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Report on the meeting at CUNY which was called by Deputy Chief Operating Officer Ronald Spalter and Senior Vice Chancellor and Chief Operating Officer Allan H. Dobrin. This seemed to arise from interest in Digital records of teaching among UFS as presented by Prof. Pecorino. Among those attending were University Librarian Curtis Kendrick, Sharon Bonk, Prof. Phil Pecorino, Ellen Belcher, Keith Muchowski and Marie C. Spina. Others attending were CUNY counsel and VPs and Records Managers across CUNY. Mr. Spalter has asked the archivists for a position statement on Records Management and retention. This will be our primary order of business. We will draft a statement and present to the Council of Chiefs and/or Mr. Kendrick as we learn more of how this should be handled under the University Librarian.

We should revisit the CUNY records plan presented by Steve Barto which has solid points on Records and this may need to updated to include new information on RM and digital records. We will have to construct a very concise statement which can be applied to the issue of management and retention and find the place where archival retention should be defined and designated.

We will consider moving to establish permanent co-chair positions and take nominations for the office or offices.

Please send any urgent agenda items to acting co chairs _Mspina@lagcc.cuny.edu_ and _KMuchowski@CITYTECH.CUNY.EDU_. Please see minutes of the June meeting with added notes below.

The meeting began at 2:15 PM.

In attendance: Stephen Barto, Queens, Ellen Belcher, John Jay, William Daly, Medgar Evers, James Kaser, Staten Island, Keith Muchowski, City Tech, Mark Padnos, Bronx CC, Marie Cimino Spina, LaGuardia, Sydney Van Nort, City College.

Marie Spina reported for Sandra Roff that the CUNY Matters editors although changed may be receptive to an archives column. Marie Spina and Keith Muchowski will co-write the first article, perhaps with the input of Sandra Roff. Since last reported the CUNY Matter editorial staff and Sandra Roff have not discussed the matter. We will draft and article based on divergent archives and issues for consideration.

Marie Spina will forward to interested parties information about ALEPH.

The following was reported by Bob Sink from the Center for Jewish History:

"ExLibris took the existing Acquisitions functionality and adjusted it to archival needs. Since this Archival GUI (as its called) tweaks existing tables, it is not ideal but seems to meet 70-80% of our needs for accessioning archival collections. Some refer to it as the Donor GUI since it was designed to accommodate donations rather than fit archival gifts into the Vendor/Price model used for acquiring books. Although some of it is designed to handle tasks specific to the Center, we tried to keep the needs of other archives in mind as we did this. Ex Libris has promised to make the Archival GUI 'supportable' (provide support for it out of the Chicago office), 'reproducible' (make it available to other clients), and..."
'upgradeable' (provide an upgrade path going forward). The Archival GUI is nearing its final form, and I'll share more information when it is completed [as is] EAD.

After the SAA meeting Bob wrote:

"Basically, we found that Aleph worked fine in terms of bibliographic records. Beyond the MARC basics we wanted to use the 773/580 linking capabilities and Aleph can do that. And, we wanted to use the 856 field as a hot link from the bib record to the EAD finding aid and that works. What Aleph didn't have was the collection management capabilities for archives that it has for books. Their development of the Archival GUI has gone part of the way to correct that. We will be able to accession in Aleph, track actions (date received, date accessioned, acknowledgment sent, deed of gift sent, deed of gift returned), have the next available accession assigned automatically, and some information transferred from the accession form to the bib record."

At our meeting on the 22nd there was a debate about the current state of automation in CUNY libraries.

The roundtable discussed finding aids. There was consensus that there should be a minimum of standards. Moreover, processing should be use driven. The idea is that things should be "uploadable" in every archive if/when the time arrived to enter them into a catalog.

Steve Barto noted that the various CUNY registrars are legally responsible to supply college catalogs and bulletins to students, although libraries often provide this service. He stressed that archives need systems in place within the individual libraries to handle this.

Many people expressed an interest in acquiring interns for their collections. Marie Spina has a contact list.

Ellen Belcher noted that it was particularly important for the CUNY archives at those schools with graduate programs to preserve master's theses. She stressed that while dissertations are important as well, they are also widely available from Dissertation Abstracts.

Many people disseminated copies of their institutions' donor forms, gift agreements, and loan request forms. It was noted that SAA has guidelines, available online, for donor forms. An alternative to the donor form is the user "use form/agreement." There was a discussion about the feasibility of a standardized CUNY-wide donor agreement form.

Soliciting materials varies widely from school to school. It is important to note for users if your archives are retrospectively collecting. Also, for users, it is important to note when the archive was founded and "staffing began in [ ]."

Everyone concurred that keeping usage statistics is vital. It is especially important to note the number of requests received, the amount of time the archivist spent on each search, and whether the user from inside or outside the institution.

There was discussion about redoing the staff professional profiles. The meeting ended at 4:40.