



THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

No. 2, 1992 (September)

RECORD

The University Archives

-

Office of the Registrar

Ninth Floor, Fisher Library
Telephone: 692 2684
Hours: 9-1, 2-5, Mondays to Fridays

University Archivist: Kenneth E. Smith, BA Macq.,
DipArchivesAdmin NSW
Assistant Archivist: Timothy J. Robinson, BA Macq.,
DipInfManArchivAdmin NSW
Admin. Assistant: Margaret A. Taylor
On Secondment: Margaret R. Dwyer, DipInfMan
ArchivAdmin NSW, BSc, PhD

ISSN 0301-4729

Established in 1954, the University Archives is the official repository for the records of the administration, of departments, clubs and societies, and of persons involved in, or closely connected with, the University. It also houses a collection of photographs of University interest, both prints and negatives, and University publications of all kinds. The reading room and repository are on the 9th floor of the Fisher Library, and the records are available for research use by all members of the University and by the general public. Restricted access conditions may apply to some records. The reading room is open 9-1, 2-5, Mondays to Fridays. Copies of records and illustrations can be supplied for exhibitions, publications and course work.

The Archivist is responsible to the Registrar for the care and preservation of the University Archives, which include the records of the Senate, the Academic Board and those of the many administrative offices which control the functions of The University of Sydney. The implementation of the University's Archival Policy includes arranging the transfer of administrative records and the deposit of records of academic departments, individuals, clubs and societies. Other duties of the Archivist include the distribution of published material under the deposit provisions of the Copyright Acts, and the mounting of exhibitions, illustrating aspects of the University's history.

The provision of information to officers of the Administration is an essential duty of the Archivist, but the University's Archives do not operate as a general information centre. The purpose of the University Archives is to provide for the safe keeping of records from which researchers may extract information, and one of the most important duties of the Archivist is the preparation of finding aids in order to facilitate such research.

Access to records designated as archival is permitted only under the direct control and supervision of the Archivist, or recognised staff of the Archives. Access by approved persons may be permitted provided that, in general, the records are older than thirty years. Intending researchers are required to complete an application form. The conditions of access to records other than official material vary according to the conditions of deposit.

ARCHIVIST'S NOTES

September 1992

The impact of technology upon modern records systems is a theme that occupies the minds of most archivists in these volatile times. The effects of many forms of technology upon university records is the theme of a penetrating article by Tim Robinson, Assistant University Archivist, in this edition of Record. Digitally encoded laser discs might not have been a topic in the archival literature of 20 - 30 years ago, but it is almost common currency in 1992. It is also significant that Mr Robinson's article had to do with records, not solely archival material. It is a classic of the "audit" or "Devil's Advocate" role that a modern archivist should assume.

Dr H.G. Holland has contributed a most painstaking analysis of the naming of some University buildings, and makes a plea for some recognition of the past contributions of prominent University of Sydney people. As Dr Holland points out, it is all too easy in these times of rapid change to forget that a university's reputation depends, to a great extent, upon the collective achievements of staff and alumni.

Dr Ursula Bygott has yet again produced a scholarly piece on the incumbents of the Office of the Registrar, this time of Dr H.G. McCredie, R.F. Fisher, and J.D. Foley, the latter being the second woman to hold the office. There were three Registrars at the University of Sydney in a short period of eight years, from 1967 to 1975. Those eight years were a period of change in the national sense, extending as they did from the end of the Menzies era to the end of the Whitlam era. The years at the University of Sydney saw the turbulent period of the Vietnam War, and the politicisation of the student body. Dr Bygott's series on the Office of the Registrar will be completed in her next article.

The forty separate accessions recorded at the end of this edition encompass the usual types of records, from photograph albums to examination records, from private papers to a student club. And that range of material is, of course, one of the reasons why working in the University Archives is so interesting.

Kenneth E. Smith
UNIVERSITY ARCHIVIST

WORK IN PROGRESS

The past six months has seen a virtual re-run of the previous period in that priority has again been allocated to "repository management", that is, re-shelving, re-arranging and re-boxing some existing record groups in order to better utilise our rapidly decreasing available space. We will need to be careful to accession only the most essential records from now on, as we need to have space for the essential "core" records of the executive, no matter what the administrative profile of the University of Sydney may be following the current review of the administration.

Further transfers of vital records has meant careful sorting over the past few months. In the two years up to 1990, there were a number of deposits from the Office of the Vice-Chancellor, in addition to transfers from the former Sydney College of Advanced Education. We are now coming to the end of these transfers, nearly all having now been accessioned. It is sometimes forgotten that, in spite of greatly increased use of personal computers, paper records continue to grow. At least some of the data generated on the many P.C. systems within the Central Administration is eventually brought together in the form of submissions and reports on the conventional Central Records system. It goes without saying that we had to abandon all thought of accessioning records of academic departments and faculties several years ago. Some of the departmental records held here for some years have recently been re-sorted, culled and listed, however.

This rationalisation of the holdings has meant that some 40 shelf metres of official records were transferred from Central Records recently, thus freeing scarce space in the basement of one building. We have also greatly reduced a backlog of records awaiting accessioning.

As many archivists are now discovering, the role of the archivist in becoming involved in current records systems is becoming much clearer and more urgent. It is not only in computer systems design that benefits can accrue through such involvement, but also in the area of backlog reduction in current records. Had this been the case with most of the administrative records transferred over the past 2 - 3 years, much unnecessary work would have been avoided.

- K. E. Smith

The installation of the hardware for the Archives local area network has been completed, although there are still some minor "bugs" to be eliminated. For those interested, the technical details are as follows: the file server is an Accom Dart 486, running at 33 MHz, with 8 megabytes of RAM and a 660 megabyte hard disc. The network software is Novell Netware version 3.11 and the main application is dBASE IV version 1.5.

At present there are three workstations, two 286 machines and one 386 SX. It is intended to upgrade the 286 machines to take full advantage of the speed of the file server.

An application is being developed using dBASE IV's programming language to control the Archives' holdings. As all computer programs have to have an acronym, it has been tentatively titled SUACS (Sydney University Archives Control System). The system will be divided into a series of modules:

1. Accessioning
2. Administrative records covering both series and item descriptions, and
3. Personal Archives covering group series and item descriptions.

There is also the Miscellaneous Photographs system described previously in Record. Besides simplifying production of the various forms used in the manual system, SUACS brings the power of computer searching to the Archives control records.

At present, the Accessioning and Series and Item systems for administrative records have been written and are in use. These will be further refined in light of our experience, and as programming skills are refined. One area in which development is anticipated is the use of the relational database capabilities of dBASE IV. At present the different systems consist of separate flat field databases.

There is still a large amount of data entry to be done to convert the manual system to SUACS, indeed some of it may never be converted. Many of the entries for series are only of very basic nature being little more than title, date range and quantity. It is not usually the Archives' practice to describe to item level, but for some records it has proved useful. In particular some large series of staff and student files which lacked any control records of their own have been listed on the system.

- T.J. Robinson

FILES, WHAT FILES? TECHNOLOGY AND UNIVERSITY RECORDS

The following is the text of a paper prepared for the Australasian Institute of Tertiary Education Administrators NSW State Conference 14 August 1992.

Introduction

"Information is a basic and universal need of a manager; it is an integral component of everything he (sic) does. To have the proper information, in the proper format, at the proper time and place, is a continuous challenge and in many instances poses problems not easily solved."

- George R. Terry
quoted in J. Eddis
Linton, Organising the
Office Memory.

It is hard to imagine an office existing without paper records, but this is being promoted as possible, if not desirable. The rapid advances in information technology permit an ever increasing amount of data (a term I prefer to information, as much of what is stored informs no-one of anything) is able to be stored in increasingly smaller spaces for less money. The technology permits the manipulation of the data in new and often useful ways, and is hopefully more cost efficient than the old manual systems. Many people are looking at their existing paper based records systems and casting covetous eyes over the latest systems. What I want to do is to address some of the issues involved in record keeping, copying

technologies and the laws of evidence.

Before I start I should probably answer a question some of you may have asked yourself. That is: Why is an archivist talking about current records, and even computers? Are not archivists dusty creatures inhabiting the bowels of buildings surrounded by old registers and files, occasionally emerging, blinking, into the light of the twentieth century?

The answer I will give comes from a paper by Glenda Acland, University Archivist and Coordinator, Records Management at the University of Queensland. The title of the paper itself gives a hint of her views: "Archivist - Keeper, Undertaker or Auditor: the Challenge for Traditional Archival Theory and Practice." Glenda states in her paper:

Let me first begin by assessing whether management of current records is simply the first stage in archival methodology or whether the archival concern, fundamentally the requirement to preserve permanently valuable records, is merely the final step in a comprehensive records management process. I have no doubt that the former is the case..."

Glenda Acland is not alone in her views, and it is not

a position peculiar to Universities. You may be fairly sure that there is an archivist in your future, anxious and able to make valuable contributions to your institutions records management practices.

But enough proselytising. Perhaps it as well to begin at basics. Why do organisations create and keep records, of any sort?

Records document transactions, they show what action was taken, what decision made. Records are evidence of the correctness (or otherwise) of the transaction, they provide a means of institutional accountability. Records protect rights and privileges of individuals and corporate bodies. They are proof of ownership of goods and real property, give evidence of contractual obligations, and of the receipt and payment of monies. Certain legislation necessitates the creation of particular types of records, and the length of time they are to be retained.

Record systems are the corporate memory, and memory is as necessary for institutions to function effectively as it is for individuals. Just as individuals do not remember everything that happens, institutions do not need to keep all documents permanently. The period of time the document is needed for administrative purposes will have some bearing on how it is created and used within the organisation. The vast bulk of records have no permanent value to the administration of organisation and therefore

should not be kept longer than necessary. Nor should such records have more resources devoted to them than the minimum necessary for the efficient running of the organisation.

Universities and other tertiary institutions are unlike many other organisations, something that need hardly be stated to those who work in them. Few other bodies, with perhaps the exception of government and some large financial institutions, exist over such a long period of time. The actions of Universities in granting degrees and diplomas have significant effect on the lives of many people. It is necessary for a university to be able to stand behind the validity of every award it makes. This can only be done with good record keeping. Put simply, without the proper evidence substantiating it, a degree is not worth the paper it could be forged on. While the testamur is the outward documentation of a student's achievement, it is the university's own result records which support the validity of the document.

Microfilm

Of all the technologies associated with copying records microfilm is the best known and still the most widely used. As with any technology, microfilm used properly and done well can save time, space and money. Done badly, as unfortunately is often the case, it is waste of all three. It is not my intention to attempt to give a detailed account of the complexities and

technicalities of microfilm in all its forms. Rather I want to raise what I see as the important issues related to its use. Those wishing to pursue a more technical account of microfilm should consult any of the standard records management texts.'

Microfilm, as with other surrogate record technologies, may be used in two basic ways. The first is to replace the original record at the point it enters the institution, and then to be used in its place by action officers. This use of microfilm is being increasingly overtaken by digitised imaging systems. The second basic use is as a means of reducing the bulk of non or semi-current records when space is at a premium. It is this second use that I will discuss in relation to microfilm, although digital imaging may be used for this purpose as well.

Too often microfilm is seen as a band aid solution to a perceived crisis in an organisation's records. Often a lack of space, or the need to better use available space results in an almost reflex response - "Why not microfilm the files?" As with all records issues such a simplistic reaction often ignores the basic problem. Records are integral to the operation of any administration, problems in one area may well be symptomatic of difficulties elsewhere and should not be treated in isolation. Records managers know this, but their advice is often ignored. Just filming thousands of files really only changes the nature of the problem, from paper to

film. If the paper files were hard to access, microfilm will probably only be worse.

The duplication of records and information is also a trap to be avoided, and is often related to retention and disposal practices. For example, there is little point in microfilming student files which contain mostly source documentation for a computerised student record data base. (Indeed, such documents should not be placed on a file in the first place.)

In organisations without archivists or records managers it seems the hardest decision anyone has to make is to destroy old files. Indeed, it is often so hard that the decision is never made, or an illogical compromise is reached where the originals are destroyed after copying. If the record did not need to be kept in the first place the result has been a waste of resources and staff time. Microfilming programs should be the result of a careful and detailed analysis of the needs of the organisation as they relate to the records in question.

The analysis should commence with an examination of the reasons put forward for microfilming the particular records. If the space they occupy is excessive and needed for other functions, it may be more cost effective just to move them to secondary storage off site. If rent is paid by the agency for the space it occupies a simple calculation can be made of the cost of the square metres used for storage.

This figure may then be compared with the cost per square metre of off site storage and with estimated cost of the filming program. Storage of microfilm only occupies 2-3% of the space of the paper records. However, there are associated costs of hardware needed to view and/or make prints of the filmed images. If such equipment is not owned it will need to be purchased, a cost to be incorporated in to the cost analysis.

One of the most important costs involved in any microfilming project is the staff time in preparing the original documents for filming, and in checking the finished microfilm. Records gain much of their usefulness from being part of an organised system. Without the system access to particular documents is difficult, if not impossible. After microfilming the order of the records has been fixed, so if the files or documents were out of place at the time of filming the resultant microfilm will be very difficult to use. Documents missing from the film will remain missing for ever, and usually not discovered until desperately needed.

Another factor to be included in determining the costs of the filming of records is the existence and/or suitability of finding aids. Finding aids may be indexes or descriptive lists, or an explanation of the file numbering system. Remember that microfilming does not solve the problems of poor intellectual control over

records. If the index was inadequate for the paper records, it is going to be no better after filming.

The workings of the record series may not be self explanatory to the uninitiated and so need title sheets to be prepared and inserted prior to filming. It may even be necessary to create complete new finding aids prior to microfilming if existing intellectual control is very poor. And, most importantly, do not forget to have the finding aid filmed with the records.

A further cost to be kept in mind in any record copying project is the time needed to check the quality of the finished film. A check should be made of the microfilm for completeness and legibility. Practically it may not be possible to inspect every frame, but a good selection should be. If the object of the microfilming program was to enable the destruction of the paper records, the film must be complete, accurate and readable. Often films are not checked and only later is it found that some documents are unreadable. When obtaining quotes or writing specification for the job ensure the bureau will refilm at no cost to you if the finished film is found to be faulty. The temptation to accept the lowest price for microfilming is strong. In my experience the lowest price will also result in the lowest quality. In reality, the actual cost of filming is only one of the components of the total cost of a microfilm project. Staff time in preparing the

documents for filming and checking them later represent a considerable investment to the institution and should only have to be done once.

As mentioned above, the retention period of the records must be taken into account when considering microfilming administrative records. Clearly it would be foolish to film files that needed only to be kept for five or seven years and were nearing the end of their life. The cost of storage for the remaining years should, of course, be balanced against filming costs.

In all microfilming the nature of the original document has a large bearing on the cost of the operation. Large series of standard sized documents in good condition are very much cheaper to film than irregularly shaped and coloured documents in poor condition and pinned in files. Something else important to look out for are double sided documents, which may rule out the use of certain, faster, cameras.

There are two basic microfilm camera types, each with different uses and operation costs. One type, called a rotary camera, works on a continuous feed of papers. This is much cheaper to operate in terms of document throughput compared with the planetary camera. However, there is a major drawback with rotary cameras, the quality of the finished microfilm. Rotary cameras generally use a narrower film (16mm as opposed to 35mm for quality

work) and the optical systems are also generally poor. The resulting film has a resolution (measured in lines per mm) about half that of 35mm microfilm made on a planetary camera.

A planetary camera has the film holder and lens on a stand and the originals are placed under the lens one at a time. This is labour intensive, but often the only possibility with irregularly shaped or bound documents such as minutes. It is also the only way to ensure a quality product. There are international and Australian standards for this type of microfilming and reputable bureaus will guarantee they meet these standards in their work.

The use to which the final microfilm is to be put will have an impact on the microfilm format chosen. Most people will be familiar with roll microfilm, in both 16mm and 35mm widths and the larger card-like fiche, commonly used in libraries. There are other formats, mostly hybrids of the basic formats such as jackets and aperture cards. It is best to consult a specialist microfilm bureau on the applications of the various formats.

One particular format I want to briefly address is known as COM Fiche. This is computer output microfilm on card like pieces of film. It is used to dump data, or produce reports, from computerised databases in a more space efficient manner than paper printout. The attraction of COM to archivists is that while data on magnetic media is volatile, fiche can be an

archival medium. For permanent records, such as basic student result data, which may otherwise only exist in electronic form, COM fiche provides an opportunity to make a permanent snapshot. Such a practice is not without its disadvantages. The main disadvantage being that data on microfilm cannot be manipulated as it can on a computer.

Another aspect of the available microformats I also want to deal with is the types of film available. The choice of the film type is directly dependant on the ultimate use of the microfilm. There are three film types: silver halide (like normal black and white film used in cameras), vesicular and diazo. Only the first type, silver halide film is used in cameras. When properly processed and stored, silver halide meets archival standards of permanence. It is also more expensive than either vesicular or diazo. Having been used to make the master negative, viewing copies are generally made from the much cheaper vesicular or diazo.

Some organisations have a vital records program in which those records essential for continuing operation are regularly microfilmed. In such case the master, silver halide, negative is stored off-site, and cheaper copies retained for current use. A vital records copying program makes a great deal of sense when the cost of reconstructing an organisations records is considered. This is the basis by which insurance

assessors determine the value of office records. Such reconstruction costs, not to mention the loss of productivity resulting in the destruction of administrative records, very quickly reach large sums. In comparison a microfilming program is a very good investment.

Imaging Systems and Digital Optical Storage

The dream of the paperless office persists. In the past various microformats were developed with the goal of ridding offices of paper documents. Other technologies overtook microfilm, although it still has its place in records management.

The introduction of computers into routine administration, especially the personal computer and word processing software, when allied with photocopiers and facsimile machines, has resulted in a massive increase in the quantity of paper documents generated by all organisations. One of the great ironies of the situation facing us at present is, of course, that increasing the automation of office work should have reduced the quantity of paper records generated.

Amongst the problems with microfilm when used for current records systems is that it is a generally fixed record. Once a file has been filmed it becomes difficult to add new documents to the working copy. The difficulty is compounded when multiple copies of the film are distributed in an

organisation. As mentioned above, various solutions were developed such as updatable film and fiche, and jackets. However, in most offices the technology was never really accepted.

Developments in computer and communications technologies, in particular in mass storage and laser technology, have resulted in another possible solution to the perceived problem of the management of administrative records. Some background may be of interest and use in understanding the developments in this area.

In 1972 Philips demonstrated a system known as VLP (for Video Long Play) which was a means of storing a video signal (TV pictures and sound) on a 300mm glass and alloy disc. It looked much like a very large Compact Disc, but with the significant difference that the signal recorded was analogue, not digital like the CD. The VLP still exists and is known as Laservision, or more commonly as video discs. The video discs were read with a low powered laser reflected from the surface. There is no physical contact between the pickup head and the disc as there is in conventional LP records. The use of the very fine laser beam meant that large amounts of data (sound and vision) could be stored on such discs. The technology was not suitable for mass text storage as the resolution was low, while acceptable enough for TV, is not good enough to reproduce text.

It was recognised that if a digital signal could be

encoded on such discs, very high densities of data storage would be possible. Digital storage is the basis of computer operations, it consists a series of zeros and ones (or off and on) which can be arranged in sequences to represent characters, numbers etc. On the laser encoded disc the presence or absence of a pit burnt into the alloy layer represented the zero or the one. The master disc was relatively cheap to produce and copies very cheap to replicate. This is the technology used in Compact Discs used for music, and some video.

Digitally encoded laser discs when coupled with a very high resolution cathode ray tube display (i.e. a very good computer monitor) had the capacity to reproduce clearly, in black and white, any document. In 1983 the first generation of Digital Optical Discs (Optical as they are read and written with light, albeit laser light) could store 25,000 to 50,000 A4 pages in facsimile on a 300mm disc. Second and third generation systems are capable of storing up to one million A4 pages per disc, which equates to one gigabyte (10 to the ninth) per side of the disc.

Most of the Digital Optical Discs were known as WORM drives. This wonderful acronym stands for Write Once Read Many times, as it was not possible to erase an image from the disc once it has been written in by the laser write head. This has clear advantages for data integrity and audit trail purposes. On some of the earlier systems the index to

the disc was maintained on a normal floppy or hard disc, if the index entry to document was erased it would be extremely difficult to detect or to locate the document. Later systems have overcome this drawback by storing the index on the Digital Optical Disc as well.

Documents are entered on the systems using scanners much like facsimile machines. The process used by most is bit map scanning. Basically the document is scanned in a series of fine parallel lines, and the document treated as if it had a very fine grid placed over it. Where there is text, many blocks of the grid will be filled to make up the character from small squares. It is similar to what can be seen on faxed and laser printed documents.

Scanning documents into such a system is by no means the end of the process. In order to be useful documents have to be able to be found, either in a manual system or an automated one. Often it seems to be thought that simply buying the latest technology will solve records problems. Without first analysing what the problems are, and how the records should be controlled, all that optical disc systems will do is convert a poor manual system into a terrible automated one.

All the systems available have indexing utilities associated with the controlling software. For many sorts of records no great problems exist. For example files relating to persons, such as staff or

student files, may be indexed by last name followed by first names. In addition staff or student identification number may be entered.

The issue becomes more complex with records requiring some subject classification. It is here that the optical disc system can be no better than the control vocabulary created to enable access to the records. As I said above, the fact that the files exist in digital optical format rather than bundles of paper makes no difference. If the intellectual control system is inadequate having the documents on optical disc will not help. In fact I suspect that the great storage capacity of the digital optical disc may become a liability in itself. The temptation will be to scan everything into the system, regardless of the use or importance of the document. The example cited above of data input sheets comes to mind here.

Such powerful computer technology does not come without its problems. The first is of course cost. The very large systems with multi-gigabyte storage units (known as juke-boxes), many terminals and several scanners cost well into six figures. To be cost efficient they are best applied to very large records systems, with hundred of thousands of records, with a very high retrieval rate. In CBD locations they may well pay for themselves in a few years simply through savings in reduced floor space costs.

Optical disc technology is very much an evolving format but various trends are discernible. One of those trends is towards a reduction in costs. There are several systems available which use discs with smaller storage capacity than the 300mm ones mentioned above. These discs are also physically smaller, and so the hardware which operates them is also smaller, to the point of being desk top units. The discs are not always purely optical, but use a variant of the technology called magneto-optical. They are also compatible with personal computers and networks. At least one of these systems is available on Commonwealth Government Contract for between \$20-\$30,000.

The reduction in cost, albeit at the moment with a reduction in capacity, will result in such systems becoming more commonplace in normal office situations. For the generality of records I do not think this presents great problems.

One of the issues often raised in consideration of digital optical discs is the life span of the disc. Current estimates of the life of the discs varies from ten to one hundred years. The necessity of being able to read the contents of discs in the future is obvious, but this is not really the issue. The problem lies not so much with the life of the disc as the life of the hardware that reads it. The rapid changes over the last decade or so of digital optical recording warns of the

danger of technological obsolescence. As does the fact that two major former manufacturers of the technology in the 1980s no longer sell the hardware in Australia. There is little point in having a disc full of data in perfect condition if the machinery to operate it does not exist.

The lack of standards in digital optical recording is a great problem. Generally discs have been upwardly compatible within one manufacturer, but a disc from brand X cannot usually be read on machinery from brand Y. I am told that it is possible to transfer data from one brand system to another, but at a very high cost. There is no doubt that the industry is working towards standardisation, but it is not yet achieved. It is, however, possible that once standards have been established new technologies will evolve which will make them redundant.

To repeat what I have stated above, the problems created by the lack of standards and the changing nature of the technology does not constitute a difficulty for the generality of records. It is only when records need to be retained permanently or for an extended period of time that difficulties arise. Only a small percentage of records are permanent, but they may be a part of a larger series of records of temporary value, for example an administrative filing system.

I am assuming that the source documents for an imaging system have been destroyed after scanning

(the requirements of evidence legislation having been met, see below for details). Some institutions using imaging systems store all source documents off site for seven years after scanning. This permits records of permanent value to be extracted and kept. Such a course of action, which may be necessary as the result of the need to produce documents legally acceptable as evidence, seems to rather defeat the point of an imaging system. Records storage costs are reduced as the originals may be stored in a low cost site, but the costs have not been totally eliminated. It is not a dilemma that I can provide a solution for. All I can state is that it is a matter that greatly exercises the minds of many archivists and records managers at present.

Record Keeping, Technology and the Law of Evidence

For many years one of the concerns of records managers has been the admissibility in court of copies of documents. One of the great advantages of technologies such as microfilm and imaging systems has been the great amount of space saved in storage over keeping the same quantity of paper. The advantages are lost if such copies of documents do not have the same legal evidential value as the originals. In the above discussion of the two main copying technologies I have avoided including consideration of the problems of tendering copies of documents as evidence. The matter is complex and changing. The following is my understanding of the

situation, based on experience and reading. I need hardly state that the following is not a legal opinion, I am an archivist, not a lawyer. Any particular problems you may have should be referred to your legal advisers.

The admissibility of documents in court is based on the Common Law, and the general rule (known as the "best evidence rule") is that the original must be produced unless it cannot be produced. It has its origins in the early eighteenth century when the only form of copying of documents was hand transcription. It was felt that errors could occur in transcription, or in the memory of someone relying on his/her memory of the document. Even slight errors might have the capacity to result in injustice.⁵

However, even following the introduction of copying processes such as letter-press (1790) did not alter judges attitudes to copies. The matter of the timing of the copying process assumed significance, rather than the accuracy of the copy produced.⁶ Copies made later than the original were suspect merely because of the time difference.

The requirement to produce the original has been inflexible in its application. In the Australian Law Reform Commission Report, Evidence, the three main areas of difficulty were identified.

1. No notice to produce given. If a notice to produce an original

document is given to an opposing party in a court case it is possible for secondary evidence (ie copies) to be produced if the party refuses to produce the original. If such a notice to produce is not given it is possible for the party possessing the original to object to the tendering of secondary evidence of the writing. Only with certain notices of writings central to the proceedings are a notice to produce not required.

2. Importance of the Writing. The rule for the production of the original document operates no matter how unimportant it may be. A party can still object to secondary evidence of the writing if the absence of the original cannot be satisfactorily accounted for.

3. Authentication of the Copy. All copies must be authenticated, regardless of their importance, obvious authenticity or the genuine need for such evidence.'

Clearly, the prime reason for the production of the original document is the prevention of fraud. Documents must be as accurate as possible, slight differences, either deliberate or inadvertent, can make vast differences to meaning. The production of originals make the detection of fraud or other legal defects easier. Finally,

the production of the original protects the party against whom the evidence is tendered, as he/she has the complete original to examine.

In order to attempt to overcome some of the difficulties relating to copies of documents as evidence various acts were passed in the different jurisdictions in the 1960s. The NSW Evidence (Reproductions) Act 1967 is relevant here. Some feeling for the usefulness of such legislation may be gained from comments in the reports of the Australian Law Reform Commission:

The legislation is intimidating in its length and detail. The Commission has been told that lawyers, when asked to interpret the legislation for clients, have offered different opinions about its meaning. Considering the limited nature of the common law difficulties, the legislation is remarkable for its size and complexity."

and,

This legislation, regrettably, is so complex that few organisations have attempted to comply with it.'

The Evidence (Reproductions) Act is primarily concerned with the impact of microfilm technology on record keeping. Section 5(1) of the Act creates the category of an "approved machine" for copying. This required a machine of a particular make and model being certified as meeting certain standards of reproduction by the

relevant Minister and the publication in the Government Gazette of that approval.

A print from microfilm made by an approved machine may be used as evidence in place of the original document, providing it is proved that the microfilm was made in good faith on an approved machine and that the print is a true copy of the microfilm.

An affidavit is required from the person who did the microfilming of the original documents, made at the time of the filming. In general these affidavits have been filmed at the beginning and end of each roll of microfilm. Another affidavit is also required to accompany a print made from the film if it is to be used in evidence in place of the original document. The affidavits remove the need for the person making the microfilm or the print to be called to give evidence as to the accuracy of the copies.

Even if the requirements of the Evidence (Reproductions) Act are met it does not necessarily follow that the original documents can be destroyed. If another federal law requires the retention of the document for a specified period, the state Act does not override it.

If a NSW law requires the retention of a document for more than three years section 9 of the Act permits its destruction after three years. The microfilm must have been made on an approved machine for it to be retained for the balance

of the time greater than three years in place of the original.

The Act permits the destruction of original documents after microfilming, if there is no other legal reason for its retention. However the a print from a microfilm will generally only be admissible if the document is at least twelve months old at the time of its destruction. Practically, then, documents must be kept until they are twelve months old before they can be destroyed even if they have been filmed in accordance with the Act."

From the above it is little wonder that the Australian Law reform Commission found little compliance with the law. While the references above were to copies made by microfilming, the Act applies to other copying media such as digital imaging. With the development of this technology scanners and similar devices needed to be gazetted as "approved machines." Scanning would also need to include the necessary affidavits if the originals were to be destroyed after twelve months.

In order to remedy the situation relating to documents as evidence the Australian Law Reform Commission, in its Interim Report, made a number of recommendations. The existing law should be replaced by a rule of exclusion rendering oral evidence and copies generally inadmissible as evidence of the contents of the original document." Importantly, a number of

exceptions covering computer tapes, discs and microfilm were made.

a. Copies made by modern reproduction techniques should not be excluded as evidence of the contents of the original document regardless of whether the original existed or not.

b. If the original document was unavailable, oral or other secondary evidence should not be excluded. However, if the original had been destroyed in bad faith, secondary evidence would not be admissible.

c. The proof of the contents of business and public records, including the records of commercial organisations and government departments and instrumentalities, was proposed to be relaxed. Copies would not require authentication by evidence of their correctness, provided evidence was given that the copies were made in the ordinary course of business or purport to be copies of such records.¹¹

In addition, safeguards were included in the proposals, including the updating of the procedures for the discovery of documents, to include modern information storage media. In response to the Interim Report there was general support of the proposals. It was thought that present rules are rules

of admissibility rather than rules prescribing modes of proof, and that the proposals would be more comprehensible if they were to be rules of admissibility. This turned out not to be the case, and so the Commission produced rules prescribing the ways in which the contents of documents may be proved.¹²

As a part of the final Report on evidence the ALRC included a draft model evidence bill. The draft bill was intended to be a model for the states and Commonwealth to follow to ensure uniform evidence legislation throughout Australia. In NSW the Report resulted in the Evidence Bill 1991. This Bill, which incorporated most of the recommendations of the ALRC was introduced into the Legislative Assembly in March 1991. Unfortunately it lapsed on the dissolution of the House for the last state election. It is at present being re-drafted and is expected to be re-introduced as the Evidence Bill 1992 during the Budget Session of state parliament, in about four weeks. Until the new Bill is introduced into the House there is no text available. It is reasonable to assume that most of the aspects of the Bill relating to evidence reproduction will remain in keeping with the recommendations of the ALRC Report.

The significant feature of the NSW Bill is clause 130 which abolishes the common law rule of "best evidence." This rule limited the circumstances in which copies of documents could be tendered as evidence if the

original was available.

Following the recommendations of the ALRC, clause 131 sets out the ways in which the contents of documents can be proved. The original can be produced or an alternative such as photocopies, transcripts of tape recordings and computer printouts. Particular provision is also made for the tendering of copies, extracts or summaries from business records and official printings of public documents. Clause 131 permits the tendering of copies of documents, or oral evidence to be given, not only if the original document is unavailable, but also if it would be unduly inconvenient to obtain the original, or if its contents are not in issue.

Part 3 of the Bill covers the facilitation of Proof. Clause 133 deals with evidence produced wholly or partly by machines. It establishes the presumption that a machine was working properly when it produced the document in question. However, this is only a *prima facie* presumption and evidence to question the validity of documents may still be raised.

The remainder of Part 3 of the Bill covers a number of other areas of proof of documents. Clause 134 removes the need to call a witness who attested to the execution of a document (other than a will) to give evidence about the execution of the document. Clause 137 similarly provides a *prima facie* assumption that seals on documents are authentic and valid. Clause 143 establishes the presumptions

that properly posted letters are received four days later and that documents from telex and similar machines correctly show the message transmitted. Clause 141 presumes that a document more than twenty years old produced from proper custody is what it purports to be and to have been duly executed or attested.

It can be seen that while the matter of the admissibility of copies as evidence is complex, there is some hope for a simpler handling in the future if the NSW Evidence Bill is passed.

Conclusion

The two greatest assets of an organisation are its staff and its records. The importance of the staff is well recognised. What is often overlooked is that for the staff to perform effectively they must have access to the necessary information. Although I have dealt with two more specialised aspects of records management in the form of microfilm and imaging there is no escaping the importance of good, basic records management. Records management is too often at the bottom of the priorities list. Only when matters reach crisis point is action taken, often the wrong action. It has been my intention to encourage a rational approach to technological aids to effective records management. Microfilm and imaging technologies have a lot to offer if used correctly. There are disadvantages to both technologies, and such challenges as those

associated with the reproduction of evidence for legal proceedings. However, in your organisation you will find that there are people with the skills and abilities to overcome any obstacles - use them!

T.J. Robinson

Notes

1. J. Eddis Linton, Organising the Office Memory, The theory and Practice of Records Management, Centre for Information Studies, University of Technology, Sydney, 1991. p. 40.
2. Glenda Acland, "Archivist - Keeper, Undertaker or Auditor: The Challenge for Traditional Archival Theory and Practice." in B. Reed and D. Roberts, Keeping Data, Australian Council of Archives and Australian Society of Archivists Inc., 1991, p. 115-119.
3. For example: W. O. Maedke, M.F. Robek and G.F. Brown, Information and Records Management, Glencoe Publishing Co., Encino California. 1981.
4. R. Cross, Evidence, Australian Edition by J.A. Gobbo, Butterworths, Sydney, 1970, p.15.
5. L. Katz, "Micrographics and the Law of Evidence," Archives and Manuscripts, vol. 10, no.2, Dec. 1982. p. 149.
6. Ibid., p. 150-151.
7. Australian Law Reform Commission (Interim) Report 26, Evidence, Canberra, AGPS, 1985. p. 159.
8. Australian Law Reform Commission Report 38, Evidence, AGPS, Canberra, 1987. p. 160.
9. ALRC 38, ibid., p. xxiii.
10. Katz, op.cit., p. 154.
11. ALRC 38, op.cit., p. 128.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid. p.129.

UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY - ADMINISTRATION REVIEW

This submission has been prepared by a retired staff member in response to the notice in the University's Administrative Bulletin (Issue 48/91) of a "Review of the administration", including an invitation to "staff and students" to make submissions to the review team.

The profound changes of recent years in the structure of the University have raised (or re-raised) a number of questions. The coincidence of the review with a national economic and social crisis (and the consequent restrictive impact on the University's finances) has increased the urgency of some of those questions but reduced the relevance of others.

The questions raised in this submission have little or no relevance to the details of present or future administrative structures, or to the University's financial predicament. But any profound analysis of matters relating to a university needs to be carried out against a background of what a true university aspires to be. Its reputation depends to a large degree on the recognised achievements of its past and present members and alumni, and in particular their contribution to learning and discovery.

By tradition recognition of past contributions to a university's reputation takes many forms, some of durable significance, others more transient. The contributions of founders and benefactors are collectively kept alive by regular commemoration. A benefactor's name may be permanently attached to a Chair or Lectureship. A named scholarship, fellowship, exhibition, bursary, prize, or medal may be awarded at a regular interval. An anniversary (a jubilee or centenary) may be signalised by a conference or exhibition. Some form of durable public monument may be selected for commemorative purposes, such as an establishment (research station, rural property, etc.); a site feature (such as a roadway); a named building, or building component (such as a lecture-theatre, library, museum, laboratory, or clinic); or some smaller feature (such as a statue, sculpture, stained-glass window, or plaque). In many, but not all, such cases recognition is posthumous. But one form of recognition - an honorary degree - is always given to a living person.

The core University of Sydney has followed that pattern, and now faces the challenge of integrating within its traditions and reputation the traditions and reputations of its newly assimilated components. Any program designed to enhance the sense of unity within such a large amalgamation will need to give attention to matters beyond the topology of administrative structures. In this wider and deeper context there is room for a critical consideration of personal recognition.

It would be a worthy scholarly exercise to make a thorough analysis of policies and practices in this area, both generally and particularly as they have been applied in the University,

particularly in its original form. Such an exercise would be of value in providing a framework for future policy.

Commemoration of personal names within the University

While young by comparison with universities in the Old World the University already has an extensive tradition of personal memorialising, dating from its origin. A study of this tradition should provide answers to questions such as the following:

- (1) What forms of recognition have been used?
- (2) What distinction, if any, is made between lifetime recognition and posthumous recognition?
- (3) What kinds of person have been chosen to be honoured?
- (4) What kinds of person have made the choice?
- (5) What kinds of service have been recognised?
- (6) What kinds of service, if any, have been excluded from recognition?
- (7) What steps, if any, have been taken to draw continuing attention to the subject of the honour conferred (and by implication provide justification for the choice?)
- (8) Along what lines have policy and practice evolved?
- (9) What policy, if any, has been in place to maintain some degree of consistency?
- (10) What future policy is most likely to contribute to the general aims of the (enlarged) University?

The University provides a rich variety of examples to illustrate the problems and questions raised. Included are virtually all of the forms of recognition listed in the introduction. Commemoration [of Benefactors] Day was long part of the University's calendar. A notable collective memorial is the University Carillon. Chairs exist carrying names of such benefactors as Challis, Bosch, and Boden. Lectureships commemorate Hovell, Liversidge, G.J. Cohen, and many others. Among many scholarships there are those named Woolley, Belmore, Deas Thomson, Barker, James King, Liversidge, Kolling, Caird. There are bursaries and exhibitions named Wentworth, Frazer, Hunter-Baillie, Walker, Badham, Salting and so on. The numerous commemorative prizes and medals include the John Smith, H.C. Russell, G.A. Wood, MacCallum, Pitt Cobbett, and P.N. Russell. Anniversary celebrations have included a seminar marking the birth centenary of G. Elliott Smith and one marking the death centenary of John Smith. Individuals have been memorialised within anniversary celebrations for a Department (as recently the History centenary and the French 70th); a Faculty (for example: Medicine and Science centenaries; Agriculture 75th); and the University itself.

Establishments have been named in honour, for example, of a benefactor (Crommelin, McGarvie Smith); and a professor (I. Watson). Named roadways commemorate a benefactor (Fisher), a Chancellor (Manning), and administrators (Barff, Maze).

Buildings confer recognition on some benefactors (Challis, Bosch, E. Williams, J. Shute); some Chancellors (Manning, Blackburn); some Principals and Vice-Chancellors (Woolley, Badham, MacCallum, Wallace, Roberts, Williams); an administrator (Selle); and some professors (Anderson Stuart, Holme, R. Watt, J. McMillan, J. Stewart, R. Gunn, Mackie, Madsen, R. Mills, E. David, G. Taylor, Carslaw, Brennan, Wilkinson, Ward, Martin, Ford).

A highly ornamental gateway is named Nicholson. Named lecture theatres and laboratories are numerous. Some recognise persons (such as Stephen Hales) with no University link. One recognises a former staff member, Robert Robinson, who was later a Nobel laureate (though nothing yet commemorates his student and fellow Nobel laureate, John Cornforth). The University Library commemorates a famous benefactor, Thomas Fisher; branch libraries (such as the Boden Library) are named after others. Libraries also memorialise a Principal (Badham); and some professors (Mackie, Burkitt, etc.). A museum is named after Nicholson (co-founder, benefactor, and first Chancellor); while other museums memorialise a benefactor (Macleay) and outstanding scholars (Wilson, Haswell, etc.). A handsome reception room honours the late Chancellor Black.

Commemorative art-works include stained glass memorials (of founders); statues (of Wentworth and Challis); several busts (including P.N. Russell and A. Renwick); numerous fine portraits (notably Nicholson, Woolley, Badham, Liversidge and A. Orchard); and various plaques (notably that for T. Fisher). (An excellent and superbly illustrated account of the University's early art-work appears in McKenzie Stained Glass and Stone 1989.) Honorary degrees have been conferred on many distinguished persons, of which perhaps only a minority have made a direct contribution to the University's achievements and reputation. Included are the two Nobel prize-winners, Robinson and Cornforth, as well as benefactors such as Cecil Green and Alexander Boden.

Some curious aspects of the subject appear. The inaugural University, with its achievements all in the future, commemorated (in stained glass and sculpture) not only founders and benefactors but also many figures from the Old World and the Ancient World, none of whom ever contributed anything directly to the University's reputation.

In later decisions some names received multiple recognition, including co-founder Wentworth and such major benefactors as Nicholson, Challis, Fisher, and Bosch, but also including others such as A. Mackie. An outstanding benefactor, Power, is memorialised in an art collection but not in any major structure such as a building or museum. The permanence of commemoration is less than absolute: Chancellor MacLaurin's name supplanted benefactor Fisher's, which was recycled. Principal Woolley's name supplanted that of benefactor P.N. Russell, which was likewise recycled. Chancellor Blackburn's name displaced that of benefactor Rockefeller. With particular irony, Principal-and-classicist Badham's name was applied to

a building which was created by a pioneer Physics professor (Threlfall) and is now occupied by a biology library and laboratories. Likewise administrator McCrea's name was applied to a lecture room formerly used by dedicated but uncommemorated pioneer scholars of natural history.

The greatest anomaly of the whole picture is illustrated by the following quotation:

"It is a surprising fact that despite the pioneering contributions made to this University, not one of Smith, Pell, Thomson, Liversidge, Gurney, Stephens, Haswell, and Threlfall is commemorated by name on any building or room. Two of them, Liversidge and Threlfall, actually designed two surviving buildings (now Pharmacy and Badham) down to a fine degree of detail. Perhaps the Science Centenary is the time for restoring the balance." (Branagan and Holland [editors] Ever Reaping Something New 1985)

For various reasons, including the limited number of opportunities for such a momentous gesture, many have questioned the propriety of allocating an entire building in honour of a single individual. In spite of such reservations the practice has continued, and is unlikely to be abolished retrospectively, or perhaps even prospectively. In that case it is all the more important that decisions of this importance should be the subject of public discussion, and a high degree of consensus.

- Dr H.G. Holland,
C/- School of
Chemistry

30 January 1992

THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR PART V

On the retirement of Margaret Telfer in 1967 the Deputy Registrar, Hugh George McCredie, was appointed to the position of Registrar.¹ Educated at Fort Street Boys' High School, McCredie had joined the New South Wales Auditor-General's Department on leaving school.² He worked there from 1938 to 1941. During that period he had completed the qualifying examinations for the Commonwealth Institute of Accountants and the Institute of Chartered Secretaries and Administrators.³ In the early 1940s McCredie joined the A.I.F. and served in Australia and New Guinea (1942-1946). He achieved the rank of Lieutenant and remained on the Reserve of Officers until 1965.⁴

In 1946 he commenced his legal studies and in 1948 completed the four year Law degree with honours at the University of Sydney under special provisions made for ex-servicemen and women.⁵ In 1948 he became a trainee executive with the Colonial Mutual Life Assurance Society Limited and then in 1949, Secretary of G.H. and J.A. Watson Pty. Ltd. and Associated Companies.⁶ Prior to the Second World War McCredie had qualified as an accountant, cost accountant and secretary.⁷

McCredie returned to the University in 1950 on his appointment as Assistant Registrar under the then Registrar, Harold Maze, and was at various times over the next few years Secretary to the Faculties of Arts, Law, Economics, Dentistry and Science.⁸ In 1961 he was appointed Deputy Registrar under Margaret Telfer who had succeeded Maze as Registrar.

In 1963 McCredie completed a British Council course on university administration and as both a Carnegie Travelling Fellow and a British Council Scholar visited universities and other institutions in the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States of America.⁹

McCredie also kept in touch with the teaching side of academic life: during 1954 to 1961 he held a part-time lectureship in Accounting and from 1955-56 he was Part-time Lecturer in Commercial Law at the New South Wales University of Technology.¹⁰ He was Chief Examiner in Commercial Law for the Australian Society of Accountants from 1957 to 1966. In addition from 1955 he had been Honorary Acting Secretary, then Secretary of the Rhodes Scholarship Committee, Secretary of the Rothman's University Endowment Fund and from 1966 the University's representative on the Bursary Endowment Board.¹²

McCredie was also involved in the social and sporting life of the University. He was Secretary of the Sydney University Staff Club [now the University of Sydney Club] in its formative years and a member of the Committee for two years. A keen sportsman, he was President of the Sydney University Sports Union 1961-1963 and then Senate Representative; he was also President of the Sydney University Lawn Tennis Club.¹²

During these years prior to his appointment as Registrar he had become a Senior Associate of the Australian Society of Accountants; an Associate of the Chartered Institute of Secretaries and Associate of Cost Accountants of Australia.¹³ By 1967 he had published twenty-two papers and articles, one book and was co-author of one other book.

In 1967 the selection committee was unanimous in its recommendation that McCredie be appointed Registrar. He was to hold this position until 1972 when he was appointed Secretary prior to Maze's retirement. In 1974 McCredie was appointed Deputy Principal - the transition from academic to financial administrator was complete.¹⁴

In 1988, the then Vice-Chancellor, the late Professor J.M. Ward, said of McCredie, as a Registrar, Secretary and Deputy Principal, he was:

"... an outstanding example of a career administrator, tireless in trying to establish a more efficient University. Paper never sat long on his desk, though not all of it was moved during normal working hours. A familiar brown briefcase was his regular companion and into it went any papers not attended to by the end of a long day. Those who worked for him could be sure that next morning all these documents would have returned to the University with instructions annotated upon them. Despite the extremely heavy workload that he imposed on himself, Hugh McCredie was always to be found with an open door to hear anyone's problems, both personal and professional. Compassionate and sensitive solutions were regularly found. Both as Registrar and later as Deputy Principal, Mr McCredie brought a special blend of sensitivity to the academic needs of the University, well-based skills in financial management, and an independent mind dedicated to improving the University's efficiency and effectiveness and fostering its good relations in the business and rural communities."¹⁵

In recognition of his services to the University Hugh McCredie received the degree of Doctor of Laws (honoris causa) on 16 April 1988.¹⁶

The tenth Registrar was a classicist, Ralph Burns Fisher, who succeeded McCredie in 1972. Fisher was a New Zealander, born in Auckland on 9 September 1924.¹⁷ He was educated at Auckland Grammar School and Auckland University College (University of New Zealand).¹⁸ In 1946 he was awarded an M.A. with First Class Honours in Latin from the latter University and in the following year was appointed Junior Lecturer in Classics in the University of Queensland.¹⁹ He was subsequently appointed Assistant lecturer, then Lecturer in Classics.²⁰

In 1955 Fisher decided to leave the academic world for a time and seek further experience in secondary education. He accepted an appointment as Senior Classics Master at Knox Grammar

School.²¹ Fisher's stay at the School was short for in 1955 he applied for the position of Graduate Assistant at the University of Sydney. One of his referees was Professor F. Schoneil who spoke highly of Fisher's work in connection with the Classical Ancient History course for the Diploma of Education in the University of Queensland and his ability as a teacher and administrator.²²

Fisher was appointed Graduate Assistant in the Registrar's Office, or, as it was then known, the Department of Administration. At the same time he maintained his association with academic work. He was appointed a part-time lecturer in the Latin Department and later he successfully gained a full-time lecturing appointment.²³ However he soon found that his "first love" was administration and he returned to a Graduate Assistant position.²⁴

His administrative skills were soon recognised and in October 1958 he was appointed Assistant Registrar; in 1967 Deputy Registrar and in 1970 Associate Registrar. Two years later he was appointed Registrar.²⁵

It was a popular appointment. Throughout the University Fisher was known as a man with a strong commitment to the University: as one who knew him well recalled in 1984:

"He was extremely dedicated to the institution, perhaps too dedicated and perhaps too meticulous, spending many long nights to meet the demands of his office, often working throughout the night, and I mean throughout the night, because of the high standard he set for himself."²⁶

He was remembered by those who worked with him as a man of integrity, intelligent, good-humoured with considerable energy and a tremendous capacity for work.

"A more helpful and understanding colleague one could not hope to meet. He went out of his way to encourage and support his staff and never hesitated to assist when looked to for help. I doubt if one would find a more cooperative and helpful associate. Although a very serious person, he was delightful company, always in good humour."²⁷

In 1974 Fisher requested that he be relieved of his duties as Registrar on medical grounds.²⁸ His resignation was accepted with regret by the Senate. Fisher was appointed to the position of Secretary to the Senate. His health however continued to be a matter of concern and in 1980 he retired officially after a period of recreation and long service leave from September 1979 to December 1980.²⁹ He looked forward to his retirement especially to devoting more time to his music. At his farewell he said:

"I plan to spend a lot of time on my music. I play the organ and want to practise a lot. I am also going to do some gardening, some walking, a lot of reading and other things

I've often wanted to do but never seemed to have time to do."³⁰

In his retirement Fisher was a frequent visitor to the University and was actively involved on the Chancellor's Committee.³¹ He also spent considerable time on his music and in producing choral presentations at major choral festivals and special occasions. Sadly, like Margaret Telfer, he had only a short period of retirement. He died suddenly on 28 March 1984 at the age of fifty-nine years.³²

Jean Foley (nee Laing) was to be the University's eleventh Registrar and the second woman appointed to the position. She had graduated with the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1946 and received a Diploma in Social Studies in 1947.³³

In 1950 she joined the staff of the University of Sydney as a temporary Graduate Assistant to the Appointments Board and later its Assistant Secretary.³⁴ In 1953 she resigned to take up the position of Supervisor of Training and Systems Officer at International Business Machines.³⁵ In 1958 she was appointed Mechanisation Officer of the Hospitals Contribution Fund. The experience gained in those positions was to stand her in good stead when she returned to the University in 1960 as an Assistant Registrar.³⁶

Her duties in this position included responsibility for the installation of a new computer for Data Processing.³⁷ In addition, as Assistant Registrar, she was over a period to hold the following positions: Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Dentistry, and Secretary to the Boards of Studies in Divinity and Social Work.³⁸ She was also involved as part of her work in Data Processing with organisation and methods.³⁹

Jean Foley also played an important part in the establishment of the Metropolitan Universities Admission Centre and the success of this Centre was said to be due in large part to her continuing interest and expert guidance.⁴⁰

In 1970 she was appointed Deputy Registrar; Associate Registrar in 1972 and, on Ralph Fisher's resignation in 1974, Acting Registrar.⁴¹ In 1975 she was appointed Registrar. Her period as Registrar was to be all too short for she resigned because of family commitments in mid 1975.⁴²

Her qualities as an administrator were well summed up by Professor Rogers, a former Dean of the Faculty of Arts, when he wrote that she would long be remembered "for her unobtrusive efficiency, her charm and her unfailing good humour."⁴³ He noted that she was a constructive administrator, "always looking for better ways of doing things, putting into practice the injunction of Geoffrey Chaucer (a poet who was also an administrator) to take the fruit and let the chaff be still."⁴⁴

The Vice-Chancellor, Professor (later Sir) Bruce Williams, wrote in July 1975:

"Mrs Foley's term as Registrar has been regrettably short. Her great integrity,

judgment, foresight and charm helped to make her an ideal Registrar. We shall miss her. It is small consolation that she has agreed to remain with us in a consultative capacity, to complete some important work she had started 45 and to give us the benefit of her advice."

References:

1. For details of Margaret Telfer's career as Registrar, see U.Bygott, THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR, PART IV, Archives Record No. 1, March 1992, pp 16-20. For H.G. McCredie's appointment see Report of the Senate, 1967.
2. Remarks by the Vice-Chancellor and Principal, Professor J.M. Ward, AO, in presenting Hugh George McCredie for admission to the degree of Doctor of Laws (honoris causa), on 16 April 1988. Biog. 246
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. University of Sydney News, 29 June 1982.
6. Union Recorder, Vol. XLVII, No. 10, June 8, 1967.
7. University of Sydney News, 29 June 1982.
8. Ibid.
9. Union Recorder, Vol. XLVII, No. 10, June 8, 1967. See also J.M. Ward, op.cit.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. In a later period (1971 and 1983) he was President of the Australian Universities Sports Association and in 1985 was awarded the membership of the Order of Australia for his services to the administration of University sport. See also J.M. Ward, op.cit.
13. Ibid. He was later to be a Fellow of the Soc. of Accountants and the Chartered Institute of Secretaries. See J.M. Ward, op.cit.
14. University of Sydney News, 29 June 1982.
15. J.M. Ward, op.cit.
16. Ibid.
17. See G3/187, S.U. Archives.
18. Ibid.
19. Keith Jennings, 'Death of Ralph Fisher', University of Sydney News, 1 May 1984.
20. Ibid.
21. Ibid.
22. See G3/187, S.U. Archives.
23. Keith Jennings, 'Death of Ralph Fisher', University of Sydney News, 1 May 1984.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid., 24 September 1979.
31. Ibid., 1 May 1984.
32. Ibid.
33. Calendar Supplement of the University of Sydney, 1955-56.
34. University of Sydney News, 23 July 1975.
35. Ibid. See also G3/187.
36. Ibid.
37. See G3/187
38. Ibid.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid.
43. University of Sydney News, 23 July 1975
44. Ibid.
45. Ibid.

- Ursula Bygott

SUMMARY LIST OF RECORDS ACCESSIONED
IN THE UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES,
JANUARY TO JUNE, 1992

(Note: Restricted access conditions may apply to some records on this list.)

The list is compiled in accession number order, together with the transferor, where known. It does not include publications received, unless such material is part of a record group.

1151 Registrar, Office of - Archives Archives Finding Aids. 1991

1152 S.U. Chemical Society (Dr N. Gibson) Records of the Society. 1970-1979

1153 Mahoney, Jack Andrew (Mrs M. Mahoney) Papers of Jack Andrew Mahoney. 1954-1983

1154 History Teachers Association. (Ms M. Mortimer) Records of the Association. 1964-1986

1155 Melville, Ruby (Late). (Walter G. Maizey) Copies of John Smith Photographs. 1956? - 1992

1156 Brewer, Ilma Mary. Additional papers of Ilma Brewer. 1985-1992

1157 Properties and Investments Office. Grants and Sub-Grants of land. 1855-1926

1158 Medicine, Faculty of. (Edmund Alfred Elliott). In and Out of the Medical School, University of Sydney. 1913-

1159 Education, Faculty of. Alexander Mackie Library. (Office of the Principal, Sydney Teachers College) Principal's correspondence. 1968-1981

1160 Registrar, Office of. Examinations. (Student Records). Examination Results. 1900-1986

1161 Purves, Algernon Grafton. (Mrs Eileen Gemmell-Smith, OAM) Albums of cuttings and photographs. 1889-1913

1162 Registrar, Office of. (Accountant - G. Stowell) Minutes of the Finance Committee. 1976-1982

1163 Vice-Chancellor, Office of. Examination Results Analysis. 1944-1965

1164 Vice-Chancellor, Office of. Student Statistical Analysis. 1951-1963

1165 History, Department of. (Rev. Arthur Dean) History Course Notes. 1947

1166 South, Winifred (nee Small). (Ms J. Small) History Lecture Notes and Essays. 1924-1926

1167 Various. (Miss L. Campbell-Brown) Miscellanea relating to Florinda Katherine Ogilvie. 1933-1984

1168 Vice-Chancellor, Office of. Development of the Nepean Campus. 1983

1169 Athletics Club. (Mr P.V. O'Hara) Additional records of the Athletics Club. 1978-1991

1170 Todd, Frederick Augustus. (Professor A.J. Dunston.) Additional records of Frederick Augustus Todd. 1922-1941

1171 Dunston, A.J. (Professor) Additional papers of Professor A.J. Dunston. 1923-1984

1172 Senate of the University of Sydney. (Professor A.J. Dunston) Report of the Committee re future developments in Chemistry and Mathematics. 1951

1173 Professorial Board. (Professor A.J. Dunston) Report of the Matriculation Committee. 1952

1174 Cozens, Wilfred Gordon. (Mrs E. L. Blazey) Photographs by Wilfred Gordon Cozens. 1940-1941

1175 Registrar, Office of. Examination Papers. 1991

1176 Vice-Chancellor, Office of. Papers by Professor John Manning Ward. 1981-1990

1177 Senate. (Office of the Vice-Chancellor) Minutes of the Interim Board, Chifley University College. 1988

1178 Postgraduate Representative Association. Minutes of the Executive and Council. 1990-1992

1179 Board of Studies in Physical Education. Minutes of the Board of Studies in Physical Education. 1940-1945

1180 Loveday, Peter. Lecture Notes on Philosophy. 1949-1954

1181 Senate. Indexes to Minutes. 1982-1989.

1182 NSW Government Architect. (Mr Ian Wilson) Anderson Stuart Additional Plans. 1909-1910

1183 Vice-Chancellor's Management Advisory Committee. (Vice-Chancellor) Agenda and Minutes. 1990-1991

1184 History, Department of. (Ms M. Miller) Minutes of the Departmental Board. 1972-1985

1185 S.U. Dramatic Society. (Anon.) Play Scripts. n.d.

1186 Registrar, Office of. (Faculty of Arts). Minutes of the Faculty of Arts. 1987

1187 Medicine, Faculty of. (Jim Donovan, Basser Department of Computer Science) Photograph of Farewell Dinner for Professor Wilson. 1920

1188 Sydney Teachers College. (Alexander Mackie Library.) Slides of Alexander Mackie Library. 1979-1980

1189 Kabeiroi. (Mr I. Davidson) Additional records of the Kabeiroi. 1957-1978

1190 Robin, Geoffrey Herbert. (Mrs Y. Campbell) Photograph Album - Rowing. 1926-1928