

Preservation/Retention Committee
July 10, 2008

Attendees

Paul Sullivan

Kip Drew

Dan Rives

Phil Bantin

Steve Keucher

Jason Baumgartner

Mark

Discussion Items

D1. Paul opened the meeting stating that many of the rules surrounding records retention have laws pertaining to how long, etc. they should be kept. In some instances there are federal requirements about student records. Mark noted we need an inventory of university policies. Phil noted that there are few laws, but mostly “best practices”. For instance I-9 forms are required to be kept for a specific period of time. Phil has information on his website with some of this information on it pertaining to Bloomington Registrar. About three years ago a policy was crafted regarding retention for faculty records; contacted the dean of faculties on all campuses.

D2. Mark noted there will be issues around how things are stored. This group needs to discuss the scope of work of this subcommittee. Are we going to deal with paper as well as electronic? There is concern about how paper documents are held and discarded. Phil stated that there is a tendency to retain too much. Paul noted that a great deal of material has been transitioned from paper to electronic. Some offices scanned paper materials into system and discarded paper; some are continuing to do so. Kip noted that she is not sure if paper should be discarded when she scans it into the system. Because of the insecurity surrounding the long-term use of systems like OnBase, people keep paper.

D3. Should this subgroup try to identify the ideal environment? Should they make recommendations? Phil noted that there is a lot of literature on these topics available. Phil advocates setting up functional requirements. Kip advocates training people like her to know when to discard paper when materials are scanned into an electronic environment. System includes, hardware, resource, people, software, management, access, etc.

D4. Paul indicates that we are fairly narrowly focused on data; should we expand further to include e-mail or other types of information that the CDS may not normally encompass? Dan gave the example of a personnel file now including information in e-mail form which normally would have been only in other paper or electronic forms. Dennis notes that UITS is looking at e-mail archiving solutions from a technical perspective – part of that is to eliminate e-mail quotas. This might allow for methods to address some needs for archiving, both personal and institutional.

D5. Paul talked about the whole web environment. Phil noted that we are crawling every website now and archiving in Internet Archives (this doesn't provide good access and only crawls every six months). Research Libraries Group (RLG) partnered with Internet Archives to provide better access and the ability to tailor crawling schedule (<http://www.archiveit.org>). Should we take a closer look and decide if we need to get permissions for this? Mark doesn't see the need for permissions, but we should publish this more widely so people are aware that we are doing this. For example, there would be a copy of school bulletins at a point in time. In lieu of another trustworthy system, we have a web version being archived.

D6. Mark distributed documents regarding archiving of materials at other institutions. Phil says we have similar approval from the Faculty Council giving permission to archive materials. Phil indicates we should get approval from Board of Trustees. Purpose paragraph – where we want to start to determine what we need to do. This includes a reference to state laws, etc. Mark noted that almost all the documents he reviewed started with the same language. Phil and the library went to President Herbert to get authority to designate Phil as the Records Manager – this was signed by President Herbert.

D7. Mark's other documents from Adams State College (Colorado) had good definitions. Mark can send URL or electronic version of documents. Phil notes that most state institutions are closely aligned with state archives. Data Stewards are going to be in a position to set standards and policies. We need to provide more concrete directives about what goes into a trusted repository. Another issue Paul raised was the lack of need for anyone to keep duplicates.

D8. Example of a problem experienced at IU. Employee expired – HR discarded file including beneficiary designation. This would point to a need to keep the file for a long enough period of time for the estate to be settled. Everything this group does needs to be thought of in terms of the Institution. Paul noted that many of the guidelines do not apply across the board. Having discrete policies regarding retention time, allows an institution to decline a request for information it does not have. These policies must be consistent though. Mark indicates that this group would then set policies or guidelines or “best practices” which would assist departments in keeping or discarding documents. At this point in time, these policies and procedures are determined department by department.

D9. Dan asked if it is possible to specify where records are retained. Phil is responsible for storing records under specific guidelines. The destruction part of this is as important as where they are stored. Paul used an example of performance reviews; most do not send to HR. In this case we have to rely on departments to keep these for a specified period of time. Kip does not think it is necessary to send to a central location from a legal standpoint, but group feels that it would be best to keep in a central location because all departments won't understand the need to keep them safe. Many things constitute a person's personnel files, including anything a manager might store in their desk drawer. Kip indicates that it's okay for a department to have their own means of storing these. We cannot say only that which is in HR counts. HR can produce guidelines for departments though. Phil indicates that people currently send things to the warehouse;

there is no control over the environment – suggests that the university consider a real “storage center”. A great deal of what we are discussing is paper-based. As we go forward, more and more is going to be electronic. Where is the control?

Action Items

A1. Kip will work with Phil on putting together an inventory of current retention policies. Identify any gaps.

A2. Phil will put together a campaign this fall to publicize the ArchiveIT initiative and the fact that we are crawling and storing and making accessible the information on IU websites.

A3. Look at purpose and scope in Massachusetts documents before meeting on the 21st.

A4. Phil will get a copy of the BFC policy.

A5. Mark will send copies of handouts from today’s meeting to Phyllis