

MINUTES
RECORDS MANAGEMENT MEETING ~ JULY 18, 2001

Introductions/Campus Reports

Meredith O'Connor, who had assisted the Committee with sponsored research records matters, has left UCOP for a job at Stanford. Anyone with suggestions of campus individuals with knowledge of contracts & grants operations, who might be able to assist with the Research section of the retention schedule revision, is asked to pass along the name(s) to Connie Williams.

Serena Dionysus attended on behalf of the Santa Cruz campus and announced that Dayoan Rivera's replacement had just been hired and will attend the next meeting.

Clery Act Retention Requirements

The next report, about the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act, concerned a records retention requirement. The ruling states that the campus must maintain security records that document its annual security report for three years following the last year the information is included in the report. For example, an incident or crime reported in 2001 would be included in the Annual Security Report in 2002, 2003 and 2004, so record of the incident must be kept until October 2007. The retention schedule should be 7 years and include the following records: campus police logs and crime investigation reports; requests to and response from local police for crime statistics; instructions and requests for incident reports as well as submitted reports; timely warning notices and copies of campus policies and procedures.

The official online version of the Records Retention Schedule Manual, maintained by UCI, will be updated with new descriptive language and time limits per these requirements. Martha will provide an updated description for inclusion.

Electronic Records Task Force Proposal

Robert Zornado gave an update on his and Brad Westbrook's proposal for an Electronic Records Task Force, which they submitted to SOPAG (Systemwide Operations & Planning Advisory Group) in June. SOPAG reports to the University Librarians' group. SOPAG had some questions which Robert and Brad answered in a revised proposal which was, at the time of our meeting, about to be re-submitted (on July 27). A copy was also sent to Associate VP Campbell.

RMP-1 & RMP-2 Revisions

Three outstanding questions in RMP-1, dealing with responsibilities and jurisdictional issues, were discussed and resolved. In review of RMP-2, page 5, it was decided that a paragraph regarding data warehouses was necessary since the guidelines do not reflect this area. Martha Winnacker will draft a paragraph for insertion. Connie Williams will draft language reflecting the new procedures for modifying the retention schedules, replacing the form currently provided as Exhibit B to RMP-2 for that use. The various "record" definitions must be resolved before RMP-1 and RMP-2 can be forwarded outside the Committee for review.

Definition of Records

The elements of record definition are:

1. recorded—regardless of media/format
2. documents action
3. documents policy/organization/function
4. has value
5. related to transactions of /on behalf of University
6. created/received by organizational unit
7. retained

The 3 definitions of University records found in RMP-1, ECP and RMP-8, define university records as public records. This needs to be changed since there are public records that are not university records (i.e. non-records). The questions raised are as follows:

- define University record, then administrative record
- just define administrative records
- define university records, include academic record in scope

It was decided that Martha will integrate all comments on definition of records and send it out for review.

RMP-4

The group decided to delete references to "preservation" since the term has a specialized meaning to archivists. Connie Williams will research to verify whether the Bulletin should apply to records of the Regents Officers. Vital records will continue to be indicated on the Records Retention and Disposition Schedules. The relationship between Vital Records and "Essential" electronic records was clarified. These and other changes will appear in the next draft for the Committee's review.

Retention Schedule Status

The Purchasing and Equipment sections have been disseminated for review by their respective university-wide managers groups. Payroll and then Accounting Schedules will follow next.

So far most responses to the draft Schedules have focused on the retention of specific forms rather than the grouping of forms into categories. It is hoped that campus Records Coordinators will have better luck one-on-one with their constituents working in the specific functional areas. The first two sections (Purchasing and Equipment) will be reformatted, removing references to current line item form listings, and sent to Committee members for local review.

The Committee deferred discussion of the official sign-off and publication processes. Suggestions for these should be directed to the listserv, specifically:

- How to point to the new Schedules as segments are covered serially, and
- How will new Schedule function in relation to campus Schedules.

Housekeeping

The next meeting will be scheduled for late October, with half of the day devoted to training for Records people only and the other half attended by the entire Records Management Committee.