

Papers from the Seminar "10 years of SUV: Past Achievements - Future Strategies"

20 - 21 August 2004, Vienna Technological University, Austria

	PAGES
<i>Increasing access to archival knowledge through archival cooperation and partnerships: a proposal for enhancing networking and linkage capabilities among academic archives in developing countries</i> By Fe Angela M. Verzosa, University Archivist of De La Salle University-Manilas, the Philippines.	1-8
<i>SUV as an ICA Section: A Facilitator of Membership or More? What Do We Expect of an International Section?</i> By Renata Arovelius, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU), Sweden	9-14
<i>A Short History of ICA/SUV, 1992-1996</i> By Marjorie Barritt, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, U.S.A.	15-17
<i>Suggestions for the ICA Section on University and Research Institutions</i> By Karen E. Benedict, Winthrop Group Inc.	18
<i>« Archival Solidarity », the Plan, its Aims and the Prospects for SUV Members</i> By Benjamin Haspel, Tel Aviv University, Israel	19
<i>SUV and Eastern European University Archivists: Challenges, Expectations and Realities</i> By Valery Katzunov, St. Kliment Okhridski University of Sofia, Bulgaria	20-24
<i>Possibilities and Roles for the SUV in the ICA and the Profession: Commentary and Context</i> By William J. Maher, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, U.S.A.	25-28
<i>Different Archival Cultures – a Source of Misunderstanding in an International Setting?</i> By Juliane Mikoletzky, Vienna University of Technology, Austria	29-32
<i>Notes on Working Group Discussions: Communications Group</i> By William J. Maher, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, U.S.A.	33
<i>Computer-Mediated Communication vs. Human Networks</i> By Margit Pohl, Institute for Design & Assessment of Technology, Vienna University of Technology, Austria	34-35
<i>Financing a Seminar</i> Moshe Somer Forum of Archives Managers in Institutions of Higher Education, Haifa, Israel	36-38

"Increasing access to archival knowledge through archival cooperation and partnerships: a proposal for enhancing networking and linkage capabilities among academic archives in developing countries"

by

Fe Angela M. Verzosa

ABSTRACT:

The SUV has grown from a small group of members in 1994, and over a period of ten years has been successful in the fulfillment of its primary objective, the strengthening of relations among members who are academic archivists in universities and research institutions thru the holding of annual seminars and conferences. Little has been done, sadly, towards the promotion of a very important objective, i.e., archival cooperation in the fields of documentation, bibliographic access, digitization, open access scholarly publishing, and related activities that would enhance the networking and linkage capabilities among academic archivists, particularly those in the disadvantaged regions as well as in developing nations. The strategic development of archives in the region through collaboration, partnering schemes, and networking can create an information-rich environment, and wide opportunities to benefit from shared information resources. Part of the success of ICA-SUV will largely depend on how well its members can exploit these networking opportunities, and contribute to the development and growth of archival knowledge on a global scale. This paper aims to bring out the spirit of cooperation among the members by promoting the development of sustainable short-term projects that are doable and mutually beneficial, and thereby contribute to the increased access to archival knowledge.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR:

Fe Angela M. Verzosa is the University Archivist of De La Salle University-Manila since 1988, and served as its Library Director from June 1994 until May 1998. She graduated with an A.B. History degree (1966) and a Master in Library Science (1978) from the University of the Philippines, Diliman. She served as Head of the National Committee for Culture and the Arts-National Committee on Libraries and Information Services from 2001-2004. She is currently the President of the Philippine Association of Academic and Research Libraries (for the second time) and was past President (2000) of the Philippine Librarians Association, Inc., an accredited professional organization of licensed librarians.

Introduction*

First, I wish to express my appreciation to the organizers for inviting me to speak on a topic that is close to my heart, that is, “Increasing access to archival knowledge through archival cooperation and partnerships.” One of the primary reasons why I attended last year’s ICA-SUV conference in Poland was for me to have some kind of an international exposure on the world-wide issues and concerns of archivists connected like me in an academic and research environment. I strongly believed, then and now, that the strategic development of academic and research archives anywhere in the world, particularly in regions rich in cultural knowledge but sadly disadvantaged by the lack of technical know-how, human resource, and funding sources, should merit considerable concern by an important international organization like the ICA-SUV. Through collaboration, partnering schemes, and networking, I am convinced we can bridge the digital divide, so to speak, and create an information-rich environment in the archives sphere of influence, and provide wide opportunities to benefit from shared archival information resources. Part of the success of ICA-SUV for the last ten years has been in holding these annual gatherings of academic archivists, and I am sure much of its future success will largely depend on how well its members can exploit collaboration and networking opportunities to contribute to the development and growth of archival knowledge on a global scale.

I came here hopefully to bring out the spirit of cooperation among the members of ICA-SUV by promoting the development of sustainable short-term projects that are doable and mutually beneficial, and thereby contribute to the increased access to archival knowledge.

Early Attempts at Collaboration

International cooperation has been extremely difficult to achieve because of geographical distance. So for many years, I watched on the sideline how early attempts at collaboration in the Southeast Asian region, wherein my country is closely linked to, will fare. It is sad to say here that, apart from organizing conferences and seminar-workshops, attended mostly by government archivists, and publishing yearly a journal that contains the papers presented at such conferences and seminars, little has been done to accomplish collaboration objectives for academic archives and research institutions.

In 1969, there was a Conference on Research Materials held in Puntjak, Indonesia, focused on sourcing archival materials, microfilming, and bibliographical control. An offshoot of this conference was the founding of the Congress of Southeast Asian Librarians (CONSAL), which held its inaugural meeting in Singapore in 1970, and the first General Conference of Southeast Asian Regional Branch of ICA known as SARBICA, which was held in Manila in

* Paper presented at the ICA-SUV Seminar- “10 Years of SUV: Past Achievements, Future Strategies,” held at Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria, August 20-21, 2004

1971. One of the noteworthy projects of the combined efforts of CONSAL and SARBICA involved the establishment of a Regional Microfilm Clearinghouse, which was intended to keep members informed of microfilming activities in the region to avoid duplication of efforts and to fill in the needs and gaps. The Southeast Asian Microfilms Newsletter, which published its maiden issue in December 1972, survived until 1993.

Another cooperative regional project was the Masterlist of SEA Microforms, published in 1978 and updated in 1985. In 2000, the proposal to digitize the Masterlist with a total of almost 36,000 entries of holdings from 44 institutions in Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand and with the expected cooperation from 16 new institutions (making it a total of 60), was approved at a meeting of an informal grouping known as the Southeast Asia Consortium on Access and Preservation (SEACAP) in Chiang Mai. This project was to be funded by Japan Foundation. Despite so many glitches (mostly on funding requirements, delays in fund approval and releases, unmet deadlines for submission, and so on), the project was successfully launched and partial results are shown on the MSEAM database accessible at <http://mseam.seas.edu.sg>. Now the project is in limbo because of data transfer nightmares (due to incompatibility of parameters) and suspension of funds from JF.

In my own country, there is a joint microfilming project of our Records Management and Archives Office (RMAO) and the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas (CSIC) on the initiative of our government and the Spanish Embassy, resulting in a turn-over of the catalogues produced by the CSIC of microfilmed centuries-old documents during the Spanish colonial period of my country.

Speaking of the Philippines, I should mention here that there is a remarkable range of cooperative activities and consortial arrangements that range from the simple to the more complex. A number of them were shaped by varying needs and interests. Many active consortia are still informal and voluntary in nature, borne from institutional linkages of academic libraries (where academic archives are attached) within a particular geographical location, and established expressly to engage mainly in interlending activities and bibliographic control. Only two are government-sponsored. Quite a few are spearheaded by professional associations. The National Committee on Archives, under the National Commission for Culture and the Arts, is represented by a group of archivists, mostly belonging to the Society of Filipino Archivists, with the National Archives in an ex-officio capacity, and mandated primarily to provide technical assistance to institutions starting an archives and conduct training for potential archivists. Its one ambitious project is to create a database of archival resources in the country.

Barriers to Cooperation

It is obvious from the above discussion that geography is not the only obstacle to cooperation. Sustained funding and commitment can make or break cooperative endeavors. The channels of communication among cooperating partners should be kept open and constant, and not merely episodic. Deadlines for submitting inputs have to be met, or materials exchange will wither and collapse. Also, it is essential for a successful experience in cooperation that participating members feel that they are getting a proper level of benefit. Consortial arrangements need to be flexible, adaptive to changing situations, pragmatic and well-focused in

order to be effective. Cooperation in the area of digitization is now a major area attracting multiple consortia, but, sharing of digitized materials is hampered by copyright issues, and the reluctance of major repositories with rich collections to participate.

Several barriers have been cited too, such as rivalry and competition, mistrust and jealousy, politics and personalities, different institutional priorities and indifferent institutional administrators, unequal development and parochialism, and so on. Other challenges to cooperation stem from negative attitudes, such as skepticism, fear of loss, reluctance to take risks, and the pervasive lack of tradition of cooperation.

Proposals for New Avenues at Collaboration

It is not my intention here to dwell on the successes and failures of past and present archival cooperation but to seek new avenues, and perhaps better alternatives for cooperative activities on an international scale that are more focused on academic and research archives.

With the increasing use of Internet and electronic resources, digital archives are now an emerging platform for cooperation. Thanks to the Internet, collaborative programs now extend far beyond the traditional. Much of the information that is available on the Internet is free. And even if some are not free, they are usually low-cost. Once the networking infrastructure is in place, the expense of electronic information becomes minimal. What this means for cooperating institutions which use the Internet as their base of operations, is that the information they are sharing is far less costly than if the same information were printed and shipped thousands of miles. Equity in terms of cooperation, therefore, should not be a major problem. Each archival institution has its own unique collection that can be offered to the international community of archive users, and in the context of free or almost-free.

Unquestionably, the Internet presents one of the most effective means towards networking. However, I believe we must recognize that the value and focus of the Internet is full text rather than a mere catalog of bibliographic information. At this juncture, there is a more urgent need for content on the Internet, and this is something that we need to carefully explore as the focus of cooperative projects

Although geography was conceded to be one major obstacle to cooperation, it is now of no consequence if the Internet is used as a cooperative medium. The advantages of using the electronic medium to carry out collaborative projects is fairly evident. Large volumes of paper do not have to be transported. In terms of materials exchange, if electronic materials are lost in transit, they can simply be re-transmitted. Fax, telephone, and microform present traditional modes for information transfer, but none can compare with the possibilities that the Internet offers in terms of immediacy, resources conservation, and retrievability.

Joint Electronic Journals

One potentially very commendable area for cooperation concerns the joint publication of electronic journals. Joint electronic journals can open the avenues for increasing access to archival resources, especially those rare and otherwise inaccessible materials, by encouraging

faculty, scholars and researchers at our own academic and research institutions to publish their works in non-subscription electronic journals. By providing the mechanisms for open access publishing through the Internet, the major source of academic information pertaining to Asia and other remote regions will be available on the Web; and scholars and researchers anywhere in the world will gain access to information that would have been extremely difficult to locate. Open access in a cooperative arrangement would even solve the complex problems of document delivery service.

De La Salle University Archives has recently put on trial a few articles online under the journal title, *Sinupang Lasalyano*. This journal will provide open access to all of its contents on the principle that making research freely available to the public supports a greater global exchange of knowledge, and such access is associated with increased readership and increased citation of an author's work. The contents are indexed and searchable by OAI engines. This approach uses an open journal system, designed by the [Public Knowledge Project](#), to improve the scholarly and public quality of research, and the software is freely distributed to support the open access publishing of scholarly resources.

If ICA-SUV facilitates in assembling a group that wants to take immediate collaborative action leading to the establishment of OAI compatible preprint repositories, then this can become one project in archival cooperation. SUV members participating in this project can organize the open archives on a discipline-oriented basis, and then decide who should be the party(ies) responsible for launching, managing, and maintaining the system, whether the universities, scholarly societies, international research centers, or individual volunteers.

Digital Archives Collaboration

For pictures, sound, and other archival multimedia materials which are storage-intensive, the opportunities for cooperation by establishing as many websites as possible offers a better alternative than a single site. A single site will definitely be burdened with a big storage requirement, while building separate sites will encourage cooperation. The more participants involved, the better for the project to achieve efficiency and effectiveness.

For digital archives, the innovative use of information technology will enable archival information to be accessed anywhere anytime by anyone who needs them. However, the need to integrate technology and content is evident. And outside funding and the commitment of volunteers in such digital initiatives are critical to its success.

In my country, our National Archives has started its project on digitization of archival documents since 1998 and is still on-going. More than 13 million historic documents have been digitized but not accessible in the world wide web. How many more such digital projects are ongoing in developing countries but are not accessible in the web, no one knows. Why? Clearly, there are problems in funding initiatives, technology infrastructure, and technical expertise.

This is in contrast to the initiative of the National Archives of Japan, spearheaded by the Japan Center for Asian Historical Records (JACAR) which is a full-fledged digital archives. JACAR provides image data of official documents concerning the relationship between Japan and its Asian neighbors through the Internet. It offers "anyone, anytime, anywhere" access to the records free of charge. Internet users can read a large amount of Asian historical records from the Meiji Restoration in 1868 until the end of the WWII in 1945, download and print it out easily. About six and a half million images have been scanned, and around two million images every year will be added. All the documents were previously microfilmed and converted into digital format.

Another model of collaboration is JARDA, the Japanese American Relocation Digital Archive, which results in a single point of access to digitized archival materials on the evacuation and internment of thousands of Japanese Americans during WWII. Curatorial and digital collaboration was made possible through California Digital Library's Online Archive of California, which spearheaded the development of digital archives for "thematic collections." Putting all these primary documents in one site made a big contribution to academic research.

These examples lead us to the conclusion, rightly or wrongly, that developed nations can manage its own website for digital archives without need of collaboration. Collaboration becomes an attractive alternative only for the poorer nations when better endowed countries take on the initiative to extend assistance by way of providing the required funds, or the needed technical expertise and training, and/or the technology infrastructure or network mechanism that will facilitate access. Here, SUV can initiate the launching of an international network of institutional repositories, matching institutions with common interests, needs and requirements.

Copyright Concerns

One of the most serious barriers to building digital archives and establishing open access journals for such archival resources like faculty publications and theses and dissertations, is related to copyright and intellectual property concerns. With these legal issues, it is may be difficult to develop higher levels of cooperative arrangements, but the problem is not insurmountable. One of the potential solutions is to require waivers from faculty, scholars and other intellectual property right-holders to the digital contents of their works in the spirit of shared scholarship and complementary research.

Certainly, many academic and research institutions can be encouraged to require their waivers, provided the collaborative partners are also willing to do the same and share their valuable resources. At present this willingness is still doubtful, and efforts towards digital collaboration have been focused on historical materials and government works free of copyright concerns. Hopefully, ICA-SUV can start with small beginnings.

International Collaboration on archival training & education

In the sphere of international collaboration on archival training and education, Southeast Asian academic archivists enjoy limited opportunities. Many of the staff sent for training courses are state or government archivists and records manager, primarily because fund grants are limited to government-to-government arrangements. For instance, the State Archives Department of Vietnam over the last few years has sent its staff to Algeria, Indonesia, China, Japan, France and Laos to attend seminars, conferences or study tours, and, in turn, accepted archivists from neighboring countries like Laos for training under the government's cultural exchange program. Another example is a training workshop on conservation and restoration for 25 Vietnamese conservators held in Hanoi jointly with the Tokyo Conservation and Restoration Center under a Japan Foundation grant. Malaysia has also been consistently active in providing training courses in archival education, and so is Thailand particularly in the area of conservation and restoration under government cultural exchange programs..

Internet-based distance education may offer an alternative to the more expensive traditional teaching involved in archival education, and training courses available only to funded or government-sponsored trainees. The digital environment certainly offers the opportunity to develop archival training through distance education. It is essential, however, to have a centralized system at the institutional level dedicated to building, supporting and maintaining the distance education infrastructure. Hopefully, the ICA Section on Archival Education will work towards developing one. According to a survey made recently, distance education program in archival studies are offered by universities and colleges in collaboration with international organizations or professional associations, and national/state archives, which cover education and training for professionals and para-professionals. These are, however, extremely limited, and to academic archivists in developing countries like the Philippines, are still expensive. Many of these academic archivists have no formal education in archival studies, and post-appointment training in my country is limited to 2-3 day seminar workshops on basic courses such as appraisal, arrangement and description, conducted by practicing archivists who are, likewise, lacking in formal education in archival studies. Many library schools in my country do not even offer archival courses in their curriculum, for both graduate and undergraduate degrees, and not one school offers a doctoral degree.

Online learning as an emerging educational practice poses several issues and concerns, such as pedagogical and technical problems. But SUV can tap a team of archival educators who can deliver courses online, and decide what teaching competencies should these prospective online educators need to develop to become effective in online training course delivery.

What we are suggesting is an in-service professional postgraduate distance training in basic archival courses that may or may not require external accreditation, just to meet the immediate needs of academic administrators, information professionals, potential academic archivists and records managers. This will provide a higher level training supplementing the World Bank's Learning Program, which is aimed not at practicing archivists and records managers, but at project managers who need record keeping skills within developing institutions.

Conclusion

At the beginning of my talk, I mentioned that I came here to once again meet archivists from all over the globe. It is a constant source of inspiration for me to interact and connect with

them in the hope that something fruitful and eventful will happen. Holding these annual gatherings is one thing, but doing something in between these meetings together is another. I am certain that in the very near future, ICA-SUV can exploit collaboration and networking opportunities to promote the development and growth of archival knowledge on a global scale with its better endowed members leading the way. .

*10 Years of SUV: Past Achievements – Future Strategies
Vienna, Austria, 20 -21 August 2004*

Friday, 20 August 2004, 14:00 – 14:30

Session 2: Working as a Section of ICA

*Presentation: SUV as an ICA Section: A Facilitator of Membership or More?
What Do We Expect of an International Section?*

Presenter: Renata Arovelius, SLU

SUV as an ICA Section: A Facilitator of Membership or more? What Do We Expect of an International Section?

During the last ICA Congress in Seville 2000 there was a lively discussion about the role of the SUV owing to establishing of the Committee of Science and Technology (CST) within the ICA.

There were many voices from the Steering Committee and from the membership noticing that setting up of this Committee is the same as the questioning of the whole idea of the Section. This critical undertone was understandable and, when looking at the context of the discussion, reasonable. This critical undertone was also as justified to particular circumstances as to our work in the Section. One of the reasons for the establishing of the CST was lack of knowledge: the SUV is dealing with records of science, as well. This brings us to the problem of policy for the work of the section, its aims and goals and ways of participating in the archival discourse.

General objectives of the SUV tell that the section is open to archivists working in universities, colleges, academies of science and letters, learned societies and research institutions. It should be thus obvious what kind of records and archives are considered in the work of the section, even though some universities do not keep records of science. We have different archival rules and different working conditions; our different administrative backgrounds and traditions make that we apply different policies to our archives. And of course, those different conditions for the university archives should be transparent and should be made transparent in an international setting. An international section should also make its work well-known, by products, networking and active dialog with other parts of ICA. In fact, the SUV is dealing not only with records and archives of university/research institutions

administration, but also with records of science, was not well known, it indicates, the section has been not visible enough within the work of the ICA.

According to the constitution of ICA, (art. 45), section shall draw up their programmes of activities with the Programme Management Commission; a working plan and section's activities must be consistent with the constitution and activities of the ICA.

But has the policy of the section ever been evidently formulated? If we look at the background for the establishing of the CST, (and not only CST, even other committees within the section), the answer must be no. We have e.g. never defined what role the Subcommittee on Science Archives, as a part of the organisation, has to play, not only for the members of the section, but also for other members of the ICA.

A section policy and a working plan connected to and consistent with activities and constitution of the ICA imply also results in form of concrete products. Those last ten years of the SUVs work show many good and interesting initiatives undertaken, but somehow these initiatives have never been finalized or are progressing. (I think about the biography, "conceptual framework", documentation of the seminars). Of course there are many reasons for that, but perhaps lack of a working plan and a proper structure for our work are the main reasons.

It is obvious that a successful and useful activity should be based on clear goals and on understanding of different conditions. The need to formulate a clear policy for our work is thus evident, but also need to structure it and to specify how the work should be carried out. If we look at different activities of the section, we must note that there are mostly members of the Steering Committee involved in them, which - on the one hand - makes that different initiatives are going on and are carried out on the whole, but - on the other hand- it makes that the members of the section are not included in the section's work.

The SUV members vote for and elect their representatives. However, it does not mean that the steering committee has to do everything and actually it shouldn't. It would not be especially democratic. But, the steering committee should, with the help of the members, organize and lead the work. It also should stimulate and encourage participation in the work of the section. I don't think we were mostly lucky in those efforts in the past, but we should try to be more successful in the coming years and hopefully the outcome of this seminar will prepare for a better way of the participation. Perhaps it is also about time to discuss how do we nominate and elect our representatives. Perhaps the current way does not suite our needs any longer and calls for a change. It seems not to be particular significant to vote for just one candidate for a

position. Perhaps a nominating committee that looks after an optimal composition of the steering committee, considering representation of different parts of the world – as we are an international section – would be better; perhaps there are other ways, but I think it is worth to discuss it.

To improve the ways of acting is important, but furthermore, being successful as a section demands also a great portion of active interest, share and commitment from all involved. Even though it is a volunteer job, it should be understandable that if a member has accepted a task, it means that he or she has the possibility to carry out this task, what ever it can be: participating in the steering committee work, answering to a survey or contribution to the biography. I know by own experience that the decision making process in the steering committee can be quite long-lasting and meet obstacles. - And in many cases a prompt decision is needed. But on the other hand it is not always that easy when we are working in different parts of the world and represent different cultures, languages and mentality. (Juliane will speak about it in more detail). We have learned a lot during those years, but many things still can be improved. The new information technology with its rapid changes may cause many problems for digital archiving, but it makes the communication much easier and takes away the distance. (But still: we have to keep our commitments, even by e-mail). The annual meetings have also great importance for how to plan and how to structure our work.

Since the Lancaster meeting in 1994 there have been two different views about the way of working and goals for the activity of the section. The first view was for updating of the recent knowledge in the field of research institutions archives and the other view was represented by those members who wanted to spread the existing experiences to developing countries and isolated colleagues. Much of the activity of the section tried to satisfy either the first or the other view.

The last years have shown, however, that this discrepancy does not have to exist and that the one view does not exclude the other. Both ways can result in united actions. There have also been made some tangible proposals for acting that can both update the recent knowledge and spread existing experiences. One of those is a report or publication on our different traditions, backgrounds and rules for handling of university and research institutions archives, and rules for appraisal. This proposal results in the concrete action in form of the member's survey on handling of records of science. The survey is a good stride, a first step, in this broader and united approach. The outcome of this survey will be presented during the Congress.

The experience of using electronic records management systems for university records is, in my opinion, another example of the merge of those two views. Moreover, this subject is also connected to the very urgent task with the digital preservation and record keeping systems. We can deepen our knowledge about the use and the preservation; we can also spread the already existing knowledge.

By some occasion I have also mentioned, in this context, courses in information retrieval at the SLU for postgraduate students and for scholarship holders from abroad. There are many students from developing countries participating. A part of this course is preservation and handling of scientific material and rules for archiving of records of science including digital preservation. There is always – fortunately enough - an unflagging interest in the archival matters and it is easy to observe how this information is needed and welcomed. This is another field we could unite those two different views on, when we update recent knowledge by designing a programme for developing countries and isolated colleagues, by preparing a “handbook” and guidelines, and spread the existing experience. And it must not only be the handling of scientific records that we as an international section are sharing with others, but every urgent topic connected to the university archives. (Benni will talk later about the archival solidarity, and I think this attempt can be included in such an action). This way of working would also be a good help from an international section, as in fact many of our colleagues can't afford the participation in seminars arranged by the section. Many of our colleagues at the universities around, and the Eastern Europe is just one example, still don't have any access to the Internet and no possibility to communicate by e-mail.

These are the realities we have to consider in our policy and our working plan. (I assume Mr. Katzunov will touch upon those problems).

Working with archives and archiving is always connected - in a very intimate way - , with its users: users of today, but also future users. How do we satisfy the needs of the users, how do we make the archives more interesting to the public and how do we promote our archives, this is the next field in which the exchange of experience and the international cooperation can contribute. The last seminar in Poland was a very good example of such an exchange of both experience and ideas. To make the archival material more “alive” by integration of museum objects and library activities in the outreach was a pointer for possibilities to our profession. A very interesting contribution to the archival discourse from the University of Dundee on participating in the university's teaching and research process is also a good illustration to the possibilities.

International cooperation implies also use of international standards. At least by two different occasions during the last time the need of information on standards has been pointed out by the members of the section. The development of such a standard as EAD (Encoded Archival Description) with the ISAD/G and ISAAR (CPF) in the background and implementation of OAIS (Open Archival Information System) or the standard for records management have a big impact on both systematic documenting, preservation and exchange of records and data for the universities and research communities, and in particular for the records of science. The best forum for the discussion on new possibilities and instruments for our work should be and must be an international section.

The aims of the SUV according to the section's by-law are:

- to promote communication and cooperation between the archives
- to gather and disseminate information about the creation and administration of archives and also about the administrative policies and procedures
- to assist in the development and strengthening of archives through symposia, publication and consultation
- to cooperate with other bodies of the ICA

If we look closely at our aims, we must notice that it is not possible to act as only a facilitator of membership if we really want to achieve them. The expectation one may put on an international section can't be confined to just an affiliation to a specific sector. To be a member of an international section means that I can find support, recent knowledge and inspiration for my work and the particular area. And the membership allows me to find new instrument for the tasks I have to carry out, it enriches and develops me and my profession. But it also allows me to contribute with my experience and my knowledge. We have been very successful in organizing our seminars and it is a very good ground for the cooperation. But I think we can be a bit critical to other activities as delivery of concrete products or especially the cooperation with other bodies of the ICA. The named example with the Committee of Science and Technology is a witness about the lack of this dialog and SUVs inactivity in this environment.

The field of universities and research institutions archives is unique to us, and so is our knowledge about those archives. But still, there are many joint archival problems. Our experience and achievements can contribute to the solutions; the section can profit from the input from others; we can solve problems together. The cooperation may and perhaps even should be extended to joint activities with other organisation outside the ICA, with

similar aims and needs. Just to give a concrete example: CODATA's efforts on archiving and preserving access to scientific and technical data and our efforts regarding scientific records are complementary. (CODATA is an interdisciplinary Scientific Committee of the International Council for Science, ICSU). Such collaboration on the digital preservation and future access to records and data of science is more than welcomed and can help to find ways to solve joint problems. The world of science is an international one, and so is the world of science archives. (Anne will talk more about the relations inside and outside ICA)

You have certainly observed ICA's announcement of changes in the organization of its programme of activities and projects. Those changes have to serve a better planning and a more timely delivery of effective results. The focus will be put on projects that can be developed also by - sections. I think we can contribute to the ICA programme with many interesting suggestions: Guidelines and handbook for science archives including a term list and handbook on digital preservation and appraisal; a programme for developing countries on university and research institutions archives and records including records management, preservation and protection issues; educational contribution and other help to isolated colleagues. – Just to mention some examples.

But this contribution implies that the SUV formulates a clear policy and a working plan with deadlines that we shall keep. This is a "condition sine qua non" for a successful and useful activity and for its results. It will also promote and encourage the membership in the section.

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE ICA/SUV, 1992-1996

Marjorie Barritt
Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan

The inaugural meeting of the SUV occurred at the ICA Congress in Montreal, Canada, in September 1992. It came about by-and-large through the vision and work of an Australian archivist, Alan Ives, who, with the support of Charles Kecskemeti, Secretary General of ICA, gathered together an ad hoc committee of university archivists and planned a program to launch the section. Forty-one archivists from thirteen countries attended the first meeting of the provisional section in Montreal. A steering committee was elected-it was a very informal election-Alan Ives was named chair and Andre Despy-Meyer secretary. That steering committee, with some changes, provided leadership for the section during its first four years. Marjorie Barritt took over as chair from Alan Ives in August of 1993. Sections were rather a new entity within ICA and there was little information, instruction, or guidance with which to build a viable organization. In the beginning, therefore, the section was "winging it" as Americans would say. The section was quite free to plan its program, to set its priorities, to adopt its own rules-as long as the rules stayed within the by-laws of the parent organization, ICA.

The section did receive some guidance. It was customary, it was told, for ICA entities to meet annually, for committees and sections to draw up by-laws, and to submit reports to the ICA executive.

>From 1992 through 1996, the section's major activity was an annual seminar. In September 1994 in Lancaster, England, the seminar topic was "Documenting Science and Technology in an Academic Setting." This day-and-a-half seminar was planned to coincide with the 4th European Conference sponsored by the Society of Archivists of the UK. Helen Samuels, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA, was the keynote speaker. Thirty archivists representing twelve countries attended the SUV seminar. This model, that of holding SUV seminars in conjunction with other international archival meetings allowed archivists to make a better case for travel support from their home institutions.

Because of the SUV's demonstrated interest in documenting science and technology, and in recognition of the necessity of cooperation between universities, research institutions, governmental agencies and scientific professional organizations in the effort to document science and technology, the ICA executive asked the SUV to include the existing ICA Committee on the Archives of Science within the SUV. Thus the Archives of Science subgroup of the SUV came into being with Odile Welfel as chair.

In Lancaster the section organized itself into three additional committees: a Bibliography Committee, a Guidelines Committee and a Survey Committee. Shortly after the Lancaster meeting a newsletter and a directory database were created. Communicu, the newsletter, was used both as a communication tool for members of the section and as a publicity tool. By 1995 it was published in English and French and mailed to section members and to approximately one hundred persons who had expressed an interest in the section but who were not members. Also an international and multi-lingual bibliography of readings on college and university archives was begun under the auspices of the Bibliography Committee. The section next met in Washington D.C. in September 1995, in conjunction with the annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists. The Washington seminar had a double focus: the first day's meeting, planned by the Guidelines Committee, Frank Scheelings, chair, began the discussion of the development of guidelines for university archives in a session titled "Applications of Archival Techniques at a University: Problems and Solutions." The second half-day seminar was planned by Joan Warnow-Blewett of the Archives of Science subgroup on "How Researchers Communicate in the Electronic Age." Thirty-three archivists from ten

countries attended. After the Washington meeting two additional communication tools were created, the STAMA Listserve and the ICA/SUV Webpage, by Gavan McCarthy and Tim Robinson respectively.

In September 1996, the section met for a one-day seminar in conjunction with ICA's international meeting in Beijing, China. The seminar topic "Toward an Archival Methodology for University Archives" represented the culmination of two years of intensive work by the section's Guidelines Committee. Committee members included Peter Harper, Breanda Weeden, Virginia Teehan, Anne Barrett, Didier, Devriese, Moshe Somer and Tim Robinson and was chaired by Frank Scheelings. The work of this committee grew out of the Lancaster seminar where future topics were discussed. The future seminar topic of greatest interest to members was that of building an infrastructure for a university archives including such related points as: formulating a mission statement, the implications of electronic records for a university archives, the academic use of university records, locating sources of funding for the development of a university archives, developing a records management program, and descriptive standards as applied to university archives. The members suggested that the planning for a seminar on the topic of creating an infrastructure for a university archives and the drafting of guidelines were complementary tasks and that they could be carried out together.

The first draft of the guidelines document was presented at the section's seminar in Washington, D.C. and the subsequent work of the drafting committee was presented at the seminar in Beijing. The work of the SUV Guidelines Committee was not carried out in a vacuum; the committee had access to relevant documents prepared in the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom, among other countries. The Beijing seminar title "Towards an Archival Methodology for University Archives" reflected the fact that information creation, dissemination, preservation and administration was in too great a state of flux for any guidelines to provide adequate guidance for a great number of years without revision. The title implied a never ending journey.

[I understand that you were hoping to include some thoughts about the future of the ICA/SUV in the papers presented in Vienna. I have included the remarks I made in Beijing in the hope that they may still be relevant. If they are not, please do not use them.]

Remarks of Marjorie Barritt as outgoing chair, Beijing, China, September 1996

As the new steering committee begins its work, I hope they will consider the role of the SUV carefully. It is a talented and committed group, the new steering committee, one which holds great promise for the section.

Based on the experiences of the last four years, I would like to make just a few comments. As I stated in the last newsletter, our major activity, the seminar, which consumes most of our financial resources, is not accessible to many of the section's members. Yet, there is no substitute for face-to-face encounters; for the chance to exchange ideas with colleagues on topics of mutual interest, for the opportunity to visit another university archives or to be introduced to the concerns of another archival community. How can we continue the seminar, yet provide access to the riches of such an encounter to our members who cannot attend? There is much interest among some of us in technology and its impact on our work. But member archival institutions represent varying levels of technological competence. Can we provide guidance to university archivists that is not dependent on any one level of technological competence?

And finally, can we build on the strengths represented by cultural diversity and the

multiplicity of archival traditions and current practice which are inherent in an international archival organization such as the SUV to enable all university archivists to be more informed? It has been a busy and productive beginning for the SUV. I have had great personal satisfaction in working with the members of the section; it is an organization with much talent and good will. I look forward to the future progress of the section.

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE ICA SECTION ON UNIVERSITY AND RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS

Karen E. Benedict
Winthrop Group Inc.

One of the ways in which the Section on Professional Associations has made itself an important contributor to the ICA is through undertaking projects that have produced products that are useful to ICA members and others. Examples include: The International Code of Ethics for Archivists; Guidelines for Local Conference Planning; Guidelines for International Conference Planning; A Model Constitution for Professional Archival Associations.

SUV could undertake these kind of projects, for example: Guidelines for Establishing University Archives, Guidelines for Records Management in Universities, and similar guidelines for research institutions, learned societies, and other member institutions of the section.

Until the European Branch was formed, the Section on Professional Associations was solely responsible for administering the European Conferences of the ICA. I noted from your website that you hold an annual seminar every year. You may want to consider posting the papers from those seminars on the section's web pages in order to more widely disseminate the information exchanged in the seminar.

Communication of the activities of the SUV is extremely important. The new ICA Website is constructed to provide maximum flexibility for Sections and Committees to use as a communication tool. The publication of seminar and congress presentations on the web would increase awareness of what SUV is doing. Similarly if you undertake other projects that result in a written product that information should be posted on your web pages and the ICA page on SUV should note that the information is available on your web pages.

Another potential advantage of putting the information on your seminars and projects on your web pages is that it lets the other sections and committees know what you are doing. The awareness of your activities may help to stimulate cooperation with other sections and committees on joint projects. By the same token, the SUV Steering Committee should take a look at the web pages of other sections and committees for possible collaborative activities.

For the Section on Professional Associations, the work done by the section is all done by the Steering Committee. It means that you need to have a Steering Committee whose members are able and willing to take on additional responsibilities. It is a lot of work, but one of the delightful benefits is that you form a close relationship with your colleagues.

„ARCHIVAL SOLIDARITY“, THE PLAN, ITS AIMS AND THE PROSPECTS OF IT FOR
THE SUV MEMBERS

Benjamin Haspel
Tel Aviv University

“Archival Solidarity” is a program, which is led by the ICA section of Archival Organizations.

The program tries to cope with a major problem that is faced by the members of the ICA and other international organizations: The polarization of the world between developed and developing countries. Many archivists cannot benefit from these organizations and cannot join the congresses and meetings and even proper connection to the Internet they do not have. In fact, most of the archival world is as such. University Archives are not exceptional.

In the 90's some initiative had been realized such as the “Archives without Boundaries” of the Catalanian Archivists of Spain which had given help to archivists in Africa and the “Rucksack Mission” which involved no less than five countries (Israel, Slovakia, Lithuania, Estonia and Holland). These initiatives prove that if your colleagues cannot come to the centres of activities in Europe and North America, experts should go to them and share their experience “on site”.

Archival Solidarity will monitor, arrange funds and connect experts with “host countries”. In my paper I shall describe my experience in such program. I shall suggest how the SUV, as a well organized section can integrate in the program and help University Archivists in developing countries in handling their archives.

SUV AND ESTERN EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY ARCHIVISTS: CHALLENGES, EXPECTATIONS AND REALITITES

Dr. Valery Katzunov
St. Kliment Okhridski University of Sofia

At the start of my presentation I should say that I am a historian as my educational background. I had a specialization in Archival Studies during my course of study at Sofia University. At that time there was not a special program on Archival Studies like the one already in existence in the last couple of years at the Faculty of History where I teach now. All these facts are relevant to my presentation and I ask for your excuse if there are some shortcomings in my paper.

The Pre-History

The system of Bulgarian archives is a relatively young one in the 1300-years of history of the Bulgarian people. In fact it comprises of a network of archives with almost the same general purposes and objectives. The archival system of the country was established in 1951 with the Decree No 515 of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Bulgaria. As all the other branches of Bulgarian government after the Second World War it was established and organized under the Soviet model.

After the liberation of Bulgaria from Ottoman rule in 1878 the Bulgarian State administration had no systematic organization of its archives. Each one of the administrative-government structures – the ministries, the courts, the municipalities and other state bodies kept the documents which were not in operational use in a manner that it found suitable. The criteria for the selection of documents and their organization were dependent only on the will of the institution itself.

At the start as a tradition, and later because of a special law passed in 1911 all documents, manuscripts and old printed books, created before the Liberation of 1878 were to be preserved in the St.St. Cyril and Methodius National Library. That is why today it is exactly there where one can find all the documents from the creation of the medieval Bulgarian state up to 1878.

In the period 1878 – 1951 several attempts were made to introduce general criteria and rules about the selection of those documents that were to be preserved permanently. Unfortunately those general rules were not introduced. It was a frequent practice when several valuable and important from our contemporary viewpoint collections of documents were destroyed just because of the pure lack of space for their storage.

As far as science was structured – this relates to the scientific archives as well, I have to acknowledge that in Bulgaria the predominant model and structures are the ones inherited by the Soviet model. Within the system of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences there exist tens of research institutes employing several thousands of scholars. They presume that the documents about their work are private properties. You should however have in mind

that Sofia University, like the majority of the universities in the country (around 40 in number) and the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences' institutes are state ones and the people working there receive their salaries from the state. Before the Second World War there existed in Bulgaria alongside the Soviet University several others institutes and pedagogical schools. During the socialist period a vast network of special universities were created – including ones dealing with medicine, engineering, communications, arts, music, theater, cinema, even sport.

In this respect it is important not to forget that at that time the only private property allowed by the state was over the home the citizens of socialist Bulgaria lived in and the cars (if they had ones) that they drove. Many Bulgarians managed to keep the village homes they were born in with its small plots of land. Those homes were called villas and thus in the 1970s and 1980s some people managed to get some plots of land and they built villas upon them. Everything that was outside of that was state property.

The main element of the socialist ideology was the principle that the socialist state was taking care of everything – from healthcare and education to the big industrial enterprises. That led to the formation of the so-called “socialist mentality”. It included the presumption that the people would show no initiative and would wait for the state to take care of everything. That made people “takers”, not “givers” with their inclination not only to receive but to demand and take from state and society as a whole. Thus workers got accustomed to producing every small thing they needed free of charge at their factories, while the scholars became working as private owners in their state institutions.

About the Scientific Archives in Bulgaria

After the changes of 1989 and the transition that followed the network of universities in Bulgaria increased by 4-5 folds. The privatization of state property had no effect on professors and scholars. They began to “privatize” the results of their labor in the universities and the Academy. Thus today, because of that same logic each university professor or academician keeps the documentation of the research efforts of a whole institute as his own private property. In my opinion this is indeed a big problem, which as far as I know is not only a Bulgarian one. Probably it is evident in any country of the former Soviet block.

In the University of Sofia we can define as scientific archives all those places where there are concrete documents about the results of academic research. In natural sciences (mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, geology, etc.) the practice is the results about the research activities to be kept by the scholar who created them. As already pointed out during socialist times they were considered personal achievements and because of the relative disinterestedness on the part of the Bulgarian institutions dealing with copyright issues, those documents remained in the hands of the individual scholars. That is why the tradition is all collections of documents of that kind to go to the Archive of the Bulgarian Academy of Science.

The situation in the area of the humanities at Sofia university (law, philosophy, philology, economics, etc.) is relatively the same. Here we come upon an interesting phenomenon which is linked with the nature of research in the humanities. Social scientists had a different angle in their approach to society although the object of their research is identical. As a historian I regard the results of their research as very valuable ones for the future historians. For example I can point out the research of my colleagues who are archeologists, as well as those from ethnology and anthropology. I have personally attended as a participant several of their projects and field research work commissioned by the World Bank or by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Bulgaria. I can assure you that as a rule the results of those efforts are not preserved at Sofia University.

From a professional point of view the scientific archives of archeologists and anthropologists at the universities are the most important for me. I should point out that the institutes of archeology, ethnology and folklore at the Academy had old scientific archives of their own which are a part of the holdings of the libraries of the particular institute and which are available under some guidelines. институт и са достъпни при определени условия. There is one important detail – the documents of archeologists and ethnologists are peculiar. Although there are certain general rules of unification, the documents are interlinked but consist of several types – texts, diagrams, drawings photos

Another thing, those documents depend directly on the people, who lead the excavations or field research. In this respect every leader of an expedition, field research and other work creates, sorts out and preserves the documents of the study in a manner that is considered as the most suitable one. A small fraction of that is kept at the departments of the History Faculty – those are mainly reports and plans about the follow-ups. The University Archive is not even aware about the existence of such documents.

I want to draw your attention to another problem I consider an interesting one – the M.A. thesis of the university graduates. Our unwritten rules are that they should be kept by the departments where they originated. However, because of the lack of space their preservation is a selective one and is organized according to the criteria and structure by each department. The number of the theses preserved is a marginal one. Each new reconstruction work done new piles of theses are discarded. The largest collection of about 200 such works are kept in the Department of Archival Studies.

From a theoretical point of view it is interesting what does such thesis present, As a body of paper it looks much like a book with its volume of 80-120 pages. Some argue that because of that it should be kept in the Faculty library. Is that true however? In my opinion it is more a report about a certain research study rather than a monographic kind of written text. If this is the case, then its place is in the University archive, not in the library.

The Archive of the St. Kliment Okhridsky University of Sofia

Today the system of archives in the Republic of Bulgaria is operating under the rules of the special law, enforced in 1974, which had several significant amendments (the last one

from 2001). According to its article 9-11 The St. Kliment Okhridski University of Sofia is obliged to create and keep its own records center, where all documents, related to the functioning of the University should be kept for a period of ten years. After the expiration of that 10-year period the documents should be transferred to the Sofia City branch of the state archives. With a decision of the Rector's Council from 19 January 1998 such an archive was indeed created with one permanent employment place for an archivist.

The functions and activities of our University Archive were regulated by a General Instruction, published in 1982 that set the framework for the structuring and functioning of all administrative bodies' archives in the country. Another regulation was the Unified State Records Management System, introduced in Bulgaria in 1980. On the basis of those state administrative acts the Sofia University administration worked out its own similar but much more detailed instruction of 2001. That instruction established the types and all general accompanying details in the written University documentation, the manner of their registration and the circulation of the documents within the university administration.

As of today, the Sofia University Archive is structured in 9 fonds, each one containing a different number of archival units and files. The most numerous one are the documents concerning the activities of the central administration of the University. Considerably less in their numbers are the documents about the various Faculties with some of them having not transferred even a single document to the University Archive. This fact is linked with the old tradition of every Faculty storing its documents in its Dean's Office.

In a methodological sense the University Archive is linked not only with the Chair of Archival and Documentation Studies but also with the General Department of Archives at the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Bulgaria. The latter is responsible under the law about the structure and functions of all elements of the archival system of the country. Periodically, representatives of the General Department visit the University Archive and give their recommendations and instructions.

The University Archive has a serious competitor in the face of the Museum of Sofia University. Because of the personal efforts and dedication of its staff the Museum keeps in its possession few documents about the lives and activities of some university professors, as well as about the activities of the different Faculties. Partially as a tradition, partially regulated legally some documents about the lives and work of some Bulgarian academics and professors since 1878 are preserved in the Archive of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.

It could be summarized, that today most of the people employed at the University are not satisfied with the present status of the University Archive. That was the reason why recently, in the past few months members of the University administration in collaboration with lecturers of Archival and Documentation Studies at the Faculty of History began to work upon the elaboration of new organizational guidelines for the structure and use of the University Archive. Most probably this fall the new rules will be enforced.

It may be said in conclusion, that the Archive of the St. Kliment Okhridski University of Sofia is a relatively small one and moreover it is in the beginning of its existence. Regretfully, it could not allow itself to preserve the M.A. thesis of its graduate students or at least the most interesting ones. On its part, the University administration has the responsibility to help the University Archive get mature as an important element in the institutional structure of the University of Sofia.

Possibilities and Roles for the SUV in the ICA and the Profession:
Commentary and Context
21 August 2004
William J. Maher

In describing the function of the International Congress on Archives (ICA), its Section on the Archives of Universities and Research Institutions (SUV), or a national organization such as the Society of American Archivists (SAA), one runs the risk of delivering either a bitter list of complaints or an uncritical panegyric about the wonders of associations. Thus, I would like to preface my remarks with a slightly cynical view on the rationale for professional meetings, and by extension for associations. The Prologue to David Lodge's novel: Small World: An Academic Romance notes:

The modern conference resembles the pilgrimage of medieval Christendom in that it allows the participants to indulge themselves in all the pleasures and diversions of travel while appearing to be austere bent on self improvement. To be sure, there are certain penitential exercises to be performed--the presentation of a paper, perhaps, and certainly listening to the papers of others. But with this excuse you journey to new and interesting places, meet new and interesting people, and form new and interesting relations with them; exchange gossip and confidences (for your well-worn stories are fresh to them, and vice versa); eat, drink and make merry in their company every evening; and yet, at the end of it all, return home with an enhanced reputation for seriousness of mind.¹

As a cautionary tale, I think that we should keep these observations in mind. Still, we must not overlook an important fact--one of the reasons that professional meetings and associations are so essential to the development a fields such as archives is that they foster a creative atmosphere where the pleasures of travel can be productively mixed with the exchange of ideas and information about the nature of our work. Thus, I would like to frame my remarks today with both a skepticism about the lofty rhetoric that is often used to justify professional associations and a belief in their fundamental importance to archival work.

First, I think that we should reminder ourselves of the fundamental characteristics of professional associations. I am sure you are all familiar with the traditional values and purposes

¹David Lodge, *Small World: An Academic Romance*, (London: Secker and Warburg, 1984).

which are attributed to professional societies. Associations do the following things:

- 1 educate members and non-members in the given occupation
- 2 communicate information relevant to the occupation
- 3 advance knowledge, theory, and practice in the field
- 4 define, promulgate, and enforce standards of practice
- 5 control the definition and use of the occupational title, especially regarding the linkage of the term "professional" to the name of the occupation
- 6 advocate on behalf of the fundamental concerns of the occupation before governmental, institutional, and competing professional bodies.

Associations have several mechanisms by which they try to accomplish these goals: formal conferences, workshops, and seminars ; publications, especially newsletters, journals, technical literature, and public relations documents; committees and task forces working on a subfield of the occupation, a technical problem, or a political issue; promulgation of policy statements, formal and informal lobbying, and representation on inter-occupational committees, task forces and agencies; hosting of events that foster development of informal communication among individual professionals.

Before we dig into a needed introspective analysis of the SUV, we should also take a moment for some perspective on what it is we are doing in a sociological and political sense when we form and act as a professional association. The systematic study of professions and their structures has received considerable attention from historians, sociologists, anthropologists, and leaders of diverse professions trying to understand their own field. There is not the time to discuss the divergent findings here today, but suffice it to say that these studies range from eulogies on the wonders of occupational progress to broad criticism of professional structures as anti-competitive attempts to control the labor market or devices to secure autonomy through

claims of monopolistic control of specialized knowledge.²

Given its one decade record, often characterized more by the cumbersomeness of maintaining continuity from one annual seminar to the next, such Marxist critiques of the SUV are premature at best and quite possibly totally irrelevant. A less radical but perhaps better way of thinking about the SUV as a professional organization is illustrated by Thomas Haskell's study of the American Social Science Association, in which he found evidence of T. S. Kuhn's contention that professionalization was a measure not of quality, but of community.³

Another important approach to understanding the SUV's continually emerging role is through the concept of "invisible colleges" the essence of which is communication outside, or previous to, formal dissemination of information on research plans, methodology, and results. Invisible colleges have the beneficial effect of reducing the possibility of duplication of work already completed elsewhere, and by providing latest results so each professional can build on a larger body of research than otherwise available. Although the extent to which invisible colleges exist varies from discipline to discipline, they often function as "social circles" organized around a discipline or speciality, and they provide the "space" in which interaction can occur among both highly-active and rank-and-file members. While the concept of invisible colleges has been most extensively applied in the highly collaborative and interdisciplinary environment that has characterized physical, chemical, and life sciences since World War II, the same kinds of social dynamics can occur in other gatherings of professionals organized around a specialized body of

²William J. Maher, "Contexts for Understanding Professional Certification: Opening Pandora's Box?" American Archivist 51 (1988): 408-27.

³Thomas L. Haskell, The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth Century Crisis of Authority (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977), vi, 18.

knowledge and practice.⁴

When thinking about how relevant the notion of invisible colleges may be to understanding possible roles for SUV, one should think first about the nature of archival work and consider to what extent communication, currency, and interdisciplinarity is determinative of progress in the field. To an extent, archival work is inherently focused on the institution holding the archives, and one could argue that there is little need to become engaged externally. From this perspective university archivists might find little value in participation in invisible colleges. On the other hand, because archives are by definition focused on the unique documents and heritage of one institution and local ways of doing things, it is quite plausible to assert that this very uniqueness requires that archivists attend to external professional interaction to avoid isolation and unproductive methods borne of ignorance of national and international standards.

Certainly many of these conditions could be met by affiliation with national associations of archivists in general and university and research archivists in particular. However, it is the development of affiliations, or invisible colleges, at the international level that can be the most effective way of overcoming the insularity that otherwise affects archival work. The ICA/SUV offers a golden opportunity to deliberate and communicate with colleagues from institutions of sufficient similarity but also of significant enough difference to enable the development of both a higher standard of professional practice and an understanding of how much of our archival work is socially, economically, legally, and politically determined. This perspective is only possible when we look at our archives in a global setting.

⁴Derik J. de Solla Price, *Science Since Babylon* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961).

DIFFERENT ARCHIVAL CULTURES – A SOURCE OF MISUNDERSTANDING IN AN INTERNATIONAL SETTING?

Juliane Mikoletzky
Vienna University of Technology

In the historical and social sciences, we have seen for some years the so called “cultural turn”, a growing interest in the cultural aspects of life and their impact on society, on individual and collective identities. It may be worth while to apply this concept also to the archival community. I am not going to elaborate a complete theory here, but just want to give some ideas for another perspective on how cultural factors, in the broadest sense of the word, may be relevant for the archival community, with a special view to university and science archives.

Different archival cultures – do they exist? Or is the world of Archivists a homogeneous one? I am not convinced of that.

To illustrate what I have in mind, please allow me to begin with a personal remark:

Being a member of SUV since 1994 –more from a distance during the first years e, since the late 1990s in a more active way - I have always tried to follow the activities and discussions of the section as best as I could, by studying the newsletter and publications of members of the section, later also by visiting a number of seminars. What I never did get totally rid of was the strange feeling, that I had come to know many very nice people, and read and heard lectures on very interesting subjects – but what I heard and read was in the end of a rather poor practical relevance for my daily work at home. (And I know for certain that at least one of my Austrian colleagues had precisely the same impression, which must have been the reason why he seems to have dropped out of SUV in the course of time).

I have often wondered about that phenomenon, and I came to the conclusion that evidently, even among a rather small community like the University and science archivists, there is room for more differences than one might expect: differences in terminology, in the organization . If this is so, then we should be much more aware of these differences, try to define and to understand them, and take them into account when planning our activities.

This seems to me the more important, as SUV has been successful in the last years to attract members from countries, especially from Middle and Eastern Europe, that have been hardly present in the section before bringing with them also a broader range of cultural traditions.

When preparing my paper, I did a little digging into the past activities of the section – I was interested if and how these aspects might have been discussed in former years. My findings were a bit of a surprise to me. Having never belonged to the “inner circle” of the section, I had only published sources to go on with – and I found them to be rather poor, at least as far as the internal discussion was concerned. Nevertheless, it might be interesting in a retrospective seminar to sum up what I could find out.

One of the basic assumptions leading to the foundation of the SUV Section was, quite naturally, that University and Sciences Archives share, even in an international perspective, a considerable amount of common structural features, and consequently of common problems to be solved by common efforts.

The aims of the section's activities were defined in a rather broad way: to promote communication and cooperation between archives in universities and scientific institutions, to gather and disseminate information about the creation and administration of University and Science archives, about policies and procedures and the role in relation to host institution and society at large, and to assist in the development and strengthening of archives through seminars, publications and consultation and through cooperation with other institutions in the ICA.

One of the most ambitious projects to realize them, conceived as early as 1994, was to develop general "guidelines" for university archives – a project that is still under way and has, to my knowledge, not yet reached any presentable results.

At the same time, the first SUV steering committee began with a survey on the situation of university archives in the member countries of ICA. The results of this survey (that must have been completed about 1996) have never been communicated to the members in full detail, as far as I know. There evidently was presented a summary by Patricia Methven, then Chair of SUV, in Beijing, according to a very short information in the SUV Communique from December 1996. She came to the conclusion that the common features of university and science archives prevail, so that a development of common standards for their archival work was attainable (see also her article in *Janus*, 1998). In the context of the Beijing discussions "Towards an archival methodology for University Archives", the guidelines – project mentioned earlier seems to have been renamed in "conceptual framework for university and college archives".

About the same time Gavan McCarthy, in his invitation to the STAMA conference, noted the "need to develop a better and deeper fundamental understanding of how archival practice is realized in different national and cultural frameworks." (SUV Communiqué, December 1996, p. 5:)

From these meagre traces I dare to conclude that there were evidently from the beginning of the section two tendencies in the SUV discussion: one stressing the common factors and working for standardization and in a way, for "unification", another evidently focusing more on empirical differences in archival practice of university archives in different countries.

The subject of "common features" vs. "diversity" came up again at the 1997 SUV seminar in Barcelona (on "University archives: Common heritage"). Unfortunately, I have not been able to participate in that seminar (nor in those before) so I can again judge the outcome only by what has been published afterwards in *Janus*: this gave me the impression that in the end, the aspect of "common features" was dominant. In the following years, a discussion on these subjects is not to be found explicitly in the SUV any more, for reasons I can at the moment only guess:

One may be found in the dominance, among the more active members of SUV, of persons from the Anglo-American countries, so that for them the question of difference among them

obviously was not very pressing. But there may have been other reasons of more importance. So evidently the work on the guidelines seems not to have been a central subject of SUV' s thoughts and activities. These concentrated more and more on the organizing of yearly seminars, dealing usually with the more "technical" aspects of archival work, like electronic record keeping.

Nevertheless, both perspectives were not mutually exclusive, but represent different aspects of the archival reality.

Common features were usually derived from the evident functional and structural similarities of universities and colleges as institutions of higher education world wide (though even here the differences between separate types can be remarkable even in one country, like the US). Of course no one will deny these similarities. But to become aware of the differences, one will have to change the focus of interest.

In my view, differences are more related with the institutional, historical and professional background of University and Science archives. To mention only some of the relevant aspects, there can be

- differences in the juridical status of the institution (public – private)
- different traditions of the division of labor between university and science archives, museums, and libraries
- a different organization of the national archival system (centralized – decentralized, university and scientific archives maybe included in state legislation on archives, or not)
- a different organization of the archival profession and of archival training – not everywhere archival science is an academic discipline
- different self-images of university and science archives (more service-oriented, trying primarily to serve the administration and external user's needs, or more research-oriented, regarding as their duty not only to give support to external researchers, but also doing a fair amount of research by themselves—in archival science, but also in the historical field or preparing editions of documents)
- different status and image of archives in society in general, as well as of the university and science archives inside their institution.

In reality, these factors can have a considerable impact on the possibilities of archives and/or archivists to act.

Moreover, these characteristics are dynamic: for example, the movement to reform and restructure the higher education sector that actually happens in many European - and maybe even in Non-European - countries can affect the situation of university archives fundamentally. Practices that have been common use for a long time in one country may be transferred to another (often by an external, political decision) and produce similar situations (or very different ones) there. It seems to me important in a political perspective that we try to analyse these processes, their effects on archival work under varying conditions, and that we learn how to deal with them.

Therefore, especially regarding the relatively large number of new members from countries until now hardly present in SUV, I think it is time to become aware of the fact that university and science archives in spite of their undeniable common features, are at the same time rooted in quite different social, institutional, and historical traditions. There is something like different cultures in the archival world. To ignore them might affect communication among colleagues in an undesirable way, and may make cooperation more difficult – it may happen that SUV offers is offering help that is not really needed because it seems of no practical use for every day work. It may also happen that cooperation and guidance is defined (or perceived) as a “one way”- activity, where those who are in possession of the better solutions will donate them to those who are helpless and ignorant. (perhaps they are just different). Personally, I do not believe in the engineering dream of the “one best way” to do things – there may very well be more than one “best way” according to varying conditions. Transferring concepts from one cultural area to another may have beneficial effects, but it may as well end up in getting not the best, but the worst of two worlds.

What I propose, therefore, is:

- to resume the earlier discussion on common and diverse features of university and science archives on an international level,
- to provide an empirical basis, update or at least communicate in detail the results of the earlier survey, trying not only to discern the common features but also to define different archival cultures relevant for university and science archives
- a regular monitoring of changes
- to resume and make public the discussion on the “conceptual framework” with a view also to different contexts
- to use the existing differences in archival practices actively as a source of mutual inspiration and as guidance for our design of future activities of SUV.

ICA/SUV 21 August 2004

Notes on Working Group Discussions: Communications Group

Agreed that we needed to have a clear indication of who the SUV members are. Several noted that they had encountered difficulty obtaining a list of members when working on membership solicitation, nominations, and election. The database provided by the ICA Secretariat is complex and confusing, and sometimes apparently out of date. Some noted how difficult and protracted it was to enroll as a member of the SUV.

Agreed that a high priority should be given to a complete overhaul of the SUV website so it can function together with the listserve to communicate with members. The listserve's inability to handle binary files as attachments to messages would be made more manageable if we had an active website where such documents could be posted with ease. The site should be able to hold copies of papers presented at meetings, calls for paper, program announcements, section bylaws, calls for nomination, and candidate information, as well as information on how one becomes a member of ICA and the SUV.

Some noted that it would be helpful to have some guidelines as to what kinds of communications and content were desired for the SUV listserve. Others suggested that we might want to use the list to launch an on-line salon for open discussion with a topic of the month. Non-members of the SUV could be encouraged to participate, for example by having a SUV member contact a non-member to serve as the expert advisor on a subject posted for discussion on the listserve. It was also suggested that the responsibility for developing the "e-salon" topic and coordinating discussion could rotate among current Steering Committee members. A related suggestion was that we use the list to encourage people to submit inquiries about specific archival problems they are having, and then ensure that one person serve as mediator, moderator, or coordinator of the listserve discussion. One item noted as a possible stimulus to discussion would be to post a photograph from a repository (either of a facility or from a collection) to the website.

Despite the invaluable role of the electronic communication, it was also noted that having a hard-copy document for mailing to members every once in a while would help establish visibility and direction for the SUV.

It was also suggested that we should treat the seminars in quadrennial Congress years differently than those in other years. The extra costs associated with attending a pre-Congress seminar and the Congress as well are significant enough to discourage membership from one or both of the events.

The group recognized that it was focusing on the methods of communication without considering what it should be communicating. Some suggested that the content of communication was the responsibility of the other working groups. Others noted that content could start by asking what it is that a non-member would want to know about the ICA and the SUV.

Reported by William J. Maher, University of Illinois, U.S.A.

COMPUTER-MEDIATED COMMUNICATION VS. HUMAN NETWORKS

Ao. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Margit Pohl
Institute for Design & Assessment of Technology
Vienna University of Technology

Computer-mediated communication is communication that takes place between humans who do not interact directly but use computers. This form of communication can replace older forms (face-to-face interaction, telephone, etc.). In addition to this, it offers new features to the users (for example, the possibility to exchange electronic documents very quickly and to work cooperatively on these documents). There are various tools to enable communication via the computer – email, mailing lists, video-conferencing etc. There are considerable differences between these tools. Email is text-based and offers little information about the partners in the communication process. In contrast to that, video-conferencing enables users to see the other persons, their mimic and gestures and how they dress and behave. It is, therefore, very difficult to talk about computer-mediated communication in general. In the following, I will discuss advantages and disadvantages of computer-mediated communication for professional networks using the example of email. The reason for this choice is that email is the most important service of the Internet. At the end of the presentation, I will also discuss some specific features of video-conferencing and how they overcome some limitations of email.

Email can be seen either as a deficient form of communication (compared to writing or talking) or simply as a different form of communication. As mentioned above, we do not know very much about our partners in the communication process when we use email. In the last decades, a considerable amount of research has shown that communication is more than the exchange of information. Communication is apparently a continuous process of interpretation which relies heavily on non-verbal factors of the interaction – especially mimic and gestures. These sources of information are not available in email. Some researchers, therefore, see it as a deficient form of communication. It must be mentioned, however, that email also offers possibilities which transcend either conversation or letter writing – for example the possibility to comment other peoples messages or to organise email messages according to specific topics. Other researchers, therefore, argue that email is not deficient but different.

There are several obvious advantages of email. Email is not intrusive (like the telephone). People do not have to be available at the same time. Nevertheless, it can lead to very fast and efficient communication processes if needed. On the other hand, email also has very distinct disadvantages which makes it inefficient in some contexts. Email is not as binding as face-to-face communication. In face-to-face communication, every utterance demands an answer. Agreements made in face-to-face communication are more binding than in email conversations. In addition, the turn-taking process in email conversation is different. Turn-taking means that in face-to-face conversations there is usually only one speaker. There are very complicated rules which govern the process by which the right to talk to is passed on from one speaker to the next. Turn-taking guarantees that requests for clarification can be made easily. In addition, hearers signal whether they have understood what the speaker said. All this helps to avoid misunderstandings in face-to-face conversations. These mechanisms do not work in email. It is, therefore, not surprising that there are many reports about misunderstandings in email conversations in the scientific literatur. Another serious problem

is the question of privacy. If email messages are not encoded anybody with the appropriate knowledge can read them.

Email can be used efficiently in many contexts (e.g. open ended discussions). In other contexts it is not so advantageous (e.g. negotiations with a defined goal). Video-conferencing can only overcome some of emails problems. It is, for example, difficult to use it in group discussions. Privacy is also not guaranteed in video-conferencing. There are probably still some situations in which face-to-face meetings are necessary.

FINANCING A SEMINAR

Moshe Somer
Forum of Archives Managers in Institutions of Higher Education

Financing a seminar is not an easy task. As usual we have high expectations and limited resources. In an international congress, the aims of the organizers are to create a professional event combined with good time so people will have good impression from the host country and the host university.

My experience in the organization of the SUV seminar at Haifa in 1999 enriched me with vital experience that I would like to share with all of you.

The seminar lasted 5 days, out of them 3 discussion days at the University of Haifa and the last 2 days were dedicated to professional trips with professional tour guide: one to Jerusalem and one to Nazareth,. There were social events, 2 days of lunches, gala evening in a restaurant, simultaneous translation, transportation from the hotels to the university and back to the hotels in tourist bus etc. Everything was well budgeted and the expenses did not exceed.

It is Obvious that the sum which we receive from the ICA or SUV does not much our needs. I want to remind that at Haifa seminar we did not charge even a penny from SUV members.

What can we do to fill the gap and find enough money to produce a good and pleasant seminar?

Building a task force:

One of the most essentials things is to build a good and coordinated local staff.

Not only archivists but also some friends specialize with fund raising and most of all marketing. Every member will have a defined area or responsibility.

My long experience as a manager in the general administration and as an archivist and my activity in trade unions enabled me to reach our goals.

The task force has to be formed at least 6-8 months before the event.

Planning the event:

Budget is a consequence of planning. Immediately after the forming of the team we have to create a general plan such as how many sessions, how many events etc. All these will be resulted in forming the budget.

We have to map our needs:

Classes or halls

Computer with PP

Speakers etc

A bus for one day with guide

Etc...etc...

We need to write down even the least important things such as cleaning etc.

Forming the Budget:

According to all above lists we can form a preliminary budget. This must be done at least 6 months before the event.

Incomes:

We have three kinds of resurges or incomes:

Secured Money

The rest of the Budget

Materials and things that are not finance in the seminar budget

Secured money comes from the ICA.

The rest of the budget has to come from other recourses such as registration fees, the host university, our foreign ministry, the local archives association, exhibitors, sponsors and advertising.

In order to achieve that money we need to do the following steps:

1. Preparing a letter on behalf the ICA and SUV. This letter will be distributed to the institutions from whom there is a possibility to obtain money. I recommend to send the first letter to the host University, since the best odds are that it will donate money and will be an example and "commitment" to the other universities – for them to keep their prestige.
2. Mapping these Institutions, such as other universities.
3. The main target is the host university. The recourses that we can obtain are very useful such as rooms, post services, copy and printing, phone, fax etc. By explaining the importance of the seminar to the highest levels, and by inviting them to open the first session, we recruit them also in giving us those means.
4. Other universities, and even other bodies at the host university will be notified about the adoption of the seminar by the highest level. This will create a momentum of help.
5. Cooperation with the local archival association. This means direct financial help. In Haifa we made a joint archival day and this gave more money because we could have some suppliers that made exhibitions and paid for it.
6. Getting some money from the government according to the bilateral sciences and cultural agreement.
7. Offering a commercial company to sponsor the seminar as a whole. Its name will be on the publications, the letters and also on a banner that we shall hang on the hall. It will exhibit its products and advertise them.
8. All these steps must be done at least a half year before the event.
9. A precise budget will be formed. This will include also an estimation of the registration fees according to the answered received so far. We have to add some 10% - 15% for unexpected expenses.

In Haifa we went according to these steps and we achieved as follows:

Budgets 15000 USD

Incomes

Source of income	\$	%
Haifa University	2750	18.2
Tel-Aviv University	2500	16.6
Hebrew University	2500	16.6
Bar-Ilan University	750	5
Weizman Institute	1500	10
Israel Archives	1300	8.6

Association		
Foreign Office	1200	8
ICA/SUV	1500	10
Registration fee from colleagues who are not ICA/SUV members	1000	7
Sum	15,000\$	100%

Outcomes

Description	\$	%
Simulating translation	1650	11
Social events	1425	9.5
Meals	5625	37.5
Office expenses and gifts	1500	10
Trips	4150	27
General expenses	900	6
Sum	15,250\$	101%

Income	15,000\$	100%
Outcome	15,250 \$	101.7%
Deficit	250\$	1.7%

A cooperation of 5 universities, 6 Israeli SUV members and few more colleagues, a will to work hard and invest creativity, good marketing and fund raising made a well-budgeted seminar that gave good reward to the participants.