

MINUTES

University Records Management Committee Meeting

May 7, 2003

Attendees

Susan Combs, David Farrell (UCB); Lynette Temple (UCD); Jennifer Jacobs, Penny White (UCI); Linda Arquieta (UCLA); Meta Clow (UCSB); Chuck Piotrowski (UCSC); Paula Johnson, Linda Maczko (UCSD); Maria Shanle (OGC); Carolyn Baker, Bea Deering, Mike O'Neill, Judy Peck, Connie Williams (UCOP); David Gaynon (LLNL).

Introductions

David Gaynon, Group Leader, Records Management, LLNL, attended the meeting for information.

Bea Deering is a business analyst working with Connie Williams on special projects.

Brief campus reports

UCSC – Chuck Piotrowski has been named UCSC University Archivist, in addition to his position as Campus Records Manager. He is coordinating policies on privacy, access, whistle blowing, SB 1386, the USA PATRIOT Act, and more in one unit.

General Counsel – Counsel Maria Shanle noted that University Counsel Cynthia Vroom is responsible for making campus presentations on the USA PATRIOT Act, legislation that broadly covers “business records related to terrorism” and library records of internet use and circulation. Jennifer Jacobs noted that circulation records for archivists’ special collections should be considered permanent.

LLNL – Dave Gaynon wants to be sure records retention at LLNL is consistent with UC policy, because most UC policies apply to the lab except those excluded by contract, and the issue could come up in an audit. He will consider whether having an LLNL rep on the committee would be helpful. Another option would be to have representation for all three labs handled by someone from the Office of the VP–Laboratory Management (UCOP).

UCSD – Paula Johnson reported on some of the activities of UCSD’s HIPAA workgroup. The scope of records thought to be covered by HIPAA is evolving: Originally, all medical information was considered covered Personal Health Information (PHI), but the definition has narrowed to information where there is a contract for medical services and money is paid. For example, human resources records contain medical information but where there is no billing relationship, they aren’t covered. For help one can go to the campus HIPAA privacy official or Maria Faer at UCOP.

UCOP – Mike O'Neill explained the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act of 1999, which specifies how banks store information and what records can/can't be shared. UC is considered a “financial institution” in the area of student loans and must comply, but is exempt from the bill’s privacy regulations because of FERPA. UC is substantially in compliance now, and an addendum to BFB IS-3 will cover G-L-B requirements. Although not a concern for the Committee at this time, a reference to G-L-B may be added to RMP-8.

Connie Williams reported that Kristine Hafner has been appointed permanently to the position Associate VP--IR&C and CIO. Kris is recruiting for a policy director.

Policy revisions: Overall strategy, RMP-1 status

Connie Williams is still collecting comments on RMP-1 from the campuses. After incorporating these, RMP-1 will go to administrative vice chancellors, then to required employee review for 30 days. The policy was drafted utilizing a Word template that Bea Deering created, which will be used for subsequent RMPs. Campuses should contact Bea directly if they want the template for their own use.

Discussion followed on the applicability of RMP-1 to the DOE labs. Dave Gaynon explained that the UC/DOE contract defines university records and federal records, and requires following the standard for retention on the date a contract is signed. However, ambiguity and confusion occur. For example, jurisdiction changes with funding, some records are “unscheduled” or unspecified, and the federal schedule does not cover records the way they are created. This may result in “force fitting” some records into the federal schedule. Generally, lab employees follow the federal standard unless the UC retention period is longer; however, some employees aren’t well informed of UC standards. To help with this, LLNL has its own retention schedule based on the federal schedule.

Connie invited Dave to participate in the RMC, join the list serve, monitor what UC is doing, and bring up any problems, such as instances in which the university retention period is longer than the federal.

UC Archivists Council report

The UC Archivists Council (UCAC) met on April 25, 2003. Jennifer Jacobs reported on UCAC’s suggested language for RMP-1 and RMP-2. Although in the past the archivists may have wanted minimal mention in the RMPs, they now want to be more visible. For example, they want to introduce the idea in RMP-2 that “records that have enduring administrative, legal, historical, or research value shall be transferred to the University Archives as prescribed by the Records Retention and Disposition Schedules.” However, archives should not become a records center. When the Schedule states records should go “to archives,” they suggest adding “contact archivist first.” Jennifer provided the list of what archivists consider campus-level core administrative records taken from the Policies for Administration of UC Archives.

UCAC is cooperating with UCSD on an IT project to determine how online courses are to be retained, what electronic version is the record, and how to access this information later. David Farrell reported that in coordination with the Center for Studies in Higher Education (CSHE), he is planning a second all-university history conference, this time on the theme of history of science and technology.

Coordination with other entities

Coordination with LLNL was covered above.

Coordination with UC Information Technology Policy and Security group (UCITPS) – Connie Williams reported on establishment of a relationship between the Records Management Committee and the UCITPS, an informal group of people from all the campuses and UCOP with common interests in IT policy and security issues. UCITPS will be a good group from which to get input on the policy revisions. UCITPS sees the Records Management Committee as being able to help their group by establishing a retention period for server logs. Currently there is no guidance from either the records or the IT community, and practices throughout the University differ widely. The pros and cons of creating a schedule were discussed, with no definitive conclusion on whether such logs meet the University definition of a *record*.

RMP-2

The UCAC contributed new material that elaborates on dealing with records that have been identified in the disposition schedules as being “permanent” and to be transferred to University Archives. The group discussed “how permanent is permanent?” Paula Johnson suggested thinking of a record’s relationship to Standing Orders and delegations of authority as an indication of permanency.

Jennifer Jacobs clarified what the archivists see as enduring traditional archives vs. administrative records central storage. The archivists are interested in broadening the material they accept because sometimes an administrative record memorializes a historic change for the campus. The archivists feel it is their responsibility to identify this type of record before it is disposed of. The process will be subjective and individual, and this is why it is important to state "contact Archivist first," before records are transferred. Perhaps it would be sufficient for archivists to know where this sort of record is kept rather than collecting it. It may be useful to refer to historical records relating to legal, business, or administrative business processes as "administrative historical," "legal historical," "research historical," etc.

Retention Subcommittee Report

Penny White reported that the retention subcommittee is continuing its work rewriting and updating the records retention schedule.

Design proposal – new retention schedule online view

Bea Deering demonstrated the searchable Records Retention Schedule application that she is designing. It is built for the reworked systemwide schedule, which lists broader, functional categories of records, rather than the current line-item listing by record name or type. Campuses will be able to upload their location-specific records into the database and associate them with the functional categories.

The group liked the design. Suggestions were made to increase the information presented, such as an indication of a record's confidentiality or whether it is a public record, and information on legal requirements. There was discussion on whether there could be a thesaurus to aid in keyword searches.

The transition plan for moving from the current to the new online Schedule has been to upload sections as they are completed by the retention subcommittee, and to point to the new environment from the current one for those sections. Linda Maczko suggested treating the new application as the production environment, instead, and pointing users who don't find what they're looking for to the old (current) online schedule. The group asked if the design could be put online for comments or discussed by conference call. Chuck Piotrowski and Penny White will help with beta testing when the time comes. Everyone was enthusiastic about the ease of use and clarity of the new application.

Retention issues: gift acceptance records; construction documents (media issues); encryption

Due to lack of time to discuss, these issues will be followed-up on the listserv.