

Library, Media, and Information Services Committee

Meeting Notes for 4/17/2018

Present: Jeremy Cucco, Kate Cohn, Sue Hannaford (Chair), D. Wade Hands, David Latimer, and Lisa Wood

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

The minutes from our meeting on April 3 were approved with minor corrections.

Committee members discussed a draft of a table summarizing the types of sensitive documents for the remainder of the meeting. (Draft table attached to minutes.)

Jeremy Cucco clarified that the OT and PT programs are the only HIPAA certified entities on campus, because these programs provide medical care to members of the community. While other faculty and staff may see medical information about students and staff, legally this information is governed by FERPA regulations rather than HIPAA. Woods offered that faculty and students do have health data (e.g., as part of a research project). Cucco stated that one potential resource for advising faculty on how to deal with such situations is Professor Ann Wilson in her role as the university's HIPAA privacy officer.

The committee discussed how best to fill in the table cells relating to suggested document retention time and purge method. Members recognized that faculty keep records for various reasons. For example, a faculty member might hold onto paper in a senior seminar for several years, in case the author asks for a graduate program letter, while discarding essays by first-year students after a semester. Woods volunteered to rework on combining the retention time and purge columns into a single recommendation and share the revision with the committee prior to the next meeting.

The committee also discussed the types of documents discussed under the heading "faculty and staff documents." Woods said it would be appropriate to refer this section of the document to the Professional Standards committee.

With a few minutes left in the meeting, the committee discussed the next steps. There was consensus that we should forward the draft document to the Faculty Senate in the year-end report. Discussion points included:

- 1) To make clear that LMIS realizes that our draft is not the final document, but a working draft.
- 2) Suggest that the Senate refer the document to other committees (i.e., IRB, Professional Standards) for feedback.

- 3) The committee advises that the Senate does not implement the document until it has been piloted by a variety of faculty.
- 4) The committee members recognize that it may be appropriate for the Senate to consult with next year's LMIS to finalize the document.

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 am.

Respectfully submitted,
Sue Hannaford