

Stephanie A. Brantley. Determining Current Practices for College and University Electronic Records Management Programs: Follow-up Interviews. A Master's Paper for the M.S. in L.S degree. July, 2010. 33 pages. Advisor: Dr. Helen Tibbo

The establishment and implementation of electronic records management (ERM) programs in academic institutions has become a focus of numerous studies in recent years. The interviews conducted for this study were follow-ups to a study completed between 2005-2009 by Lisl Zach and Marcia Frank Peri. The objective of Zach and Peri's study was to gain an understanding of the work currently being done with ERM programs in college and university archives. The purpose of this study was to follow-up on the original interviews to determine how much, if any, progress had been made in the last four years.

Analysis of the information collected during the interviews indicates that significant progress has not been made since the original interviews. The majority of the participants recognize the importance of ERM programs and are eager to implement these programs, however, a lack of support and training prevents these programs from being established and successful.

Headings:

Electronic resources management

Electronic data archives

College and university archives – Administration

Surveys -- College and university archives

DETERMINING CURRENT PRACTICES FOR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY
ELECTRONIC RECORDS MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS:
FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEWS

by
Stephanie A. Brantley

A Master's paper submitted to the faculty
of the School of Information and Library Science
of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in
Library Science.

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

July 2010

Approved by

Dr. Helen Tibbo

Introduction

According to the Society of American Archivists (SAA) glossary, the term “electronic record” is “data or information that has been captured and fixed for storage and manipulation in an automated system and that requires the use of the system to render it intelligible by a person” (2005). The term can encompass many forms and for the purposes of this paper the term is used broadly in order to encompass all the forms that university archives might encounter in collections. Electronic records management (ERM) programs associated with university archives are few as the academic world has seemingly been slow in establishing these programs. Studies show that there has been interest in this field for a number of years but the lack of support from administration and also the lack of standards in the field have prevented many institutions from pursuing start-ups of ERM programs.

One of the more recent studies focused on ERM programs was a three-part project conducted by Lisl Zach and Marcia Frank Peri between 2005 and 2009. This study endeavored to “provide a picture of the state of the field for archivists in colleges and universities” (2010, p. 105). In 2005, Zach & Peri sent an online survey to 638 archivists and records managers in the United States and Canada which yielded 193 responses. Out of those 193, Zach and Peri conducted interviews with archivists at 20 institutions. They sent a follow-up survey out in 2009 to the 193 institutions that originally responded to gauge if any changes had occurred over the intervening four years. Sixty-five percent of

the surveys were returned and showed that little progress had been made in the development of ERM programs (Zach & Peri, 2010).

In the spring of 2010 I interviewed archivists and electronic records managers at the 20 institutions Zach and Peri had originally contacted in order to gain a better understanding of current issues regarding the implementation of ERM programs. The primary goal of contacting the institutions was to see if any significant changes had been implemented over the past four years. In the course of the interviews, I asked questions pertaining to how the university archives worked with records management, how the electronic records received were handled, stored, and made available, as well as questions concerning funding, support, and training.

The literature review below provides background information about the intertwining histories of university archives and records management. It goes on to describe the current trends of handling electronic records in regards to capturing, storing, organizing, maintaining, and accessing electronic records as these areas were addressed during the interviews. The literature review concludes with a discussion of institutions' past and present work in ERM to show how the field has grown and provide a baseline of current practices to compare to the answers from the interview participants. The results and a discussion of the follow-up interviews conducted conclude the paper.

Literature Review

History between University Archives and Records Management Programs

There has been a long standing, somewhat tumultuous, relationship between archival programs at colleges and universities and their respective records management

programs. Richard Cox (2005) contends that this relationship demonstrates that “records managers grew from the archives field” (Cox, 2005). The difference between archivists and records managers emanates from education, outlook, and job title. Cox is quick to point out that these differences are ostensible when it comes to the actual management of records. The line between the two is blurred because “records need to be managed to support organization and societal purposes...” and because these records are important to the organization, they “almost always become an archival record” (Cox, 2005, p. 7).

The relationship between archives and records management has been of interest to many as demonstrated by a number of studies on the topic. The SAA Committee on College and University Archives conducted one of the first studies in 1949. SAA sent surveys to its members “to determine the extent of archival awareness in institutions of higher learning in the United States and Canada.” The responses received indicated that there were very few institutions that were actively archiving institutional records. It seemed many of those surveyed were unclear as to the difference between official institutional records and collections of historical material about the institution and/or the region where the institution is located (Wilson, 1950). In subsequent years, similar follow up surveys were conducted to gauge how much, if any, progress had been made in the establishment of institutional archival programs. Most notably these studies concluded that most of the archives surveyed were small and overseen by the library as an afterthought.

In 1982, Bruckel and Cook conducted a survey in which 110 institutions were chosen at random from the United States and Canada. The goal of the survey was to provide a more comprehensive look at the state of records management in North

American universities. Their results revealed that 52 percent of public institutions and 30 percent of private institutions engaged in records management. A similar survey conducted a year later by the Office of Management Studies of the Association of Research Libraries found that the vast majority of their respondents indeed had university archives and that the archives were “responsible for the acquisition and preservation of records of the parent institution” (Burckel & Cook, 1982).

In 1989, Marjorie Britt conducted a survey to gauge the comprehensiveness of records management programs but in her words, they remained “elusive.” She believed that this could partially be explained by the idea that many of the “campus archival programs grew out of the historical manuscript tradition. Successful [records management] programs seemed to depend upon the ability of the archivist to adapt records and management practices to suit particular institutional settings and needs” (Britt, 1989). Don Skemer and Geoffrey Williams published their findings in 1990 from a survey in which they attempted to contact 1,500 four-year colleges and universities in the United States regarding their records management programs. Four hundred and forty-nine (29.3%) of the survey questionnaires were completed and returned. The results supported previous research showing that most records management programs were part of the institutions’ archives and the majority of those records management programs could be found in large public universities (Skemer & Williams, 1990). As a whole, these surveys indicate that while the archivists in most of the programs recognize that the relationship between records management and archive programs is vital; most administrators, however, do not realize the relationships significance, which in turn makes it low priority

when it comes to budgeting and overall administrative support (Schina & Wells, 2002, p. 38).

The results of Schina and Wells' survey in 2002 of public universities in Canada and the United States showed that lack of support and funding were still issues in university archive programs and that archivists and records managers were grappling not only with paper materials but also the complicated issue of electronic records. When discussing policy implementation and compliance, most respondents did not have specific policies regarding electronic records. The few that did have policies acknowledged that the policies "have not helped promote records management issues or good records practices." When electronic records policies were in place, the main issue causing complaint was the lack of an "implementation mechanism" (Schina & Wells, 2002, p. 40). The only area that had seen significant progress was email policies because IT departments had begun to realize their importance. Another issue that Schina and Wells discussed was the lack of training and outreach. The majority of their respondents did not have "formalized records and archives management training" programs set up for employees of their respective institutions. Of those that did, few addressed the issue of ERM (Schina & Wells, 2002, p. 42).

In order to effectively manage electronic records, there needs to be a relationship between the records and archives program and the institutions' department(s) of information technology. Many of the respondents in Schina and Wells' survey lamented that the current relationship between the two groups was weak and that the records and archives program staff were not included in making decisions regarding management of institutional electronic records (2002). Nancy Kunde conducted an informal online

survey in 2005 which focused on “organizational and communication ties of [records and information management] programs in colleges and universities and whether or not they were engaging in activities that positioned them to be more active partners in managing an institution’s information resources, particularly those that were in an electronic format” (2008, p. 189). ERM or “some aspect of it” seemed to be the overwhelming response to the survey’s question about the most challenging facet of their work. Kunde (2008) asserts that the findings from her survey demonstrate that while most academic record programs have good foundations, the time has come for them to expand in order to work in a “complex, technologically oriented information environment” (p. 161).

The work done by Zach and Peri between 2005-2009 with surveys and interviews provides a good overview of some of the current practices being followed in higher institutions in the United States and Canada. The findings from this work indicate that “no uniform solution appears to be available for developing and implementing a successful ERM program.” Much work needs to be done before this can take place and Zach and Peri offer suggestions as to how this might be accomplished. Their recommendation of building relationships with the administration and external staff is one of their key suggestions. These relationships could help foster a setting in which ERM is a priority and lead to the creation of a successful ERM program (Zach & Peri, 2010).

Issues To Be Addressed

There are many different issues that need to be taken into consideration regarding the management of electronic records. The physical issues of capturing, storing,

organizing, and maintaining electronic records need to be considered as well as issues that arise when trying to make the records available for use. Literature concerning these issues has grown considerably in the past couple of decades as governments, organizations, and institutions are beginning to realize the importance of gathering and maintaining electronic records. In 1997, the International Council on Archives (ICA) Committee on Electronic Records developed a *Guide for Managing Electronic Records from an Archival Perspective*. This guide was “designed to help archival institutions reposition themselves to address the management of archival electronic records” (p. 3).

Capturing Records

One of the first steps to be considered when managing electronic records is how the archive is going to capture the material. The capturing of a record is defined as the “act of incorporating a record with its metadata into a recordkeeping system” (McLeod & Hare, 2006, p. 151). Strategies involved in this act will differ for institutions as it largely depends on the abilities of the hardware and software systems that the institution has set up for this purpose. Records can be captured in various ways, including through the user interface, the operating system or a modification of the application software (Kansas State Historical Society, 2010). The timing of when the records will be captured will also vary depending on the institution. Some might require that electronic records be submitted to the archives on a periodic basis to make sure that vital work of the institution is not being lost; others might require that materials be submitted when the records are no longer in active use. These decisions are largely based on retention schedules that have been created by records managers for different types of documents and provide a timeframe which record creators are supposed to follow.

Storing and Preserving Records

In the 1960s, archivists generally printed out electronic records deemed “archival” and “stored in established filing systems” (International Council on Archives Committee on Electronic Records, 1997). The electronic records were viewed as “special media records” and were considered important because of the “information content” they contained not their format. This remains true today, however, new digital formats are often not amenable to total capture and printing. For example, complex and constantly changing database and other data sets need to be preserved in their digital form in order to preserve their functionality.

As technology has advanced, so have the types of mediums that are available for storing records. When floppy disks were commonly used, the amount of hard drive space available on computers was limited. Today, the information once stored on a floppy disk can easily be stored on a hard drive, USB drive, or a CD/DVD-ROM. One of the prominent issues that archivists encounter is deciding what kind of storage would be best for the records. Different archives will have different ways of approaching the preservation process and the methods used can be largely influenced by:

- Types of record creators and recordkeeping systems;
- The role of the archives in relation to records creation agencies and functions;
- Legislation;
- The archives’ skill and technical infrastructure; and
- The types and levels of user services planned (International Council on Archives Committee on Current Records in an Electronic Environment, 2005, p. 51).

One of the larger issues surrounding preservation is metadata. The SAA defines metadata as “a characterization or description documenting the identification, management, nature, use, or location of information resources” (Society of American Archivists, 2005). Metadata is usually created for analog records when an item is archived, but that is not the case with electronic records. It is recommended that metadata be added at the time of the creation of a document to provide a way for accessing it in the future as well as to help ensure the documents reliability and authenticity (McLeod & Hare, 2006). Authenticity and reliability can present major challenges as electronic documents can be quite easily changed.

Preservation action must be planned and implemented at regular intervals and, as far as possible, automated. In order to achieve the goals of preservation, organizations require an appropriate level of functionality together with the tools and procedures required to support it. It will be necessary to preserve electronic records over time as a corporate asset, in a manner that retains their reliability and integrity for as long as they are required. This will also include prevention of changes to content and context (so that authenticity is retained) and continued maintenance in an appropriate format (so that accessibility is retained) (Smith, 2007, p. 131).

Accessing Records

Accessing records can be a complex issue when privacy and security issues are taken into consideration. Institutional records can vary widely in their need for privacy and confidentiality. Policies must be put into place that will protect confidential electronic records and restrictions placed on access to these electronic records just as they would be for paper records. Archivists also need to consider cost, user needs, and service levels. The ICA’s workbook on electronic records provides a list of four different methods in which these issues are taken into consideration and suggestions as to how to deal with each issue depending on the method (2005, pp. 61-64).

Another challenge that must be met when considering access to electronic records is that of metadata. Metadata are a requisite to be able to make the records accessible allowing for efficient searching and retrieving. They are also needed to “present the records in their true context” as well as to prove authenticity. ICA lists three categories of types of metadata that could be encountered in working with electronic records; technical, recordkeeping, and archival. According to the ICA, it is difficult to incorporate the different categories of metadata in a cohesive manner so the records can successfully be accessed through an “archival description system” (2005).

Electronic Records Management in University Archives

Higher education institutions have been working with electronic records for over 30 years. In 1979, The National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) rewarded its first electronic records to the University of Wisconsin-Madison who, in conjunction with the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, desired to “develop procedures to schedule, accession, and retrieve information from machine-readable records of Wisconsin state agencies” (Conrad, 2003, p. 168). Conrad (2003) comments that while this might not seem like a noteworthy occurrence now, it was quite extraordinary in 1979.

Early electronic records management work at the University of Michigan is also noteworthy. James Duderstadt began his term as the 11th president of the University of Michigan in 1988. When his term ended in 1996, more than half his “papers” were in electronic form. After accessioning the material, it was discovered that the electronic material were not duplications of the print material received. Once this was established, the university had to decide how to preserve these electronic records. One suggestion

made was the common method of the time of simply printing out all the electronic records. This idea was rejected as it was “inconsistent with the commitment of Duderstadt to foster a digital information environment” at the University of Michigan (Deromedi, 2006). In the analysis of the project, Deromedi (2006) describes an insightful learning experience that aided in preparing staff to communicate clearly with academic and administrative departments about what was needed in order for the processing of the collection to go smoothly. These processes included “good file organization, file naming [practices], version control, updating files through active life and established office practices” (p. 7).

The Recordkeeping Functional Requirements, or the “Pittsburgh” Project, conducted at the University of Pittsburgh between 1993 and 1996 focused on ERM and long term preservation in the business setting. The Pittsburgh Project resulted in a framework of “functional requirements” necessary for the business world. These functional requirements mandated those records that needed to be preserved based on the functional needs of the organization. Philip Bantin, University Archivist from Indiana University, subsequently applied the framework and tested the feasibility of basing a university ERM approach on such functional requirements (1995-1997) (Tibbo, 2008).

Three of the eight lessons that Bantin outlines are essential when it comes to the management of electronic records within an academic institution. First, “archivists and records managers must gain significant technology skills to work in the digital environment.” Knowledge of information technology, systems analysis, and database management will be crucial in coming years as there will continue to be an influx of electronic records transferred to university archives as most of the work done on

campuses today is completed in electronic form. The second lesson stresses the importance of archives staff working in conjunction with information technology staff. This is due to the fact that an “appropriate technological infrastructure on campuses for archival storage and long-term preservation of digital objects and electronic records” is a necessity. The third lesson that needs to be considered is the need for archivists and records managers to work closely “not only to determine records schedules and ultimate disposition schedules but also to establish preservation metadata requirements and migrations schedules” (Tibbo, 2008, p. 35).

Many initiatives have begun in the last decade to address the issue of how to manage electronic records. In 2003, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign realized that the absence of a records management program was hindering its ability to “secure university records of enduring value” and with the addition of electronic records this hindrance only increased. In order to overcome this issue, the University Archives began an “initiative informally called Strategic Information Management Services (SIMS).” This initiative placed staff in departments and initially focused on the “departmental informational needs” and subsequently on meeting the records management schedules. As a result of this initiative, record creators in the various university departments were able to better communicate with University Archive staff and that enabled the University Archives and the departments to successfully work together in making sure that records management policies were followed (Kaczmarek, 2006).

Susan Davis conducted a survey of academic libraries, historical societies, and libraries in 2006 in which she tried to “determine the level to which these repositories

[were] working with born-digital records.” The results of the survey conducted indicated that while repositories were indeed receiving born-digital materials, most of the institutions did not have policies in place that indicated how the institution was to proceed with their acquisition, access, or preservation. The majority of the institutions were handling the materials on a case-by-case basis which can lead to a significant amount of inconsistency (Davis, 2008).

The relationship between university archives and records management programs continues to evolve. The studies completed over the last 60 years demonstrate the need for the two programs to work together in order to accomplish the goal of preserving different institutions’ records. The studies also demonstrate the need for these programs to work closely with information technology departments in order to more effectively manage an institution’s electronic records. The capturing, storing, preserving, and accessing of electronic records needs to be a priority so these records are properly handled and there is no question of their authenticity. ERM practices in university archives is a growing field and over the past 30 years, much progress has been made but there is still a large amount of work yet to be done.

Methodology

The interviews conducted for this paper were follow-ups from a research project conducted by Lisl Zach and Marcia Frank Peri as part of the National Historical Publication and Records Commission’s (NHPRC) Electronic Records Fellowship Program (National Historical Publications and Records Commission; School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; University

of Michigan School of Information, 2007). The purpose of the surveys and initial interviews conducted for the Zach and Peri project was to investigate patterns in practices among North American college and university archives and records management programs regarding their approaches to capturing, storing, organizing, and making available institutional electronic records. The follow-up interviews conducted for this paper provide a picture showing the state of the field for archivists in colleges and universities today. The questions I asked the participants were based on the original interview questions covering topics such as administrative support, budgeting issues, as well as the types of electronic records they were currently collecting.

Sample and Data Collection

For the interviews conducted by Zach and Peri, a total of 20 institutions were represented by the end of the project. Their goal was to gather a more in depth understanding of the state of ERM programs in colleges and universities because “they or their institutions were actively implementing or planning an ERM program” (2010, p.111). My goal for this paper was to determine whether anything had changed since 2006 when the original interviews took place. The names of the 20 institutions and the title of the positions of the person originally interviewed were provided to me by Dr. Lisl Zach. From that list, I gathered contact information, including both email and phone number if available, for each person using the respective institutions’ websites. I initiated contact in an email message requesting a telephone interview and asking for a time that would be convenient to conduct the interview. A deadline was given for a response and I contacted those who did not respond to my initial email by phone. I was able to set up interview times and successfully interview eight of the twenty people I originally

contacted. Five responded either via email or when I telephoned saying that nothing had changed with their respective programs and that it would not be helpful to conduct an interview. I did not receive any response from the other seven who I contacted despite repeated contact attempts.

At the beginning of the phone interview, I read a telephone consent form to the participant and once he or she verbally agreed to be interviewed, I then asked for consent to record the interview and use anonymous quotes if desired. All eight participants agreed orally and I began asking the interview questions. The questions asked were pre-determined and the interview was conducted in a semi-structured manner (See Appendix A). I was able to direct the interview using these questions and during the course of conversation additional related topics arose. The interview included questions regarding organizational structure, administration, funding, training and best practices regarding ERM at their respective institutions. The interview questions also addressed how, if at all, the institution's practices regarding ERM had changed in the four years since the last interview. The time spent on each interview ranged from 20 minutes to 50 minutes. This difference in duration was due to factors such as varying amounts of knowledge on the part of the participants about some of the areas addressed as well as some institutions not having made progress in a certain area concerning ERM.

Results and Discussion

After conducting the eight interviews, I compiled my notes by entering the responses from each institution into one document containing the interview questions. I labeled each response with a number corresponding to the institution. This provided me

with a means to compare and contrast the answers I received to each question from the different institutions. The analysis of each section provided interesting insight into the current practices of academic institutions and how they feel they have, or have not, progressed in this field since the last interviews were conducted. The findings from the Zach and Peri studies indicate that there is a significant disconnect between the needs and the resources that are available for the institutions that responded. As the results show, disconnects remains.

Organizational Structure

When asked how their department deems records archival, the majority of the answers from the participants indicated that it was based solely on a records schedule that had been created and provided to the different offices and departments in their institutions. One institution indicated that they had no set record schedule but instead an informal policy. The information was available on their website but most staff do not have the time and/or training for appraisal. As a result, the archives receive more records than they actually need to keep and have to sort the records themselves with limited staff and resources. Management of records falls mainly to the University Archives whose duties to maintain the records have been sanctioned by the Board of Trustees for half the participants. One institution stated that they do not have the “capability of managing electronic records or the authority to do so” and another institution indicated that their Information Technology departments were responsible for the management of their electronic records.

The question was posed for the participants to describe their current electronic records program including the specific types of electronic records they manage and what

software/hardware is being utilized to facilitate the management. The most common response was faculty and administrators' papers with fifty percent of the institutions indicating that these documents in electronic form were their main focus. Other types of electronic records that were mentioned were institutional publications, presentations, and digital photographs. A common theme that arose when talking about the types of records that each institution managed was the fact that the majority of the records they dealt with were still paper. Most institutions are the midst of pilot projects or looking to start pilot projects to see how to best go about dealing with electronic records. With this in mind, the software/hardware they are using is also in testing stages for the majority of the institutions. Three of the institutions do not have specific software for ERM. The other five institutions are using a variety of different systems including Fedora, D-Space, and Content DM to manage their electronic records.

The participants were asked how the process of managing electronic records has changed since the last interviews were conducted and the majority expressed their disappointment in the fact that not much progress had been made. One participant felt that the reason that paper records were still prevalent was because there is an underlying fear and lack of understanding about how to proceed to accessioning and preserving electronic records. This same participant also expressed concern that there has been some pressure about making sure that everything is available electronically in the University Archive but what does not seem to be understood is the time and cost involved in converting paper to electronic records.

Administrative Authorization

The next set of interview questions focused on how the administration supported the University Archives in areas such as campus mandates for ERM, dedicated funding, and the availability of staff. None of the respondents indicated that there was a specific campus wide mandate for ERM. Most mentioned that there was a mandate in place for paper records but the policies have not been updated to include electronic records. One participant noted that their Information Technology department is beginning to see the need for such a policy and there has been some talk but most of the work has been “under the radar” and is not widely circulated. The question was asked if there was a campus-wide oversight committee whose focus was on electronic records and only one institution indicated that they had anything remotely similar to this. There is a team at this particular institution that is proposing an enterprising document content management program and has been working on the proposal for about a year and a half. There are many director level staff members involved in this team and they all want to see electronic records brought more into the spotlight.

Budget can be a great hindrance when trying to start a new process and in this case, trying to integrate management of electronic records into University Archives’ practices can be an obstacle. Only one participant indicated that there was specific funding set aside for ERM and that funding was specifically for the salaries of the Associate University Archivist and the Electronic Records Archivist as well as a few electronic document management programs, such as D-Space and Fedora which would in turn allow the university to ascension electronic documents and have a means to store and organize the material. About half of the participants indicated that there was no budget

because more awareness was needed on the part of the administration as to the importance of ERM.

Staffing issues also play a large role in being able to manage electronic records. The larger of the responding institutions had more archival staff available and were more likely to have a specific person designated for records management, both paper and electronic. The archives at the smaller institutions interviewed had, on average, 2 full-time employees and their focus was not on ERM but on trying to manage any kind of material that arrives at the University Archives.

The question was posed as to whether the support from the administration has increased since the last interviews took place and only four of the participants indicated any change. One participant stated that their administration had been very supportive in allowing the University Archives staff to try and “find ways to handle electronic records.” Another positive answer was that the institution had recently acquired a new president who is anxious to see a system set up to manage electronic records. A third participant expressed disappointment when saying that after organizational restructuring the University Archives now come under the direction of the library system and that the Archives is “kind of low on the totem pole.” This participant feels that if the University Archives had been placed somewhere else, they might have a little more authority to be able to push their agenda to set up a system to collect and manage the institution’s electronic records. The last participant asserts that the support they receive from the administration has definitely increased over the past four years as a result of the University Archives being revalidated by the Board of Trustees two years ago. Unfortunately the support has seemed to decrease slightly in the past year and they find

that they must push their agenda themselves. Trying to make sure that people are aware and are complying with the records schedules has proven to be difficult.

Cooperation and Coordination

Cooperation and coordination within an institution's administration and various departments can be difficult to come by. One particular participant illustrated this difficulty well when describing how decentralized their institution is. This is a large institution with about 22 information technology infrastructures as well as over 40 different email systems being used. Recently it was decided that all the administration would begin using the same email system but because of the vast number of different systems and infrastructures found at this institution, it makes it extremely difficult for the University Archives to standardize their practices.

In order to properly maintain electronic records, a solid relationship with the information technology department is often the key. Five of the eight participants indicated that there was no formal relationship between their institutions' information technology department and the University Archives. One participant said that their library system has its own information technology staff and the combined efforts between the two groups has worked well in the little bit of ERM that has been attempted thus far. With the increase of information security issues, one participant said that their staff is heavily involved with information technology and are in the midst of a collaborative effort to create records schedules for electronic records.

Another important player in the role of records management is legal counsel. The current standing of the relationship between legal counsel and University Archives tended to be non-existent with the majority of the participants. Most indicated that legal

counsel was consulted when the University's records schedules were first created but have not been a part of the process since that time. However, twenty-five percent of the participants declared that they have a strong relationship with their institutions' legal counsel. One of the institutions' administrators also serves as the school attorney and is heavily involved in trying to establish policies and procedures for electronic records. The other participant's relationship with legal counsel is highly active with trying to develop information security and stewardship policies.

Training and Outreach

Training and outreach play a large role in providing staff with information they need when trying to discern records schedules. For this reason, the participants were asked to describe any training that is conducted on their campus involving records management and then more specifically ERM. Twenty-five percent of the participants said there are training sessions conducted for faculty and staff that have information about records management embedded in them but that it is not a main focus of the training. Two other participants indicated that training workshops are conducted specifically on records management so, as one participant said, "People will realize they are not alone in their situation." The situation referred to is that people do not know how to effectively manage records that they encounter daily. The other participants claimed that there have not been recent training offerings of these types but as new staff is hired, their hope is to create new presentations addressing records management, especially electronic records. All but two of the participants indicated that they gladly provide one-on-one training for new hires upon request of the offices/departments but they realize that more needs to be done. As one participant said, "the challenge now is that everyone has

records on their [individual computers] and has their own method of creating and storing [these records]. This can create major problems when trying to transfer materials to University Archives if no guidance is provided ahead of time.

Best practices

The latter part of the interview was spent discussing what the participants felt were important issues to be addressed with ERM. I also asked them to take these ideas and to consider if a set of “best practices” were to be developed, what would interest them the most. Surprisingly there was a large variety of answers given by the eight participants regarding important issues in the field. One issue that was addressed was the tension between the desire for knowledge management and information protection issues. The tension lies with sharing information for research purposes and the fear of protecting that information for infringement reasons. The management of large data sets was also brought to the forefront in one interview as the participant stressed the fact that these data sets possess a great deal of value but there are concerns with their management overtime as well as rights associated with the data. Several participants addressed the issues of hardware and software obsolescence. They also stressed the need for non-proprietary, open-source software in a time of rapid technological change. Change management was also mentioned as an issue. With technological advances, many institutions have senior staff members who are unwilling to adapt to new technology and want to continue with what they are accustomed to using. One participant expressed her dismay when discussing how rapidly technology is changing saying that it is “hard enough to keep up with the day to day stuff much less new technology that comes available.”

One issue that many participants did agree on was the necessity of more funding. It was impressed upon the majority of the participants that in order to potentially gain an increase in their funding they would need to demonstrate that the materials in the archives were being used and would also need to provide evidence that training was necessary. It was stressed that institutions needed to demonstrate that the materials in the archives were being used and to show the need for training. These training sessions would teach faculty and staff how to effectively manage their records. This would save the archivists' time, as well as teaching the legal ramifications of properly archiving and disposing of records so as to avoid legal risk in the future. Consistency in naming practices and descriptions of electronic records was also a big concern and with proper records management training, this concern could be alleviated.

The answers to the question of a set of "best practices" closely followed the concerns previously expressed about the field. The respondents stressed that having good policies in place was one of the only ways that a records management program could succeed. In order to do this, one participant suggested that the integration of business process analysis would be beneficial. The preservation of e-mail seemed to be another highly recommended practice and having a system that could stably store, extract, and search e-mails was considered to be a great need in the field. To continue along those lines, having a stable format for all electronic documents to preserve their authenticity as well as being able to properly retain, store, and offer for access materials that have been received was deemed essential.

Conclusion

As evident by the discussion of the results in each section, the participants concur that substantial progress has not been made since the original interview even though the majority of the participants realize the need for ERM programs and the urgency of implementing these programs. The key to implementing these programs is to gain support from key players in the institutions. The support gained can aid in the increasing of budgets which would then allow for more training sessions and more ERM systems development. Most of the participants conveyed a sense of exigency that something has to be done because each day that goes by without support systems in place, more material is being lost. One participant expressed sadness during the interview when commenting on all the electronic records that have been lost over the past 20 years because no one has known how to proceed with archiving them. As the world continues to rely more heavily on electronic records, archivists need to advocate for ERM systems in order to prevent the type of loss of electronic records that is still occurring in institutions. Many institutions are beginning to recognize this need; this is evident in the number of grants that the NHPRC has funded over the last 10 years that deal with electronic records (National Historical Records and Publications Commission, 2010). A large number of the grants have been for institutions to start ERM programs. For example in 2010, Mount Holyoke College in South Hadley, MA received \$69,500 to “support a college archives and special collection electronic records start-up project.” Michigan State University was awarded \$251,079 in order to “accession, preserve, and provide access to a significant portion of the University’s permanently valuable records that are created and maintained

in electronic form.” These grants are just a sample of the many grants that have been awarded. More institutions are endeavoring to take on the task of developing and implementing ERM programs and as they try and move forward, institutional support systems are vital. In the academic environment, Kaczmarek said it best when she wrote:

Without a good records management program, an institution creates unneeded risk for itself when it carries out inconsistent oversight of records creation, storage, and dissemination. The absence of a good records management program also bears on the quality and integrity of the institutional archives (2006, p. 24).

References

- Britt, M. R. (1989). Adopting and adapting records management in college and university archives. *The Midwestern Archivist* , 14 (1), 5-12.
- Burckel, N. C., & Cook, J. F. (1982). A profile of college and university archives in the United States. *American Archivist* , 410-428.
- Burckel, N., & Cook, T. (1982). A profile of college and university archives in the United States. *American Archivist* , 45 (4), 410-428.
- Conrad, M. (2003). Early intervention: the NHPRC's electronic records program. In B. Ambacher (Ed.), *Thirty years of electronic records* (pp. 167-186). Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press.
- Cox, R. (2005). *Archives and archivists in the information age*. New York: Neal-Shuman Publishers.
- Davis, S. (2008). Electronic records planning in "collecting" repositories. *American Archivist* , 71, 167-189.
- Deromedi, N. (2006, October 25). *Accessing, processing, and making available a born-digital personal records collection at the University of Michigan*. Retrieved April 20, 2010, from http://www.bentley.umich.edu/academic/practicum/2008/digital_cases/case1.pdf

International Council on Archives Committee on Current Records in an Electronic Environment. (2005). *Electronic records: a workbook for archivists*. Paris, France: International Council on Archives.

International Council on Archives Committee on Electronic Records. (1997). *Guide for managing electronic records from an archival perspective*. Paris, France: International Council on Archives Committee on Electronic Records.

Kaczmarek, J. (2006). Establishing a university records management program from the inside out. *Archival Issues* , 30 (1), 23-33.

Kansas State Historical Society. (2010). *Kansas electronic records management guidelines*. Retrieved July 10, 2010, from <http://www.kshs.org/government/records/electronic/electronicrecordsguidelines.htm>

Kunde, N. M. (2008). Reframing records management in colleges and universities. In C. Prom, & E. Swain (Eds.), *College and university archives: Readings in theory and practice* (pp. 185-208). Chicago: Society of American Archivists.

McLeod, J., & Hare, C. (2006). *How to manage records in the e-Environment*. London: Routledge.

National Historical Publications and Records Commission; School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; University of Michigan School of Information. (2007). *NHPRC Electronic Records Fellowship Program*. Retrieved July 11, 2010, from <http://www.ils.unc.edu/nhprcfellows/index.htm>

National Historical Records and Publications Commission. (2010). *Funded electronic*

- records projects*. Retrieved July 10, 2010, from <http://www.archives.gov/nhprc/projects/electronic-records/projects.html>
- Schina, B., & Wells, G. (2002). University archives and records programs in the United States and Canada. *Archival Issues*, 27 (1), 35-51.
- Skemer, D., & Williams, G. (1990). Managing the records of higher education: the state of records management in American colleges and universities. *American Archivist*, 53, 532-547.
- Smith, K. (2007). *Planning and implementing electronic records management: a practical guide*. London: Facet Publishing.
- Society of American Archivists. (2005). *Glossary of archival and records terminology*. Retrieved July 10, 2010, from <http://www2.archivists.org/glossary>
- Tibbo, H. (2008). The impact of information technology on academic archives in the twenty-first century. In C. Prom, & E. Swain (Eds.), *College and university archives: Readings in theory and practice* (pp. 27-51). Chicago: Society of American Archivists.
- Wilson, D. H. (1950, October). Archives in colleges and universities: some comments on data collected by the Society's Committee on College and University Archives. *American Archivist*, 343-350.
- Zach, L., & Peri, M. F. (2010). Practices for college and university electronic records management (ERM) programs: then and now. *American Archivist*, 73, 105-128.

Appendix A

Interview Questions

I. Organizational structure

- a. How does your campus identify records deemed archival?
- b. Who manages these records? (reporting structure)
- c. Describe your current program
 1. Specific types of e-records managed
 - i. Administrative records
 - ii. Course management systems (e.g., WebCT)
 - iii. Digital asset management (digital objects such as photographs, videos, etc.)
 - iv. Electronic theses and dissertations
 - v. Email
 - vi. Faculty publications
 - vii. Institutional publications
 - viii. Institutional websites
 - ix. Research data
 - x. Web pages and documents
 - xi. Other
 2. Software/hardware used
 3. Specific issues that you have encountered
- d. How has this process changed in the past 5 years?

II. Administrative authorization

- a. Is there a campus-wide mandate for e-records management? If so, from whom?
- b. Is there a campus-wide oversight committee? If so, who is involved?
- c. Is there dedicated funding?
 1. Who controls the budget for e-records management?
 2. How much is the budget?
- d. Is there dedicated staff? (if not, who is responsible?)
 1. If so, what positions?
 2. What credentials/experience are required?
- e. Has the support from the administration increased in the past 5 years?

III. Cooperation and coordination

- a. Who are the major stakeholders in the e-records management program?
- b. Who was included in developing the e-records management policies and procedures?
- c. What is your relationship with OIT? (how established?)
- e. What is your relationship with legal counsel? (how established?)
- f. (If answered in the affirmative to “d” last time) Has your relationship with legal counsel continued? If not, how has it changed?

IV. Training and outreach

- a. Do you conduct training for staff/units on campus? (describe)
- b. Do you publicize your program? (if so, how and to whom?)

c. Have your training methods changed in recent years? Has your publicity of the program increased or decreased over the past 5 years? In what ways?

V. Best practices

- a. What do you consider to be the most important issues in e-records management?
- b. If a set of “best practices” were to be developed, in which areas would you be most interested?
- c. Do you see much difference in regards to e-records management from where your institution was 5 years ago to the present? If so, what are those differences?