

**GOLDSMITHS**  
University of London

**ACADEMIC BOARD/FINANCE & RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**INFORMATION MANAGEMENT AND SYSTEMS COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the meeting held on 18 May 2010**

**Present:** Mr Hugh Jones (in the Chair except for item 35), Dr Stephen Cottrell (in the Chair for item 35), Dr Virginia Brooke, Dr Basem El-Haddadeh, Dr Juliet Sprake, Miss Rosemary Harrison (Secretary).

**Apologies:** Ms Mary Nixon, Ms Vivienne Rose,

**OPEN BUSINESS**

**33 MINUTES**

**Resolved:**

that the Minutes of the meeting held on 25 February 2010 be approved, with the following amendments:

**"18 INFORMATION STRATEGY**

.....as a precursor to the development of an Information Strategy for the College, **overseen by** the Registrar and Secretary."

**"25(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, **and the capacity of the College to backfill its business resource. The Committee sought an extra meeting to discuss the position. A member of the Committee expressed the view that it was time for an external review to assist management on the action needed to get it back on track. 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."**

**34 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

Any matters arising not otherwise on the agenda.

## **35 STUDENT RECORDS SYSTEM**

Received:

a report on recent contract negotiations with the supplier of the system (10-210).

It was noted that an important further meeting with the supplier was about to take place and that the College hoped to receive some financial compensation. There was a possibility of a system being installed within 6-9 months, according to the College's specification, if the current supplier was retained. The internal project structure was being reviewed.

Comments from members of the Committee included the following:

- (i) There was a lack of clarity regarding the generic structure for project management in the College and the role of committees in relation to it, which was of significance for this project. It was noted that this issue was under consideration by a working party of Council.
- (ii) The timescale for the project was noted as not being ideal, in that it had been initiated before completion of a full Retention Schedule or the appointment of a Records Manager.
- (iii) An external review of the project would be desirable. The focus of this review would be dependent on the outcome of the forthcoming meeting with the supplier. It was important that the College identified what lessons could be learned from the tendering and negotiation process, and considered taking external commercial advice on the contract. (Various suggestions were made as to the choice of individuals for these roles.)

It was confirmed that the project implementation was not envisaged as involving any data processing outside the EEA; in fact all was expected to be in the College. The contract would make clear that its terms were in general subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act.

## **36 AGRESSO UPGRADE**

Noted:

the successful implementation of Agresso 5.5.3, together with proposed developments in paragraph 4 of the report (10-211)

It was noted that this phase of the project had not fully met user expectations; this was partly due to misunderstandings about the original target outcomes (eg commitment accounting had always been envisaged as limited to non-pay). The need for further development was recognised.

## 37 INTERIM RETENTION SCHEDULE

Received:

a draft Interim Retention Schedule (10-212).

Comments from members of the Committee included the following:

- (i) It would be advisable to recheck the accuracy of the arrangements for I-Grasp retention in consultation with the Human Resources Department. However, it was noted that the current draft statement was taken from the online Fair Processing Notice, so that the College was committed to that retention period for candidates who had already applied.
- (ii) There as a need for additional clarification (as noted in the paper) of the position in relation to dissertations, in particular those deposited in the College Library. It was noted that there was no proposed retention period for raw research data given the wide range of potential scenarios for different types of research, and that at a later stage in the development of the full Retention Schedule it would be desirable to address this issue for research data globally, and not merely in relation to research students.
- (iii) Several academic departments had indicated that the date of 20 August 2010 for certification of destruction was unrealistic for them and should be considerably extended.
- (iv) It would be important to ensure that facilities for shredding could accommodate the peak increase in demand which would occur.
- (v) The possibility of retaining some sample student files as a historical record (practised by some universities) was problematic in terms of the consent management arrangements needed to comply with the Data Protection Act, and also the difficulty of arriving at a methodology for sampling. However it was likely that whatever position was taken by the College in this area would in the long term prove controversial. There was no strong support for instituting a sampling process.

**Recommended:**

- (i) **that the draft Interim Retention Schedule be approved, subject to amendments and additions to the Schedule in the light of the discussion prior to Academic Board, to be approved by the Chair of Information Management and Systems Committee.**
- (ii) **that the date for certified destruction of documents exceeding their defined retention periods be as proposed by the Chair of Information Management and Systems Committee.**

**Resolved:**

that the regular deadline for the certification of destructions be reviewed after the experience of the initial destruction process.

## **38 PROTOCOL FOR USE OF GOOGLE APPLICATIONS**

Received:

a draft protocol for the use of Googledocs for introduction should a contract be agreed (10-213).

The Committee noted that there had so far been no progress in Google's consideration of draft contract amendments submitted in February 2010, but that there was an indication from Google that a response to the College's proposals would shortly be forthcoming. It was thus recognised as desirable to agree a set of user protocols for Googledocs - with a view to limiting the potential detriment to Goldsmiths in terms of Records Management Policy implementation. The Committee could not however agree on the best way forward, in particular in respect of determining a workable compromise between corporate information management requirements and user need. Consideration of the item was therefore deferred.

*[Secretary's Note: arrangements have since been set in train to consider this further on a timescale which would allow clarification of the College's position before signing a contract with Google.]*

## **39 UPDATE ON IT STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION**

Received:

a progress report from the Director of Information Technology (10-214).

The Committee noted that future of enterprise information architecture needed to be reviewed, including the resource implications. It was suggested that this discussion should be integrated with the followup work to the Information Audit currently ongoing, and placed generally in the context of related issues in Records Management Strategy implementation.

It was further noted that it would be desirable for LTQC to consider the role of GLEU in the further development of the IT Strategy.

It was suggested that items smaller than £10K need not be included in this report in future.

## **40 INFORMATION RISK**

Consideration of a report from the Head of Corporate Governance and Information Management (10-120R) was deferred.

## **41 MINUTES OF THE GOLDSMITHS IT USER GROUP**

Received:

the minutes of the meeting held on 28 April 2010 (10-219).

It was noted that a review would be undertaken of the booking process for rooms and its interrelationship with information held by Media Services about items of equipment currently out of order. This would require more detailed collaboration between IT Services and Estates and Facilities. There was also a need for a review of the planned cycle of renovation and the appropriate provision of resources.

#### **42 JISC INFORMATION LEGISLATION AND MANAGEMENT SURVEY 2009**

Received:

a summary report on the JISC survey of institutions' information compliance in 2009 (10-220).

#### **43 REGULATION OF INVESTIGATORY POWERS ACT (2000) (RIPA)**

Resolved:

- (i) **that the draft Policy for compliance with the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act (10-221) be approved;**
- (ii) **that procedures for the future amendment of the Policy be the same as for the Data Protection Policy (currently approved by the Registrar and Secretary).**

#### **44 FORTHCOMING MEETINGS**

Noted:

that meetings of the Committee in the coming academic year would be held on:

2 November 2010 at 10.00am  
1 March 2011 at 2.00pm  
Thursday 19 May 2011 at 10.00 am

**RESERVED BUSINESS**

#### **45 MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE**

The Secretary agreed to approach potential members and make recommendations to Academic Board to fill vacant places for academic staff *vice* Professor Chetan Bhatt (who had left Goldsmiths) and Dr Marian Ursu (who had resigned).

RMH  
May 2010