

**GOLDSMITHS
University of London**

ACADEMIC BOARD/FINANCE AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT AND SYSTEMS COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 25 February 2010

Present: Mr Hugh Jones (in the Chair), Dr Virginia Brooke, Dr Stephen Cottrell, Dr Basem El-Haddadeh, Ms Mary Nixon, Ms Vivienne Rose, Ms Juliet Sprake, Dr Marian Ursu, Miss Rosemary Harrison (Secretary).

Apologies: Professor Chetan Bhatt

In attendance: Mr Steve Fuller and Ms Suzanne Payne (for the business to which item 19 refers).

OPEN BUSINESS

16 MINUTES

Resolved:

that the Minutes of the meeting held on 14 October 2009 be approved.

17 PARENT BODY OF THE COMMITTEE

Noted:

- (i) that, arising in part from comments by members of Finance and Resources Committee in relation to their consideration of the draft Records Management Strategy in the Autumn term, a proposal would be brought to Council on 25 March 2010 to make Information Management and Systems Committee a joint committee of Council and Academic Board, instead of a joint committee of Finance and Resources Committee and Academic Board.
- (ii) that Finance and Resources Committee would under this model only consider business from Information Management and Systems Committee if it had major resource implications - an approach consistent with the decisions which had already taken effect on 1 September 2009, making Human Resources Committee and Estates Committee directly-reporting committees of Council, rather than committees of Finance and Resources Committee.

18 INFORMATION STRATEGY

The Committee discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the College's use and management of information, as a precursor to the development of an Information Strategy for the College by the Registrar and Secretary.

19 RECORDS MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Received:

- (i) a progress report on Records Management Strategy development activities, and in particular followup to the Information Audit conducted by CIMTECH in 2009 (10-65);
- (ii) a revised draft Records Management Strategy and outline action plan (10-66).

It was noted from the progress report (10-65) that, in the light of current organisational and financial priorities, there could be no commitment to appoint a Records Manager until the outcome of 2010 student recruitment was known. This raised the question of what could be achieved in the short-term, and the Committee's discussion of the Information Audit followup activities of recent months focused on these interim arrangements.

The Committee was of the view that some of the objectives proposed in paper 10-65 for possible implementation in the interim year would be best delayed until adequate resource was available for them to be considered in a wider context. The specific technical and staffing resource issues affecting restructuring of the Q: drive,¹ as concerned any major developments in the networked sharing of corporate information between administrative support services and academic departments, were noted in particular. It was agreed that major restructuring of this kind, together with any significant increase in scanning of paper documents to electronic format, should be deferred for the time being. A future review of the networked sharing of documents would also embrace drives other than the Q: drive, and their use.

It was agreed that activity during the interim period pending the appointment of a Records Manager should focus on the top priority action identified in paper 10-65, namely production of a minimal retention schedule of key documents in both academic and administrative departments. Improvements in the reliability of information provided to Data Subjects about the processing of their personal data was an important area where there was a widespread need for improvement at departmental level in order satisfactorily to implement the Data Protection Policy in force since 2004, and there was no need for this work to await the appointment of a Records Manager. Other important areas of activity could be re-activated when a Records Manager was available, with the necessary time and expertise to guide fileplan design, assembly of information, file formats and the centralised procurement of scanning services to appropriate standards to obtain best value. It would also be for the Records Manager to undertake further development of the full Retention Schedule and Business Classification Scheme, to simplify and further customise it in line with the College's needs. In the meantime, it would be necessary to keep the database created from the Information Audit data up to date, by incorporating changes due to current and future developments.

¹ The Q: drive is the area of the network used for interdepartmental sharing of information. It consists of folders with access for specified users concerned with a particular area of activity.

The Committee noted that the satisfactory management of networked facilities on the current scale (as well as legal obligations deriving from the Data Protection Act) required the Systems team in IT Services to have available to them a reliable additional means of checking the identities of members of staff in order to ensure that access permissions were given to the correct people. This was a matter which needed to be addressed as an immediate priority, given the operational and potential legal implications of inaccuracy.

Recommended:

that the Records Management Strategy document Aims, and the outline implementation plan, be approved as set out in paper 10-66.

Resolved:

- (i) that certain IT Services staff designated by the Director of IT should be given the means of decrypting staff dates of birth, to enable them reliably to identify individuals for the purposes of managing IT systems;
- (ii) that the completion of a minimal Retention Schedule, for further development in due course, be confirmed as the main priority for records management development at Goldsmiths in the immediate future;
- (iii) that major restructuring of the Q drive to incorporate sharing of large bodies of corporate information between administrative support services and academic departments be deferred for the time being;
- (iv) that no projects be initiated involving significant increase in scanning of paper documents to electronic format, pending the appointment of a Records Manager who would both provide guidance to departments and ensure that bulk scanning was outsourced in an appropriately coordinated way.

20 SECTION 46 (RECORDS MANAGEMENT) CODE OF PRACTICE

Noted:

- (i) that a revised Section 46 (Records Management) Code of Practice, published by the Lord Chancellor under the Freedom of Information Act, had been issued in July 2009;
- (ii) that the new Code had not initially been well-publicised, which meant that the previous version had been circulated to the October meeting of the Committee (09-352);
- (iii) that the new Code was along the same general lines as the previous one, but notably contained less detail on matters of staff management, and some more specific provisions on business continuity.

21 PROPOSAL TO INTRODUCE GOOGLE APPLICATIONS AT GOLDSMITHS

Received:

a proposal for the introduction of Google Applications at Goldsmiths (10-67).

The Committee noted that the implementation of this new, more systematic approach to the approval process for off-site data processing facilities (approved in the Autumn term following consideration by the Committee, as well as by Academic Board and Council) was very beneficial in terms of the clarity and quality of information available. However some information was awaited from Google's legal department.

It was noted that appropriate clauses for termination of the contract, taking into account in particular the time needed for business continuity, were of particular importance, and had been taken into account in planning by the College.

Resolved:

to approve the proposal to sign a contract for Google Applications, subject to the negotiation of satisfactory wording for the contract and associated documents consistent with the College's obligations under UK Law, and to the satisfactory conclusion of work currently being undertaken by Goldsmiths IT Services to ensure that appropriate internal arrangements could be made for the management of the service.

22 UPDATE ON IT STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

Received:

a progress report from the Director of Information Technology (10-68).

It was suggested that updates could be shown, together with more information about dependencies, dates, milestones and also overall IT spend over defined periods. It would be preferable if the report were more comprehensive (eg the Agresso upgrade and the new Alumni database could have been included).

23 VOICE-OVER IP

Received:

a detailed proposal, recently approved by SMT, for the allocation of resources to the Voice-over IP, already approved in principle as part of the IT Strategy (10-69).

Some members of the Committee were not entirely convinced of elements of the business case for the project, although they were reassured in respect of adequate redundancy being built into the system.

The Committee noted that the New Academic Building offered a useful opportunity to test the viability of VOIP without being committed to implementation across the entire institution.

24 PROPOSED REMOTE SUPPORT POLICY

Resolved:

that the proposed Remote Support Policy be approved (10-70).

25 PROGRESS REPORTS ON SPECIFIC PROJECTS

(i) Agresso

Received:

a progress report on the Agresso project from the Director of Finance (10-71).

Noted:

that limited consultation, and lack of response to requirements specified by users was a major concern, in particular in relation to costs of employing both permanent staff and Visiting Tutors.

(ii) Student Records System

The Committee was concerned about the absence of a progress report this time, in particular as it was reported at the meeting that significant issues had arisen in the working relationship with the supplier. A discussion by the Committee of the management of the project (and subsequently perhaps subsequent referral to an external adviser) was necessary, and the possibility of an extra meeting should be explored.

26 REVIEW BY THE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER OF MODEL PUBLICATION SCHEME AND CODE OF PRACTICE COMPLIANCE

Received:

an report on the Information Commissioner's pilot review of Publication Schemes, conducted in government departments in 2009, highlighting issues of possible relevance to the College (10-72).

27 PROPOSED FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST AND PUBLICATION SCHEME COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE

Recommended:

that the draft Freedom of Information Request and Publication Scheme Complaints Procedure be approved (10-73).

28 PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK FOR INFORMATION COMPLIANCE

Recommended:

that the Management Framework for Compliance with Information Law be amended, to vary the arrangements for the handling of personal data in the event of an emergency in student residences (10-74).

[Secretary's Note: This is a recommendation for approval by Council, as personal data processing for non-academic purposes falls entirely under Council's responsibility]

29 INFORMATION SERVICES ANNUAL REPORT

Received:

a report from the Director of IT Services (10-75).

30 MINUTES OF THE GOLDSMITHS IT USER GROUP

Received:

minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 2010 (10-76).

31 FORTHCOMING MEETINGS

Noted:

that the final meeting of the current academic year would be held on:
Wednesday 5 May at 10.30am

In the light of comments from members of the Committee, the Secretary agreed to change morning meetings of the Committee in the timetable being drafted for 2010-11 to a 10 am start.

RESERVED BUSINESS

32 MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

Noted:

- (i) that a vacancy would shortly arise on the Committee due to the resignation of Professor Chetan Bhatt;
- (ii) that suggestions were invited from members of the Committee for possible replacements.