

# University Archives: Relationships With Faculty

By MAYNARD J. BRICHFORD

---

THE SUCCESSFUL college or university archivist has close, cordial, and effective relationships with the faculty on his campus. "Relationship," or the state of being connected, has the same root as "relevance," another password essential for modern dialog. Do we have a meaningful relationship? Are we relevant? There is ample professional precedent for using those platitudinous pillars as a basis for telling how well we function at our institution or for quantifying the opinions of our colleagues. If you want to know how to maintain good relationships with faculty, you can pore through many volumes of archival, library science, and records management literature, or you can address specific questions to successful colleagues. The archivist is concerned about his relationships with faculty because academic staff members are both important sources and users of archival materials. They are sources in that they donate their personal papers; transfer institutional records to the archives in their capacity as university officers; generate most of the significant records of the university as teachers and researchers; and provide the good will essential to insure that the papers of their colleagues, students, and alumni will be deposited in the university archives. They are users in that they engage in scholarly research based on archival sources, introduce research assistants and graduate students in their seminars to archival research, assign research papers requiring undergraduates and graduates to use archives, and bring the resources of the archival program to the attention of colleagues in other institutions.

Given these ulterior motives, we have relationships with faculty because we like to associate with our colleagues. A faculty is "the body of persons to whom are entrusted the government and instruction . . . of a university or college" or the president and teaching staff of a university, college, school, or "branch of learning or instruction." Modern usage defines faculty as the teaching or research staff

The author, University Archivist of the University of Illinois, read this paper on Oct. 1, 1970, during a session of the 34th annual meeting of the Society in Washington, D.C.

of any institution of learning from the local Headstart program to Rockefeller University. A professor is "one who publicly teaches . . . any branch of learning." He is "an officer in a university, college, school or seminary, who delivers lectures or instructs students and on whom the title has been formally conferred by academic authority." College and university teachers are responsible for transmitting human knowledge through formal instruction and adding to it through their own research and writing.<sup>1</sup> Archival relations with faculty should be on the same basis as relations among professional persons in any institution. The college and university archivist should be a faculty member, subject to the same responsibilities and eligible for the same privileges as other faculty. He should have faculty status primarily because of his position as a research officer of an educational institution. The development and maintenance of his professional competency further requires that he be actively engaged in personal research—writing and publishing in his field of interest. He may also teach courses in history, research methodology, and archives administration. Whether he reports to the librarian or to an administrative vice president is less important than his having faculty status.

In an important action for college and university archivists the Society of American Archivists endorsed the American Association of University Professors' Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Acting in 1966 the Society was the 45th organization to approve the statement. Its action recorded a professional commitment to the principle that colleges and universities are conducted for the common good, which is dependent "upon the free search for truth and its free exposition." Academic freedom applies to both teaching and research. "Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. . . . The teacher is entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of his other academic duties . . ." He "is a citizen, a member of a learned profession, and an officer of an educational institution." He should have the freedom from institutional censorship and discipline and the economic security consistent with the duties and obligations of his special position in the community.<sup>2</sup>

Bound to the faculty by common professional interests, college

<sup>1</sup> *Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language* (2d ed.), p. 909, 1976. Other useful definitions of faculty are in Scots law—"a power not founded on property"—and in phrenology—"an aptitude as indicated by a cranial protuberance."

<sup>2</sup> "Academic Freedom and Tenure, 1940 Statement of Principles," in *AAUP Bulletin*, 54:384-385 (Sept. 1968).

and university archivists should understand the importance of documenting faculty members' contributions to society. Some archivists may acquire material by administrative fiat or records disposal schedules and may find that the administrative and service staff are their most important clientele. Only an extremely narrow, short-sighted view of professional responsibilities could restrict communication between archivists and faculty and limit the natural inclinations of faculty to document their activities and of archivists to select those records and papers of research value.

Since medieval times university faculties have played a central role in preserving and perpetuating human knowledge and culture. In 1503 Lady Margaret Beaufort established endowed chairs at Oxford and Cambridge. Professors, instructors, and tutors played a crucial role in the humanistic revitalization of English universities during the Renaissance. Elizabethan higher education was "re-founded in such a way that the intelligentsia was henceforth contained within the ruling segment." Within the framework of medieval rules and regulations, the faculty introduced new theories and modified the statutory curriculum. An examination of archival sources has demonstrated that published rules and regulations of universities are not the best evidence of practice. One need not accept the definition of intellectual history as the history of the intellectual class to recognize college and university teachers' central role in intellectual change.<sup>3</sup> The faculties in American institutions of higher education have brought the European intellectual heritage to this continent. Often founded in religious zeal or political enthusiasm, American colleges and universities have multiplied in amazing fashion during the past century. The land grant act, the GI bill, the conversion of normal schools into regional universities, and our new "instant universities" have brought college educations to millions. Enrollment has grown from 52,000 in 1870 to over 7 million in 1970. The number of faculty members has increased from 5,553 to over 800,000.<sup>4</sup>

The increase in faculty and size of the higher education enterprise

<sup>3</sup> Mark H. Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition 1558-1642*, p. xvii, 1, 5, 12-15, 93, 101-107 (London, 1959).

<sup>4</sup> Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University* (New York, 1962); Jacques Barzun, *The American University* (New York, 1968); Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1957*, p. 210-211 (Washington, 1960); "The Magnitude of the American Educational Establishment," in *Saturday Review*, vol. 53, no. 38:67 (Sept. 19, 1970).

YEAR	FACULTY	ENROLLMENT	YEAR	FACULTY	ENROLLMENT
1870	5,553	52,000	1930	82,386	1,101,000
1890	15,809	157,000	1950	190,353	2,659,000
1910	36,480	355,000	1970	833,100	7,377,000

has not been accompanied by a parallel growth in scholarly investigations of faculties or the academic life. Until the development of college and university archives during the last two decades, papers of faculty members had largely been ignored as historical sources. Today our older research institutions contain only a few collections relating to faculties and higher education; faculty papers amount to about 11 percent of the collections reported to the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections. Despite the changing enthusiasms of historians, the personal papers of faculty are as representative of historically important activities as the papers of businessmen, politicians, literary figures, military men, and lawyers that comprise about half the NUCMC listings.<sup>5</sup> Some archivists may devote most of their time to preserving pedigrees or providing a quick-answer service for administrative offices. These are worthy goals, but they are not as important as documenting the formation of American intellectual life. Faculties, who have been largely responsible for the creation and development of scholarly disciplines, have important potentialities for extending knowledge. They have a great deal of knowledge about subject areas and an obligation to impart that knowledge to others.

Historians have made no serious attempts to write objective histories of academic disciplines. Commemorative histories written by scholarly societies are usually uncritical tributes to the great men and achievements of the past. The role of the faculty in modern American life is equally unknown. Scholars have accepted the challenge to study nearly every area of human knowledge except themselves. Most works on the faculty are concerned with such immediate professional problems as supply and demand, recruitment, job satisfaction, governance, tenure, pay, academic freedom, mobility, promotion, and retirement, not with faculty's role in the social order. At a time of serious polarizations in our social fabric and national debates over the role and responsibilities of universities, archivists should be aware of the need for scholarly research on the position of university faculty with respect to that of the intellectual and ruling elites.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Library of Congress, *The National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections* (8 vols.; Washington, 1962-69).

<sup>6</sup> Logan Wilson, *The Academic Man* (New York, 1942); Frank C. Abbott, ed., *Faculty-Administration Relationships*, p. 38 (Washington, 1958); Melvin E. Haggerty, *The Evaluation of Higher Education; II The Faculty* (Chicago, 1937); Lloyd S. Woodburne, *Faculty Personnel Policies in Higher Education* (New York, 1950); Richard H. Shryock, *The University of Pennsylvania Faculty*, p. 94 (Philadelphia, 1959); Henry C. Herge, *The College Teacher* (New York, 1965); American Association for Higher Education, *Faculty Participation in Academic Governance* (Washington, 1967); Archie R. Dykes, *Faculty Participation in Academic Decision Making* (Washington, 1968); David G.

Beyond the significance of the faculty as an intellectual class lies their role as a cultural force. In their study of middle class culture and life styles, Joseph Bensman and Arthur J. Vidich found that university professors played a special role in acculturation:

To the rural and ethnic youth who went to college in the thirties and forties, college culture and the professors' life style appeared to be the epitome of refinement, sophistication, and gentility. The generation of G.I. Bill, World War II veterans who went to college from 1945 to 1952 was the largest contingent to be so exposed and impressed. In their experience campus life involved the use of literature, art, music appreciation, theater attendance, and museum-going as major supports to leisure. These patterns, once seen, become a reservoir of life style models which the college graduate could take with him when he entered the occupational world, especially during the fifties when he moved to the suburbs and embraced a way of life for which he had no role models.<sup>7</sup>

The faculty member had the advantage in

. . . that his interest in art, literature, reading, poetry, music, and drama was part of his professional qualifications for office. It was not that he was cultured *per se* but that cultural dissemination was his job, and he had an almost exclusive monopoly on conventional culture. The bearers of this campus culture at that time, in the twenties, thirties, and forties, though diluted with intellectual refugees from Europe, were mainly drawn from white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant stock. In addition almost every campus across the country had at least one tweedy, pipe-smoking, casual, unhurried, unbusinesslike "Eastern" professor who had if not a family at least a school tie to "Eastern Culture." It appears to us that it was through the image of Eastern culture that a model of upper-middle class, cultivated, gentility was broadly diffused to several generations of aspiring second generation ethnic and rural immigrants. For these latter groups which later became the suburban middle class, the campus experience left an indelible impression which later was reinvoled in the suburban setting. It is for this reason that the upper-middle class suburb resembles, especially on weekends, a campus-like setting.<sup>8</sup>

Messrs. Bensman and Vidich assert

. . . the university has become the major center for the production of culture and for setting new styles of cultural consumption and leisure time activities. Poets-in-residence, sports celebrities, writers' conferences,

Brown, *The Mobile Professors* (Washington, 1967); Francis M. Cornford, *Microcosmographia Academica* (New York, 1908, 1966); Fred Luthans, *The Faculty Promotion Policy: An Empirical Analysis of the Management of Large State Universities*, p. iii, 3-4 (Iowa City, 1967).

<sup>7</sup> Bensman and Vidich, "The New Middle Classes: Their Culture and Life Styles," in *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, vol. 4, no. 1:34 (Jan. 1970).

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 35.

foundation-supported theaters, businessmen's retreats, and so on, are all now part of the campus scene. The university thus now has a major function in the support and maintenance of life style patterns for the newly ascendent middle class.<sup>9</sup>

The decision to preserve original source material is the most important phase of archival practice. If we understand or agree on the importance of documenting the experience of a class of people, papers of those people will be preserved. In a broad sense the faculty is the university. The personal papers of faculty form a very useful segment of the university's archives. They reveal professional interests and opinions that frequently clarify matters mentioned in official files of the president, deans, or departments. Faculty papers relate a man's academic career to his total interests and constitute an important historical record. Personal viewpoints expressed in private correspondence and documentation resulting from service on faculty committees may provide a better basis for understanding the institution than a much larger volume of official records from the office of a governing board or an executive officer. Without a broad range of faculty papers the formal, official accounts of the college or university are often misleading or unintelligible. Faculty experience and interests present a major challenge to archival ingenuity. The archivist's responsibilities and responses reflect his understanding of the importance and influence of the faculty. He should be loyal to his institution, while neutral and objective in evaluating and selecting documentation. He should preserve faculty papers that explain how university policies were adopted and that document the individual's contribution. The college and university archivist owes an additional loyalty to free inquiry. Doctrines of academic freedom and institutional neutrality are as valid as precedents are understood and accepted.

A collection of faculty papers includes correspondence; publications; manuscripts of publications and addresses; research notes and source materials; scrapbooks and clippings; biographical data; photographs; records of professional, academic, and governmental organizations; course records; committee files; sound recordings and oral history tapes; financial records; diaries; and consultant files. Many faculty members tend to accumulate a large volume of papers documenting their work. The extent and content of a professor's written remains depend on his length of tenure and the psychological factors that shape his filing habits. Larger collections are more likely to include records of professional, academic, and governmental organi-

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid*,

zations; committee files; financial records; and consultant files.<sup>10</sup> To get faculty cooperation one can show several examples of serious research produced from records and papers of other faculty members or a few documents of great potential research use. Communication with faculty can be established by regularly soliciting copies of publications and reprints. Faculty publications, which may serve as the nucleus for the subsequent acquisition of correspondence and other papers, should be filed alphabetically by author's name. Faculty papers can be acquired from the library, faculty members, emeriti, departmental offices, widows, and children. Larger collections are more likely to be given by faculty members and departmental offices. We have found that access to 2.2 percent of our faculty papers and 8.8 percent of our larger collections is restricted. Though nearly 70 percent of the collections come as a single transfer, 20 percent involve two deposits, and 10 percent involve several separate transfers.<sup>11</sup>

I should like to be able to say that we have a large number of faculty members from many disciplines using our Archives, but most who do are historians or historically minded researchers. The pattern of use is changing, and some young scholars are interested in interdisciplinary research and quantification; but it will be a long time before the archives becomes as important to the research needs of other disciplines as it has been to historians. Most faculty members are not seriously interested in using the archives of their own institution, and steady clients are a very small minority. There is a sizable group that uses the archives on occasion for historical, administrative, or personal purposes. Others find that the archives is a convenient base for planning research trips to the Library of Congress, the National Archives, or foreign repositories. Faculty members' and their research assistants' use of university archives is subject to wide fluctuations. They tend to use the archives more than administrators, undergraduates, and the public but far less than graduate students. In order of importance, the purposes of faculty uses are: historical research for publications, the completion of dissertations, administrative, for course papers, personal, and classroom use. Of those using our Archives during a recent 5-month period, 34.5 percent were from our university staff, 37 percent were graduate students from other universities who were completing doctoral research, and 28.5 percent were from other universities. During the same period 40.4 percent of the users were in the social

<sup>10</sup> Tables from a survey of 269 collections of faculty papers in the University of Illinois Archives.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

sciences, 14.4 percent in history, 12 percent in the applied sciences, 10.4 percent in the arts and humanities, 10 percent in library science, 5.6 percent in public service activities, 2.8 percent in business, 2 percent in education and the sciences, and 0.4 percent in professional schools.<sup>12</sup>

Despite professional laments about “publish or perish,” the continuing scholar is a rare bird. In most universities less than 10 percent of the scholars are responsible for more than 90 percent of the publications. Archivists should cultivate this small group. They should collect faculty publications, read biobibliographies, and develop a competency or establish a procedure for evaluating the quality of publications. Some faculty members may have no concept of the function of an archives. Skilled in the specialized teaching and research of their field, they do not understand the importance of documenting their own activity by preserving their publications and correspondence. We must get along with them and convert them when possible. To borrow a political phrase—“A good archivist sees research uses that have never been and asks why not?”<sup>13</sup>

The future challenge for American college and university faculties has been well-stated by three Soviet scientists:

The source of our difficulties . . . is the . . . suppression of and limitation on the exchange of information . . . , restriction of intellectual freedom, and other manifestations of antidemocratic distortions . . . which . . . are still looked upon here as costs of the industrialization process.

. . . Problems of organization and management . . . require . . . the creative participation of millions of people on all levels of the economic system. They require a wide range of information and ideas.

Freedom of information and creativity is necessary for the intelligentsia because of the nature of its activity and of its social function. The desire of the intelligentsia to have greater freedom is legal and natural. But the state suppresses this desire by introducing various restrictions, administrative pressures, dismissals from employment, and even the holding of trials. This brings about a gap, mutual distrust, and profound lack of understanding . . . . Under conditions of present day industrial society, where the role of the intelligentsia is growing continuously, this gap can only be termed suicidal.<sup>14</sup>

Mutual distrust between the intelligentsia and the government can

<sup>12</sup> Tables from a survey of faculty using the University of Illinois Archives.

<sup>13</sup> Logan Wilson, “Setting Institutional Priorities,” in Ohmer Milton and Edward Shoben, eds., *Learning and the Professors*, p. 34 (Athens, Ohio, 1968).

<sup>14</sup> A. D. Sakharov, V. F. Turchin, and R. A. Medvedev, “The Need for Democratization,” in *Saturday Review*, vol. 53, no. 23:26–27 (June 6, 1970).



indeed be suicidal. Current political tensions suggest that our society should be much more concerned with understanding the faculty and students in our colleges and universities. College and university archivists have a basic responsibility to provide the documentary resources necessary for a better understanding of the functions of our intellectual class. The critics of activist faculty have good reason for alarm. Many young men and women are serious in the intention to "turn things around." Without causing undue alarm, archivists should carefully document the names and activities of current faculty because the DAR of 2170 may well be the Daughters of the Academic Revolution.

If ye do truly believe, go ye into all the colleges and universities and labor to bring forth the harvest. For ye nonbelievers, no amount of personal testimony, reported miracles, or warmed-over archival experience will cause the Word to dwell among you.

## There's more to Records Storage than storing records!



### 4 reasons why Paige Miracle Box does more than store office records —

- 1 **Miracle Box offers unmatched economy.**  
Because of its interlocked **double** walls and floor, Miracle Box lasts ten times as long as single-walled corrugated storage files. Miracle Box never splits at corners, never warps, never sags.
- 2 **Miracle Box saves your personnel's time and labor.**  
Miracle Box is a completely-finished file (not a "do-it-yourself" project), sets up **instantly, automatically**—no folding, no taping, no tabbing.
- 3 **Miracle Box doesn't need shelving!**  
You may use shelving for semi-active records but inactive records can be stacked high **without** shelving.
- 4 **Miracle Box is top quality records storage equipment.**  
Made of virgin Kraft 200#-test corrugated fibreboard in the three most wanted sizes: 12" wide x 15" long x 10" high, 12" wide x 24" long x 10" high, 13" wide x 17" long x 14¼" high.

Write or Phone for Brochure A-1 and Prices



## THE PAIGE COMPANY, Inc.

432 Park Avenue South, New York, N. Y. 10016 • (212) 679-6626  
Four convenient shipping points Coast-to-Coast