UNIVERSITIES AND THE EVOLUTION OF ARCHIVAL PRACTICE IN THE UNITED KINGDOM: SOME RADICAL DEVELOPMENTS

Michael COOK[*]

A brief survey of the role of the universities in archives and records management (ARM) work in the United Kingdom, 1945-2005, with pointers to future development. At the beginning of this period, archives training was based on the auxiliary sciences of history; the appearance of records management heralded the inclusion of management sciences generally, a change that was reinforced by the growing importance of information and communication technology (ICT). Restructuring of course content occurred as a result of changes within universities (the introduction of standard modules). For the first time, full-time specialist lecturers in ARM were appointed. Changes arising from outside the universities are also proving radical. For the first time in UK experience, central government became actively interested, set up a specialist council for Museums, Libraries and Archives), which set out a training outline. The new feature of this was to see the workforce of ARM institutions as a whole: training was now to concentrate on new aspects such as leadership, which would enable the ARM professionals to guide and inspire varied teams of workers. At the same time, new legislation (Data Protection and Freedom of Information) vastly increased the range of work available and moved the basis of the work from historical study towards the accountability of institutions. Funding of university courses became increasingly dependent on recruiting larger numbers of students, including from international sources. These developments are likely to be important internationally.

Descriptors (ATLANTI)

Standards (9)

Key words

Archives and records management training, Universities in UK, Accountability, Professional education

This survey of British developments in training and education for archivists and records managers (ARM) has implications for the international ARM community, which has to respond to the challenges of a rapidly changing world.

---

[*] Centre for Archive Studies, University of Liverpool, England.

Background

Formal archival education in the UK began in the years following World War 2. Post-graduate diploma courses were started in Liverpool and London in the 1940s, and these were followed by similar courses in two colleges of the University of Wales. All these courses were founded as a result of the enthusiasm of individual academics, and all were intended to provide a supply of professional staff for the growing number of local archive services based on provincial governments (counties). Despite a close association between the course at University College London and the Public Record Office, there was no expectation that graduates would be employed by the latter. Training at the PRO continued in the tradition of the 19th century: generally they recruited post-doctoral academics and put them through a practical apprenticeship. The emphasis in all training was on the disciplines auxiliary to the study of history, particularly the Latin language, the skills of palaeography and diplomatic, and the legal and administrative history of the country, or of institutions within it[1]. There was great emphasis on the purity and authenticity of archival evidence.

This basic curriculum at these university courses changed radically in the last three decades of the 20th century. Records management, as a teachable body of knowledge, became important after 1969[2]. Its gradual encroachment on the traditional subjects was accompanied by an increasing interest in the more general skills of management. In this, the courses were following the experience of the local archive services. Before the 1970s, few archivists were called upon to act as senior managers, or to have serious budgetary responsibilities. It was only gradually that a managerial approach to normal archive work came to involve questions of long and medium-term planning of resources, specific consideration of competing priorities, concern with the work environment, costs and funding.

The gradual change from a specialist to a management approach to ARM work was assisted in most places by growing pressures from the demands of users. An enormous growth in public demand for access to archives occurred in Britain during the 1980s, and this phenomenon was decisive in moving the main emphasis of archive work from research and publication to the direct service of users. At the same time, many archives services began the process of losing their distinct identity as specialist centres, and a tendency began for them to become merged into larger areas of public service. Typically, this meant that the archives would become one of the so-called leisure services (libraries, museums). They thus had to compete with the other such services for resources, and it became clear that competent archivists were likely to find career opportunities in the wider field of managing public services on a larger scale. Leadership thus became possible as a career theme, but to take up leadership

---

[1] R. Dunhill & C. Short, 'The training of archivists 1970-1990: an overview', *Journal of the Society of Archivists,* 12 (1991), 42-50. Michael Roper, 'Archival education in Britain', *The American Archivist,* 50 (1987), 586-90. Elizabeth Shepherd, 'Partnership in professional education: a study in archives and records management', *Records Management Journal,* 8 (1998), 19-37. Caroline Williams, 'Archival training at the University of Liverpool', *Journal of the Society of Archivists',* 18 (1997), 181-8. Sarah Westwood, 'Records management education and training at Liverpool: a year of change at LUCAS', *Records Management Journal,* 8 (1999), 39-53.
[2] Susan Westwood, 'Records management education and training at Liverpool: a year of change,' *Records Management Journal* 8 (1999), 19-53.

positions seemed to many an abandonment of the initial vocation of archivist[3]. We do to some extent suffer from this problem: it still remains the case that many archivists tend to see themselves as in some sense missionaries for their discipline, rather than as collaborators in a current enterprise.

The four university courses responded to these changes, more or less slowly. Some found it easier than others. University of Wales Bangor, where the course had remained strongly oriented to historical studies and manuscript curation, dropped out at the end of the century, leaving only the three other courses. (In the Republic of Ireland, the course at University College Dublin began in 1972)[4]. The gradual change of stance in all the three remaining was much assisted by the development of oversight by the Society of Archivists, the professional association of British archivists, records managers and conservationists. A system of regular inspections by them was instituted in 1994, and although there was no legal sanction, all the University courses took care to implement the recommendations made by the Society's visitors[5].

A new university course concentrating solely on records management was opened by the University of Northumbria at Newcastle upon Tyne and two ARM training courses, one of them by distance learning, were set up in Scotland in 2003/5[6]. The appearance of these was an illustration of the growing shortfall between supply and demand that became obvious at this period.

It is interesting to note that despite increasing emphasis on records management and on the management sciences generally, British ARM training has been slow to align itself, either institutionally or in curriculum content, with the broader discipline of information management. In Liverpool there is no institutional connection with information studies; in London and Aberystwyth there is such an institutional connection but the influence of information studies has been slow to take effect. Probably the newer courses will be more responsive to this development.

Changes in the structure of training courses arising from within.

The last decade of the 20th century saw the increasing encroachment of the outside world upon what had been somewhat of a private empire. The archive courses had been set up by the enterprise of a few individuals. They had now to be brought into conformity with the national and international standards of higher education. Just as the original courses were among the side-effects of a world-wide movement (the academic study of administrative origins), so the modern courses were among the side-effects of another world-wide movement (the industrialisation of universities). Postgraduate diplomas would not be understood in this new world: it was now nec-

---

[3] David Vaisey, 'Archive training past and present', *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 22 (2001), 231-6.

[4] www.ucd.ie/archives/html/profed/higherdiploma.htm.

[5] Society of Archivists Education and Training Development Committee, www.archives.org.uk/training/postgraduate.asp. K. Thompson, 'Accreditation of education and certification of archivists', *Janus,* 1992.2, p.203.

[6] Frank Rankin, *Scottish postgraduate archives training project: project report 2002,* South Lanarkshire Council Archives and Information Management Service, July 2002. Frank Rankin, 'The Scottish postgraduate archives training project: issues for the records management community', *Records Management Journal* 13 (2003), 32-7.

essary to have taught Master's degrees. World-wide, these were generally courses that covered two years; but in Britain finances did not permit this, and the archive courses, like other vocational Master's degrees there, remained at one-year length[7]. The components of the courses were reconstructed into modules, and the teaching year into semesters. This labour occupied those involved in teaching for most of the decade. There were not enough of them to carry out all this administration, and so, for the first time in British history, a number of full-time academic posts were created for the education of archivists and records managers. This development in itself was a vital step towards the proper establishment of the discipline[8]. By 2000, there were two full-time lectureships at University College London, one at University of Wales Aberystwyth (backed by a larger Department of Information Studies), and two at the University of Liverpool (backed by the newly formed Centre for Archive Studies, LU-CAS). Bangor, failing to widen its support within the College, closed its course.

The new modules concentrated directly upon professional requirements. This meant that those elements that had derived mainly from academic interests of former times were forced out; during the 1990s Latin ceased to be a requirement, and medieval palaeography became an option (though it has remained an option chosen by many). Records management increased its weight and technicality; information technology became central with the appearance of standards for metadata, public networks and the management of electronic records; and the general elements of management as a discipline made their formal appearance. The supervision of the Society of Archivists remained a centralising force, and this was strengthened by the establishment of the Forum for Archives and Records Management Education and Research (FARMER)[9]. The appearance of this forum (actually a regular meeting of specialist academic staff, with a formal programme) marked the point where the teachers of the archives courses began to take control of the development of their discipline[10]. FARMER also began to develop a programme of research[11].

Other alterations in course organisation included changes in the role of practical experience, both before and during training. All the British courses had long encouraged experience in a professional context prior to entering ARM training, and this meant that many candidates for university training spent time after the completion of their first degrees in doing voluntary work in archive services. Gradually employers began to see the value of having graduate trainees at work in their services, and many of them set up facilities for paid work for those intending to enter the courses. Over the whole period the supply of suitable young people seeking entry into the ARM professions has remained fairly constant. Though the numbers in it are relatively small, archives and records management work continues to offer considerable job satisfaction.

---

[7] M Ellis & A Greening, 'Archival training in 2002: between a rock and a hard place?' *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 23 (2002), 197-207.

[8] The intellectual case for specialist faculty appears in Paul Conway, 'Archival education and the need for full-time faculty', *The American Archivist,* 51 (1988), 254-65.

[9] The structure and composition of degree courses was laid down in general terms by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education: www.qaa.ac.uk/crntwork/benchmark/librarianship.pdf.

[10] Tim Edwards & Gabriel Olusegun Olawande, 'Identifying training gaps: a qualitative survey of training needs', *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 22 (2001), 238-45.

[11] Margaret Procter, 'The UK research agenda for archives and records management', *Archives, Records Management and Conservation* [newsletter], January 2005, p.13. The programme was further developed by the first PhD conference in ARM, held at LUCAS in June 2005.

More and more new subjects made a claim to be included in the curriculum. This has intensified a characteristic that has always been a problem in all archival training: it requires a relatively large number of teachers to cover all the material that had to be taught to a relatively small number of students. This problem remains, perhaps has intensified. So, despite the fact that there is now a body of academic archivists and records managers, occupying posts in higher education, there is still a need for practitioners to come in and deliver specialist elements in the training. Though this is in many ways an admirable practice, it does have budgetary implications and causes a good deal of additional work in the administration of the courses. Budgetary constraints are mitigated by a large growth in the number of students, but are still a problem.

Much of the new course content has come from the rapid development of information and communication technology (ICT). The Liverpool course first accepted some elements of ICT at the beginning of the 1970s. At first, this course element was treated as giving the students basic instruction on how to use computers, and there were also several attempts to stimulate the creation of specialised computer programs. As time passed, students arrived at the courses who had learnt computing skills at school or during their first degrees; so this element perished, but not before much energy and time had been fruitlessly spent on it. The demands of the market-place changed, and what is taught now consists mainly in the use of technical software and the application of international standards. The development of technical standards occurred rapidly during the 1990s, and now all the British courses set out to teach the use of EAD, the construction of web-pages, and the application of the international description standards.

The other main element that intruded into the courses was in the area of management skills. Students had to be taught how records and archives management fitted into the general environment of the workplace. This involved presentation skills, elements of personnel management and of marketing, among other aspects. Some attempts were made, especially in the University of Wales Aberystwyth, to align archives and records management subjects with parallels in information management. A proposal to develop an archives and records management specialism in a course leading to a Master's in Business Administration (MBA) has not so far been pursued, but was in general accord with the common thinking around the end of the 20th century.

Developments in the outside world were also having their effect. The Society of Archivists ended their own diploma course, which, by means of in-house training and distance learning had offered a route to qualification to those who had not received training at the Universities. This abandonment was not for lack of candidates, but because the growing complexity of ARM work had made it less possible to offer courses backed solely by the voluntary work of archivists in post. However, by the end of the century distance learning courses were being offered by three of the universities, and this approach is likely to develop further. Additionally, the Society of Archivists began to set up a fairly complex system for Continued Professional Development (CPD) in which they were following a route already clearly marked out by other professional associations. At about the same period, the University of Liverpool, in association with the National Archives, began offering courses to paraprofessionals: the first time in the UK that training had been formally offered to this group.

Changes driven by external factors

This brief survey has now reached the end of the 20th century. Up to this point education and training in archives and records management had followed a predictable pattern, which could easily be paralleled in other professions and in other countries[12]. The main elements in it were the relative decline of purely academic or antiquarian aspects (the historical auxiliary sciences), and the relative increase in importance of those aspects that were designed as training for initial entry into management roles in a specific profession. Restructuring the courses made them fit better into what was becoming a general pattern for all postgraduate education in British (and indeed international) universities.

From this point, however, a new set of external influences began to operate, which are bringing about even more radical changes, and which are leading us into a quite new culture.

The first of these external influences, which began to be felt in 1993-4, was an important change in the way public services and higher education were to be funded and accounted for. In the new regime, routine operations were curtailed, and emphasis increasingly given to projects with a specific objective and a limited timetable. At first, the effects on the ARM profession appeared to be devastating, but quite quickly professionals adapted to it and found it to offer many advantages. Archivists came to recognise that they would often not be able to secure lifelong jobs, but would move from one contract to another. This perhaps did not suit some individuals but in general the change was easily accepted and built into career expectations. In practice there were enough of these projects, or other short or medium-term contract jobs, to satisfy the aspirations of new entrants to the profession. The overriding benefit of the project/contract system has been that a specific outcome of visible public benefit has to come at the end of the contract period.

Comparable changes were occurring within the universities themselves. Now the financial viability of each degree course had to be secured, the cost of the teaching being balanced by the fees received from the students. Uncomfortable at first, the new system was soon found to offer possibilities of development. Increasing the number of students would do something to cover the teaching costs. This would be even more the case if international students could be recruited. Home students pay a regulated fee, but overseas students (from outside the European Union) can be charged a more economically realistic amount. Funds were often available to pay for marketing and outreach, or for development projects. This regime certainly placed serious stress on the teaching staff, but it did also allow some scope for new development and for imaginative schemes.

The stress element remained a serious constraint on the small number of full-time academic archivists and records managers. At the same time, universities were made subject to external evaluation and assessment. Both teaching and research were inspected and examined by national bodies, and the findings of these assess-

---

[12] E.g. A. Menne-Haritz, 'Archival training in a changing world', *The American Archivist* 63 (2000), 341-52.

ments were backed by the award of, or reduction in, funds allocated. At the present time, academic staffs are so constrained by these influences that they are in danger of losing the traditional values of academic life, inherited from the age of the Enlightenment[13].

Other changes coming from outside the academic environment arrived in plenty. Most prominent, perhaps, was the rapid development of nation-wide electronic networks, funded by a variety of public sources (all on the basis of competitive bids). Probably the most important source was the cultural arm of the national lottery, newly invented in the 1990s. In the experimental stage a number of archives services collaborated to set up new networks covering a part of the sector. For example, in higher education (which had benefited greatly from project funding after 1995) the Archives Hub[14]; and in the London area, the archives services of the area within the peripheral motorway of the city set up AIM25[15]. The National Register of Archives, founded in 1947 and based on a collection of written finding aids, turned electronic[16], and, best known of all, the nation-wide archival network Access to Archives (A2A) became operational in 2001[17].

Although in designing these networks there was a good deal of experimental tinkering with computer systems, most of them eventually settled for formats based on EAD. The Higher Education Archives Hub and A2A in particular led the way in setting out pathways for EAD applications to be made, providing training and job opportunities for young archivists. A2A was based at the National Archives, and its development reinforced the positive action taken by this body to extend training opportunities to paraprofessionals in the archives and records management sector, both inside and outside government agencies. The National Archives was by now taking a strong leadership role in archival development over the country.

However the most revolutionary external influence was the (for Britain) unprecedented interest of the national government in archival matters. Before the arrival of the Labour government in 1997, the attitude to archives by British governments acting within England could be well illustrated by two salient facts: the Public Record Office had not been designated as the National Archives (this occurred in 2002); and there was no single government agency that had archives as its responsibility[18]. There had been no obvious sign that this situation would ever change.

Nevertheless, soon after taking office the new government announced that it would allocate responsibility for the development of archives, libraries and museums to the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), and that it would allow the necessary funds to support that development. Since that time, the archives and records management professions in the UK have been facing up to and responding to the challenges of this new situation. The DCMS rapidly set out the main lines it intended

---

[13] Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education subject bench-mark statement for Librarianship and Information Management: www.qaa.ac.uk/cmtwork/benchmark/librarianship.pdf.
[14] www.archiveshub.ac.uk/.
[15] www.aim25.ac.uk/.
[16] www.archon.nationalarchives.gov.uk/archon/.
[17] www.a2a.org.uk/.
[18] It should be understood that within the UK there are 4 distinct jurisdictions, each with (differing) ARM structures. The National Archives serves England and (provisionally) Wales. The National Archives of Scotland and the Public Record Office of Northern Ireland operate under distinct statutes.

to take. Although at first it had shown signs that it would follow a traditional course in concentrating on libraries and museums, it responded favourably to a vigorous campaign by the archivists to make it take them more seriously. A Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA) was set up. A regional framework and an Archives Task Force were appointed. The report of this body, in which were represented all the main archival interests in the country, including the Society of Archivists and the National Council on Archives, set out the main lines of development, and these were eventually confirmed and made specific in the Archives Development Programme[19].

From the point of view of archival training the main significance of these new developments became apparent quite early. Training would have to follow the lines set out by the government's broad policy, which in the field of culture meant that there would have to be very close collaboration between the fields represented in MLA: so archives and records management programmes would have to be integrated with activities in the library and museum fields. There would have to be considerable emphasis on the central lines of government policy. These were what were termed social inclusion: bringing neglected communities, the disadvantaged and groups previously invisible to society, into contact with archival (and other cross-domain) work. To support these changes there would now be at least some prospect of obtaining funds from government.

MLA's intentions towards archives and records management training were indicated, though only broadly, in its programme for Workforce Development, announced in 2005[20]. Although this document is couched only in general terms, does not propose to intrude directly into curriculum design within any of the archives and records management courses, and does not provide specific conditions for funding, what it says suggests a completely radical restructuring of course content, purpose and delivery. It remains to be seen to what extent this restructuring actually develops in practice.

In the first place, there is a reappraisal of the nature of the human resources embedded in archives and records management services. Previously, most studies had assumed that training would be directed at the production and support of full-time professional specialists. By using the term 'workforce', the MLA approach intends to promote the idea that all the workers involved in any way should be included in planning for the development of the profession, at whatever level. Though this reorientation would certainly include the growing group of paraprofessionals and support staff, the main thrust of this change is to include the also growing group of voluntary assistants and part-time and contract staff. These, we agree, should be included in any development of the training resource.

There are other implications. Provision must be made for new technologies, new areas of expertise and skills (ICT and conservation are particularly open to these). Efforts must be made to encourage new entrants to the sector from hitherto unrepresented groups, and to widen the appeal of the services to new sectors of the public. Greater emphasis should be placed on developing new skills and establishing a culture in which all members of the workforce see themselves as pursuing continuing career development for themselves and for their institutions. All ARM institutions are

[19] www.mla.gov.uk/documents/atf_adp.pdf
[20] *Learning for change: workforce development strategy*, MLA 2004, www.mla.gov.uk/documents/wfd_learning_for_change.doc.

now expected to set out quite detailed development plans for themselves, and these, of course, include plans for the recruitment and training of the various elements of the workforce.

The MLA's action plan for archives suggests four areas in which it would be desirable that training should operate[21]. These are leadership, lobbying and funding, workforce diversity and cultural inclusivity, and ICT.

The most significant of these is of course the first, leadership. In a sense this is simply a development of a traditional theme: archivists, and even more records managers, should be seen as people exercising authority within their institutions, promoting change, arguing for their area of influence, pressing for the execution of their programmes[22]. The implications are considerable, though. The difference between a 'leader' and a 'manager' may not be easily definable, but it is real. A leader works in a much less strictly enclosed field of action. He or she does not manage a closely defined team of salaried specialists, but rather inspires and directs a loosely composed team within a less closely defined environment, but with a structured programme and objective. One would expect to see such a leader working across the domain boundaries, and directing a varied group of people including part-timers, volunteers, and colleagues in parallel institutions. There is a presumption that this kind of work is likely to be carried on with a good level of public awareness. This is the future of the archives and records management professions as seen by government planners. We await the response of the university courses to these announcements.

Whatever that response may be, it is clear that we are moving into a different world, in which the functions of the information professions will change markedly. Some of the changes that will occur are already manifest in the experience of the UK. Recent legislation has already changed the nature of much archival work. Data Protection laws have already for some years affected access to archives both recent and old. In the UK, the Freedom of Information law, operative from the start of 2005, has already laid out pointers to even more change. The former standard for the passage of records into archives, the 30-years rule, is now effectively abolished. ARM workers must now liaise with management in creator departments, and these in turn must liaise with archivists. Many ARM posts are seen as being essentially concerned with legal compliance. An independent official, the Information Commissioner, is responsible for enforcement at the national level. These developments signal a considerable change of culture in public administration.

It would seem that archival training courses are now poised at a moment of change and redefinition[23]. The professions they serve are rapidly changing in response to changes in the work environment. Professionals and paraprofessionals – in fact all team members – see themselves as embarking on career-long development programmes. The institutions they work in are increasingly held accountable for providing "value for money" in terms of offering publicly recognised 'products' which can be seen as advancing government programmes for social inclusion and life-long learn-

---

[21] *Developing the 21st century archive: an action plan for UK archives,* www.mla.gov.uk/documents/21centarc.pdf, 2002.

[22] Cf Bruce W Dearstyne (ed), *Leadership and administration of successful archival programs,* Greenwood Library Management Collection, Greenwood Press, Westport Conn. & London, 2001.

[23] Margaret Procter, 'On the crest of a wave or swimming against the tide? Professional education in an information-conscious society', *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 26 (2005), 55-73.

ing. Boundaries between professions, domains and sectors may become more blurred. Project teams will include people with a greater variety of professional backgrounds and expectations. Training will increasingly demand different types of apprenticeship. The work of a project leader will increasingly demand time spent on advocacy and fund-raising. Public interest in the work will continue to increase. Numbers involved in it will continue to increase.

Meanwhile, the university courses of the UK will increasingly try to develop their overseas involvement. The ability to attract students from countries outside the European Union will be important for sustaining their economic viability. Fortunately this coincides with an increasing recognition, over the world generally, that archives and records management work is internationally valid and necessary. All countries today are facing similar problems in their information work. Archives and records are necessary components of accountable regimes and stable governance. As legal compliance spreads outwards from states with formally democratic systems of government, the need for professionals to maintain this work increases. As public awareness grows of the value of cultural services and information services that sustain human rights, so the demands on archives and records management workers also grow. Archives and records management trainers in the UK are only as yet beginning to respond to these changes, but the signs are already visible.

Conclusions: thoughts for European colleagues

This paper has briefly described some of the changes that have occurred in ARM professional education in the UK over the last fifty years or so. Naturally, each country will experience its own responses to the changes of the modern world. However I believe the British experience has some lessons for European ARM personnel to learn, and poses some questions that European colleagues may wish to formulate answers to. This observation may also be true for the international ARM community also.

Three of the recent developments I believe may be welcomed.

1. The accountability issue.
The perception held by ARM educators (thought probably not yet by the majority of ARM professionals at work) is that the driving purpose of all archives and records work has now moved from establishing historical truth to the assurance of good governance and the accountability of public authorities. This shift of purpose has of course been profoundly influenced by the historical experience of Eastern Europe in the 20th century. An indicator of the shift is the disappearance of that traditional feature of archive work, the closure date (30-year rule, etc).

2. The idea of the team.
The concept of the relatively isolated specialist (archivist or records manager) is now yielding to the concept of the team leader, guiding and supporting a varied group of co-workers. This group will include professionals from neighbouring domains (libraries, museums, social work); part-timers, volunteers, contract workers, and support staff. In this scenario, leadership skills are of more importance than management skills. Fund-raising becomes a primary responsibility of the leader. The development

signals the end of archival distinctiveness, and the sense of being a lonely missionary, that many ARM workers have had in the past.

3. The dominance of access.

In a funding regime that depends greatly upon immediately deliverable results, the primary drive in ARM work is now the public delivery of easy access. Collaborative electronic networks present finding aids to the public, and the full texts of documents become available whatever their date. Deliberately planned project work extends these facilities to socially excluded groups.

However, against these three concepts is the broader one, which may not be received quite so readily. These changes could be said to represent the liberalisation, or globalisation, of ARM work. With the passing of job security our particular form of academic freedom is being challenged. Compliance with the new laws is now enforced by an independent Information Commissioner. End-product delivery is now enforced by contract funding agencies. The authenticity of archival evidence is challenged by the electronic revolution, and also by the ideas of post-modernist philosophy that are becoming fashionable[24]. I believe that ARM educators must now consider their position in the light of these fundamental challenges.

---

[24] The literature on the post-modernis movement is considerable. See Verne Harris, 'Something is happening here and you don't know what it is: Jacques Derrida unplugged', *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 26 (2005), 131-142.

Bibliography

Council of Europe. *Recommendation No R (2000) 13 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on a European policy on access to archives,* http://cm.coe.int/ta/rec/2000/2000r13.htm.

Council of Europe, Committee of Ministers. *Recommendation Rec (2002) 2 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on access to official documents,* http://cm.coe.int/stat/E/Public/2002/adopted_texts/recommendations/2002r2.htm.

Edwards, Tim and Olawande, Gabriel Olusegun, 'Identifying training gaps: a qualitative survey of training needs,' *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 22 (2001), 237-245.

Ellis, Mary and Greening, Anna, 'Archival training in 2002: between a rock and a hard place?', *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 23 (2002), 197-207.

Hallam Smith, Elizabeth, 'Customer focus and marketing in archive service delivery: theory and practice', *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 21 (2003), 35-53.

Her Majesty's Stationery Office (HMSO), *Freedom of Information Act 2000,* www.legislation.hmso.gov.uk/acts/acts2000/20000036.htm.

Johnson, Claire, 'The relevance of archival practice within e-democracy', in *Political pressure and the archival record,* ed. M Procter, M Cook & C Williams. Chicago, Society of American Archivists, 2005.

Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA), *Using museums, libraries and archives to develop a learning community: a strategic plan for action,* 2001, www.mla.gov.uk/documents/usestrat.pdf.
----------, *Access for all: online access and digitisation,* 2002, www.mla.gov.uk/documents/atf_res01.pdf.
----------, *Listening to the past, speaking to the future.* Archives Task Force Report, 2004, www.mla.gov.uk/.
----------, National Council on Archives and the University of Sheffield, *Archives workforce study.* Appendix G of the *Archives Task Force Report,* 2004, www.mla.gov.uk/action/archives/atf.asp.

The National Archives, *Jobs and careers,* www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/jobs/specificskills.htm.

National Council on Archives, *British archives: the way forward,* 1999, www.ncaonline.org.uk/pubs.html.

Rankin, Frank, 'The Scottish postgraduate archives training project: issues for the records management community,' *Records Management Journal* 13 (2003), 32-7; also see *Scottish postgraduate archives training project: project report,* July 2002, South Lanarkshire Council Archives and Information Management Service, 2002.

Re:source (MLA), *Towards a strategy for workforce development: a research and discussion report prepared for Re:source,* 2003, London, Demos (www.demos.co.uk).

UK Government, Lord Chancellor, *Code of practice on the management of records under Freedom of Information,* www.dca.gov.uk/foi/codesprac.htm.

Williams, Caroline, ed., *Archives in the UK and the government agenda,* Liverpool, Liverpool University Centre for Archive Studies, 2002.