University of California Archivists Council

Meeting Minutes, April 30, 1997

Members present: John Skarstad (UCD), Sid Berger (UCR), Dave Tambo (UCSB), William Roberts (UCB), Deborah Day (UCSD-Scripps), Jackie Dooley (UCI), Robin Chandler (Recorder, UCSF), Brad Westbrook (Convener, UCSD)

Not Present: Charlotte Brown (UCLA), Rita Bottoms (UCSC)

Old Business:

I) UCAC Governance

It was reported that Peter Briscoe, Representative to the Collection Development Committee (CDC) had suggested to the CDC that the Heads of Special Collections (HOSC) and the UCAC should not be sanctioned members of the CDC.

Jackie Dooley indicated that Brian Schottlaender, AUL UCLA, thought defining UCAC differently from other CDC groups would lend support to the UCAC request for CDC sanction. Schottlaender also suggested that the UCAC Chair should attend CDC Meetings

In context of this discussion, UCAC members decided UCAC activity warrants two meetings a year, and a schedule of quarterly meetings could be established - two for HOSC and two for UCAC - throughout the year.

Finally, it was decided to revise the UCAC Mission Statement, including in it a statement of the professional concerns of the UC archivists, projects underway and anticipated, plans, expectations for two meetings per years, liaison role to CDC and Records Management Council, and description of committee mechanics re: leadership, agendas, minutes, etc.

> **ACTION:**
>
> 1) Chair will redraft statement and forward to CDC and Liaison from CDC Peter Briscoe.
>
> This action was completed in May 1997, and a copy of the memo was forwarded to all UCAC members.

2) Chair will draft an outline of responsibilities for Chair and Vice-Chair

This action completed just before 4 Nov. 1997 meeting.

3) Chair will talk with Brian Schottlaender about having UCAC Chair be present at the CDC meetings.

This action is contingent upon CDC officially recognizing UCAC as a sub-committee.

II. E-mail Policy:

Deborah Day reported that changes in the UC e-mail policy now public reflect the concerns UCAC discussed at the UCAC Spring 1996 meeting and forwarded to UCOP.

III. Core Records (Bill Roberts led discussion)

See Handouts: Core Records List & Draft Record Schedule for the Development Office

The purpose of the discussion is to identify core records to be collected at each campus in order to provide basic documentation of the University of California.

General discussion about aspects of the Core Records List:

· whether or not to include vice chancellor(s) in the Chancellor's Office

· clarification of purpose: intended to capture the highest level of records and the list of core records is flexible - subject to implementation at each campus

· clarification of intended audience, i.e. the larger purpose of this document is for UCAC to identify core records needed to be collected to serve as justification for additional resources

· suggestion that a functional statement be added for each item on list to clarify the utility of core records for administrators in library as well as for records creators. Helen Samuel's book "Varsity Letters" is a good resource

· heated discussion of what constitutes essential/core records which clarified that these are records that reflect the mission of the

university in teaching, research and public service, but the longest debate focused on the question whether or not the records of Department Chairs, ORUs, and Institutes are to be added to the list of essential or core records?

Specific discussion about elements on Core Records List:

· include under publications materials such as Environmental Impact Reports (EIR) and PPIMS

· suggestion to break down publications into Administrative/non-Administrative

· are newsletters from Academic departments required?

· review of the new draft records schedule for the Development Office which recommends that the records generated from gifts over $ 1 Million, foreign gifts, and endowments be considered permanent records intended for archival retention (these records include UDEV 100 forms, gift acceptance letters and the donor's letter of the gift.

> **ACTION:**
> Bill Roberts and Robin Chandler will draft functions/activities of these core offices in a 1st tier and 2nd tier of importance - based on the Varsity Letters approach. These statements will be presented for review/approval at next UCAC meeting.

New Business:

 I. UC Archives Collection Policies - Round Robin discussion

UCSD University Archives (UA) has currently revised the collection policy. First area of action has been the elimination of many duplicate university publications collected in the Library collections. This decision refined the collection scope, consequently putting some UCSD publications out of scope. The UCSD Archives will collect publications about the university, but not publications published by university offices but not about the university.

 UCSD Archives has created an organizational chart of all administrative offices, staff support groups, and student groups and is pre-assigning record group numbers to inhibit the splitting of record groups on the basis of personality and to heighten awareness of the hierarchial relationship of one record group to another so that duplication of information might be reduced. UCSD Archives's classification of record

group descends only to the primary administrative unit level or department chair. Secondary administrative units are not collected except by virtue of being represented in the records of the primary administrative office.

Other campuses provided handouts of their collection policies.

Discussion:

Collection policies are generally two to three paragraph statements defining areas of collecting, and a collection strategy is the plan by which to attain those goals in the collection policy. Some archivists see the record group system as dying a deserved death - they take too much time to maintain. Others feel that record groups will provide the advantage of knowing your organizational history

Some archivists feel one important criteria for determining which faculty papers to collect can be determined by which faculty are getting the grants.

Discussion concluded about record groups with the observation that common practice for UC Archivists is to assign incoming collections accession numbers and, as accretions accumulate for a department or faculty member, to assign a collection number, which serves as an umbrella number linking the accumulated accessions.

Discussion shifted to the idea that specific campuses could be responsible for specific areas of collecting system-wide, which would lead to strong cooperation across campuses in the areas of collecting and processing. As an example, it was noted that the British Archives of Contemporary Science (BACS) funded by the Royal Society specifically processes scientific papers and then transfers the records to appropriate universities for access. Such a program implemented at UC might mean that UCSD would become a center for primary source material in the area of theoretical physics.

Robin Chandler described a project underway to develop a collaborative collecting model focusing upon the development of an archival collecting model for the field of biotechnology to acquire original papers, manuscripts and records from selected individuals, organizations and corporations as well as participating in the effort to capture oral history interviews with many biotechnology pioneers. This project combines the strengths of the existing UCSF Biotechnology Archives with the UCB Program in the History of the Biological Sciences and Biotechnology, and it will contribute to an overall picture of the growth and impact of biotechnology in the Bay Area. During 1997, Robin

Chandler is interviewing scientists in academia and industry, UC administrators, and corporate information keepers. Products resulting from this collaboration will include specific archival appraisal guidelines for biotechnology papers and records to be used by archivists for selecting records; identification of specific papers and records for UCSF and UCB to collect from academia and industry, and project recommendations to UC and industry for actions needed.

There are natural pools of subject expertise at our UC campuses that could be utilized for assistance with processing. In addition, the UC EAD project is a another tool that could be used to monitor and coordinate collecting across UC.   One of the goals of UC EAD is better coordination of subject collection development across campuses, which could leverage additional financial and staffing support for arrangement and description as well as better coordination of processing expertise. For example, discussion focused on the documentation of Japanese-Americans throughout the UC Libraries. The availability of finding aids on the internet through the UC-EAD project will provide a means for assessing where subject strengths and weaknesses exist across the UC Libraries systemwide. This information can foster the development of coordinated collection policies between the campuses. Further discussions at our future meetings are needed to address cooperative collecting, cooperative processing, and additional means for leveraging the UC-EAD project.

II. Documenting / Collecting Web Pages

Dave Tambo asked if any of the UC Archives were actively investigating the collection/preservation of campus web pages. This grew into a larger discussion of the need to preserve electronic records. At the SAA Annual Meeting in Chicago - August 1997, Phil Bantin of Indiana University will be presenting a status report on his project to implement the University of Pittsburgh Functional Requirements as part of his Electronic Records Keeping Project. The UC Records Schedule does not have a schedule for electronic records; however, UCSD has recognized the need to get better control and has established a special task force to examine electronic records at risk. They particularly focused on daily financial records that the university is obligated to preserve for a period of time for legal and fiscal purposes.

It was suggested that UCAC establish a means for internal review of electronic record keeping practices. Our first step should be to determine who has a model we can use for assessment. The Indiana University (IU) Project might provide a model. Our second step should be to determine what kinds of electronic records are on our individual campuses - and would the IU model fit our University?   Note that the

central records at UCSD are now being digitized, as well as being retained in paper until confidence in the electronic system is such that the paper system can be abandoned. It was pointed out that many other campuses are digitizing central records also. There are also system-wide initiatives for standardizing digitization projects for records in contracts and grants, human resources, and student affairs--areas in which campuses must frequently share information either with each other or with UCOP.

ACTION:

Chair will examine the possibility of UCAC sponsoring a Retreat/Symposium which invites University Archivists, Records Managers, Heads of Systems to discuss a means to introduce the archival concept of secondary use for preserving electronic records and the need to retain archival control over widely decentralized electronic information.

This action was reported in 4 Nov. 97 meeting.

III. Electronic Thesis and Dissertations

University Microfilms (UMI) is now accepting dissertations in the PDF format. Additionally, UMI is taking dissertations in legacy microfilm and transferring these into the PDF format. The advantage of PDF is that it can be made available on the web without marking up the document, and it is readily printed.

UMI is examining business models and is considering per page charges for web access. UMI may look at the dissertation document type definition (DTD) being developed at Virginia Tech and the University of Virginia. Possibly, students will be required to submit dissertations in the ETD DTD format. Virginia Tech is currently saving $17,000 a year by providing dissertations on the web - this is cost savings from bindery, handling, servicing and shelf space. The beta test at Virginia Tech is as follows: 1) student brings in dissertation to the graduate program, where a technician checks the coding; 2) document is placed on server; 3) library catalogs the item; and 4) version transferred to UMI. Some of the cost of the process are transferred to student - who must code the dissertation, and to the user. who pays for access. Note that UMI gets the license to provide copies, but the student still retains the copyright.

The University of Waterloo is also currently involved in dissertation electronic conversion. The question is what can be leveraged out of UMI? Can a licensing arrangement be agreed upon that will provide Universities free access to their dissertations?