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A meeting of the Information Governance Group will be held on:
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1. Minutes of meeting held on 1 December 2015 (paper 1)

2. Matters arising
   - Update on Documentum Implementation in DP & FOI Office
   - Email retention policy implementation
   - Roadmap for Documentum
   - Framework for Committees & Policies Guidelines

3. Information Governance Policies
   3.1. Freedom of Information Policy (paper 2)
   3.2. Records Management Policy (paper 3)
   3.3. Policy on Confidential Data - discussion paper (paper 4)
   3.4. IT Policies Update (paper 5)

4. Project Brief for Implementation of Retention Policy Services within Documentum (paper 6)

5. Update on strategy implementation: local records officer pilot

6. Update on Digital Preservation Working Group

7. A.O.B

8. Proposed date of next meeting w/b 9th May 2016
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UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Information Governance Group

Minute of Meeting held on 25 February 2016 at 15:00 hours in Rm 321 James Watt North Building

Present: Dorothy Welch (Chair) (DAW), Johanna King (JK), Chris Edwards (CE), Sandy MacDonald (SMacD), Anna Phelan (AP), Lesley Richmond (LR), Helen McKellar (HMcK) (Clerk)

1. Apologies

None

2. Minute of meeting held on 1 December 2015

AP requested amendments to the minutes under Item 6: Project priorities for EDRMS such that the original text under item 6:

‘The Group supported the recommendation that all new projects involving the use of the Webtop user interface should be put on hold until issues surrounding the supplier are resolved. The Group also supported the current project integrating Documentum with the TRM Research System continuing to move forward, as well as an extension of the existing Exam Papers system and a means of storing and accessing Committee papers including those currently on CDocS.

SMacD advised that the Group and the Documentum team limit short-term work until it can be determined how the system will work with SharePoint. It was agreed that a roadmap for Documentum was required.’

be changed to

‘The Group supported the recommendation that all new projects involving the use of the Webtop user interface should be put on hold until issues surrounding the supplier are resolved. The Group also supported the current project integrating Documentum with the TRM Research System continuing to move forward, as well as an extension of the existing Exam Papers system and recovering data from CDocS.

It was agreed that a roadmap for SharePoint/Documentum was required in order to understand what each system is to be used for. This will form part of the existing action “Guidance on appropriate information storage to be drafted and made available for staff” under Aim 1 of the Information Strategy.’

3. Matters arising

Update on Documentum Implementation in DP & FOI Office

JK informed the group that the Training records had been moved into Documentum along with the Records Management files. A date has yet to be agreed to move the Administration records over. These records are only fully accessible by the administrative team members and will allow these
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staff members to have exposure to the system prior to taking a decision to move the DP/FOI workload onto Documentum. JK expressed some concerns about Documentum’s reliability given some technical issues experienced to date. AP advised these should be addressed with the next Java update. JK advised the DP & FOI Office is aware that their usage of Supportworks is unique and not typical of the intended use of the system, however, it has been well tailored to the office’s requirements and the value of moving to Documentum as a replacement would need to be assured prior to taking that step. AP and JK agreed it would be helpful to consult with colleagues in the Contracts Office to evaluate their experience with Documentum for a broadly similar business process.

Action: JK

Email retention policy implementation

No progress reported. This item should be carried forward to the next meeting.

Action: SMacD

Roadmap for Documentum

AP reported that the different systems and repositories (including Documentum, SharePoint and Office 365) are under discussion within IT Services and an update will be provided when these discussions are concluded.

Action: AP

Framework for Committees & Policies Guidelines

AP advised IT Services would need to work with a business user to progress this item. LR suggested that work could be undertaken to move forward with access policies. It was agreed that Court and Senate Committees should be the focus in terms of publication i.e. Court and Senate and their sub-committees. JK confirmed there was not great demand for Court or Senate records in terms of FOI requests, and that a web version of more recent Court and Senate Minutes are already available online and in the Publication Scheme.

DAW queried how far back the records in CDocs go. LR confirmed 1999-2001 depending when staff started using it. The data is still stored in CDocs but it is inaccessible. It was noted that committee clerks/members were now using a mix of Documentum and SharePoint. DAW referenced the IGG Strategy action regarding guidance on appropriate information storage: AP and SMacD agreed to produce a first draft for the next meeting.

Action: AP/SMacD

In addition, a list of the committees of Court and Senate together with a list of the committees previously using CDocs and what vehicle was now being used would be prepared for the next meeting.

Action: HMcK
4. **Information Governance policies**

Noting that IGG is the approving group for information policies, DAW requested that all policies coming to the group should be prepared with rigour and in final version for approval. She advised the Current Information Policies document, the first version of which was circulated for the meeting, would be kept up-to-date to provide a record of progress.

It was agreed that the structure of the FOI/RM Policy documents was helpful, met the group’s previous determination that policies should be concise and user-friendly and suggested these should be used as a template for all policies to be brought to the group going forward.

**Action:** All

- **Freedom of Information Policy**

JK presented the revised Freedom of Information Policy to the Group. DAW commented it would be helpful to provide more explanation as regards what is meant by information “held” by the University. DAW further recommended Section 3.3 be amended to reflect Heads of Academic and Service Units’ responsibility to ensure compliance with the policy rather than simply communicating it to their staff. JK agreed to make the requested amendments, remove the Complaints section of the document and circulate to the group for approval.

**Action:** JK

- **Records Management Policy**

JK reported that further to earlier discussion with DAW, this policy would be held over to a future meeting to allow for exploration of opportunities to link up with other University priorities and initiatives in this area, such as those under discussion by the Data Quality Group. DAW agreed to initiate discussions with the Chair of that group.

**Action:** DAW/JK

- **Policy on Confidential Information in the University**

CE described the current policy on the handling of confidential data and the advice provided to researchers regarding establishing a Data Security Plan, which fits well with the Research Data Management Team’s advice regarding Data Management Plans for researchers. The current policy includes reference to an authorisation process, the adoption of which is inconsistent across the University. The Group agreed that a better approach would be to provide staff with a suite of guidelines, including some mandatory measures to safeguard the security of the information handled.

DAW requested that CE revise the policy, defining confidential data (e.g. personal or commercially sensitive data) and being clear about mandatory elements. Further detail would be contained in guidance documents to allow for more frequent revision in line with technological changes.

**Action:** CE

- **Policy on Access to Email Accounts without User Consent**
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CE advised that the policy required additional revision. Suggested amendments from the group included widening the scope to include shared mailboxes, consistently referring to Head of Service/School rather than Deputy, expanding the criteria for access to include requirements to satisfy the University’s legal obligations, and clarifying the verification of the extent of access. Advice should be taken from HR regarding informing staff subject to gross misconduct investigations that their account has been accessed. CE would revise the policy and incorporate the amendments, bringing the updated policy for approval to the next meeting.

Action: CE

- **Cloud Storage Policy**

CE advised this policy was still in progress and would be brought to the next meeting.

Action: CE

- **Email Policy**

DAW advised previous discussion had indicated there was not a need for an email policy, rather a set of guidelines should be kept updated. CE to speak to the DP & FOI Office to ensure appropriate guidance is provided. Email Policy to be removed from Current Information Policies document.

Action: CE & JK

5. **Project Brief for Retention Policy Services**

AP presented the discussion paper advising that decisions will be required as regards how the options offered by the system will be used. She highlighted that work could be conducted in tandem to establish procedures while learning about the product, suggesting a gradual approach with a pilot while familiarisation with the product is ongoing. It was noted that although Documentum content already had retention schedules, with retention rules in place for most content, these may be at a higher level than required by the RPS product. AP advised the Documentum team is to meet with the DP & FOI Office in March to progress the RPS implementation.

Action: AP/JK

JK and AP discussed the best approach for the pilot as JK has concerns that there is personal data held in Documentum that should be a priority and therefore a good fit as a pilot for RPS. AP advised that critical data can be deleted from the system prior to RPS being rolled out. JK suggested that the good practice relating to the destruction of records by the Records Centre should be extended to the deletion of records via RPS within Documentum. She further proposed that the existing division of responsibility, whereby the DP & FOI Office and Archive staff agree the rules regarding retention and the record owners approve and sign-off destruction, would be replicated with RPS. AP suggested the product would need further exploration and understanding before decisions can be made regarding approval of destructions. LR noted that Archives will require input for records requiring permanent preservation.
Update on Strategy: Local Records Officer pilot

JK reported that the identification of areas for the pilot was proving difficult. The School of Computing Science was suggested as a favourable option given the support Chris Johnson has shown recently for rolling out data protection training across the College. DAW suggested HR as a pertinent area for a pilot on the Services side. JK to approach HR and Computing Science.

Action: JK

6. Update on Digital Preservation Working Group

LR informed the Group that a solution involving the Research Data Management team was under discussion and an update would be provided in a couple of months’ times.

Action: LR

7. A.O.B.

None reported.

8. Date of next meeting

The next meeting will be scheduled for the week beginning 9th May 2016.

Action HMcK