Grants and Contracts Functional Area Digital Document Imagery Infrastructure Working Group
Meeting Minutes
January 14, 2005

Members: (all in attendance)
Maggie Griscavage, GCS, UAF, Chair
Karol Weatherby, GCS, UAA
Tanya Hollis, GCS, SW
Candice Murdoch, GCS, UAS
Judy Brainerd, Financial Services, UAF
Sherry Lynch, CGC, CIFAR, UAF

Others invitees:
Andrew Gray, UAF OSP
Susan Harper, UAA OSP
Martha Nelson, UAA Procurement
Bob Shefchik, UAF Geophysical Institute.

Ad hoc members in attendance:
Russell O'Hare and Rory O'Neill, SW

Could not attend: Raye Ann Robinson and Michael Bates, SW

Agenda Items:
Retention Schedule
RFP Questions

1) Retention Schedule

State of Alaska statutes were reviewed by both Russ O'Hare and Maggie Griscavage to ensure that the A-110 regulation is still valid according to the laws of the state, especially in consideration of the number of state RSA's accepted by the university. The State's retention schedule for grants and contracts deferred to federal guidelines. However, there are separate schedules specifically for banking, so Accounts Payable records will probably fall under those statutes and the group has considered this when determining that while GCS files will need to be scrubbed according to A-110, connecting records' retention will be governed by the point-of-entry entity's rules.

OSP has reported that unfunded proposals retention schedule should be three years, and will be held wholly "on-site" in OSP (i.e., no archiving).

2) RFP Questions – this list was compiled during the December, 2004, group meeting. At this meeting, the group attempted to answer each item, but found that quite a few actually answered, or bled over into, other points.

a) At what point should the information be digitized?

Proposals should be scanned in OSP and committed to record with the completed cover sheet. Departments may prepare their proposals electronically, but ultimately these will also go through OSP (i.e., National Science Foundation's Fastlane, or simply forwarding a full proposal as an attachment to OSP), and OSP will transfer them into the record.

All other data should be digitized whenever it would normally have become the official document of record, whether at the department level (requisition records), or central admin level (fully-executed award document).

b) Who is responsible for digitizing?

See a). Competently trained staff should be responsible for physically scanning and indexing the documents for which they currently are accountable. (i.e., travel department will scan fully executed travel expense form, but the department will already have scanned in the supporting documents.)

c) How many entry portals should there be? Where?

Wherever there is an accountability for a document under the current system there should be a scanning portal. Read/write portals should be limited; read-only access should be available through the internet. Ideally, one portal per department (with some smaller departments sharing a portal, perhaps, while larger departments/institutes could need more than one), and one in each of OSP (preaward and intellectual property records), ORI (IRB, IACUC, special certifications records), GCS, Financial Services, Accounts Payable, Procurement, and Travel. Remote sites and campuses need their own portal. Human Resources documents are also important, but HR is being addressed in another group. However, it is necessary to state, for our group, that time sheets and payment records are auditable documents under post-award audit. Payment records are available from Banner finance system; time sheets are hard copy and would need to be scanned and linked.

d) Should/how should Banner information link to digital records?

The main Imaging Committee is looking into whether SCT has already developed an imaging system that works with Banner as being utilized by U of A. It is necessary to be able to capture Banner screen images for post-award records purposes.

e) In what format should documents be digitized – pdf, tif, film?

This decision will be made by the statewide administrative group. However, post-award is comfortable with .pdf imaging, with no foreseeable film archive needs.

f) How should the index be set up – each department has different retention needs?

The working group came to a conclusion that the indexing may well be driven by the Banner finance system. Banner finance already supplies all the financial record needs of the post award group, but there are many other non-Banner documents that are indexed according to Banner's nomenclature. See Appendix A to these Minutes for a comprehensive list of items that GCS would need for a full audit.

g) Who should have access?

Read/write should be permitted on a limited basis, according to accountability. There will need to be a multi-tiered access assignment according to user requirements. Simplistically, GCS needs access to everything; a PI needs only access to his/her award(s) documents; departments need access to only those awards made to their own faculty, but need access to everything in that "bin." A PPA at the department level would not need access to billing information, but would need to see payroll, budget, travel and personal information. A consideration would be to assign access according to the Job Family grouping – see HR group for this information.

Read access should be web-based and universally available by log-in. Certain information may eventually be ITAR and/or classified and will need special safeguards.

h) How can the document be retrieved? (Web; UA portal?)

Secure access through public internet.

i) How should "scrubbing" (deletion) be authorized – automatic or cognitive decision?

Scrubbing should be by conscious choice. The discussion should be directed to whether the eventual system would provide a "tickler" pop-up whereby the point-of-entry person would be reminded by the system that a document's life-span is about to expire and scrubbing should be done. Scrub dates may be set or perhaps could be generated by GCS system-wide whenever the retention schedule optimum has been met.

j) What's the impact on other areas when the document is scrubbed?

Propose multiple-authority scrubbing command. For example, GCS has reached its three year after the final invoice date and wants to scrub the award documents, along with any subawards made from the prime. Authority to scrub would have to be approved by both GCS and Procurement. Once GCS has scrubbed a record, if the system is queried by an auditor there should be no available links to information that needs to be kept by Accounts Payable (checks, for instance).

k) What should the backup requirement be? Daily, 48 hrs?

If the system has a shadow that provides instant backup to the prime system, then hard copy would be destroyed 24 hours after imaging. It has not been determined that any financial post-award documents would require archiving, unless under litigation and the imaging system's degradation time-line would exceed our retention requirement. At that point, case-by-case decisions would be made to film/archive post award documents.

APPENDIX A

Items normally "completing" GCS' records

Proposal and cover sheet
Special certifications – IRB, IACUC, Biohazard, etc.
Award
Budget request forms
Payroll records - timesheets
Procurement records (purchases, subawards, service contracts, etc)
Accounts payable records
Requisitions
Petty cash vouchers
Journal vouchers
Travel approval and travel expense records
Procard transactions
Interim technical/program reports
Final technical/program reports
Special program "requests for proposals" with their review and award documents
Award amendment requests (OPAS forms, etc)
General correspondence – email capture, exchanges.
Billing records – invoices, cash transactions reports, etc.
Cash receipt records – revenue accounts, checks
Financial reports
Equipment records
Intellectual property certifications – disclosures, patents or negative reports
Closeout certifications – release of claims, final billing, etc.