

The blurry line between archives and records management at the universities in South Africa

Sidney Netshakhuma
University of Mpumalanga
Sidney.Netshakhuma@ump.ac.za

Abstract

Archival scholars lament that university archives and records management (ARM) sections in South Africa struggle for a place on the margins of the information juggernaut. As a result, these functions are often separated within the universities' structures. The purpose of this study was to investigate the positioning of ARM at universities in South Africa. The study analysed literature, focusing on ARM sections within the universities structure, and demonstrated the role of archives and records in supporting the university functions. Primary data were collected through interviews with archivists and records managers of 26 universities in South Africa. Evidence suggests that there is a blurry line between archives and records management at the universities in South Africa. Some universities separate the functions by placing the archives function in the library department while records management is placed under the Office of the Registrar. As a result, archives are camouflaged as sub-ordinate divisions within university libraries in South Africa, with the university archivist reporting to the university librarian. However, there are universities that place the ARM programme within one department under the Office of the Registrar. This study recommends that ARM functions should be integrated and placed under one function reporting to the head of archives and records management. The study concludes that the continuous separation of ARM functions has implications for both future professional practice and provision of information at the universities. University archives should be given the same status as the library, as the two are on the same level.

Key words: archives, university archives, records management, South Africa

1. Introduction

Archives and records management functions at universities in South Africa struggle for a place on the margins of the information juggernaut. Lack of effective organisational structure and reporting line for both archives and records management (ARM) functions seems to be a challenge for South Africa universities. Most often, archives are camouflaged as sub-ordinate divisions within university libraries in South Africa. According to Kulcu (2009:101), ineffective bureaucracy and lack of effective organisational structure are seen as some of the challenges in university ARM systems. Hence, there is a need for professional identity if the records and archives profession is to grow and be

recognised in the university (Khumalo & Masuku 2018:50). The manner in which professionals are trained and oriented in the profession plays a great role in the shaping and boosting of their confidence in their profession (Khumalo & Masuku 2018:51). One of the problems archivists and records managers face is the lack of recognition as a profession. It is important that universities in South Africa are not left out of the reform process (Phiri & Tough 2018:54). The purpose of this study was to investigate the positioning of ARM at universities in South Africa with a view to recommending best organisational structure and placement of ARM functions within South African universities. In South African universities there is a challenge of lack of standardisation of placement and reporting of the archives and records management functions. The informality and the lack of ARM sophistication are in fact a reflection of the state of university administration. The research conducted by Zachs and Peri (2010) found that there is lack of recognition of the ARM profession because the archival function on university campuses is buried within the library, rather than having their own reporting lines. This lack of standardisation of the placement or reporting line of ARM functions led to ARM not being viewed as a strategic function by other departments within the university. As a result, very often, the existence of archives at the universities is not known. To improve the visibility and strategic value add of archives and records management, there is a need to develop appropriate standards and systems to enhance placement and reporting line of ARM functions.

2. Problem statement

The challenges archivists and records managers at South African universities are faced with are significant and include lack of recognition by the university councils, as they are placed at a low level in the organisational structure and inappropriate reporting line. Egwunyenga (2009:15) also confirms lack of effective organisational structure and lack of recognition by the university authorities in Nigeria as challenges of records management. Records and archives functions are placed in the library department, the Office of the Registrar or the Marketing and Communication Department. Yet, this blurry line of ARM to different departments remains largely unexplored in South African universities. Hence, the integration of ARM resources for their optimal utilisation works effectively and efficiently when the integration is under the same administrative jurisdiction with unified standards and procedures for managing ARM functions (An, Bai, Deng, Sun, Zhong & Dong 2017:26). This study seeks to investigate the positioning of the ARM profession with a view to recommending best structure and placement functions within the universities.

2. Background of the South African universities

In South Africa, the universities' landscape was shaped by the apartheid policies of the National Party (NP), which led to the establishment of 36 institutions of higher learning. In compliance with the 1985 Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, pre-1994 higher education was segregated along racial lines in accordance with the classification of four racial groups, namely whites, Indians, coloureds, and blacks (Bunting 2006:35). The transformation of higher education in South Africa after the end of the apartheid system led to the reduced number of universities (Ranson 2018:49). There are 26 public universities in South Africa (as in table one) that are managed through the Higher Education Act, No. 107 of 1997. The public universities are required to comply with the National Archives and Records Service Act, No. 43 of 1996 (Netshakhuma 2019). The most significant period in the establishment of an ARM programme in South African universities started in 1996 after the enactment of the National Archives and Records Service Act of 1996. This study will provide crucial information regarding the development stage of an ARM programme in South Africa.

3. Research purpose and objective of the study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the positioning of ARM at universities in South Africa with a view to recommending a better structure and placement within universities. The objectives were to:

- 1) determine the placement of ARM functions within universities in South Africa.
- 2) demonstrate the role of ARM functions in supporting the university functions.

4. Literature review

Literature was reviewed as per the objectives of the study.

4.1 Placement of ARM functions within universities

It is necessary for universities to create efficient administrative processes to manage ARM functions (Richardson 2008:249). The various universities tend to

use administrative structures based on knowledge specialisation rather than clients or products, which suggests that more is going on than a simple administrative expediency (Richardson 2008:249). The key to creating an ARM discipline is to institutionalise within the university system (Richardson 2008:262). Institutionalisation requires creating a discursive space within which the ARM function can develop, providing institutional support and outlets for ARM research and embedding ARM within broader social, organisational and institutional networks. According to (Richardson 2008:257), a discipline is to establish boundaries that require raising the profile of the field in general and identifying exemplars. The method and theory of the profession in ARM has given the discipline increased vitality (Richardson 2008:257). An archivist and records manager placed at middle management will not have the authority to implement an effective ARM programme because of low command and influence.

Universities' councils, as the highest authority, should develop an institutional structure that would facilitate the emergence of an ARM profession (Richardson 2008:248). Given the nature of university ARM programmes, records managers and archivists must be assigned a position of responsibilities in the university hierarchy to enable them to manage both archives and records functions (Wamukoya 2015). The ARM function is expected to be purposefully and strategically supported by policies, processes and strategies at a high level of management such as university council (Van Wyk & Du Toit 2016:108).

An appropriate ARM function is the best way for ensuring that records of enduring value are maintained and preserved (Cox 2004:263). ARM programme represents the memory of a university, at least the part that is captured through its records. Mnjama (2002) states that neglect of ARM functions in universities is because of lack of appropriate structures for the ARM placement. An ARM programme should be placed high in the university structure to enhance visibility and accessibility (Wagner 1999:108). Mnjama (2002) alludes that the ARM function is to be strategically placed within the administrative structure and this should be supported with the appointment of a qualified archivists and records managers at a high level as well as the availability of the ARM advisory committee to provide advice to the functioning of ARM functions. An ARM function that is not visible and accessible will have little or no impact on the functioning of university (Richardson 2008). For example, in Nigeria, ARM programmes are not being placed in the appropriate organisational structure because of lack of organisational division to coordinate all aspects of records and archives management (Egwunyenga 2009).

Internationally, ARM functions are decentralised at the division level of the universities' structure. In the USA, the study by Kaczmarek (2006) shows that the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign reframed its approach by embedding ARM professionals inside all universities departments and units. The Harvard university ARM function have had their records cared for by librarians (Kaczmarek 2006). These findings demonstrated that even universities from the developed countries experience the challenge of an effective ARM, as the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign lacks a department dedicated to the management of records (Schina & Wells 2002). University archivists and library administrators can strategically collaborate to preserve history, heritage and tradition of the university (Woodward 2015:138). The study conducted by Kaczmarek (2006) found that ARM programmes continue to lack strong or consistent support in universities.

Research conducted by Schina and Wells (2002) advocates the placement of university archives administrative within the library department. Schina and Wells (2002) emphasise the separation between the role of archivists and librarians within the library department to ensure that archivists continue to perform activities of the archival programme, while librarians continue to perform the duties of library functions. The distinction should be made between university archivists and librarians. In Canada, there are few universities that established a full functional ARM programme (Williams 2006).

The placement of only archives functions within university libraries works against the development of a fully integrated ARM department. Placing the archivists to report to the librarian is not sufficient and rightfully leads other administrators questioning the ability of the archivists to fulfil his good intentions. This is because most the librarians focus their duties on issuing books and other materials related to the library activities. University archives endeavouring to place the preservation of the records of their institution on a more systematic basis are essentially incompatible with university libraries.

In Africa, the archives' function is generally invisible because archivists and records managers are not well positioned to influence governance of universities (Lihoma 2008:5). The invisible leads to lack of recognition of the ARM function in a number of strategic university initiatives and development priorities. The key for ARM programme recognition is for it to report to the senior executive with the greatest amount of leverage across the organisation, whether that person is the executive over library, finance, legal and compliance, information

technology (Choksy 2008). In order for ARM functions to be visible, personnel with appropriate skills and knowledge to ensure that it is effective, efficient, transparent and accountable are to be employed (Department of Arts and Culture 2007:45). The National Archives and Records Service Act of 1996 needs revision in order to address conditions under which the National Archives of South Africa operates and to address, among other pertinent areas, designation and position of archivists and records managers in South Africa (Netshakhuma 2019).

4.2 The role of archives and records in supporting the university functions

Universities archives and records management functions provide administrative, research and educational service. By performing these functions, archives and records establish their role in contributing to the information needs of their university. The archives serve as the institutional memory of the university and plays an integral role in the management of the institution's information resources in all media and formats. Standards are essential to determine the role of ARM in supporting the university functions. Standards can be assessed by analysing the administrative and legal processes that affect the university ARM programmes (Kulcu 2009:88). It is necessary to consider national regulations as well as international conditions that impacted on ARM programmes (Shepherd & Yeo 2003). Managing records for legal and regulatory compliance was an important part of the ARM programme (Phiri & Tough 2018:54). This implies that national standards are important in improving and benchmarking record-keeping performance (Luyombya & Sennabulya 2012:69). The university's ARM system should be evaluated by taking administrative and legal processes into consideration.

Internationally, legislation plays an essential role in the placement and reporting of the university functions. In the United State of America (USA), all departments are subject to the State Record Act of Illinois (Schina & Wells 2002). In the USA, the ARM functions are able to gain support from all levels of administration because of the enactment of the above legislation. In Namibia, the University of Namibia operates under the guidance of the Archives Act of Namibia, No. 12 of 1992 (Matangira, Katjiveri-Tjiuoro & Lukileni 2013). Brendan (2013) states that the ineffectiveness of ARM programmes in Nigerian universities was that there was ineffective archives legislation which determines and differentiates the functions of universities' ARM functions. In South Africa, universities' ARM functions are regulated by the National Archives and Records Service Act of 1996, the Promotion of Access to Information Act (Act No. 2 of

2002) (PAIA) and the Protection of Personal Information Act (Act No. 4 of 2013) (POPIA) (Netshakhuma 2019). However, in South Africa, the legislation lacks clarity on the placement of ARM functions within an institution such as universities (Netshakhuma 2019). Phiri and Tough (2018:54) allude to the fact that existence of legislation and regulations does not necessarily deliver good effective records management.

According to Lihoma (2008:6), lack of a functional policy and legal framework that supports that ARM was a challenge to most of the universities in Southern Africa. The review of literature found a gap in terms of differentiating the role and function of ARM (Broady-Preston 2008; Netshakhuma 2019). Hence, the study conducted by Brendan (2013) found that legal framework is essential to determine the placement and functions of ARM. This statement is alluded to by Pereira (2018) who states that archival legislation is a crucial tool for universities to ensure the management, preservation and access of university records. A proper ARM will assist universities to be accountable to its constituency or regulatory framework. Records preserved by universities are essential for the continuation of universities during the time of disaster, so it is essential to ensure that archive materials are preserved by various universities (Calhoun 2014:78).

The strategic plan provides a blueprint for improving an ARM programme, a plan to effectively manage the lifecycle of records, a roadmap for preserving historical and archival records and a tool for developing a system that ensures delivery of the right information to the right person (Franks 2013:313). ARM programme management processes at universities should be formalised through adoption of policies, procedures, infrastructure, tools, training and resources (Mnjama 2002).

The study at the University of Toronto in Canada found that the development of an ARM policy is a key for an ARM programme (Schina & Wells 2002). The study conducted in Nigeria by Atulomah and Remo-Ilishan (2011) found that the National University Commission (NUC) recommended for the formulation of policy and establishment of an ARM function as a result of the lack of ARM functions at Nigerian universities.

5. Research methodology

This qualitative study used interviews with purposively selected records managers and archivists of 26 universities in South Africa. In this regard, multiple case studies constituted the research design that underpinned this study.

A research study selected multiple cases (universities) to understand the similarities and differences between the cases on the placement of archives and records management functions and to be aimed to generalise conclusions over several units. The multiple case study design provides a rigorous approach for collecting and analysing data. Case study approaches are well suited to institutions where a phenomenon is supposed to be studied in real life and its natural environment. What is significant in the use of multiple case studies is that it involves systematic and detailed study of every organisation as an individual entity, often using open-ended interviews in order to understand the concept in detail. Multi-case study enabled the researcher to make comparisons across data to generate all-embracing conclusions.

The target sampling for the study were university records managers and archivists. The participants were chosen because they were familiar with the ARM functions within their universities. A total number of 49 people participated in the interviews. Two participants from each university were selected to participate in the interview (see tables 1, 2 and 3). There were some cases where the researcher interviewed only one participant from the institution because only one official was responsible for both archives and records management functions. The researcher used emails, telephonic interviews and some of the participants were interviewed during the higher education records management forum meeting. The reasons for using the email and telephonic interviews is because South African universities are scattered all over the country. Therefore, it would be expensive for the researcher to visit individual institutions to conduct the interviews. It was easy for the researcher to access the participants as the researcher is a member of the higher education records management forum. Therefore, the researcher was able to interview some of them at the meeting and other telephonically.

Table 1: Archivists reporting to the library department

Universities	Interviewee Designation Levels	Reporting Office
1. Central university of Technology	Archivist (1)	Library Department
	Records Manager (1)	Office of the Registrar
2. University of Stellenbosch	Archivist (1)	Library Department
	Records Manager (1)	
3. University of Cape Town	Archivist (1)	Library Department
	Records Manager (1)	
4. UNISA	Archivist (1)	Library Department
	Records Manager (1)	Office of the Registrar
5. Tshwane University of Technology	Archivist (1) No vacant for records manager	Library Department
6. University of Fort Hare	Archivist (1)	Library Department
	Records Manager (1)	Office of the Registrar
7. University of Free State	Archivist (1)	Library Department
	Records Manager (1)	Office of the Registrar
8. Rhodes University	Archivist (1)	Library Department
	Records Officer (1)	
9. University of KwaZulu – Natal	Archivist (1)	Library Department
	Records Manager (1)	Office of the Registrar
10. University of Johannesburg	Archivist (1)	Library Department
	Records Manager (1)	Office of the Registrar
11. University of Limpopo	Archivist (1)	Library Department
	Records Manager (1)	Office of the Registrar

Table 2: Archivists and records managers reporting to Office of the Registrar

Universities	Interviewee Designation Levels	Line of Reporting
1. Cape Peninsula University of Technology	Records Manager (1) and Archivist (1)	Office of the Registrar
2. Durban University of Technology	Records Manager (1) and Archivist (1)	Office of The registrar
3. Mangosotho University of Technology	Records Manager (1) and Archivist (1)	Office of the Registrar
4. Solomon Plaatjie University	Records Officer (1) and Archivist (1)	Office of the Registrar
5. North West University	Records Manager (1) and Archivist (1)	Office of the Registrar

6. Sefako Makgatho Health Science University	Records Officer (2) No vacant of archivist post.	Office of the Registrar
7. University of Western Cape	Archivist (1) and Records Manager (1)	Office of the Registrar
8. University of Mpumalanga	Archivists and Records Manager (1)	Office of the Registrar
9. University of Venda	Archivist (1) and Records Manager (1)	Office of the Registrar
10. University of Zululand	Archivist (1) and Records Manager (1)	Office of the Registrar
11. Vaal University of Technology	Records Manager (1) and Archivist (1)	Office of the Registrar
12. Walter Sisulu University	Records Manager (1) and Archivist (1)	Office of the Registrar
13. University of the Witwatersrand	Archivist/ Records Manager (1)	Office of the Registrar
14. University of Pretoria	Archivist (1) and Records Manager (1)	Office of the Registrar

Table 3: Archivists and records managers reporting to Marketing and Communication Department

Universities	Interview Designation level	Line of Reporting
01. Nelson Mandela University	Archivist (1)	Marketing and Communication
	Records Manager (1)	Office of the Registrar

6. Presentation and discussions of research findings

This section deals with the interpretation and discussion of the research findings. It follows the objectives of the research study in its structure, namely determine the placement of ARM functions within South African universities and demonstrate the role of ARM functions in supporting the university functions.

6.1 The placement of archives and records management functions within South Africa universities

From the interviews, it was clear that the ARM functions are placed under libraries, registrar's offices or marketing as reflected in tables 1, 2 and 3. Participants were asked at which division the ARM was placed in the University for reporting. Some participants indicated that archives functions are placed in

the library department reporting to university librarian, while records management functions are placed under the Office of the Registrar reporting to the registrar.

Some of the universities such as the Nelson Mandela University place archives management functions under the Marketing and Communication Department (see table 3). A number of comments were made in response to the survey that are important to consider the details of the challenges of placing the archives division under the library. Some of the participants said the following: “there was the general lack of value given to archives in a library setting, which often has to do with the differing focus of the professions. The service-oriented library functions will have a higher profile and valued more than archives”. Some of the participants indicated that “it is that much harder for archivists within the library setting to market the value of their archival holdings to their peer and co-workers”.

The reasons for placement in libraries include:

- ❖ libraries use archival materials to provide support for research and educational activities in universities.
- ❖ academic libraries provide students access to primary sources to use in their daily lives whether the purpose is for academic success, to solve a problem or to create new knowledge.

The reasons for placement of records management functions in the office of the registrar include:

- ❖ the registrar is responsible for information management, including document scanning, archival and file destruction.
- ❖ the registrar plays a role in the university’s and academic operations by effectively managing the maintenance and integrity of all students’ academic records.
- ❖ the registrar ensures the integrity, accuracy, and security of all academic records of current and former students.

Some participants indicated that libraries are common administrative placement for university archives and manuscripts repositories. This view is alluded to by Delaney and De Jong (2015) and Noonan and Chute (2014:202) who found that there is a historical relationship between archives management and library management. Libraries and archives have traditionally fulfilled a societal role as a collector and guardian of social and cultural records. Archival and library services play a role to facilitate access to collections under their care so that they

are accessible for education and research purposes (Segaetsho & Mnjama 2012). Libraries and archives involve maintaining a reference collection for researchers, education and the university community (Segaetsho & Mnjama 2012). ARM is guided by collection management and metadata standards. Different relationships between archives and libraries are evident at national and state levels in the USA (Williams 2006:24). In Canada, the influence of librarians led the Public Archives Act of 1912 to favour the historical attributes of archives over the administrative and evidential functions. As demonstrated by the National Archives of Canada and the National Library of Canada in 2002, the relationship was strong to form library and archives Canada. In the United States of America, the Library of Congress collected the archives of the Federal Government before the National Archives of United States of America. At the University of Minnesota in the USA, collaboration between the director of archives and special collections and the university librarian played an essential role during the digitisation project in the USA (Calahan & Dietrick 2016:116). According to Leresche (2008), archivists and librarians have the shared responsibilities of preserving institutional heritage. The heritage comprised documents created by university administrators and other institutions in carrying out their functions. All the ARM programmes share the concern of making their resources known and enabling access to society. The findings of this study coincide with the notion stated by Leresche (2008:2) who emphasised that the introduction of digital library initiatives reflect an awareness that various emphasises that institutions complement one another by bringing together the collection of archives.

The placement of the archives functions within the library department appears to have complicated the issue of archives management and this stems from the fact that ARM departments are seen as being less influential in the circle of university decision-making. The disadvantage is that most of the library administrators do not understand the archival functions and how they differ from the library functions. This factor can lead to tension, misunderstanding and the possible underfunding of the archival programme (Hunter 1997). One participant noted, “there is a disconnect in how higher university administrator view the role and competencies of archivists and records managers within the library department”.

The participants said that all ARM functions are placed under the Office of the Registrar. The placement of the ARM profession in the Office of the Registrar is the focal point of universities because the Office of the Registrar is responsible for governance. It seems that the Office of the Registrar is the most relevant

office for the placement of ARM functions based on the participants' responses. Placing the ARM function as part of the Office of the Registrar makes it easier for other internal departments to transfer the archival materials to archival custody. The participant expressed lack of understanding of where the ARM functions should reside within the university. One of the participants said that "I think that the placement of the ARM function in the Office of the Registrar is good, as it gives the department a mandate across all spheres in the university with a direct instruction from the registrar. Some of the participants indicated that "separation of ARM functions within the universities are unhelpful to an individual career development". Some participants indicated that they should see ARM functions as the overarching profession, just as other professions such as Information Technology. Some of the participants indicated that "the idea that records are part of governance is good as it puts us in a position to have oversight of the ARM programme. The department that is the final holder of the record, keeps/stores/retrieves/disposes it at the legal retention period".

The participants indicated that the ARM functions report to the Marketing and Communication and Stakeholders Liaisons Department. The researcher found that lack of awareness and appreciation of the importance of record-keeping and archiving is a major challenge for the universities, as more focus will not be placed on the ARM programme. Participants indicated that there are no university-wide ARM functions or, even in spite of them, programmes develop in individual offices in response to legal requirements and administrative need to manage all types of records created within the university. This means that each and every department preserves and collects its records within their university

The participants were asked at what level archivists and records managers should be placed in the university's organisational structure. As reflected in tables 1, 2 and 3, archivists and records managers are almost placed at middle management or junior level. Twenty-three of participants indicated that they perform the functions of both archives and records management. Some of the participant said that "I truly believe this to be a specialist position that should, at a minimum, be at executive management as the position requires digital knowledge and expertise as well as records management sensibilities". These findings are alluded to by Van Wyk and Du Toit (2016:114) who indicate that archives and records management functions need to be placed at a statutory decision-making level, where the institutional repository is recognised and incorporated into higher education institutions' governance processes.

The challenge of the blurry line of ARM functions is the emergence of digital records, and the skills required to manage records effectively and securely are in the IT domain, as reflected by Ngoepe and Katuu (2017). The position of archivists and records managers requires intense collaboration between records and archives management, IT and governance. If ARM functions are not recognised, products that are not in line with the requirements of ARM functions are purchased and designed by IT for users, which could lead to loss of institutional memory.

Obtaining support of senior management for the ARM functions is essential for the effective development of the ARM profession. The university is in the process of education in order to raise awareness. This is confirmed by other participants who said that “maintaining effective and efficient records systems is a management issue. This means that if ARM functions are not being managed, it opens the debate about the placement of ARM in the institution. The researcher believes that ARM programmes are to be regarded as part of strategic planning and development, especially since we exercise or are expected to exercise a direction-giving and advisory function, as well as manage secure digital repositories for records and documentation. This is alluded to by Egwunyenga (2009) who indicates that record keeping occupies a strategic position in the efficient and effective management of the university system. In some universities, the Archives Department has been established as a unit inside the university library system, with the archivists and records manager report to the librarian.

6.2 The role of archives and records in supporting the university functions

The participants were asked what inform the role of archives and records in supporting the university functions. The majority of participants stated that it is informed by legal mandates or records management requirements, as the university is expected to improve records retrieval and save space. The university was responding to the legal requirements such as the National Archives and Records Service Act of 1996, the Higher Education Act of 2007 and the Public Finance Management Act of 1999 for public accountability through ARM functions. The participants indicated that it was a result of the need to preserve the historical records. Legal requirements compliance in the university was cited as the most important aspect for the creation of ARM positions, even though emphasised was not considered on the placement or reporting.

The participants were asked whether their ARM policies clarify the role of ARM functions in supporting the university functions. Eighteen participants indicated that their university has an approved ARM policy. Participants cited lack of ARM-approved policies as the main obstacle to the management of ARM functions. ARM best practices recommend that ARM functions should develop policies that address boundaries of ARM functions. Most of the university respondents develop ARM policy; however, the policy does not address placement and reporting line of the archives and records management functions. Regardless of their placement or reporting line, the responses indicated that they recognise policy as an essential element of determining influence of organising the records.

7. Conclusion and recommendations

The following general conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of the data collected from various South African universities. Placement and reporting of archives and records management functions are essential to manage institutional memory. Integrating the archives and records management functions may be seen as a fight for survival of the profession going forward. This is so because records management and archives professionals share a long relationship in terms of collections and disseminating information. Because of the emergence of technology, there must be a renewed focus on the interdependency between the two professions. University management should support the development of the ARM programme to ensure placement of the ARM programme in the strategic position and visibility of the profession. ARM functions should be placed in and report to the same head of archives and records management. The archives and records management position within the university should be placed higher within the university organisational structures.

In view of the findings of the study which are presented and discussed above, the study makes recommendations as outlined below.

- ❖ Records and archives functions should be combined and moved out of the library so that they have an identity of their own.
- ❖ Placement of these professionals should be at a higher level such as director level. Having a head of ARM to oversee all ARM activities in the universities will provide the leadership that is currently lacking in South African universities.
- ❖ Universities should develop a standard for the records and archives management placement.

References

- An, X, Bai, W, Deng, H, Sun, S, Zhong, W & Dong, Y. 2017. A knowledge management framework for effective integration of national archives resources in China. *Journal of Documentation* 73(1): 18-34
- Atulomah, C & Ilishan-Remo, R. 2011. Perceived records management practice and decision making among university administrators in Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Available at: <http://unllib.unL.edu/LPP/> (Accessed 29 January 2019).
- Brendan, A.E. 2013. The readiness of universities in managing electronic records: a study of three federal universities in Nigeria. *The Electronic Library* 31(6): 792-807.
- Broady-Preston, J. 2008. Professional education, development and training in a web 2.0 environment, a case study of the UK. Paper read at the 7th International Globenet Conference, “Globalization, and the Management of information Resources”, Sofia, Bulgaria, 12-14 November 2018 (Accessed 10 January 2019)
- Bunting, I. 2006. The higher education landscape under apartheid. *Higher Education Dynamics* 10(1): 35-52.
- Calahan, L & Dietrick, K. 2016. Setting the Stage and keeping sane: implementing ArchivesSpace at the University of Minnesota. *Journal of Archival Organization* 13(3-4): 114 -126.
- Calhoun, K. 2014. *Exploring digital libraries foundations, practice, prospects*. London: Facet.
- Choksy, E.B. 2008. Where RM should report to ensure effective electronic records management. *The information Management Journal* 42(2): 58-61.
- Cox, J.R. 2004. *Archives and archives in the information age*. London: Neal-Schuman Publishers, INC.
- Delaney, B & De Jong, A. 2015. Media Archives and Digital Preservation: Overcoming Cultural Barriers. *New Review of Information Networking* 20: 73-89.
- Department of Arts & Culture. 2007. *Records Management Policy Manual*. Pretoria. Department of Arts and Culture.
- Egwunyenga, J.E. 2009. Record Keeping in universities: associated problems and management options in South West geo-political zone of Nigeria. *International Journal of Education and Science* 1(2): 109-113.
- Franks, C.P. 2013. *Records and Information Management*. London: Facet books.
- Hunter, S.G. 1997. *Developing and maintaining practical archives. A how-to-do- it manual*. New York. Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc.

- Kaczmarek, J. 2006. Establishing a University Records Management Program from the inside out. MidWest Archives Conference. *Archival Issues* 30(1): 23-33.
- Kallberg, M. 2012. Archivists – a profession in transition? in Smeby J.C. (ed.). *Professions and Professionalism* 2(1): 27-41.
- Khumalo, B.J & Masuku, M. 2018. The self-worth of records and archives management students at the National University of Science and Technology, Bulawayo, Zimbabwe. *African Journal library, archives, and Information Science* 28(1): 49-60.
- Kulcu, O. 2009. Records management practices in universities: a comparative study of examples in Canada and Turkey. *The Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science* 33(1/2).
- Leresche, L. 2008. Libraries and archives: sharing standards to facilitate access to cultural heritage. Paper read at the World Library and Information Congress: 74th IFLA General Conference and Council, Quebec, Canada, 10 – 14 August (accessed 20 January 2019)
- Lihoma, P. 2008. Situation of archives in Africa: The case of National Archives of Malawi. *African Research & Documentation* 106.
- Luyombya, D & Sennabulya, S. 2012. An analysis of the public archives infrastructure in Uganda. *Comma*.
- Matangira, V. Katjiveri-Tjiuro, M & Hertha Lukileni, N. 2013. Establishing a university records management programmes: a case study of the University of Namibia. *Journal for Studies in Humanities and Social Sciences* 2(2). Available at: <http://hdi.handle.net/11070/1402> (Accessed 29 January 2019)
- Mnjama, N. 2002. Managing university records. *East and Southern African Regional Branch of International Council on Archives. ESARBICA Journal* 21: 32-40.
- Netshakhuma, N.S. 2019. The role of archives and records management legislations after colonialism in Africa: case of Southern Africa. *Records Management Journal* 29(1/2): 210-223.
- Ngoepe, M & Katuu, S. 2017. Provision of records created in networked environments in the curricula of institutions of higher learning in Africa. *New Review of Information Networking* 22(1): 1-12.
- Noonan, D & Chute, T. 2014. Data Curation and the University Archives. *The American Archivists* 77(1): 201-240.
- Pereira, R. (2018). Assessing the implementation of the National Archives and Records Services Act at Eduardo Mondlane University in Mozambique. *ESARBICA Journal* 37: 221-224.

- Phiri, J.M & Tough, G.A. 2018. Managing university records in the world of governance. *Records Management Journal* 28(1): 47-61.
- Ranson, S. 2018. *Education and democratic participation. The making of learning communities*. London. Routledge Publisher
- Richardson, A.J. 2008. Strategies in the development of accounting history as an academic discipline. Available at: <http://ach.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/13/3/247>. SAGE (Accessed 9 March 2019).
- Schina, B & Wells, G. 2002. University archives and records programs in the United States and Canada. *Archival Issues* 27(1): 35-51.
- Segaetsho, T & Mnjama, N. 2012. Preservation of library materials at the University of Botswana Library. *SASA Journal* 45:68.
- Shepherd, E & Yeo, G. 2003. *Managing records: A handbook of principles and practices*. London: Facet.
- Van Wyk, B & Du Toit, A.S.A. 2016. A survey of sustainable curation in research repositories of higher education institutions in Southern Africa. *African Journal of library, Archives and Information Science* 26(2): 107-116.
- Wagner, C.S. 1999. Integrated archives and records management programs at professional membership associations: a case study and a model. *The American Archivists* 62: 95-129.
- Wamukoya, M.J. 2015. Reflections on African archives: their role in meeting societal needs in the 21st century. *SASA Journal* 48: 14-20.
- Williams, C. 2006. *Managing Archives Foundations, Principles and Practice*. Oxford: Chandos.
- Woodward, E. 2015. Building relationships. The university archives, the university archivists, and the university's alumni. C & RL News.
- Zachs, L & Peri, F.M. 2010. Practices for college and university Electronic Records Management (ERM) programs: Then and Now. *The American Archivists* 73: 105-128.