies. Other media formats to be collected included: photographs, paintings, microfilm, tape recordings, film as well as architectural drawings and plans. The final group of records to be acquired were those of other bodies related to the University. All of the above mentioned material was to be appraised according to its evidential value specifically, how it reflected the organization and functioning of the University and also for its informational value, or how it revealed what the University dealt with. The drafting of collecting priorities for the University Archives was a recognition of the distinction between University records and the other general manuscripts and archival fonds acquired and managed by the Special Collections Division. Furthermore, this policy represents a total archives approach. It included not only records in all media, but also institutional records of the University as well as extra-university records of outside societies and personal papers of faculty members. This plan is significant since it laid out a strategy for what material should be included in the holdings of the Archives. Prior to this plan, acquisition was haphazard, passive, and driven externally. This was the beginning of an understanding and appreciation of the need for standards, control, and parameters defining the scope of the institution’s holdings of University records. Although at this stage the Plan was not
formally approved outside the Library, it represents an important element in the first stage of
development.

In addition to outlining acquisition priorities, the 1970 plan also set out a development
proposal. Issues addressed in the plan included such concerns as consolidation of collections,
storage space, public profile, administrative authority, transfer of records and reference service.
The first goal focused upon the consolidation of existing holdings of University records into one
central location within the Special Collections Division. It also addressed the problem of
inadequate storage space and environmental controls. It was recommended that controls be
installed in the back room which housed the University Archives and that until this problem was
rectified, it would not be possible to actively solicit additional records. The second goal
addressed the profile of the Archives within the University and outside community. It suggested
that prior to any attempt to acquire new records, it was necessary to make the existence of the
Archives known. This was to be accomplished through the Vancouver Press, as well as University
publications, in cooperation with the University’s Information Services Office. The third goal
dealt with the transfer of non-active records to the University Archives. It was pointed out that in
order for this objective to be accomplished, the Archivist required authority from the governing
body of the University. The recommended method of achieving this authority was to revive the
President’s Archives Committee. Suggested members included, a representative from the
President’s office, the University Librarian, the Chairman of the History Department, a legal
expert, and finally, a financial expert. This committee was to be responsible for the appraisal and
scheduling of University records. The fourth and final goal of the plan addressed the issues of
archival arrangement, description and reference service. It emphasized the responsibility of the
archivist for the ongoing arrangement and description of University records, as well as making
them accessible to researchers. 24
Following the drafting of the plan for the University Archives, steps were taken to accomplish the first and second objectives. University records were gathered together in one central storage location. Having been located in various sections of the Special Collections Division, they were consolidated inside “the cage”, an environmentally controlled area of storage. In addition, much needed acid-free supplies were purchased to properly store the University Archives. Recommendations to publicize the Archives were also initiated. Contact was made with the Information Services Department, in order to run articles on the function and services of the programme in the UBC Reports. These steps were taken in an effort to establish the University Archives programme as a distinctive function within the Special Collections Division and to attain a measure of recognition and legitimacy.

With regard to the third goal outlined in the plan, a progress report submitted to the Head of Special Collections in March 1971 reiterated the need for reactivating the President’s Archives Committee. The report again stated the need for the Archivist to be empowered to acquire University records. The value of an archives committee has been widely supported in the literature on university archives. Nicholas Burkel, Director of University Archives at the University of Wisconsin-Parkside, stresses the importance of such a committee as a vehicle for increasing the visibility of the archives to all segments of the university community. It is usually recommended that members bring financial, historical, legal, and administrative expertise to bear on the question of records disposition.25

Throughout the 1970’s, the acquisition of University records continued on a piecemeal basis. Although significant success was achieved through the voluntary transfer of records, the archives programme was still operating without the authorization of a governing body. The Archivist’s plans remained unapproved by either the University President, the Board of Governors or the Senate. During this time, University records were received from various University offices,
including: the President, Ceremonies, Information, Bursar, Registrar, Academic Planning, Instructional Media Centre, School of Architecture, Senate Food Service and the Department of Chemistry. Special Collections also acquired records of the Alumni Association, the Alma Mater Society, the Faculty Women’s Club, the Faculty Association, International House, and several faculty members. The records of presidents Wesbrook and MacKenzie were also taken in.

In addition to textual records, significant progress was achieved in the acquisition of non-traditional forms of records. Over the years, Special Collections had collected photographs of the University dating from the earliest days of the University. These photographs were turned over to the University Archives in April 1974. The Division had been entrusted with the care of a collection of recordings of University ceremonies, lectures, broadcasts, and certain oral history recordings. Upon their transfer to the University Archives in 1974, a project was embarked upon to expand these holdings. Arrangements were made through the Combined Services Trust Committee for an Oral History Project to interview people associated with the armed services and war efforts on the campus. The following year, further initiatives resulted in an agreement for the regular deposit of tapes from the Vancouver Institute, Cecil Green Lectureship Committee, Department of Ceremonies and the Information Office.26

Throughout the University Archives first decade, a number of issues and problems remained unaddressed. This continuing lack of attention from the administration was an ongoing cause of concern and frustration for the University Archivist. Each year, a summary of these problems and suggested solutions were outlined in her annual report to the Head of Special Collections. The most pressing problems included the absence of an officially sanctioned mandate and collections policy; insufficient storage space; and also, inadequate clerical assistance.

In order to evoke action on the implementation of an approved mandate and collections policy, the University Archivist recommended that the Senate Library Committee make a
recommendation similar to one passed by the Senate of the University of Victoria 1961 and designed to empower the University Archivist to examine records in university offices and arrange for their final disposition.\textsuperscript{27} Unfortunately, the Senate Library Committee never acted on the University Archivist's recommendation and a motion was never passed.

By the mid-1970's the problem of adequate storage space had become a priority. The Archivist suggested that serious consideration be given to moving University records outside the main library building, such as in a facility for infrequently loaned books. The Archivist also badly needed more than the five hours per week clerical assistance she was allotted.

Another issue which presented an ongoing challenge for the University Archives was publicity. Throughout the period 1970-1975, the Archivist relied upon the circulation of bulletins requesting the transfer of records and publications to the archives. In addition, numerous articles describing the services provided by Special Collections were published in the UBC Reports and the Alumni Chronicle. By 1975, it was evident that the Library's programme for University records was still not widely known in the academic community. The Archivist continued her efforts, but publicity alone could not make up for a lack of sanction for the programme.\textsuperscript{28}

In 1976, the Archivist attempted yet again to develop a records policy in the hopes that it would be approved by the administration and implemented by the Library. As she put it:

\begin{quote}
The University Archives is seeking to develop a university records program which will:
1) Collect and preserve the permanent records of the university.
2) Index the records and make them available for administrative and historical research.
3) Provide a central secure storage for permanent records.\textsuperscript{29}
\end{quote}
With regard to procedures for the retention and disposition of University records, the Archivist proposed that records were to be transferred to the Archives when they are no longer needed in their office of origin. Furthermore, each department, office, faculty and committee, in consultation with the Archivist, was to develop a records retention schedule. This schedule was to indicate which materials were to be saved and after what period they were to be transferred to the archives. The final section of the proposal detailed the types of material the University Archives was to acquire. Except for the introduction of a proposal for records scheduling, this initiative merely reiterated those outlined in the Archivist’s plan of 1970. They represent little more than testimony to her frustration that the efforts to bring about a records programme had received little recognition and support, and certainly not the vital sanction needed from the administration.  

Thus far, attempts of the University Archives to implement a systematic records management program faltered on the matter of authority. Although limited success had been achieved in securing the interest and cooperation of a few administrative offices, this informal approach to records selection and acquisition proved to be inadequate. The University Archivist required the administrative authority and position to deal with university officials. Ian Wilson suggests that an archivist reporting to a Chief Librarian will result in administrators’ questioning the ability of the archivist to fulfill good intention. However, instances can be cited of programmes located within the library that have attained the authority necessary for records management responsibilities. The issue of placement of the archives in the structure of administration needs to be distinguished from the issues of the archivist’s authority to regulate disposition and thereby develop systematic acquisition of records. Presumably a strong authority can coexist with almost any administrative placement, but weak authority almost always produces poor results. The archivist is forced to
adopt a rescue mentality and soon finds that piecemeal acquisition dependent on good fortune is
the order of the day.

The University's Archivist found herself on a treadmill in this regard. Once again in 1980, a
decade after taking up her post, she submitted a report to the Head of Special Collections calling
for initiatives to develop a full-fledged records programme. It reiterated the need for approval of
a records policy by the Board of Governors, development of the means to regulate disposition of
University records, and a role in facilitating better records management practices. Of course these
recommendations required multiple levels of approval including the Head of Special Collections,
University Librarian, senior administrative officers and Board of Governors before the Archives
would be able to apply the sanction necessary to act. As will become clear, it is not impossible
for this to occur, but the greater number of approvals required, the greater chance there is for any
initiative to die on the vine.

The degree of frustration inherent in this situation became apparent two years later, when a
University Records Task Force was set up without the Archivist on it. As the Archivist put it to
the Head of Special Collections:

If future Committees are set up to discuss university
records, I cannot stress sufficiently how important
it is that the function of the Archives be represented.
Failure to do so will mean that the archives will not be
able to collect the official records of the university and
will not therefore be serving its correct function.31

Despite the fact the Archivist's work was not officially sanctioned by the University, great
strides were made in the areas of acquisition, description, and outreach. Through the assistance
of Youth Employment Grants and School of Librarianship practicum students, the Archives was
able to continue the indexing of university photographs, as well as the preparation of inventories
for numerous accessions of faculty papers. Each summer the Archives employed three to five
Youth Employment students and throughout the school term, ten to thirteen library school students completed practica under the Archivist’s supervision. In order to promote a continued awareness on campus of the University Archives, an average of five displays were prepared each year. These displays were placed in the Main Library, Faculty Club and Cecil Green Building. In addition, the Archivist continued to submit articles on the archives to the UBC Reports, Library News and Alumni Chronicle.

As in the past, the Archives continued to receive support from outside sources. In December 1979, $2,000 was received from the Koener Foundation to arrange and describe the papers of Charles E. Borden. A library school student was hired to work on the project throughout 1980 and 1981, when a second Koener Foundation grant was received. Financial support was also received from the Alumni Association. In 1980, the Association presented the archives with a substantial grant to index and microfilm the student newspaper, The Ubyssey. Further support was provided again in 1983, when the Association established a Heritage Committee to work on projects relating to the history of the University. One project which received the Committee’s support was the indexing of university photographs. To assist with this the Committee donated $8,000 to the Archives. These projects illustrate how the Archivist had to occupy herself with initiatives which lay far from her central concerns to develop a records programme. Indexing newspapers and photographs provided a focus of activity in the absence of policy development and implementation which she could not get off the ground.

The securing of adequate financial resources to assist the archives with projects to arrange and describe collections is a sad reality for most Canadian institutions. The report of the Consultative Group on Canadian Archives in 1980 found that in 33% of Canadian archives there was not even a part-time paid archivist, while another 17% had to make do with only the half-time services of an archivist. If this pitifully low number of staff is compared with the staff time required for
arranging and describing holdings and servicing users, the situation looks even more bleak. On average, archivists reported spending 20% of their time dealing with research visits and a further 17% of their time handling enquiries.\textsuperscript{33} In a one-person operation, if 37% of the archivist’s time is spent on public service, that does not leave much for managing collections. Consequently, the reliance on contract, summer and student assistance to arrange and describe collections is a necessary reality for institutions with one staff person or less. An examination of the budgets of Canadian archives further explains why certain activities can only be accomplished through grants of one kind or another. The bulk of budgets are devoted to personnel costs and basic equipment and supplies. Once these are paid for, there is very little money remaining for such crucial needs as conservation, records management, or public relations, or even basic arrangement, description and indexing in many cases.\textsuperscript{34} This reality is clearly evident at the University of British Columbia.

Outside funding was secured in 1982 to conduct a records survey of the University. The project was funded by a grant from the Public Archives of Canada, under a Summer Canada Student Employment Programme, and ran for two consecutive summers. The goal of the project was to determine what records existed at the university and to develop a programme to ensure the preservation of permanent records and the disposition of all others. The project team spent two weeks studying the history of the university and receiving instruction in records management and surveys. University offices were then notified about the survey. Throughout the summer, the team visited various offices on campus examining records which were retained and their extent. By the end of the first phase of the project a considerable number of records were transferred to the University Archives. A disturbing result of the survey was the confirmation that many historical records were lost or destroyed, due to the casual records management practices.\textsuperscript{35} The records survey was completed in 1984 and resulted in a greater understanding of the records existing at the University. Another positive result of the project was that numerous offices
transferred their inactive records to the Archives. The records inventory represents an important component of a records management programme. It is a necessary element for any archival service responsible for maintaining the records of a parent body. By completing the records inventory the Archives accomplished one step in managing the records of its parent body. Despite the absence of an approved mandate, collections policy or legislated authority, efforts were being made to create an infrastructure for future progress.

Another important development for the Archives at this same time was the expansion of storage space. Inadequate space had been an ongoing problem for the archives practically from its inception. As a result the records survey and the transfer records, space was finally made available on the seventh floor of the Main Library for the preservation of University records.

As in previous years, the issue of official authorization continued to be a cause of concern. All past attempts to achieve prompt action and attention in this regard had fallen on deaf ears. By the mid-1980s it was evident that the Archivist was experiencing a great deal of frustration in trying to gain the necessary authority to perform the responsibilities of the University Archives programme. A number of probable causes can be cited for this lack of attention. It is possible that the draft records policy statement did not progress to approval because it originated in the Library and may have been viewed as an interference in what was recognized as an administrative matter. Without this approval, progress achieved within the Library could only be limited at best. Since most libraries are hard pressed for space to house the published documents of the information explosion, they cannot easily support the budget, staff, and space requirements needed for the management of university records.

Funding from outside sources continued to allow the Archives to embark upon projects which would otherwise have not been possible. One such project was initiated in 1985, through funding from the Social Sciences Humanities Research Council of Canada. Christopher Hives was hired
as a project archivist to produce a guide to the archival and manuscript holdings of the Special Collections Division using new computer hardware and software. Through renewed funding and other grants, the B.C. Heritage Trust and the provincial government’s Challenge programme, the guide project continued for three years, resulting in completion in February 1988. This was a significant project for the Archives in that it generated interest and attention both provincially and nationally. With the assistance of the School of Library, Archival and Information Studies, a workshop and demonstration of the MARCON system was presented to over sixty archivists. Purchased for the Guide project, MARCON was a database management system designed specifically for preparing archival finding aids. In addition, an article on the project was submitted to the Association of British Columbia Archivists Newsletter and a lecture was given at the annual meeting of the Association of Canadian Archivists.

During 1986-1987, the reorganization and the realignment of many University offices, coupled with public awareness generated by the records survey, led to the transfer of more records to the Archives. To accommodate the growing number of acquisitions, additional space was secured in the Library Processing Centre. Another important achievement was the preparation of a brochure promoting the University Archives programme, its mission, history, and acquisitions policy. The University Archivist’s annual report for the year concluded with an endorsement of the 1979 “Plan for the Future” report. It stated that when the plan was submitted, the University Librarian responded with a promise to give it consideration in the near future. This consideration never materialized, due to the fact that other matters took priority. The Archivist contended that even in 1987, the plan was still valid and an opportunity was needed to discuss it with senior administration.
Laurenda Daniells retired from the University of British Columbia’s Special Collections Division in the summer of 1988. Christopher Hives was hired as the new archivist for university records. A professionally trained archivist, Hives had worked during the previous three years on the Guide project. Following his appointment, Hives embarked on a course of action aimed at providing the University records programme with an officially approved mandate and policy. To this end, a letter was submitted by Hives to President Strangway in October 1989, outlining the urgent need for an officially sanctioned mandate and policy statement. This letter was accompanied by a proposed policy statement prepared by the Archivist including a mission statement; materials to be acquired; the function and responsibilities of the archivist; and conditions of access to University records. Hives stressed the importance of a policy for the University records programme and noted that a recent survey of ten University Archives in Canada revealed that the University of British Columbia had the only programme operating without the official endorsement of the University’s governing body. Summarizing the situation he stated:

"...Lacking a policy statement for its first twenty years of existence, the University Archives at U.B.C. has experienced varying degrees of success in obtaining and preserving the archival heritage of the University. The University Archives operating of its own accord, simply lacks the ‘clout’ necessary to ensure that the permanently valuable archival material generated on campus will be eventually deposited in the Archives." 41

The President responded to the proposed policy by referring it to Vice-President Srivastava for review and recommendations.

In addition to the proposed policy, Hives also submitted a detailed report to the President addressing all operations of the Archives and these three areas of most critical concern. First was the absence of an official mandate; second, insufficient resources, primarily staff; and finally, an ineffective reporting structure. Furthermore, the report included comparative statistics from other
Canadian universities demonstrating the deficiencies of the University of British Columbia's archival programme. The report outlined the current difficulties facing the Archives, namely, processing deficiencies; underutilization of archival resources; inadequate reference service; and inefficient use of the archival programme. The causes of these problems were identified as the absence of a mandate/policy statement, an insufficient operating budget, ineffective reporting structure and the space shortage. In summary, the report offered two possible solutions: either to stop collecting or to expand the scope of the programme. The report concludes by stating:

...I feel we must address these issues immediately to ensure the continued existence of a functional University Archives at U.B.C. The difficulties confronting the University Archives are not passing problems that can be resolved through stopgap measures. They will only be compounded in the future. In dealing with archival records one must confront the grim reality that once these unique materials are lost, no amount of money in the world will ever replace them. This makes it all the more imperative that some long-term strategy be developed very quickly.  

The year ended with Vice-President Srivastava requesting Hives to prepare rough budgetary requirements for a University Archives in two scenarios, first as part of the President's Office and second as part of the Library.

The Archivist had prepared well researched, planned and articulate reports aimed at addressing the Archive's stagnant position and lack of progress. Although no decision was reached in 1989, the hard work and dedication resulted in an open dialogue between the Archives and President's Office which had not previously existed. Ultimately, this dialogue resulted in approval of a records management policy by the Board of Governors in January 1994.  

This policy, the first ever endorsed as an official records policy of the University, commits the institution to implement a full-fledged scheme of records management. It also gives authority to approve all schedules to a University Records Disposition Committee, on which the University
Archivist will sit. This policy was accomplished through the work of a University Archives Advisory Committee set up to advise the University Librarian, to whom the Archivist now reports, regarding records matters. Thus, to some extent the reporting arrangements have been streamlined. Proposals are now developed through the Advisory Committee, proceed to the Vice President, and when necessary by the Board of Governors.

The approval of this new records policy ends the first stage in the development of an archives programme for the university. The long period of establishment of a basic infrastructure and rescue of materials at risk has begun to give way to a planned approach to the management of university records. The University Archivist is in the forefront of developing more systematic means of records management. To give further impetus to this initiative, an assistant to the Archivist was hired in 1993. Clearly, the University Archives is just entering the second stage of development outlined in Chapter One with regard to the National Archives. With its authority to act finally established in university policy, it can begin working out systematic procedures for the care and disposition of records. As yet, it remains far from the relatively autonomous position of the National Archives of Canada, but it has grown beyond the stage of informal rescue of records, even if the building of basic infrastructure remains incomplete.
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CHAPTER THREE

Case Study Two:

The University of Victoria

The University of Victoria was the second degree granting public educational institution to be established in British Columbia. Affiliated with McGill University and later the University of British Columbia, it did not attain degree granting autonomy until 1963. Archival activity was initiated two years prior to this. This chapter will trace the development of this early initiative over the next twenty-six years, in order to determine the factors influencing progress and change.

The growth and development of the University of Victoria is a story of change and contrast. The academic leaders of the community of Victoria faced many obstacles in their efforts to establish an institution of higher education. Numerous makeshift campus sites were occupied before the eventual creation of the present University in the Gordon Head area of the city.

Initially, university-level programmes in Victoria, as well as Vancouver, were affiliated with McGill University of Montreal. The Principal of Victoria High School, Edward B. Paul, had been a leader in the move to introduce university studies to the young province of British Columbia. In 1902, McGill University in Montreal responded by establishing branch campuses in Vancouver and Victoria. Classes began in the fall of 1903 in the old Victoria High School building, with seven students in attendance. As enrollment steadily increased, a small wooden annex was constructed near Fort Street, and Victoria College had acquired its first permanent building. In 1908, Samuel J. Willis, became Dean of McGill University College in Victoria and Principal of Victoria High School. Facing an accommodation crisis, Willis planned construction of a new campus. In April 1914 the new Victoria College and High School occupied a building on the corner of Fern and Grant Streets. However, College-level courses were only given in it for one
year; they were discontinued in 1915 when the University of British Columbia opened in Vancouver.

Refusing to admit defeat, Paul continued to fight for higher education through his position as Superintendent of Schools for Victoria.⁴ In 1920, he convinced the University of British Columbia to re-establish Victoria College as a branch campus. After sharing facilities with Victoria High School for one year, it moved in 1921 to its third campus, the Dunsmuir Mansion, also known as Craigdarroch Castle.⁵ For a quarter of a century, Victoria College prospered in Craigdarroch Castle, offering scholarly instruction in the first two years of arts and science.

A new phase of growth began for the College with the return of World War II veterans. The small quarters could not accommodate an enrollment which grew to six hundred students by 1949. Dr. John M. Ewing, the Principal, began the search for yet another campus site. Following a student protest parade to the steps of the Parliament Buildings, the Government proposed that the College move to the Landsdowne Campus of the Provincial Normal School.⁶ The College moved there in 1946 and remained for the next decade. Upon Ewing’s death in 1952, his successor, Dr. W.H. Hickman, began the construction of the new Ewing Building to house the college’s expanding library.⁷

By 1959, a third year of the curriculum was added in arts, science and education. In 1961, a student could complete degree studies at Victoria College, the degree being awarded by University of British Columbia.⁸ This same year, a decision which would effect the future growth and development of the College was made. Following spirited debates within the faculty and the community at large, it was decided that the College would move to an undeveloped tract of land in Gordon Head which had been acquired from the Department of National Defense and the Hudson’s Bay Company.⁹ During the next two years construction was completed on the
Clearihue Building, a general classroom block, and the Student Union Building. In addition, funds donated by the estate of local benefactor, Thomas S. McPherson, provided for the construction of a new library building. On July 1, 1963, the efforts and determination of the pioneers were rewarded when an act passed by the provincial legislature established the University of Victoria as an autonomous institution.

Concerns regarding the preservation of the University of Victoria’s documentary heritage were first voiced two years prior to its official establishment. On May 16, 1961, Victoria College Council approved the establishment of the library and appointed Dean Halliwell both College Librarian and Victoria College Archivist. The Council expressed the hope that “a start could be made on assembling the important historical documents in connection with the college.” Since Halliwell was appointed both Chief Librarian and College Archivist, it was clearly established at the outset that college records would be preserved in the College Library.

During the early years, archival activity focused upon special collections, rather than university records. Special collections existed within the Library from the very beginning. It consisted of twelve display cases and a number of “special” drawers, shelves and closets, which housed both rare books and manuscript material. The separation of this material from other library publications seems to have been prompted by the unusual circulation problems they presented. The impetus for actively expanding these small holdings came from professors Roger Bishop, Ann Saddlemeyer, and Robin Skelton, who recognized the need for creating a holding of books and non-university archival materials that would act as a “research laboratory” for the honours and graduate students in the field of Modern English Literature. Under the guidance of William Taggart, who was appointed Head of Collections in 1966, a written collections policy was developed. Acquisition concentrated on rare books and literary manuscripts in the field of Anglo-Irish and Modern British Literature. However, the focus soon
expanded to making the Special Collections Division as relevant as possible to all academic disciplines. This resulted in the acquisition of original and reprint publications and archival materials in the subject areas of Vancouver Island and British Columbia history; Canadian Military history; Northwest American anthropology and linguistics, as well as selected areas of theatre, music and art. The policy developed by Taggart was largely a rationalization of acquisitions already existing within the Special Collections Division.

In 1966, the Division was given a permanent home, in a large room in the basement of MacPherson Library. The following year, the position of Rare Book Librarian was created. Early acquisition initiatives were similar in motivation to those of the National Archives of Canada, in that they were a response to a perceived need for scholarly research. The University of Victoria was actively acquiring a holding of archival materials in conjunction with non-archival materials which would support academic research and study in a wide range of disciplines. This effort to make archival resources available for social, cultural and historical research was a model adopted by most Canadian Provincial Archives and many other university libraries.

It was not until 1973 that the issue of acquiring the records of the University was seriously raised. At this time, the Commission on Academic Development recommended that there be an improvement of the University’s archival facilities. In a letter to University President H. E. Farquhar, History Professor Peter L. Smith endorsed the Commission’s recommendation and supported an immediate response. In his letter of February 1973, Smith stated:

...I have always felt that we were far too casual about the preservation of our own historical record. May I suggest that this can be one Commission recommendation that can be swiftly effected without reference to any legislative body. I am sure Mr. Halliwell would welcome any effort in this direction, especially now that Library Extension is approaching completion...
The efforts of the Commission and Smith were rewarded on October 10, 1973, when the Senate passed a motion requesting the Librarian, who still held the position of Archivist, to establish a programme for the preservation of University records.\textsuperscript{16}

The development of this programme received both financial and moral support from the University’s Alumni Association. In March, 1974, the Association presented a grant of $2,000 to the library, in order to hire an assistant to work on the University’s archival records held in Special Collections. Joan Wenman, an alumna and former employee of Special Collections, was employed for a term of four months. The Librarian noted that the limited period of the project would not permit the total organization of the material, nor any extension of the collection, but would enable the archives to make substantial progress.\textsuperscript{17} Wenman’s appointment received the official approval of President Farquhar.\textsuperscript{18}

The employment of an assistant to work on the University records holdings represented the first effort to establish a University archives. The President of the Alumni Association, Olivia Barr, expressed her support for the work in a memo to the University Librarian in July.

\begin{quote}
I stopped into Special Collections today to see what Joan Wenman has been doing. I was most impressed by the amount she had managed to do and the interest she is developing on campus. All sorts of material seems to be coming in...what provisions are being made to continue her work? What can the Alumni do to see that this work having been begun is continued?\textsuperscript{19}
\end{quote}

Although the effort to acquire, organize and manage the records of the University was a step in the right direction, at this point it represented only a marginal effort on the University’s part. The Senate motion, Alumni grant, and short term employment of an assistant were not substantial enough to ensure the long term management and preservation of the University’s records.
During her term of employment in Special Collections, Wenman organized and inventoried those records which had accumulated, and also contacted offices on campus to assess in determining what historically significant records existed and their extent. To this end, a memo was sent to various offices explaining the nature and purpose of the University records project and requesting the transfer of all non-current records. The memo was signed by D. Halliwell as University Archivist and distributed to the following offices: University Relations, Social Science and Research Centre, Registrar’s Office, President’s Office, Malahat Review, Faculty Departments, Faculty Association, Graduate Studies, Alma Mater Society and Continuing Education. As a result of these efforts material was transferred from the offices of University Relations, Continuing Education, the Alumni Association, the Registrar’s Office and the Malahat Review. While records were brought together from numerous departments and offices, it quickly became apparent that a records survey and retention policy were needed. However, it was recognized that this activity required greater authority if it were to proceed. To achieve this authority, an archives policy was needed. Wenman was responsible for drafting the University of Victoria’s first policy statement. In drafting the policy she consulted archivists Laurenda Daniells of the University of British Columbia and Liisa Fagerlund of Simon Fraser University. The three archivists met in Vancouver to discuss a possible “Tri-Universities Archives Policy”. In a report to the University Librarian, Wenman stated that the meeting was very beneficial, resulting in a revised draft policy, which could be reviewed by the Senate in the fall. This first policy was entitled “University Archives Policy”, dated July 26, 1974, and was intended to be applicable to all three university archives.

The draft policy statement described the objectives of the University Archives, and listed types of materials to be acquired. The objectives were to collect and preserve the permanent records of the University, to index the records and make them available for administrative and
historical research, and to provide centralized secure storage for the permanent records. The policy empowered the Archives to act on the behalf of the university to negotiate and accept the transfer of non-university records. Furthermore, it proposed the University Archivist be empowered with a right of access to all current and non-current university records housed in campus offices. It proposed that it was the responsibility of all record creating divisions to release non-active records to the custody of the University Archivist. Unfortunately, no action resulted from Wenman's proposals.

Wenman completed her term of employment in August 1974. Following her departure, Special Collections was without a staff person to care for University records. However, this problem was addressed in February 1975, when the University advertised an opening for a general librarian in Special Collections. The duties of the new position were to include organizing, listing, indexing and cataloguing manuscript and holograph collections, as well as administering university records. Chris Petter was hired to fill this new position. With the official job title of Archivist/Librarian, Petter was directly responsible to Dean Halliwell, who retained the title University Archivist.

The addition of a full-time archivist responsible for university records represented a positive step toward stability and continuity essential to an orderly and planned course of development. From this point, care of the University records component of Special Collections was assigned to a single position. What had evolved as a natural outgrowth of Special Collections acquisition was recognized as an identifiable function reporting to the University Archivist. In this regard the experience of the University of Victoria differs slightly to that of the University of British Columbia, whose archivist with responsibility for University records reported to the Head of Special Collections.
During the first year of his appointment, Petter identified a number of priorities for University records. The first was the drafting of a policy on records. It was intended that the policy would cover access and the constitution of an Archives Committee. Once complete, the policy was to be presented to the Senate by the University Archivist. It would also cover the establishment of a records management programme and the promotion of archival services within administrative departments. The third focus was outreach and publicity, while the fourth was acquisition. Finally, Petter intended to improve the description and indexing of photographic collections.25

The support and financial assistance of the Alumni Association continued even after an archivist was hired. A second donation of money was received in 1975, with instructions that the funds be used for "special archival projects".26

Despite the progress which had been achieved during the preceding two years, there was still concern that the Archives was not receiving the financial support necessary to properly fulfill its mandate. In a letter to President Petch, in June 1977, the University Librarian and Archivist outlined the problems which were impeding the development of the university archives. The letter stated:

...the primary function of the University of Victoria Archives is to maintain and preserve its own institutional records and private papers of its administration, faculty, and staff...at present the University of Victoria Archives has no separate budget and very little true Archives. There is not sufficient room in the McPherson Special Collections to house even a small part of administrative papers let alone the private papers of administration, faculty and staff. Given the reduced library budget it will be difficult if not impossible for the library to initiate a full archival programme to collect the masses of papers currently tucked away in small store rooms around campus. I am concerned that under the circumstances the University Archives will remain a sadly neglected area of our University...27
President Petch did not respond to the University Archivist’s appeal. Both Halliwell and Petter recognized the importance of administrative approval and support for the archives programme. The absence of any substantial support from senior level administration forced the Archives to continue the ad hoc method of acquiring and managing the University’s archival material.

Four areas were identified as being integral components of a University Archives programme. The first was the approval of archives and records management policy; second was an improvement of the archives profile and recognition within the university; third was an increase in budgetary and staff support for the Archives. The final area involved encouraging the transfer of records and increasing archival acquisitions. Throughout the next two years the efforts of the University Librarian and the Archivist/Librarian concentrated on these four areas.

During 1978, Halliwell and Petter prepared a draft policy for the University Archives. The intention was to submit it to the Executive Council of Senate for consideration. Once approved, it would proceed to the Board of Governors for final approval. With the endorsement of the Board, the policy could then be implemented. Petter’s annual report for 1978/79 noted that an approved policy would undoubtedly result in an expansion of the University Archivist’s role and responsibilities. Also, an additional staff person would be required to undertake the components of a records management programme. The report also acknowledged that the responsibility for managing the University’s records through sound records management practices would necessitate an increase in the Archive’s storage space. Furthermore, a Records Management Board would have to be established as a forum for advice and input from the other administrative departments. Unfortunately, progress on the approval of the legislation came to a standstill in April 1979. On April 20, President Petch received a letter from the Secretary to the Board of Governors regarding the proposed policy. The Board referred it back to the President for further
study with a view to developing terms of reference first and then determining what is to be accomplished under those terms of reference. 29

Unaware of the status of the policy, Petter expressed concerns of his own to Halliwell in August 1979. He raised the question of having adequate space, shelving and personnel to run the kind of operation outlined in the draft policy. 30 He suggested that the University Archives move to another location. In addition, he expressed concern over the lack of authority to act within the University to identify and preserve records of enduring value. He questioned the location of the archival programme in Special Collections, where he found it difficult to generate enthusiasm for the mundane records of administration among librarians accustomed to managing prestigious literary manuscripts. 31 In conclusion, he agreed that “it is incumbent to suggest at this time that the University Administration be approached...and an effort be made to increase the support for the University Archives.” 32

Halliwell responded to Petter by revealing that the Board judged the draft policy to be “too detailed and overly prescriptive; it could lead to empire building and a bureaucratic monstrosity; there should be no place in the archives policy for any type of student records,” 33 Clearly the Board did not appreciate that a properly constituted archives policy makes provision for preservation of all records, whether located in the Archives or not. Halliwell responded, “I see no hope of getting further staff until a clearer role and more substantial mandate for the Archives have been accepted, and given some of the reaction at Board meetings, it may not be easy to accomplish.” 34 As a result, Petter was assigned the task of developing “Terms of Reference” for the University Archives, based upon the draft policy and procedures previously developed.
Despite the Board of Governors’ criticisms of the draft archives policy, Halliwell defended it and expressed reluctance to develop a shorter more general policy. In a letter to President Petch, he emphasized the adequacy of the draft policy.

I feel reasonably sure that there are sufficient checks in existence to ensure against unbridled growth of the Archives in terms of space, personnel, facilities, or any other aspect with budgetary implications. The safest guarantee against bureaucratic hyper-development would appear to be for the Board to approve a detailed document, such as that presented to them, rather than to pin its faith on a briefer, necessarily more general statement. In other words, I am reluctant to give up the attempt to have what I believe is a good basic document approved...\textsuperscript{35}

This response to the Board’s rejection of the archives policy was understandable given the Board’s reasoning. It is clear from the Board’s comments on “empire building” and “beaurocratic monstrosity” that there was a concern that the Archives could become too powerful and command a disproportionate share of resources. The Board’s concern that the policy was too detailed and overly prescriptive was entirely illogical. The University Librarian’s response in support of a detailed document to prevent hyperdevelopment was a more appropriate assessment of what would in reality be in the best interest of the University. The Board’s reaction to the policy was focusing on the immediate and short term costs associated with its implementation, rather than the long term saving which would result. It is unfortunate that the University Librarian’s response did not outline the cost effectiveness and efficiency which would result from the implementation of the policy, namely the proper management of the University’s records. All in all, 1979 was a disappointing year for the University Archives. To sum it up, Petter reported that the records programme of the University remained “inadequately funded, housed, staffed and with little direction or purpose.”\textsuperscript{36}
Despite these setbacks, Petter proceeded to consult with colleagues and redraft a shorter policy statement which was submitted to President Petch on July 22, 1980. With some revisions, it was formally approved by the Board on November 18, 1980. Although the policy did not include detailed procedures, it did provide that records could only be destroyed with the permission of the University Archivist and that records management policies were to be developed with the aid of a University Archives Committee and Records Management Board.

During the period 1961 to 1980, efforts were concentrated on acquisition. Despite the approval of the archives policy in November 1980, a number of components essential to the first stage of development of an archival institution remained unaddressed. These included the resources necessary to ensure the stability and security of the operation. The University Archives did not have adequate staff resources. The Archivist/ Librarian position was not dedicated to manage university records on a full-time basis. The position remained shared between the University Archives and Special Collections. Until these basic needs were met, the records programme continued to struggle to establish its basic authority and infrastructure.

To address space and budgetary concerns Petter began gathering data from archival repositories to develop a base of information which the Archives could use to draft a budget and determine the requirements of a sound archival programme. Don Baird, Simon Fraser University Archivist advised Petter that a University Archives should have at least 2,000 square feet of stack space and 1,000 square feet of office space. Petter determined that approximately 400 linear feet of shelving would be needed each year's acquisitions. Other equipment recommended included tables for sorting and research use, microfilm readers, desks for personnel and a computer outlet. This request was forwarded to Mr. Taggart, Head of Collections, no action resulted.

Following the approval of the archives policy in 1980 by the Board of Governors, the next step necessary to ensure the implementation of a sound archival programme was the development
of specific policies and procedures related to records management. To this end, the University Archivist appealed to President Petch in 1981. The President’s approval was requested for the appointment of an Archives Committee and Records Management Board. Once appointed the Committee and Board could begin the implementation of records management procedures. The President accepted Halliwell’s recommendation and agreed to the appointment of such a committee with a mandate to serve in an advisory capacity to facilitate the development of the University Archives. On the recommendation of the Executive Council of Senate the membership of the Committee was to consist of the Registrar, the University Librarian or his designate, three members of faculty with one being appointed Chairman by the President and finally the University Archivist in the position of Secretary. Although the establishment of the Archives Committee was favourably supported by President Petch in 1981, it did not receive the official approval of the Executive Council until February 23, 1982. The composition of the University of Victoria’s Archives Committee and Records Management Board did not include representation from the University’s finance or legal departments. Although the Registrar’s office was represented, the committee was composed largely of ordinary faculty members. From its inception it was limited in the scope of what it could accomplish due to lack of authority and its isolation from administrative officers in charge of records.

The Archives Committee proved ineffectual. It first met on October 31, 1983, with Professor Artibise of the Department of History as chair, later replaced by Professor Smith of the Classics Department. The committee had little choice but to embark on a policy of persuasion, given that the Board of Governors was not prepared to give it or the Archivist the requisite authority to develop records management programme. It decided to appeal to the University community to retain potentially valuable records, to solicit the cooperation of records officers to identify valuable records, and to approach all departments to make contact regarding records matters.
This attempt to implement these plans predictably brought little substantial change in the situation of records. The Committee met regularly from 1983 to 1987, but then its activities lapsed. It did make an appeal to the President that all records “prior to 1975 now be transferred to the MacPherson Archives.” It also directed an assessment of presidential records stored in a basement vault of the Sedgewick Building. At its December 1984 meeting, the Committee considered a proposal to implement a survey of all existing records on campus, but efforts to obtain funds from the administration failed. In the main, the Committee received reports from Petter and supported certain of the initiatives he proposed, but it did not, and perhaps could not, make any significant changes or decisions on its own, for it was merely advisory.

In 1987, Mr. Halliwell, University Librarian and Archivist retired. A report for the new librarian, Marnie Swanson, described the archives as an “ad hoc and passive operation heavily dependent on grants to accomplish projects.” The archives operation received a steady stream of grants or grant-funded workers in this period to mount special arrangement, description, or indexing projects, often for non-University records. The grants came from the Social Science and Humanities Council of Canada, The Canadian Council of Archives, and University related sources. At the end of 1988, Petter reiterated the need for a reactivated archives committee with a stronger mandate, better facilities, more staff, basic equipment, and funding for a records survey.

In 1989, the title of University Archivist was conferred upon the Archivist/Librarian and was no longer held jointly with that of University Librarian. In order to plan for the future development of the University Archives, a list of goals and priorities was forwarded to the University Librarian in July 1989. The list included issues which had been raised numerous times in the past, namely, space, the Archives Committee, public relations and the records survey. The
only issue which was resolved was the Archives' inadequate space allocation. Following years of appeals, the Archives was finally given additional storage space by the Library Space Committee. The Alumni Association continued its support by providing funding for the purchase of new shelving. By the end of the year, one-quarter of the new space was filled and it was estimated that the entire storage area would be full within four years.

In the area of public relations a small accomplishment was achieved when Petter was granted permission to purchase business cards for the University Archivist. In addition, a brochure which had been recommended in 1988 was in the initial stage of production. Other publicity for the University Archives was fostered through the publication of articles in university publications and academic journals including, The Ring, The New Informer, The Bulletin and Archademe.

The Archives Committee remained inactive despite numerous appeals for its reappointment. The records survey which had originally been proposed by the 1985 Archives Committee remained in the realm of discussion, however the approach to the survey was amended by Petter. It was recommended that the survey initially be conducted in only a few offices and departments and be expanded to others as funds and staff resources permitted. Although the University of British Columbia's University archives programme did not have an approved archives policy it was successful in conducting a survey of University records. The University of Victoria's repeated attempts to secure funding for a survey both within and outside the university represented an understanding of the necessity of a survey to the subsequent development of retention and disposition schedules. Undoubtedly the administration was cognizant of the additional resources which would be required for staff and storage once the survey was completed. Perhaps this understanding blocked the availability of funding.

The Archives Committee was established in 1983, three years following the approval of the Archives policy. Although the original intent of the Committee was to develop policies and
procedures related to records management, it was mandated by the President to serve only in an advisory capacity. It was not empowered with the authority necessary to implement procedures. Nor did its membership include anyone from the President’s Office who could have assisted the Committee in translating its recommendations into action. Clearly, the vision of the Committee’s role as articulated by Halliwell and Petter, and its actual authority and function were disparate. In its years of operation only seven Committee meetings were held. At these meetings topics and issues significant to the progress and development of the University Archives were addressed. However, with the exception of publicity and promotion, no appreciable advances were made toward the implementation of a comprehensive archival and records management programme. Disbanded in 1987, after the retirement of the University Librarian, repeated attempts to reconvene the Committee proved unsuccessful.

During the period 1980 to 1989, the University of Victoria archives laboured to implement a records management programme and to properly manage the records of the University. However, beyond the approval of the archives policy, no progress was achieved toward improving the archives authority and infrastructure. Although repeated attempts were made to initiate a University records survey, they all proved unsuccessful. Material acquired by the Archives during this period was solicited from individual offices and departments through memos and other publicity, not through retention and disposition scheduling. The University Archives was plagued with resource deficiencies, namely monetary, staffing and space. These deficiencies consumed the time and energy of both Petter and the Archives Committee. The inadequacy of the Archives operation was acknowledged by Halliwell and Petter on numerous occasions. It was described as a sadly neglected area of the University and also, an ad hoc passive operation. In the period, 1989-1993, some headway was made, the basic situation of the records programme remains the same. A second archivist has been hired to help the University prepare for access to information
and privacy legislation, but policy and reporting issues still keep the archives operation essentially in the first stage of its development. It can hardly be thought of as an autonomous unit capable of managing affairs officially assigned to it without administrative support for the archives policy. There has been no lack of vision as to the needs of the archives programme, but a continuing lack of administrative will has obstructed this vision. Consequently, the University Archives at the University of Victoria remained in the first stage of development.
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CHAPTER FOUR

Case Study Three: Simon Fraser University

The final case study will examine the historical development of the Simon Fraser University Archives. Established in 1965, Simon Fraser University is the youngest of the three universities under discussion. Despite its short history, the university began an archival initiative quite soon after its charter was granted and made headway more quickly than its older counterparts.

Concerns regarding the preservation of Simon Fraser University’s history were first voiced in early 1965. At that time, University Librarian, Mr. Donald Baird, raised the question of archival materials at a staff meeting of department heads, held at the University’s Dunsmuir Street headquarters in Vancouver. At first, the proposal met with the reservation that perhaps the initiative was premature. Following a discussion of the importance of documenting the early developments of the University, it was resolved and the Library was given unofficial approval to collect material documenting the new university’s history.

During the first two years of the University’s operation, the Library collected newspaper clippings, photographs, student, and faculty publications. Toward the end of 1967, Baird expressed the desire to expand the effort to include University records. In a memo to President McTaggart, he noted that interested parties from the library and Department of History had reviewed the Library’s collection of material and determined that “many documents should be brought together and maintained for examination in the future.” He aimed to acquire the minutes of committees; newspaper and magazine clippings; student and faculty publications; photographs and correspondence of the Chancellor and President. He also recommended that material be transferred after three years.

Following the presentation of the memo to President McTaggart, Baird drafted an archives policy. He proposed that the archives of the University be maintained as a section of the Library’s
Collection Division, with records being preserved in a restricted area. The Senate Library Committee approved the policy in principle, and suggested that a letter be sent to various University bodies asking them for their co-operation in the establishment of "schedules for deposit of archival materials." In April 1968, Senate approved the policy, and in May the Board of Governors endorsed it.

The sanctioning of the University Archives by the Senate and Board of Governors at such an early date in the University's history was a noteworthy accomplishment. At this stage all concerned in building a new institution eagerly sought to assure their efforts would be recorded. This initiative was not a recognition of the life cycle of records or other records management principles, but simply an effort to provide posterity with a sense of these founding accomplishments. It is safe to assume that the university's governing body did not understand the long term implications of sanctioning an archival programme. Later developments will support this position.

Two years later, the first archivist was appointed. The event was reported in an article which appeared in the *Vancouver Sun* on August 5, 1970. The article was entitled, "SFU Feels Historical at Tender Age of Five." The article stated the Simon Fraser University was already recording its history and had just recently appointed a librarian, Liisa Fagerlund, as University Archivist. Her position as archivist was held in addition to her regular duties in the Social Science Division of the Library. The article quoted Mrs. Fagerlund as stating, "the University, which opened only in 1965, is so young that we have a unique opportunity of recording in detail the process of our founding and the development of educational goals and techniques."

During the early years, the University Archives was physically and administratively located within the library's Special Collections Division. A report explained that the primary reason for this relationship was due to similar environmental, security, and research space needs. Special
Collections consisted mainly of contemporary poetry, literary manuscripts, and a magazine collection, while the University Archives holdings consisted of two sections; first, the records of the University; and second, local history materials with a focus on the surrounding municipalities. The University Archives made arrangements to store municipal records against the day when neighbouring local governments could take up the task of preserving their own records. The motivation behind the storage of these records was a belief in a mutual benefit to the university and the municipalities. The arrangement relieved the municipalities of the difficulty involved in storing infrequently used materials, requiring extensive space and professional handling, and yet still enabled them to retain ownership and access to the material. The benefits to the University included an increased accessibility of primary material for research by students and faculty, as well as the ensured preservation of historically significant archival fonds. By 1974, Simon Fraser University Archives was providing archival facilities for Burnaby and Port Coquitlam, with a proposal for Maple Ridge under consideration.5

Each of the university archives examined in this study originated within university libraries. They were administratively linked to the libraries’ Special Collections Divisions, reporting to either the Head of Special Collections or the University Librarian. The impetus for the initiation of university records acquisition was a natural outgrowth of existing historical records programmes. The acquisition of both non-university and university records was motivated by a desire to serve the needs of researchers thereby promoting and supporting historical writing and scholarship. This motivation and impetus is similar in experience to that of the Public Archives of Canada. The acquisition of public and private records was a response to cultural needs and not a means to manage the records of an administration. The key factor in the early development of each of these archival institutions is the preservation of documentary heritage to support scholarship, research, publication and indirectly national, regional, local or institutional pride.
The initial policy at Simon Fraser University focused primarily upon outlining which groups of records the University Archives was to acquire. By 1974, concerns for the implementation of proper records management procedures prompted its revision. On July 26, 1974, the University Archivist submitted a revised policy clearly outlining the objectives of the University Archives, the authority of the University Archivist, and the rights and responsibilities of University departments relating to their records. The first section of the policy stated that the objectives of the university archives were to collect, preserve and make available for research the permanent records of the university.

The University Archivist, on behalf of the University, is authorized to negotiate for the transfer of and to receive University Archives from the custody of any Office of administration or instruction or other record creating division. Any record-creating division at the University is hereby directed and empowered to release to the University Archivist such University records in its custody as are not needed for the transaction of the current business of the office.6

The policy also made provisions for the automatic transfer of the records of any Division, in the event of the termination of its existence. Furthermore, the archivist was given the right of reasonable access to examine all current and non-current university records. As in the earlier policy, the revision included a specific listing of fourteen categories of records to be collected by the Archives.

The 1974 policy was an attempt to establish a full archival programme. It is clear that there was a recognition of the importance of records management as a necessary component of a successful Archives. The University Archivist strongly supported the implementation of records
management at the university. This was demonstrated by her active membership in the Vancouver Chapter of the American Records Management Association. Her belief in the value of records management was expressed in a 1974 memo to the University Librarian. The memo stated that records management was directly related to a good archival programme and it was hoped that in the near future the university would take a more active interest in records management and personnel of administrative departments would join the American Records Management Association.7

The revised policy aimed to ensure the long term stability and success of the University Archives but it never reached the President or the Board of Governors being held up by the University Librarian. The University had entered a period of restraint, and the economic climate proved unfavorable to the adoption of policies which involved increasing the library’s budget.

In the summer of 1975, Liisa Fagerlund resigned from the position of University Archivist and Special Collections Librarian. Due to budgetary restraint a replacement was not hired. The archival community of British Columbia responded vocally concerning the vacant Archivist position at Simon Fraser University. On behalf of the profession, George Brandak, President of the Association of British Columbia Archivists, complained to the University Librarian about the cutback. Baird replied that he had:

put the original proposition for an Archivist to the President and was instrumental in seeing that the position was successfully approved by both the Senate and the Board of Governors. Those were the affluent days of the sixties and they bear little relationship to the realities of the summer of 1975. Priorities have to be set and that exercise never produces a consensus. There it is: we cannot afford an Archives this year...8
Concern over the replacement of a University Archivist did not end with the University Librarian’s reply to the Association of British Columbia Archivists. Despite the fact that Helen Gray, Senior Librarian for History and Political Science assumed some of the University Archivist’s responsibilities, the archival profession continued to voice concern. Gordon Dodds, President of the Association of Canadian Archivists, expressed the opinion of his Association in a letter to Baird in September 1975. Dodd commented that:

The position of University Archivist should in my opinion not report to the University Librarian. Responsibility for acquiring, preserving and making available the institution’s own records on the basis of a records management system should be the responsibility of a professionally trained Archivist reporting to senior University management.9

In reply to Dodds’ letter, Baird again stressed that Simon Fraser University could not afford to rehire a “bonafide” archivist, or any other professional person in the fiscal year 1975-1976. In addition, he stated that the negotiations with the union of office, technical and clerical workers had resulted in the disestablishment of seven Library positions.10 It is obvious that the policy endorsed by the Board of Governors in 1968 was not strong enough to protect the archivist’s position.

The position remained vacant until January 1978. From August 1975 to April 1976 Gray worked one day a week on archival matters, but she recommended that acquisitions cease and most projects be suspended in favour of a holding of operations.

In April 1976, Gray returned full-time to her position in History and Political Science, transferring the operation of the University Archives to Reva Clavir, Library Assistant. Upon her
departure, Gray recommended to Ted Dobb, Deputy Librarian, that the revision of the original archives policy prepared by Liisa Fagerlund be again set in motion.\textsuperscript{11}

On December 31, 1977, after thirteen years as University Librarian, Don Baird resigned from his position. During 1978, while on administrative leave, Baird obtained an Archives Certificate from the Public Archives of Canada and also gained valuable archival information while studying at the University of London, England. Upon completion of his leave, Baird returned to Simon Fraser University and assumed the position of University Archivist, in September 1978.\textsuperscript{12} Other Archives staff at that time consisted of a part-time Secretary and Word Processing Operator, as well as a part-time Assistant Archivist, Reva Clavir. With Baird’s appointment, the University Archives became an autonomous department reporting directly to the President. However, the Archives remained physically located within the Library.\textsuperscript{13} As a condition of Baird’s appointment, President Jewett approved that a number of expenses to establish the Archives as an autonomous department. These included the construction of a wall to create a self-contained Archives space complete with mobile shelving units. During Baird’s administrative leave, the organization of the new archives room was complete and University records were transferred from Special Collections.\textsuperscript{14} The administrative restructuring of the University Archives represented an opportunity for the programme to achieve considerable progress. By reporting directly to the President, the University Archives was linked to the highest level of authority and power within the administration. Simon Fraser University Archives was the first University Archives in the province to separate from the jurisdiction and control of a University Library.

In a letter to Acting-President, Daniel R. Birch, in the fall of 1978, the University Archivist outlined priorities for 1978-79, and a rationale for the development of the University Archives. The first item discussed was the arrangement and description of University records. Baird noted
that the system in place was both incomplete and of poor professional standard. He aimed to prepare a new arrangement of record groups based upon the Society of American Archivists standards. It was expected that this would be complete before the end of the year. He also planned to introduce automation for the control of records. His other main trust dealt with the transfer of photographs and university records to the Archives. At a meeting attended by representatives from the Audio-Visual department, The Peak, News Service and the Centre for the Arts, it was agreed that the University Archives would be the central repository for all collections of University photographs. In addition, he sent reminders to all administrative units reminding them to transfer records to the Archives. Finally, he confirmed a policy for municipal records. During the early part of 1979, the original collections policy of the University Archives was further expanded to include not only the administrative records of the University and municipal records, but also business archives relating to major industries in British Columbia, and ethnic archives.

The decision to acquire records of local governments, businesses and ethnic groups, in addition to the University records, expanded the Archives' acquisition programme in the private sphere. Acquiring records from both public and private sources is a recognized feature of a "total archives", but Baird seems to have been motivated by a concern to buttress the Archives' stature in the University by acquiring non-University records. It should be noted that, contrary to the situation at the other two universities, private archives were not assigned to the Special Collections Division of the Library.

Further staff changes occurred in February 1979. Both the assistant and the secretary left the Archives to accept positions in the Computer Centre. The assistant's position was filled by Jim Ross, a history graduate, who had worked as a student in the Archives for three years. The replacement of the part-time secretarial position did not receive the approval of the President and
therefore remained vacant. However, as an interim solution, a temporary typist was hired for a two-month period, from an allocation of unexpended funds.17

Following the separation of the University Archives from the Library, efforts were made to announce the Archives' new autonomous status to the larger archival community. One such effort was an article entitled, "Simon Fraser University Archives", published in the Association of British Columbia Archivist's Bulletin. The article provided a brief administrative history of the University Archives, outlining its collections policy, staff changes and plans for future development. A second effort to clarify independence involved a letter written by the University Archivist to the editor of the Union List of Manuscripts. It stated that since the University Archives was now an autonomous Department reporting to the President, it should be listed separately from the Library's Special Collections. Due to the fact that there was no overlap in the holdings of the two units, it was logical for the University Archives to have its own location number and listing.18 By announcing its autonomy to the larger professional community, the University Archivist was attempting to forge a reputation and status for the Archives. Clearly, this was an effort to repair the damage caused to the Archives' reputation three years earlier.

With the reorganization of the University Archives in late 1978, the need for a revised Archives policy once again became a priority. In February 1979, K.G. Pedersen, University President, visited the new University Archives facility. In his monthly report, the University Archivist noted that although the show-and-tell segment of the visit seemed of little interest to the President, he was very keen to discuss the ongoing operation of the Archives.19 During this visit, the President called for a new policy to strengthen the Archives' position. Usually policy initiatives have been left to the Archivist, yet here was a President eager to solidify the Archives' mandate. Nevertheless progress on a new policy became stalled by budgetary and other considerations.
In the interim, while he worked to develop a policy and seek its approval, Baird continued to appeal to departments to transfer records. He also held discussions regarding the acquisition of private archives. The Dean of Graduate Studies encouraged Baird to focus on ethnic archives as multiculturalism was then strongly supported by federal policy.

By April 1980, only minimal progress was achieved on the new policy. The University Archivist and University President met to discuss the policy statement. Unfortunately, this meeting yielded no conclusive decisions. The President was concerned that a greater role for the Archives would be costly, that a records management programme was an extravagance and that a strong thrust on the private records side was appropriate to universities with larger graduate studies programmes. These concerns, short sighted as they were, left the Archivist little room to manoeuver. As at the other two universities, financial concerns blocked development and placed the Archives in an administrative backwater.

The policy issue remained unresolved for the remainder of 1980. Other areas of concern related to the approval of the policy included budget, staff and space allocations. Throughout the next few years the efforts of the University Archivist concentrated in these three areas. He was able to increase his staff to three full-time positions: University Archivist, Archives Assistant and Secretary/Operator. Further budget allocations were requested in 1981/82. The proposal noted that during the fiscal year 1980-81, the $1,100 allocated for temporary staff was inadequate to hire the student assistance necessary to arrange and describe the increasing volume of accessions of University records. Consequently, he requested $2,200 for the fiscal year 1981-82. Space was also an issue, so Baird prepared a proposal for the Space Allocation and Planning Committee, suggesting that space on the library’s Third Floor be utilized in addition to 5,000 square feet on the Ground Floor, formerly occupied by the Instructional Media Centre. He also suggested that the Archives might find a permanent home in the Social Sciences building at the north end of the
extended mall. The Committee did not respond to the University Archivist’s proposal, but an agreement was reached with the Physical Plant enabling the Archives to share space with the Library in the Academic Quadrangle for the storage of records.

In October of 1980, President Pedersen asked the University Archivist for his view of where the Archives should be situated in the administrative structure. Baird argued forcefully that the University Archivist should continue to report to the President. The Archives was responsible for documenting the history of the university. He described the university as a multi-dimensional entity comprised of both professional and administrative departments. The responsibility for managing this entity rested with the President. Within the President’s responsibilities rested all aspects of the University. For the Archivist to report to an academic or administrative officer would emphasize one aspect of the university over another. Any change in reporting would be illogical and philosophically unsound. Nothing further came of this matter and further discussion was dropped.

In 1983, President Pedersen left Simon Fraser University and was replaced by W.E. Saywell. Prior to his departure, the President met with the University Archivist to discuss a revised policy statement, staffing and the state of University records, with no concrete results. Baird communicated his concerns to the new President in mid-1984, noting that the effort to develop policy seemed to be “dead in the water.” President Saywell responded with the assurance that the policy was indeed still under consideration and that his assistant was reviewing related material and further discussion would proceed in the fall.

The fate of the archives policy was again raised in January 1985. Baird suggested that further information could be conveyed to the Board of Governors regarding the policy in order to expedite its approval. The President responded later in the year informing the University
Archivist that he intended to proceed with the proposed policy and that his assistant was in consultation with interested parties in order to move it along. The President's response also raised the issue of the Archives' reporting structure. He informed Baird that once the new Vice-President in charge of Research and Information Systems took office on September of 1985, the University Archives would then report directly to that officer. As the President put it,

...Since it seems to me that your space problem is going to be partly alleviated by a good records management system that is partly based upon electronics developments, it would seem to me that he is the appropriate VP to report to.27

The University Archivist responded favourably to the newly established reporting structure, and conveyed to the President that he believed quite in contradiction of his own earlier position the proposed reporting chain was an "eminently logical choice."28

Finally, in 1986, after years in limbo, the University Archives policy was reviewed by Vice-President Calvert, who placed it before President Saywell. With the President's recommendation, the policy was referred to the Board of Governors. Final approval was received in July of 1986. A number of immediate developments followed. First, an Archives and Records Management Committee was required, as outlined in section 3 c of the policy. To this end, the University Archivist proposed a list of possible Committee members. Second, the University Archivist initiated the upgrading of the archives assistant position to an administrative/professional position. This action was justified on the grounds that the approval of the policy required a greater degree of professional responsibility. The archives assistant would be performing records management duties and therefore, a new job description for a Records Manager was a necessary progression. Vice-President Calvert raised no objections to the re-evaluation of the position.
The period prior to the approval of the Archives’ new policy in 1986 represents the first phase of development, namely “establishment and rescue”. The years 1965-1986 were essentially a period of founding and establishment, when the focus for the Archives was the acquisition of holdings. Although the University Archives had its first policy mandate approved by the Senate and Board of Governors in 1968, it continued to focus on acquisition for the next eighteen years. During this time attempts were initiated to take a greater role in managing the records of the University, but only limited success was achieved. During this first stage the Archives achieved the basic components of an archival programme: it was formally sanctioned by the University administration and empowered with the authority to exist, acquire, preserve and make available for study records as outlined in its approved policy. Finally the basic resources of funding, space and staff necessary to operate were secured. The approval of the new policy marked the beginning of the second stage of development concentrating on the implementation of an integrated archives and records management programme.

Following the establishment of the Archives and Records Management Committee, the University Archivist initiated the necessary steps to formalize a structure linking each unit within the University to the Archives. To this end, in 1987, a memo was sent to the President, Vice-Presidents, Deans, Department Chairs, Registrar and Librarian, requesting that they provide the name or position of a person in their unit who would liaise with the University Archives on matters related to official records. These newly appointed liaison officers were necessary to provide a continuing link between record creating bodies and the University Archives Records Manager, in order to receive information and assistance on the disposition of official records. The request for the appointment of records officers represented an attempt by the University Archives to implement a more formalized structure for records management. Through these officers the Archives could institute required records management functions such as file
classification systems and retention and disposition schedules. Under the direction of the Records Manager, these officers would be responsible for the implementation and application of University-wide standards.

In 1987, the University Archives' budget received an increase of 5.8%. Encouraged by an improvement in the financial situation, the University Archivist again requested the upgrading of the part-time clerical worker to full-time. Following previous requests to increase this position the Vice-President asserted that it would be given serious consideration if the overall budget increase was 5% or above. Despite the promising budgetary situation, the Archives clerical support remained at a part-time level.

During the remainder of 1987, the Archives focused its efforts on the retention and disposition of records. The mandate of the Archives and Records Management Committee was to ensure that records of permanent value were retained by the University, and that those of no continuing value were destroyed. At this time, the University Archives was storing over "two million" records in its Records Centre and it was imperative that retention and disposition schedules be put into effect, in order to alleviate the growing space problems. To this end, the Archives and Records Management Committee approved the preparation of schedules for the offices of the Deans of Arts, Education, and Science, 1965-1978, as well as the Personnel Department. In memos to the Deans and Directors of these Departments, the University Archivist emphasized that they not be alarmed by the implications of the Archives and Records Management policy. It was clarified that all correspondence, policies for faculty and other similar high level directives would automatically be retained, along with committee agendas, minutes and papers. Items marked for destruction would include administrative records such as receipts, financial reports and all housekeeping documents that identified a completed action. Furthermore, it was reiterated that according to the policy, all records were restricted until ten years after creation. Only after
this restricted period would they be arranged, described and opened for research use. Clearly, the Archives was finally on its way to developing a fully operational archival programme within the university.

The Archives and Records Management Committee elected to meet once each semester, throughout the academic year. In 1988, the Committee met three times. The membership included two representatives from the History Department; the Registrar; the Assistant Comptroller; a member of the English Department; the Head of the Library’s Collections Management Office; the University Archivist; the Vice-President, Research and Information Systems; the Associate Vice President Academic; and the Records Manager. Unlike the composition of the University of Victoria’s Archives Committee, the Committee proposed at Simon Fraser University included representation from all the vital areas of the administration. By including representatives from the faculty, Registrar’s Office, Finance Department and President’s Office, the Committee was empowered with the expertise necessary to ensure sound decisions and success.

At the Committee meeting in January 1988, discussion focused upon the problems related to University records held in electronic form. By way of addressing the problem, a meeting was scheduled with the Manager of Operations and Technical Support of Computing Services. At this meeting several issues were discussed, including the impermanence of information held on diskettes; the effects of non-directive policy of the University regarding the acquisitions of hardware and software; the rapid change of hardware and software and its influence on the loss of University records. The Committee acknowledged the difficulties facing the Archives as a result of these problems and recommended that the National Archives, the Provincial Archives and the provincial government’s Records Management Branch be contacted to solicit information.
Furthermore, it was moved that a records advisory notice be sent to all Departments and Offices alerting them of the vulnerability of records held on computer diskettes.33

In addition to the problem of electronic records, the Committee also addressed the issue of satellite archives. Discussion was prompted by developments within the Canadian Centre for Studies in Publishing and the Communications Department. The Canadian Centre for Studies in Publishing had received funding in the amount of $50,000 and was also preparing grant applications for additional funds, in order to acquire archival and library materials. Similarly, the Communications Department had developed a proposal to establish a Television News Archives. Both of these archival initiatives generated a great deal of concern from the Committee members. It was contended that these new ventures would not be sustained. Furthermore, they would be operating outside the University Archives sphere and mandate.34 In response to the issue, the Committee recommended that a meeting be scheduled with Vice-President Calvert, to discuss the problem.35 The results of this meeting were reported at the Committee’s October meeting. It was noted that Vice-President Calvert, “did not view the situation with concern”.36 Despite this view the Committee decided to monitor the progress of the two initiatives.

Another issue raised by the Archives and Records Management Committee was faculty papers. At the Committee’s meeting in October 1988, it was recommended that the University Archives develop a policy for the acquisition of faculty papers. After a lengthy discussion, the following motion was passed:

The University Archives will actively seek and accept faculty papers with the clear understanding that strict appraisal techniques shall be exercised. Only materials reflecting strong research potential will be accepted into the collection. Those materials not accepted into the collections shall be returned to the donor or disposed of in the most appropriate fashion.37
Concerns regarding space promoted deliberations at each Archives and Records Management Committee meeting held during 1988. Attempts were made to find an alternate location for the University Archives. The Library wished the Archives removed from its building; likewise, the Archives desired a permanent location outside the Library. Baird recommended the construction of a 25th Anniversary Heritage Building, to house the University Archives and the Art Gallery. The idea was conceived from the similar functional relationships which the Archives and Art Gallery shared, namely, environmental controls, security and conservation. The location suggested for this new multi-purpose facility was east of the Theatre on the Mall. The two units discussed this matter and agreed on certain common needs but the proposal for a building to cost $6 million never got off the ground.

During the period 1986 to 1989, the University Archives focused its attention toward developing a comprehensive management programme for the records of the university. The University Archives initiated the preparation of retention and disposition schedules for four University departments. It continued to utilize its Records Centre in the old Transportation Building for the storage of semi-active and dormant records. Finally, it actively sought to transfer to the Archives records with enduring administrative, fiscal, legal and historical values. However, despite the considerable progress achieved during these years, the University Archives was continually hampered by the need for additional staff and more storage space. Throughout this period the issue of adequate clerical support was never resolved. Despite an improvement in the University’s financial situation and a budget increase in 1987, the position remained at the part-time level. Similarly, repeated attempts were made to address the ever increasing shortage of space. With the support of the Archives and Records Management Committee alternative locations and options were investigated. However, this deficiency also remained unresolved. Valuable time and energy which could have been more productively expended on the
consolidation of the basic resources of the Archives. Consequently, the University Archives remained poised at the beginning of the second stage by capitalizing on its new found authority to take a leading role in managing University records.
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CHAPTER FIVE

The British Columbia Experience:

Divergent Levels of Progress.

Traditionally, publicly sponsored archives in Canada have come to regard the acquisition, preservation and accessibility of public records to be their prime responsibility. At the same time, they have also actively sought and acquired private historical records, as well as expanding their holdings to include non-textual records such as photographs, films, video, sound recordings and cartographic materials. This systematic effort to preserve public and private records in all forms, making them available for research in a single repository represents a "total archives" approach. The growth and development of the National Archives of Canada provides a model for the establishment of a "total archives". Furthermore, as an institution with a fully integrated and operational archives programme, it exemplifies the components required to achieve this functional level. Throughout its one hundred and twenty year history the National Archives progressed from a three room institution, directed by one staff person, armed with a very vague and general mandate into a network of multiple institutions, mandated by an Act of Parliament to acquire both cultural resources and the records of government. This progression was a gradual evolution through three apparent developmental phases, namely: establishment and rescue; improved authority and infrastructure; and finally, autonomy and management. Inherent in each of these phases are specific goals and objectives which define priorities and translate into components of an archives programme.

Within the first phase, establishment and rescue the objectives are to define collecting priorities and to acquire through transfer or donation material which will form the basis of the institutions holdings. Defining an acquisition strategy is achieved through the approval of an institutional mandate and collections policy. This mandate and policy is a significant and
necessary component of any archival programme. An institution must articulate its responsibility for preserving the permanently valuable records of its sponsoring agency. This responsibility will provide the archives with a role in the administration of the agency and furthermore, a rationale for ongoing support. In addition, any expansion of this role beyond the parent body to the sphere of historical records must also be clearly defined. A comprehensive acquisitions mandate will delineate the scope of historical record collecting, either geographically, institutionally or on a theme basis. Other components of an archival programme addressed in the first stage of development include the delineation of a clear reporting structure and administrative position, as well as the basic resources, facilities and staff necessary to operate. Resources continue to be an ongoing component throughout each of the three developmental phases. As the archival programme expands so too must the resources necessary to support the programme.

The second phase of development, "improved authority and infrastructure" shifts attention from the acquisition of holdings to the establishment of systems and procedures necessary to manage the records of the sponsoring agency. Records management is a systematic approach to the creation, use, storage, retrieval, disposal; and preservation of the records of an administrative body.¹ The application of records management can be justified administratively by its cost benefits and efficiency. Staff costs are reduced by controlling the creation of records; storage costs are reduced by using the most efficient media or methods of storing information; time is saved by simplifying information retrieval; and finally, high-cost office space is used effectively through a smooth flow of records from creation to disposal.² In order for an archives to properly preserve the official records of its sponsoring agency, records management practices must be implemented. The process of preserving and disposing of records is regulated by records retention and disposal schedules. A schedule will list the categories of records created; their active period of use in administrative offices; whether they should be stored more economically in
an inactive records centre; and when they should be destroyed or transferred to the archives. The components of a sound records management programme include records inventory, file classification, retention and disposition schedules, storage for inactive records and micrographics. Records management is not emphatically an all-or-nothing proposition. Initial efforts do not have to be full-scale, state of the art programmes. Choices can be made depending upon an institution’s budget and available resources. The question for institutions should not be whether or not to establish a records management programme, but rather what size the programme should be.3

Within the third phase of development “autonomy and management” the archives has attained a full level of operation. It is able to fulfill its mandate with adequate resources and respond to an expansion of its holdings and service levels, without compromising any one facet of the operation. Although challenges will always occur, the institution which has attained this stage of development will be stable and secure and, therefore well able to anticipate and address problems as they arise.

Integral to the development of any archival institution are resources; namely, facilities, staff and an adequate budget. The establishment of an archives is a matter for serious consideration and commitment because once an institution has been founded, the sponsoring agency will have to allocate resources on a continuing basis to preserve, accrue and service the holdings of its records.4 As an archival programme develops and expands, so too must its core funding, storage, space, staff resources and equipment. Consequently, the procurement of resources is an ongoing challenge for institutions from their establishment to autonomy and management.

The three university archives examined in the preceding chapters demonstrate the developmental struggle to achieve a fully operational archival programme. Furthermore, their experiences exemplify the evolutionary process toward implementing the numerous components
necessary to attain full autonomy and management. The case studies reveal that the three institutions have progressed to different stages of development and achieved various degrees of success at implementing the components of an archival programme. The historical development of the National Archives of Canada provides a model to evaluate and compare the progress of the three university archives. Furthermore, a comparison of their institutional experiences will illustrate the state of university archives programmes in British Columbia and reveal the factors which both influenced and hindered their development.

Numerous surveys of university archives have been conducted to assess their development. As noted in Chapter One, these surveys reveal that in terms of Canada's archival heritage, university archives have only been established in the last thirty years. A 1966 survey of college and university archives compiled by the Society of American Archivists contacted forty-five institutions in Canada. Eighteen of these responded that they maintained no formal archives. The remaining twenty-seven claimed some form of archival programme, but only seven of these employed a full-time archivist responsible for university records. By 1971, the seven universities with full-time archivists had increased to fifteen. By 1985, a survey on university and college archives conducted by the Association of Canadian Archivists revealed that 73% of all universities had some form of archival programme. The establishment of university archives in British Columbia is reflective of the broader national scene. Although all three universities examined had experienced archival initiatives within the library special collections units by 1965, it was not until 1970 that British Columbia's first full-time university archivist was hired. The University of British Columbia was the first to employ a university archivist. Simon Fraser University also employed a university archivist in 1970, but only in a part-time capacity. The University of Victoria followed in 1975, when an archivist was hired with half-time dedicated to university records.
A survey of university archives conducted in 1975 by Ian Wilson revealed that of the twenty-seven participating institutions, only seven were administratively autonomous, reporting to a vice-president. The remaining twenty were administratively subordinate to the university Library. Collections of historical university records have grown chiefly within their institutions' libraries, because librarians have recognized and appreciated the cultural importance of this archival material. The motivation for preserving early university records was to ensure the preservation of history and the promotion of scholarly research and study. Such efforts within university libraries were similar to the early acquisition strategies of the National Archives to amass a storehouse of documentary heritage to support, study, serve posterity and promote a national consciousness. British Columbia's three university archives reflect the findings revealed in Wilson's 1975 survey. Each originated within a university library, therefore mirroring the majority of their national counterparts. The impetus for their establishment and their administrative position within libraries is compatible with other Canadian university archives at that time.

The case studies reveal the diversity of archival initiatives within the province's three public universities. At the University of British Columbia, the initiative was motivated by the President's Archives Committee, which facilitated voluntary preservation of historical material at the department level and its subsequent transfer to the Library's Special Collections Division. The increasing volume of University records necessitated the creation of a University Archivist position in 1970. A similarly unique experience is evident at the University of Victoria. In 1961, the Victoria College Council appointed a College Librarian/Archivist in anticipation of the library opening in 1964. Nine years later, the Commission on Academic Development recommended an improvement of archival facilities. This resulted in a Senate motion for the establishment of an archives for University material. Despite this high-level initiative, the driving force in the archives establishment was the Alumni Association, who provided enthusiasm, support and financial
resources to acquire and arrange the initial holdings of the University Archives. This diversity in establishment is evidenced further by the Simon Fraser University Archives experience. At a meeting of University department heads held in 1965, the University Librarian was given unofficial approval to collect University records. Consequently, a university archives programme existed within Special Collections from the founding of the universities studied. At each institution examined, a different motivation and action prompted the acquisition of university records. Despite their uniqueness a common concern is evident, namely, the preservation of the university’s history. Within each institution this responsibility was assigned to the library. This reporting structure was a natural outgrowth of the library’s role as a centre fostering and supporting research and scholarship.

Following their establishment the most pressing concern was the articulation and approval of a collections policy, empowering the archives with authority to acquire university records. The University Archivist at the University of British Columbia drafted its first policy in 1970 for a university archives programme. Although this “Plan” was never approved it served as an unofficial policy until 1976 when it was revised. Again, the revised policy did not receive the approval of the Senate or Board of Governors; it was superseded in 1989 by an updated “Proposed Policy Statement”. It was not until 1994 that the University of British Columbia had a fully sanctioned archives and records management policy. A similar struggle was experienced by the University of Victoria’s archives, whose first policy was drafted in 1974 and revised in 1978, but was rejected by the Board of Governors. Finally, a short one page policy was written in 1980 and received official approval in November of that year. Prior to its approval, the University Archives acquired and managed its holdings according to a policy which was not endorsed by the University. Simon Fraser University archives did not experience a similar struggle. The first archives policy was drafted and approved by the Senate three years following the establishment of
the University. The University Archives was officially sanctioned and governed by Policy S-117 for the next eighteen years. However, in the mid-1970's efforts were made to update and revise this early policy. New draft policies were prepared in both 1974 and 1978. Finally, in July 1986 a revised, comprehensive policy received the approval of the Board of Governors. The approval of an institutional mandate and collections policy is a key component to any archival programme. Without the sanctioning of its parent body it is virtually impossible to institute a full archival programme and to properly manage the records of the sponsoring agency. However, it should also be noted that the approval of a policy will not guarantee the success of a programme, unless it is accompanied by an ongoing financial and administrative commitment through adequate budget, staff, facilities and equipment.

In addition to conveying the authority to acquire holdings, a policy serves to articulate which groups or series of records are to be acquired by the archives. British Columbia’s university archives followed components of a “total archives” approach. In his 1975 survey, Ian Wilson commented on the significant number of university archives soliciting and acquiring the private papers and records of individuals and organizations not directly connected with the university. Twenty of the twenty-seven surveyed were responsible for general manuscript programmes. Wilson proposed that the fact that sixteen of these archives were located within libraries may have been related to this acquisition approach. Subsequent surveys conducted by the Association of Canadian Archivists in 1975 and 1985 provide further insight into the acquisition of extra-university records. Of all institutions surveyed in 1975, 88% were acquiring extra-university records and by 1985 this number had increased to 90%. Shelley Sweeney comments on this trend in a paper addressed to the Society of American Archivists in 1986. She notes that the notion that collecting manuscript material reflects library policies toward research no longer provides a sole explanation for the acquisition policies of university archives. This explanation is supported by
the continued pattern and actual increase in the acquisition of extra-university records, even though the number of university archives located within libraries has dropped. The surveys conducted in 1975, 1980 and 1985 reveal that university archives have been administratively separating from libraries; their numbers decreasing 13% between 1975 and 1980, and 12% between 1980 and 1985. Sweeney suggests that university archives are simply enlarging the scope of their acquisition strategies. “They are justifying the collection of extra-university records by writing in their mandates their intentions to support the teaching programmes of their universities.” She suggests that manuscript holdings provide vital and exciting research material and therefore draw in external users. However, university archivists have recognized their obligations to serve the needs of their parent bodies and have initiated records management programmes. Dual collections mandates provide as broad a justification for university archives as possible. The acquisition policies of British Columbia’s university archives exemplify a dual mandate or “total archives” approach. However, since two of the institutions are located within libraries it is difficult to determine if their strategies were motivated by their administrative link or by a pattern clearly evident on a national level, namely, that a broad mandate provides greater stability and security for the overall programme. However, Simon Fraser University Archives did eventually separate from the library, yet retained its dual mandate. Clearly, Sweeney’s position is validated by the experience of British Columbia’s university archives.

It has been recognized that many factors have played a role in the development of manuscript acquisition within university archives. Often material is acquired in a desperate bid to rescue important documents from destruction. Other material is acquired due to a lack of interest at federal or provincial archives. Another consideration has been maintaining a regional focus in collecting, in order to forge close ties with surrounding communities. Furthermore, there may be a
need to accommodate benefactors and graduates in an effort to enhance the university’s public relations profile. Related to this justification is a response to the needs of the university faculty. Finally, manuscript material may be acquired to accommodate the wishes of a particular donor who has a preference for smaller institutions closely linked with academic research and scholarship. It has been noted that whatever the rationale or justification for the acquisition of manuscript material, it can only be successful if the programme is co-ordinated and a balance is achieved between both university records and historical manuscripts.

The motivation for the acquisition of historical manuscripts at British Columbia’s three university archives varied within each institution. As part of a Special Collections Division, both the University of Victoria and University of British Columbia archives were administratively linked to an existing manuscript programme. This was expanded further by the inclusion of faculty papers in the acquisition policies of both institutions. The University of British Columbia’s University Archives actively acquired not only the personal papers of faculty, but also publications of students, alumni and other societies. The University of Victoria’s Archives, acquired the personal papers of faculty and staff. In contrast, Simon Fraser University Archives’ historical manuscripts section focused on municipal and ethnic records. Simon Fraser’s programme reflected a regional focus, as well as a response to the research needs of faculty and departments. Obviously each of the university archives programmes was motivated to acquire historical manuscripts by one or a combination of recognized factors. However, their ability to serve both components of their dual mandates and strike a balance between, had varying degrees of success, as the following discussion will reveal.

A result of the 1975 survey of Canadian university archives was the contention that many institutions were involved in broader research manuscript programmes at the expense of their responsibilities to university records. Integral to managing and preserving the records of the
sponsoring agency is a comprehensive records management programme. In 1975, university archives involved in records management were largely those outside the library milieu and were generally French Canadian. Ian Wilson speculated that those archives outside the library setting were unhampered by library collections policies which tended to favour acquiring private papers over corporate records. Consequently, these archives could more easily embark on programmes to fulfill their corporate mandate. Facts may have suggested this theory in 1975, however subsequent surveys reveal that this was no longer the case. Both archives within and outside libraries have participated in records management programmes. Furthermore, records management initiatives are no longer confined to French-speaking Canada, but are widespread across the country. Records management has not been an issue at large university archives only, nor those with long established histories. It is evident from more recent data that academic archivists have acknowledged their obligation as corporate archives and the need to serve their constituent bodies. Hence, the move into the realm of records management. The extent of records management initiatives and the components which have been successfully implemented in British Columbia are evident in the institutional case studies.

Attempts to implement records management programmes were initiated as part of British Columbia’s university archives programmes. Each archivist clearly recognized and understood its responsibility for the records of the parent body. However, the components of a programme successfully implemented and their extent varied considerably. The establishment of an Archives Committee to facilitate records management systems and procedures is a common and necessary component for success. Only Simon Fraser University Archives was able to establish a permanent Committee which met on a consistent and regular basis. Although a Committee was appointed at the University of Victoria it operated for only three years before it lapsed and was not
reappointed. The University of British Columbia was not successful in establishing an Archives Committee until 1994.

One of the initial components of a records management programme is a records survey or records inventory. The purpose of a survey is to document records created by an organization, their purpose, function and extent. A records inventory provides the basis for records scheduling and retention. Only the University of British Columbia successfully completed an inventory of university records. Although repeated attempts to undertake an inventory were made by the University of Victoria’s Archives Committee, the necessary funding was never secured. An inventory was never initiated at Simon Fraser University and was in fact never raised as an issue by the Archives Committee.

Another important component of a records management programme are retention and disposition schedules. Simon Fraser University archives was the only programme to successfully draft and approve retention schedules. However, this success was limited, since they related to the records of only four Departments. One component of records management which was addressed by all three university archives programmes was records centre storage. Each institution was able to acquire off-site storage for inactive university records. Finally, in terms of the necessary link with university departments to manage records through all phases of the life cycle, only Simon Fraser was able to install and continue a liaison network. In addition, Simon Fraser was also the only university archives programme to have a full-time Records Manager on staff. It is obvious from this summary that Simon Fraser University Archives achieved the greatest progress toward implementing records management. However, the other two university archives programmes recognized records management as an integral component of a total programme and were actively lobbying for its implementation. The issue of adequate resources impeded progress at both the University of British Columbia and University of Victoria.
The problem of adequate financial, staff and space resources was a continuing source of concern for each of the university archives programmes examined. It was a lack of commitment of the part of administrations to provide basic resources which frustrated and in fact impeded the development of British Columbia’s university archives. The problem present at all three is more serious at the University of British Columbia and University of Victoria than at Simon Fraser University. None of the three university archives programmes are housed in a separate facility. All are located within the university library facility. Staff resources vary with the University of British Columbia being administered by one person; Victoria by a half-time person; and Simon Fraser by two and one-half persons. In addition, two of the institutions did not have a separate budget: only Simon Fraser University Archives controlled its own finances.

The three case studies reveal institutions at varying stages of development. Neither of the three institutions has achieved the third stage of development: autonomy and management. Simon Fraser University Archives remains at the very beginning of stage two improved authority and infrastructure, as does the University of British Columbia following the approval of its policy in 1994. The University of Victoria remains in the first stage of development, establishment of basic infrastructure and rescue of materials.

The process of development toward achieving a fully integrated archival programme is an ongoing struggle and evolution. The developmental history of the National Archives of Canada has spanned a period of one hundred and twenty years. Measured accordingly, British Columbia’s university archives have achieved considerable success in the short time period covered in this study. Each institution is faced with challenges and based upon their determination and commitment, they will undoubtedly achieve their goal of acquiring, preserving and making accessible their holdings, serving both their parent body and the general public.
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