

University of California Archivists Council

Meeting Minutes

November 4, 1997

Brad Westbrook, Chair (UCSD)
Robin L. Chandler, Recorder (UCSF)

Present: Bill Roberts (UCB), John Skarstad (UCD), Deborah Day (SIO), Charlotte Brown (UCLA), Sid Berger (UCR), Rita Bottoms (UCSC), Brad Westbrook (UCSD), Robin Chandler (UCSF)

I. Approval of Minutes

Minutes approved.

Discussion: UCAC Chair raised question about what should be done with the approved minutes from each meeting. Members agreed they should be shared with the UC Community through a UCAC website, because of ongoing and future issues that need public awareness concerning technical issues.

ACTION ITEM: Brad Westbrook agreed to establish UCAC website and add minutes to it.

II. Old Business

1. UCAC Governance

a. Chair circulated a draft document outlining the responsibilities of UCAC Officers - the Chair and the Vice Chair - for comments from UCAC membership

ACTION ITEM: Brad Westbrook will edit the governance document to include the following comments:

- Date the document
- Eliminate specific calendar years campus representatives will serve - and change to subsequent two year periods for time of service
- Responsibilities of UCAC Officers will go on the website along with the UCAC mission statement and meeting minutes

Chair Responsibilities:

- Add Records Management Committee to liason groups and emphasize our external liason responsibilities outside of Library Groups to UCOP
- Expand responsibilities to include UCAC mission

- Correct disseminating to dissemination

Vice-Chair Responsibilities:

- Add that Vice-Chair will assume responsibilities of Chair as needed
- Add in the event Chair resigns/leaves current employment the responsibilities of Chair will roll-over to the Vice-Chair, who will then assume the job for a two year period.

b. No response has been received from the Chair of the CDC in regards to UCAC letter requesting official affiliation with CDC. As point of reference, HOSC has not heard from CDC regarding similar letter.

2. Core Record Discussion Continuation (Bill Roberts/Robin Chandler)

As discussed at the last UCAC meeting, defining a selection of core archival records to be preserved within the context of the University of California would be well served by reviewing the functions described by Helen Samuels in Varsity Letters. For the purposes of the discussion, Bill Roberts provided membership with a handout of Samuel's functional categories for institutions of higher education. The following comments/discussion stemmed from examination of this handout.

Main Topic 1: Convey Knowledge

Subtopic 1: Curriculum

Discussion: To document curriculum, UCSD is considering collecting only the Academic Senate Educational Committee Records. Discussion noted that the old model for developing curriculum rested authority/responsibility in individual departments. The new model for curriculum development is the overarching hierarchical structure - the Academic Senate Educational Committee oversees this responsibility.

Decision: UCAC Core Records for Curriculum are catalogs and curriculum studies from Academic Senate Educational Committee.

Subtopic 2: Teaching

Who Teaches:

Discussion: Bio-Bibs are the official university record for faculty - they are filled out by faculty and updated periodically. Depending on the campus, the office of origin is Academic Personnel, Alumni Office or the Development Office. Why are the Bio-Bib's important? They are a one-stop shopping place for information on faculty. However, it was noted that some campuses get information about their faculty from the Chronicle of Higher Education and Guggenheim reports.

What is Taught:

Discussion: Samuel's perspective is that this is a very difficult function to document, and many in UCAC observed that what is taught can be gleaned from the faculty files we preserve as manuscript collections.

The question was raised if documentation of conferences is a core record? If the conference was at your campus, you could consider them core records.

Discussion shifted to consideration of the registrar's records. Registrar's records are certainly vital and core records for the University, but it is a question of custody. It is critical that they are preserved, but how this responsibility is met can be decided differently on each campus. At UCLA, the University Archives preserves the registrar's records and allows public access to records seventy-five years or older. UCLA considers UC an educational leader nationally - and encourages that we consider future uses of university records in our appraisal - there are demographic, anthropological and curriculum development uses of these records.

Learning/Evaluation of Teaching:

Little discussion, although a question was raised about personnel files - are they core records? The only comment was to raise a parallel question--should they be considered vital records?

Decision: UCAC Core Records for Teaching are catalogs, directories, course schedules for each academic period, faculty and staff handbooks and complete list of teaching staff. The suggestion was made to modify Samuel's document type from personnel file to bio-bib files and make bio-bib files optional records, not core-records. It was stressed that the registrar's records should be considered vital records.

Main Topic 2: Foster Socialization

- Subtopic 1: Academic rules & regulations
- Subtopic 2: Housing - no core records
- Subtopic 3: Governance & activism
- Subtopic 4: Performing Arts - no core records
- Subtopic 5: Publications
- Subtopic 6: Religion - no core records
- Subtopic 7: Service - no core records
- Subtopic 8: Social
- Subtopic 9: Sports - no core records

Discussion: Minimal - sped through list.

Decision: UCAC Core Records for Socialization could include academic rules and regulations. Governance and activism is well documented by ASUC student government records and student newspapers and these too should be considered core records. Social events are well documented by yearbooks and these should also be considered as core records.

Main Topic 3: Conduct Research

Subtopic 1: Framing the research problem
Subtopic 2: Planning/Carrying out work
Subtopic 3: Data
Subtopic 4: Staffing
Subtopic 5: Funding
Subtopic 6: Research Dissemination

Discussion: UCAC membership agreed that we should ensure that patents and licensing agreement records are considered vital records at our individual campuses. It was generally agreed by membership that the faculty papers we preserve document this topic and that these records are discretionary, as are the annual reports of Organized Research Units (ORUs) and individual departments.

Decision: UCAC Core Records for Conducting Research: Annual Reports from Contracts and Grants Office are Core Records.

Main Topic 4: Sustain the Institution

Subtopic 1: Founding and Incorporation
Subtopic 2: Statewide governing boards
Subtopic 3: Accrediting Organization
Subtopic 4: Internal Governance
Subtopic 5: Sources of Revenue - no core records
Subtopic 6: Acquiring Resources - no core records
Subtopic 7: Investment - no core records
Subtopic 8: Budget -
Subtopic 9: Financial Accounting
Subtopic 10: Personnel Administration
Subtopic 11: Labor Relations
Subtopic 12: Staff - no core records
Subtopic 13: Faculty - no core records
Subtopic 14: Physical Plant

Discussion: Founding and Incorporation records should be considered Vital Records. Regarding Statewide governing boards, the UC Regents records are governed by UC Records Disposition Schedule and maintained by UCOP. Labor Relations should be documented by preserving the Union Contract Handbooks. Building planning documents and the as-built architectural records are core records. If the the University Archives is not preserving physical plant and facilities documentation, then the archivist should urge the Physical Plant or Facilities Planning office to do so.

Decision: UCAC Core Records for Sustaining the Institution will included accreditation documentation; the meeting minutes, annual reports, and organization charts for the Chancellor's office and the Academic Senate; the APM and Faculty and Staff handbooks; the Union Contract Handbooks; the planning documents; the as-built architectural records; photographs; and campus maps.

ACTION ITEM: Bill Roberts will draft a list of UC core records and distribute for review by UCAC membership prior to the meeting tentatively scheduled for the end of April..

3. Collection Policies - Round Robin

UCSD's Revised Archives Collection Development Policy draft was distributed during the summer for our review. Westbrook asked for comments and suggested that this discussion could form part of the discussion of a UC-wide archives collection goals (New Business item no. 4).

Charlotte Brown reported that, in a recent UC Focus, an article described a recent study of academic strengths and ranking of academic stature. UC campuses ranked well nationally, Brown pointed out. She suggested that UCAC make UC's academic leadership in higher education a major collection focus.

Brown suggested that UCAC could approach UCOP for funding for processing archival collections of UC wide importance. Brown suggested that this could potentially dovetail with an approach previously discussed at HOSC and UCAC meetings. This approach, recommended by Lynda Claassen, postulated campus collection centers that would be subject oriented, e.g. a physics center at a campus or a critical theory center at another campus..

ACTION ITEM: Charlotte Brown and Deborah Day will write a UCAC general collecting philosophy for the UC Archives systemwide. It is envisioned that this collecting philosophy will compliment the UCAC Mission statement and guide our core records efforts, our electronic access and digitization efforts in conjunction with the UC-EAD and the UC Digital Library, and the collection policies at each individual campus. This document will also become a Web document. A draft of the document is to be distributed to UCAC members in January 1998, and, assuming little need for revision, the final version of the document will be posted to the web in April 1998.

LUNCH BREAK

3. Collection Policies - Round Robin (continued)

Charlotte Brown noted that UCLA is going to be making government and political papers a core collecting area. They will be coordinating acquisitions with the Political Science and Urban Policy Departments on campus. UCLA is also formalizing regular contact with the Research Library Bibliographers in order to coordinate the acquisition of collections. Anne Caiger and Charlotte Brown are developing this policy document.

4. Electronic Records - Round Robin

a. Electronic Thesis/Dissertations

Brad Westbrook reported that the UCSD's decision is to let other institutions, like Virginia Tech which is working closely with UMI on digitizing theses and dissertations, establish a model for a database of digital dissertations and theses. UCSD may then look at the developed model(s) and implement, assuming there is campus interest in doing so.

John Skarstad noted that UCD is monitoring the UMI progress, but no one at Davis is considering substituting electronic submission for paper copy at this time. Paper copy is still considered the format for submission.

Charlotte Brown indicated there is no campus-wide standard for theses and dissertations at UCLA. The graduate school does not care what form the thesis is submitted in, and they have decentralized this responsibility, leaving it to the Department Chair's discretion, which the University Archives simply must accept. Examples of problems are 1) website postings and 2) NSF funded theses - where data sets are in electronic formats and NSF requires the data sets to be archived. Brian Schottlaender will be hiring a digital librarian at UCLA. Brown hopes to be able to put pressure on the graduate program to standardize theses submission, with the help of the new digital librarian.

As of January 1997, Virginia Tech is accepting primarily electronic files as the thesis submission format. Brown visualizes an online theses and dissertations database in the future, but that the migration of data will be very expensive. Brown also predicts that microfilm will be output from the electronic files because the migration of digital data across platforms will be so expensive.

Discussion: UCAC membership speculations on Brown's predictions ranged from the sentiment it would be a gamble to demand electronic versions of theses and dissertations to the hope that migration would be inexpensive. However, others countered that electronic storage is getting cheaper, that digital theses and dissertations might consume less staff time, especially in the areas of binding and handling paper copies.

Brown explained that there will be no problem with migrating/compressing text files; however image files will be difficult. Others observed that archivists will need to obtain new skills to manage this data, and that the tracking of metadata is not specific to archives or to systems; it is something else and these two departments cannot simply assume the other will be responsible.

Brown asked if we envision electronic theses and dissertations as a larger UC wide issue. She pointed out if that was the case then the responsibility to develop a standard for preservation and maintenance of this data might reside with the UC Digital Library. Brown also added that Libby Stevenson, UCLA Social Science Data Librarian, is a great resource for these issues. Stevenson's department has been storing/refreshing data for thirty years. Brown will be looking to Stevenson for help with UCLA theses and dissertations in electronic format. UCLA has not produced any cost/benefit analysis recommendations for this issue.

Brown stated that regardless of what the UC campuses decide, there will be a UMI database of theses and dissertations. UMI microfilms the paper copies and then scans the microfilm with OCR software. The downside is that with the current contractual agreement that exists with UMI, UCLA would have to pay for accessing their own UC theses and dissertations.

Discussion then moved to the need to examine archival preservation models for electronic records - what standards exist and what are the costs? A question was raised about considering writing a strategic recommendation to the CDC about possible choices concerning electronic theses and dissertations. These choices would include 1) recommend UC develop its own theses and dissertation database as a scholarly publication resource or 2) negotiate a licensing agreement with UMI favorable to UC.

ACTION ITEM: Chair reminded UCAC membership of the suggestion made at the UCAC April 1997 meeting to table actions or recommendations about electronic theses and dissertations to CDC until the UC-EAD project is nearly completed at which time more resources might be available.

b. Records Management/Electronic Records Workgroup

Chair reminded UCAC membership that at the April 1997 meeting we asked him to pursue setting up a meeting/retreat with the UC Records Managers. Westbrook discussed this with Penny White (UCI) who thought it a great idea, but would like to postpone discussion of the possibility for at least eighteen months.

Chair discussed the upcoming Electronic Records Workgroup Meeting at UCSF on December 5, 1997. This group has several concerns:

1) Standardizing Electronic Document Management Systems at UC

There are several EDMS being implemented or examined throughout the UC System:

- UCLA, UCOP are using Excalibur
- UCSD will be entirely digital in 18 months
- UCSF/UCB have established their guidelines and may share a vendor
- UCSC is considering electronic records management

Given that these different models are being implemented, the Workgroup has decided to formulate guidelines for implementing EDMS on UC campuses.

2) Incorporating Electronic Records into the UC Records Disposition Schedule (RDS)

There are internal debates about the appropriate means to revise the existing schedule. The debate centers on considering whether electronic records require such a revision to be made. Are electronic records simply versions of paper based forms, or do they indicate the creation of new types of records that need to be represented in the disposition schedules? There is strong sentiment in the Electronic Records Workgroup that the current Records Disposition Schedule is not useful for administering electronic records and that revision of the schedule might be done from a functional analysis point of view. (The RDS revision will be an agenda item at the December 5, 1997 meeting.)

Discussion: UCAC membership raised the question of revisiting the core records in light of RDS revision, i.e. can our core records document become an Appendix to the RDS?

III. New Business

1. EAD Update - Round Robin

John Skarstad reported a great deal of progress has been made with the Snyder finding aid. Alvin Pollock has been working closely with UCD to develop a finding aid with the capacity for "out-of-context" searching. The finding aid may be viewed at this URL:
<http://sunsite.Berkeley.EDU/snyder>

This will ultimately offer the researcher a thesaurus of subject terms which, if clicked-on, is activated in the search box. This approach helps the user to know what terms are available for use in a search. At the moment, this thesaurus search tool is only available for the Snyder finding aid, but it can be extended to multiple collections.

Discussion: Brown observed that this is a timely development, because research access is the next issue for the UC-EAD. The Dynatext search engine as it now exists is horrible.

Charlotte Brown recounted that, as of January 1998, the American Heritage project will be completed and the five technicians (called EPAs) will begin working on the UC-EAD project. Efforts will then be turned to rekeying the legacy finding aids in our collections. Brian Schottlaender will soon be asking us for a description of our legacy finding aids - specifically:

- number of legacy finding aids
- number of most important legacy finding aids
- number of roman vs. non-roman legacy finding aids

In addition to the five EPAs, UC-EAD project managers are considering sending the legacy data to a contractor in Virginia called APEX, which uses workers in India to code documents. It was pointed out that if we use APEX, we will have to be very explicit about informing the inputters to pay attention to the edits/marginalia on legacy finding aids. APEX workers are told only to type in text, not the edits.

Brown advised that at the end of the project, there will be a template available for each campus to continue to create EAD Finding Aids in the future as we process collections. UCAC Membership observed, however, that the EAD DTD discussion group is meeting soon in Washington, D.C. and the standard may be changing - and this could effect templates.

Brown stated that, if individual campuses desire a back-up copy of their EAD finding aids, each campus will need to maintain their own preservation copy. UCAC membership observed that there is the larger issue of who will maintain the systemwide database for the long-term, and where we will send new EAD finding aids after the project is formally concluded?

Brown informed the group that UC-EAD received the LSTA grant from the California State Library - so the funding is available for the project through November 1998. She also reported that UOP, USC, Huntington Library, California State Library, and Cal State Dominguez Hills are now participants in the project.

Brown suggested that Bill Roberts should use the EPAs to process UCOP Archives and encode the resulting UCOP finding aids.

Discussion: UCAC Membership expressed concern about putting up finding aids for partially processed collections. All members shared horror stories of unprocessed collections. Membership also raised the issue of general reference access to the finding aids - and the need for the UC-EAD project to begin to think about the curatorial context of the collections within the universe of materials. It would be important to create Bibliographic Reference Guides to finding aids on a topical scale, i.e. 1 - 2 page textual narratives for the web could be written as a guide to the physics records available across the UC Library system with links to the appropriate physics finding aids embedded in the document.

Robin Chandler reported UCSF has MARC records for all of its archival and manuscript collections. These are bare bones records. At UCSF, a minimal record is created with main entry, added entries and subject access that a researcher could locate in MELVYL/INNOPAC and then click on the URL for the finding aid which would provide a detailed history, scope note and container listing describing the collection.

ACTION ITEM: Each University Archivist/Head of Special Collections should develop a blanket disclaimer statement that can be placed on each SGML finding aids for partially processed collections. Suggested text could read: Collection partially processed. For more information contact the XXXX.

ACTION ITEM: Brown will bring up the idea of creating Bibliographic Reference Guides for the finding aids with Brian Schottlaender.

ACTION ITEM: Brown will schedule a UC-EAD project wrap-up - one-day meeting for September 1998 - after SAA Meeting. (It's my understanding this meeting will most likely take place during the first quarter of 1998 and that HOSC has lead responsibility for its scheduling--bdw)

2. Standardization of UC Manuscript Statistics

Discussion/Resolution: One linear ft of shelf is equivalent to One manuscript unit.

3. UCOP Archivist

Discussion: UCAC Membership concurred that UCOP needs to hire its own archivist - and that UCAC should make this recommendation. Further discussion expanded this position to suggesting that UCOP create a position of Digital Archivist/Electronic Records Manager with the responsibility of providing guidance for electronic records management policies. Chair

suggested that we gather support for this effort from the Records Management Committee and that the final position description be sent in the form of a recommendation to Richard Lucier as UCCL Executive Director and copied to the CDC.

ACTION ITEM: Brad Westbrook will draft the position description for the Digital Archivist/Electronic Records Manager and circulate for UCAC Membership review.

The proposal to write a letter was discussed at the 12/5/97 meeting of the Electronics Records Workgroup. A draft of the letter has been composed and will be shared with members of UCAC and ERW before it is forwarded. It has also been suggested that the letter should be forwarded to the Chairs of CDC and the Records Management Group.