UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

Information Governance Group

A meeting of the Information Governance Group will be held on:

Wednesday 11 May 2016 at 10:00 in Sandy MacDonald’s Office, Room 321, James Watt North Building

AGENDA

1. Minutes of meeting held on 25 February 2016 (DAW) (paper 1)

2. Matters arising
   - Update on Documentum Implementation in DP & FOI Office (JK)
   - Email retention policy implementation (SMacD)
   - Roadmap for Documentum (AP)
   - Court and Senate committees using CDocs (JK) (paper 2)

3. Information Governance Policies
   3.1. Data Protection Policy (JK) (paper 3)
   3.2. Access to absentee email accounts (CE) (paper 4)
   3.3. Cloud Storage Policy (CE) (paper 5)
   3.4. IT Regulations (SMacD/CE) (paper 6)

4. Draft Guidance on Information Storage (AP) (paper 7)

5. Update on strategy implementation: local records officer pilot (JK)

6. Update on Digital Preservation Working Group (LR)
   6.1. Current scanning practices and considerations

7. A.O.B

8. Proposed date of next meeting
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UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
Information Governance Group

Minute of Meeting held on 11 May 2016 at 10:00 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), Stacey Harper (SH) (Clerk)

1. Apologies
None

2. Minute of meeting held on 25 February 2016
The group agreed that the minute of the last IGG meeting provided an accurate record of that meeting.

3. Matters arising

Update on Documentum Implementation in DP & FOI Office

JK informed the group that the DP & FOI Office has agreed to move governance records (e.g. agendas and minutes for IGG and the Information Policy and Strategy Committee) into Documentum. Migration of other administrative records has not yet been agreed. JK acknowledged that her team has specific short to medium term storage requirements and that the system is not necessarily suitable for the DP & FOI Office; however these requirements are not typical of all Documentum users. JK and AP advised that Documentum is better suited to users with long-term storage needs. It was agreed that DP & FOI’s exercise demonstrated that while Documentum might not be suitable for all users, it is still worth moving forward with the Retention Policy Service module albeit for those who require long term storage of documents. AP and JK informed the group that they are meeting with HR in June to discuss piloting RPS within that service. DAW will discuss with Christine Barr a preference for RPS to be piloted with HR.

Action: DAW, JK/AP

Email retention policy implementation

No progress had yet been made. SMcd would progress before the next meeting.

Action: SMacD

Roadmap for Documentum

This item would be carried forward to a future meeting.

Court and Senate committees using CDocs

The Group noted the information previously circulated. JK informed the group that there was difficulty in determining which committees use SharePoint for document storage. Information was
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provided to the DP & FOI Office, in the form of user-generated SharePoint URLs rather than a list of official committee names. Helen McKellar (HMcK) in the DP & FOI Office will approach individual committee clerks for more information on where records are stored.

LR advised that in the past there was a group that met to discuss and track the activities of University committees. She will investigate the records of this group, to determine if any useful information can be found on committee document storage.

AP informed the Group that her team is planning to migrate all records held in CDocs into Documentum. Once this task is completed, the Group will discuss how to manage and publish these records. Going forward, AP also suggested exploring the utility of the JISC created “Board Papers” framework for this task.

Action: HMcK, LR, AP

New member arrangements

Recognising the development of both Information Governance and Data Governance and the potential for both mutual learning and a joined up approach, DAW informed the Group that the Data Governance Group’s Alison McGuiggan will become a member of IGG, and that JK will be a member of the Data Governance Group.

Freedom of Information Policy

The Group approved the revised FOI Policy (v1.3) which had been circulated electronically.

4. Information Governance policies

- Data Protection Policy

JK presented the revised Data Protection Policy to the Group, highlighting changes to formatting, reference to Heads of Academic and Service Units’ responsibilities in Section 3.4, and the removal of the Complaints section. DAW suggested streamlining Section 5.0. After explaining the intention behind the emphasis on various training options, JK agreed to revise the section to clarify the importance of each option.

Action: JK

- Access to Absentee Email Accounts Policy

The current draft of this policy is titled “Exceptional Circumstances Policy”. The Group agreed that this title should be changed, to avoid confusion as this phrase is used in relation to student assessment. Other suggested amendments from the Group included: change Section 5 to clarify that IT Services can deny access requests; remove or alter all limiting references to “legitimate business access” and “emails and files” from Section 6; highlight in Section 7 that ensuring awareness of this policy is a University-wide responsibility rather than the sole duty of Heads of School and Service; at the end of the policy, provide the contact details for IT Services and remove DP & FOI Office as a contact option. It was agreed that the policy should focus on accessing business information when the user is absent, but it should make clear throughout that personal information might be accessed.
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without user consent in disciplinary investigations. CE will incorporate all suggested revisions and circulate a revised policy for approval electronically.

Action: CE

- **Cloud Storage Policy**

CE advised this policy was still in progress, as he is uncertain how to cover off cloud storage services (e.g. Dropbox, ownCloud, Microsoft OneDrive) as well as explaining to those purchasing cloud application services the various personal data requirements. The University’s current guidance is to avoid storage of personal data in the cloud; this is appropriate advice for storage services, but most application services will upload personal data automatically to the cloud. CE asked for input on developing a cohesive policy that addresses both of these cloud services.

JK stated that the DP & FOI Office firmly advises that no personal data should be held in the cloud, as this removes ambiguity and confusion for users; however, it was recognised that workplace needs and solutions provided were changing. AP suggested that average users want to know where to store their documents, not the distinction between cloud storage and application services: user education was required and advice would be taken on this from Internal Communications. Taking these points into consideration, the Group agreed that this policy should focus on user storage guidance, and acknowledge that cloud applications are handled differently. The Group also agreed that consideration of data protection issues surrounding cloud application services – i.e. data sharing agreements and other contractual requirements – must be built into the procurement process. CE will revise the policy and circulate it electronically ahead of the next meeting.

Action: CE

- **IT Regulations**

DAW reminded the Group that it was previously agreed to approve the IT Regulations every May for the coming academic year. The Group approved the current IT Regulations for the 2016/17 academic year. It was noted that the Regulations may need to be revised after the approval of the Cloud Policy.

5. **Draft Guidance on Information Storage**

AP spoke to the draft Guidance on Information Storage previously circulated. The Group welcomed the draft, agreeing that it would be helpful for all users. JK suggested that the table in Section 3 should be clearly labelled as storage recommendations. DAW advised amendment to the case study on “Joan Lecturer”, to omit seeking guidance on the draft exam questions from external examiners. Changing the name of “Peter Professional” was also suggested. LR requested the addition of guidance on long-term storage solutions to the paper, once these solutions are determined. AP advised that her team will test the draft guidance with appropriate colleagues across the University, to ensure that the actions described in the case studies are realistic. The paper will be finalised ahead of the next Group meeting, and discussion with Internal Communications on how to share it with staff will follow.

Action: AP
6. Update on Strategy Implementation: Local Records Officer pilot

JK reported that she met with Alison McGuigan from Planning and Business Intelligence who was developing a data governance strategy; part of her thinking was the identification of local Data Stewards. JK is concerned that there will be duplication of effort between Local Records Officers and Data Stewards, and is mindful of competing resources between primary roles and these additional duties. She requested Group feedback on whether, taking this into consideration, the Group should either refrain from introducing Local Records Officers, or discuss the role in tandem with the Data Stewards. The Group agreed that implementation of the Local Records Officers should be done concurrently with the implementation of the data governance strategy, perhaps with both roles occupied by the same individual. Discussions between IGG and the Data Governance Group (DGG) should continue.

Action: JK

7. Update on Digital Preservation Working Group

LR informed the Group that the Research Data Management team will take responsibility for the practical activities associated with digital preservation. Details of the RDM team’s required duties are yet to be determined. The Digital Preservation Working Group is currently looking at roles and responsibilities in relation to curatorship of all non-research records. A strategy for digital preservation, along with procedures for managing records, is in development. The strategy will be presented at the next IGG meeting.

Action: LR

Current Scanning Practices

LR reported that Estates & Buildings has been advising relocating staff on electronic documents storage and scanning procedures. This is a concern, as the advice provided does not necessarily align with record retention needs. LR advised that guidance must be established, to be able to be implemented ahead of future large scale moves. DAW agreed to convene a meeting of the appropriate individuals including both information professionals and Estates & Buildings staff, to agree on and provide appropriate guidance.

Action: DAW

7. A.O.B.

None reported.

8. Date of next meeting

The next meeting will be scheduled for August or September 2016.

Action: SH