

MINUTES
University Records Management Committee Meeting
November 14, 2002

Attendees

Susan Combs, David Farrell (UCB); Lynette Temple (UCD); Jennifer Jacobs, Penny White (UCI); Sonia Johnston (UCM); Russell Lewis (UCR); Chuck Piotrowski (UCSC); Paula Johnson, Linda Maczko (UCSD); Bill Westbrook (UCSF); Maria Shanle (OGC); Carolyn Baker, Nancy Capell, Judy Peck, Jane Sterzinger for Mike O'Neill, Helen Valness, Connie Williams (UCOP). Meta Clow (UCSB) listened to the afternoon session via telephone.

Introduction of new members

New members are Paula Johnson, Director, Administrative Records, UCSD; Russell Lewis, Purchasing Manager, UCR; Jennifer Jacobs, University Archivist, UCI; and Sonia Johnston, MSO-Administration, UCM.

Brief campus reports

UCM – Sonia Johnson has hired an assistant and is starting on a report scanning system.

UCI – Penny White mentioned that the Records Disposition Schedule (hosted on the Web by UCI) now has a link to the searchable version at UCOP, and other enhancements.

UCB – David Farrell reported on recruitment for a permanent archivist to replace Bill Roberts. The Bancroft is working on the problem of staffing and funding to handle Presidential records.

Policy revisions: charge to the Committee

Kristine Hafner, Acting Assoc VP and CIO, spoke about the policy revision effort in the context of the New Business Architecture (NBA) initiative. She distributed copies of the section of NBA that addresses the proposed future direction for policy and policy development. She encouraged thinking of UC as an information-based organization, and noted that decentralization in the 1990s in some situations resulted in more work falling to campuses and units, without the funding, time, staffing, authority, or standards to support the work.

Associate VP Hafner announced that beginning December 1 for the next year, Connie Williams will be primarily devoted to the assignment of revising the records policies. Concurrently, Assoc. VP Hafner is convening a group from throughout the UC system to provide input on the agenda and priorities for Information Technology policies. She will identify an agenda of these issues, including those that may overlap with records issues, and consider what tools and guidance UCOP can provide to campuses.

Discussion of the broader policy environment followed, including topics such as the need for a single set of university policies that allow for differences in campus implementation; whether policies in the Business and Finance Bulletin series are reaching those who need to use them; and much more.

RMP Bulletin recommendations and discussion

Due to changeover in staffing of the policy function in IR&C, RMP-1 and -2 have not progressed beyond the revisions dated Nov 2001. "Last call" comments received at this meeting, as well as previous comments from Coordination & Review, will be incorporated and final drafts circulated to the Committee before wider review.

Connie Williams presented a chart with recommendations for revision/reorganization of the RMP Bulletins. The project plan has been crafted with the following goals in mind, in addition to much

needed updating: increasing the usability and relevance of the bulletins; creating policies that are easy to keep up-to-date; improving identification of the scope and applicability of the policies (e.g., by means of more descriptive titles); refocusing the bulletins on general records topics, leaving function-specific matters with narrow interest to the area specialists; incorporating New Business Architecture principles wherever possible. The proposed plan appended to this document.

The policy discussion also included these topics: the need to strike the right balance between University-wide guidance and campus implementation; questions as to what extent procedures should be embedded in policy; and the notion of different policy “views” for different audiences, such as those who only need how-to lists, deans who only need to know the set of responsibilities associated with their role, etc.

There was specific discussion concerning the ongoing utility of RMP-3 - Forms Management Guidelines. As currently configured, with its concentration on centralized Planned Purchasing of multi-part paper forms, it does not match the reality of forms use in UC. The question is whether to update RMP-3 to incorporate online forms topics (including requirements for privacy statements), or to disperse those issues to other RMPs and the BFB-IS (Information Systems) series. The best path may become clearer as other RMPs take shape, and for now, it seems that RMP-3 can be left in place without doing harm.

Counsel Shanle asked that all the current Information Practices coordinators be included when the Committee gets to revisions of RMPs 7 through 12, which shift from Records Management to Information Practices issues (for example, public records and privacy). Several of the Records Coordinators also play the IP coordinator role at their locations, but most do not. After discussion of the proposal to cover Privacy and Public Records in separate bulletins (rather than the current combined treatment in RMP-8), the group generally accepted the concept.

RMP-10, Instructions for Responding to Subpoena – The audience for the bulletin as currently composed is likely limited to just a handful of individuals (IP coordinators). The practices at each campus/UCOP are so location-specific that if RMP-10 is revised, any University-wide guidance will need to be extremely general. The Committee was informed that the Office of the General Counsel does not at this time have a method for publishing and disseminating this kind of advice and wishes for it to remain a Business & Finance Bulletin.

Retention Schedule revision status

No formal report was given due to lack of time; however, work on the Retention Schedule will continue as part of the overall policy revision work plan.

HIPAA Presentation

Maria Faer, the Director of HIPAA & Corporate Compliance, joined the group after lunch. She gave an excellent overview of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 and its implementation at UC. HIPAA relates not only to Medical Centers and medical records per se, but also to business, finance, and legal services when provided to UC health care providers or health plans. UC is considered a single entity under HIPAA. However, UC is a “hybrid organization” in that it is both a provider and a plan. All individuals and units within UC that are subject to HIPAA must be identified. Covered units include student health services, athletic departments, DOE laboratories, and any research entities that interact with the Institutional Review Board (IRB). These units generate Protected Health Information (PHI) and must have policies, procedures, and training to comply with HIPAA requirements and respond to PHI records requests. At least two of the Records Coordinators have some responsibilities relative to HIPAA at their locations.

There will be new types of records with prescribed retention periods created as part of the HIPAA process. In discussion, it became apparent there may be HIPAA implications for campus Archives. Also, as the records policy revision/development progresses, the Records Management

Committee will need to coordinate with Maria Faer to include references to HIPAA and to point to HIPAA policies and Web site where appropriate.

UC Archivists Council report

Jennifer Jacobs reported on some of the UCAC's current projects. In conjunction with the UC History Digital Archives (<http://sunsite.berkeley.edu/uchistory/index.html>) at the Center for Studies in Higher Education, UCB, UCAC will (may?) sponsor a second All-UC Conference. The topic would be the history of science at UC.

UCAC remains concerned about "permanent" retention records designated for archives and issues surrounding their transfer and continuing viability if in electronic format. To this end, they have begun a survey of five record types that each campus archives is likely to collect, in order to learn how uniform or diverse the formats in which these records currently are being transferred might be. (The records are: press releases, biobibs/faculty lists, course catalogs, contracts and grants lists, and staffing lists.)

Although there is support in UCAC for the UCSD proposal to form a task force on electronic records in UC, the Council supports and offers to assist the records disposition schedules revision project. The offer of assistance is gratefully accepted by the Committee. Jennifer pointed to Yale University as having an archives-centric example of a retention schedule. (See: http://www.library.yale.edu/archives300/schedules_index.html)

Training Initiative and BOI input

At the previous Committee meeting, it was decided to propose that a presentation on records be added to the Business Officers Institute (BOI). The proposed 30-minute presentation (drafted by a group of four Committee members) was not accepted due to the already full BOI agenda; however, it was offered that the topic of records could be covered within the Information Technology presentation, which happened to be undergoing revision. Bullet points from the proposed records presentation were provided to the presenter for insertion into the IT presentation. Also, a contact list of campus Records Coordinators and links to key policies and laws were provided for the conference proceedings. BOI will provide attendee contact information to any campus Records Coordinator who wishes to make connections with these people. Anyone desiring this information should let Connie Williams know.

In discussion it was noted that many employees need everyday guidance on what to destroy or delete from the computer, and these tool kits, checklists, or training tips can be separate from policy. Lynette Temple noted there was an email liability class at her campus.

Records Coordinator code of ethics

Chuck Piotrowski posed the timely question of what to do if you see someone shredding records that should be kept, and more generally what to do about non-compliance with University records policies, requests for information, etc. During discussion, several suggestions were made, including: invoking the help of management, counsel, or internal audit as appropriate; stating concerns in writing to the individual or perhaps just "to file"; and reference to the "Rules of Conduct..." appended to RMP-8 (<http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/policies/bfb/rmp8.html#D>).

Other agenda items

Remaining agenda items were: discussion on the Revised Schedule for Gift Acceptance Records, Status of Academic Personnel Records within the Records Management program, and completion of the discussion on the RMP revision proposal. Discussion on these will take place on the Recman Listserv to the extent possible.

Date for next meeting

The goal is to meet in 4 to 5 months. The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

RMP Bulletin Recommendations – D R A F T

Project goals, in addition to much needed updating of this policy series, are as follows:

1. Increase the usability and relevance of the bulletins;
2. Create policies that are easy to keep up-to-date;
3. Improve identification of the scope and applicability of the policies (e.g., by means of more descriptive titles);
4. Defocus the bulletins on general records topics, leaving function-specific matters with narrow interest to the area specialists; and
5. Incorporate New Business Architecture principles where possible and appropriate.

| RMP # | Title | Current state/recommendation | Relationships to other IR&C policies | Proposed order of completion |
|-------|--|--|---|------------------------------|
| 1 | University Records Management Program | Draft revision dated Nov. 2001. Incorporate comments rec'd from C&R; final committee review; wider review; issuance | cited in ECP | 1 |
| 2 | Records Disposition Program and Procedures | Draft revision dated Nov 2001. Incorporate C&R comments; final committee review; wider review; issuance | cited in ECP, IS-3, IS-10 | 2 |
| | Records Disposition Schedules Manual | 1992 Manual, with over 2,000 individual 'record types,' is being converted to new format with fewer functional groupings; lengthy project is about ¼ done. | Procedures outlined in RMP-2; cited in IS-3 and IS-10 | |
| 3 | Forms Management Guidelines | Topic in flux with advances on Web; ensure issues covered elsewhere and consider rescission of this Bulletin | | |
| 4 | Vital Records Protection, <i>becomes:</i> Vital Records: Identification and Responsibilities | Draft revision completed Sept 2001; excise material other than vital records identification and responsibilities; rename; coordinate more tightly with IS series; then C&R; final committee review; wider review; issuance. Excised material to new bulletin (RMP-13) in conjunction with key topics from RMP-6. (will | cited in IS-3 and IS-10 | 3 |

| RMP # | Title | Current state/recommendation | Relationships to other IR&C policies | Proposed order of completion |
|-------|---|--|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | need to issue in concert with RMP-13) | | |
| 5 | Records Retention Program for Financial Documents Pertaining to Federal Awards to the University | Ensure topics covered in C&G manual with goal of rescission in coordination with Research Administration Ofc. | | |
| 6 | Microfilm Guidelines | Cover preservation and storage issues in a new bulletin (RMP-13) and rescind | | |
| 7 | Privacy of and Access to Information Responsibilities | Cover in revised RMP-8 and new bulletin RMP-15, and rescind RMP-7 | cited in ECP | |
| 8 | Legal Requirements on Privacy of and Access to Information, <i>becomes</i> : Collection, Maintenance and Release of Information About Individuals | Refocus RMP-8 on aspects of <i>information about individuals</i> , and rename. Excise public records material and create a separate new bulletin (RMP-15); include information about responsibilities from RMP-7; coordinate closely with OGC on restatement of laws | cited in ECP, IS-3 and IS-10 | 6 |
| 9 | Guidelines for Access to University Personnel Records by Governmental Agencies | Fold any relevant unique info into revised RMP-8; negotiate with functional areas (Academic Personnel, HR) to have them cover function-specific instructions in their own materials, with a goal of rescinding RMP-9 | | |
| 10 | Instructions for Responding to Subpoena | "Policy" content seems more appropriate for OGC to issue, and the strictly operational components should be dealt with at each location; see if OGC has a distribution method (advice letter?) and rescind, if so. | | |
| 11 | Student Applicant Records | Fold any relevant unique information into revised RMP-8; confirm with admissions directors a standalone bulletin not needed, with a goal of rescinding RMP-11 | | |

| RMP # | Title | Current state/recommendation | Relationships to other IR&C policies | Proposed order of completion |
|--------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| 12 | Guidelines for Assuring Privacy of Personal Information in Mailing Lists and Telephone Directories | Fold any unique info into revised RMP-8 and rescind | | |
| 13 | New: Records Maintenance, Storage, Protection and Preservation | Issue in concert with revised RMP-4 | relates to IS-3 and IS-10 | 4 |
| 14 | New: Electronic Records | Could take the form of guidelines (possible topics: retrieval, accessibility, media, formats, backup, authenticity, legality, responsibilities); or a compendium that points to other relevant policies/documents and states explicitly that existing policies and documents apply to electronic, as well as paper records. | relates to ECP, IS-3, IS-10 | 5 |
| 15 | New: Public Records | | relates to ECP | 7 |

Optimistic end result:

- RMP-1 University Records Management Program
- RMP-2 Records Disposition Program and Procedures (and companion Functional Records Disposition Manual)
- RMP-4 Vital Records: Identification and Responsibilities
- RMP-8 Collection, Maintenance and Release of Information about Individuals
- RMP-13 Records Maintenance, Storage, Protection and Preservation
- RMP-14 Electronic Records
- RMP-15 Public Records