

June 16, 2017

REPORT #: 2017-08

Ardashes "Ardy" Kassakhian  
Glendale City Clerk

Dear Ardy,

Enclosed is the final report of the Records Management Audit. Internal Audit would like to thank you and your staff for the support and assistance provided during the course of this project.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact Sameel Salim or myself.

Sincerely,



Jessie Zhang, Acting Internal Audit Manager

Enclosure

cc: Yasmin Beers, Assistant City Manager  
Robert Elliot, Director of Finance  
Michele Flynn, Assistant Director of Finance  
Michael Garcia, City Attorney  
Scott Ochoa, City Manager  
Lucy Varpetian, Senior Assistant City Attorney  
City Council  
Audit Committee

REPORT #: 2017-08



INTERNAL AUDIT

# **Records Management Audit**

**June 16, 2017**

## Background

In accordance with the fiscal year 2016-17 audit work plan, Internal Audit completed its review of the records management practices of the City of Glendale (City). This review was performed at the request of the City Clerk's Office.

According to the California Local Government Record Management Guidelines, "*Records Management Program is designed to apply efficient and economical management methods to the creation, utilization, maintenance, retention, preservation, and disposal of state records. Effective Records Management ensures that records are kept **only** as long as they have some administrative, fiscal, or legal value. When records no longer fulfill the value for which they were created, they should be destroyed unless they also have some historic or research significance.*" It further states, "*records retained beyond their value 'just in case' only extend the agency's legal liability in the event of adverse litigation.*"

The City does not have an approved, comprehensive record management program/policy in place. Rather, record management is addressed in various policies, including Administrative Policy Manual (APM) 7-3, which is the Records Retention and Destruction Policy. The policy states, "*Each division is directed to institute its own records retention and disposal program*". However, most City departments do not have their own record management programs.

In response to the lack of departmental record management programs, the City Attorney's Office drafted a Record Management Program policy for City departments to use as a guideline. Internal Audit reviewed these record management related APMs and compared them to the following external sources, which collectively provide for "good practice" criteria:

- California Secretary of State Local Government Records Management Guidelines, February 2006
- California Electronic Records Management Handbook, February 2002
- The Historical Records of County Government in California, 2004
- Recommended Practice: Analysis, Selection, and Implementation of Electronic Document Management Systems, June 2009
- CalRim Vital Records Protection and Disaster Recovery, December 2003
- California Government Code 34090-34095, 1975
- California Privacy Laws, January 2016

With input from both the City Clerk and City Attorney's Office, Internal Audit also conducted an internal and external survey to assess the record management practices of the City and to gauge how they compare to the practices of other cities. The internal survey was sent to departmental record management liaisons identified by the City Clerk's Office. All 14 departments responded to the survey. The external survey was sent by the City Clerk's Office to numerous California cities within the City Clerk's email distribution list. In total, 22 cities responded to the external survey.

## Objective, Scope, and Methodology

The objective of this audit was to evaluate the record management program of the City as compared to good practices and the practices of other cities. The scope of this audit was limited to performing a gap analysis between the City's current record management policies and guidelines and "good practice" documentation. The internal survey results were used as testimonial evidence to support the observations identified in the gap analysis. Similarly, the external survey results were used to compare, at a high level, the overall record management program of the City against that of other cities. Survey responses were taken as is. Test work was not performed to verify the accuracy of the responses.

In order to accomplish the audit objectives, Internal Audit performed the following procedures:

- Obtained and reviewed both the City's and external record management documentation, such as the State guidelines.
- Conducted an internal survey of each City department to gauge the City's current record management practices.
- Conducted an external survey of cities within California to gauge their current record management practices.
- Performed a gap analysis between the City's record management policies and guidelines and state laws, regulations, and other external record management guidelines.

- Reviewed internal survey responses and determined if findings identified in the gap analysis have an impact on current practices.
- Reviewed external survey responses to compare and contrast the overall state of the City's record management program with that of other cities.

## Summary of Results

Based on the gap analysis, we have noted various opportunities for improving the City's existing record management program policies and guidelines. For example, we noted that clearly defined roles and responsibilities are not established for the various personnel involved in the records management process. In addition, the internal survey responses revealed inconsistent practices amongst the various City departments. These findings were primarily due to the records management process being a decentralized effort. The inconsistent practices noted in the internal survey responses reinforced the need of a citywide comprehensive records management program policy to direct the varying practices.

We learned from the external survey responses that many cities also appear to be struggling with similar record management related issues, including the development of a comprehensive citywide policy.

One way in which some cities addressed their lack of a comprehensive program involved the utilization of external consultants.

**Conclusion**

Overall, the main improvement opportunities relate to updating and finalizing the draft record management policy and establishing roles and responsibilities for the various record management participants.

This along with other improvement opportunities identified are summarized by risk rating in the chart that follows and included in the Observation, Recommendation, and Management Response Section of this report. The internal survey responses can be found in Appendix A, and the external survey responses can be found in Appendix B.

<b>Priority 1</b>
Critical control weakness that exposes the City to a high degree of combined risks.
None
<b>Priority 2</b>
Less than critical control weakness that exposes the City to a moderate degree of combined risks.
None

<b>Priority 3</b>
Opportunity for good or better practice for improved efficiency or reduce exposure to combined risks.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Record management program is not established at either Citywide or departmental level.</li> <li>2. Record inventories are not being performed to ensure the record retention schedule is updated.</li> <li>3. Electronic records are not adequately addressed in the existing policies and procedures.</li> <li>4. Inconsistencies were noted between policies and current practices on retaining emails.</li> <li>5. Policies and procedures do not address breach of confidential and private information.</li> <li>6. Roles and responsibilities are not clearly defined or documented within the record management program policy.</li> <li>7. Draft policies and procedures do not firmly instruct employees to destroy records when they are no longer needed.</li> </ol>

	Item	Observation	Recommendation	Management Response
<p>Priority 3</p>	<p>1.</p>	<p>Although there is no formal citywide record management policy, the Record Management Program policy, developed in 2006, has been utilized by the City Attorney’s Office as a guideline for departments with their own record management activities. This policy has been in draft form since development.</p> <p>Further, according to the Record Retention and Destruction policy (APM 7-3), the City’s record retention and destruction program is decentralized and each department is required to develop their own written program.</p> <p>As a result of the incomplete draft Record Management Program policy and decentralized process, inconsistent practices were noted. Based on the internal survey, we noted 10 of 14 (71%) stated their department does not have a record management policy in place, and 7 of 9 (78%) who provided feedback for improving the record management process stated a uniform, Citywide policy would be helpful.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the City Clerk’s Office review the record management related policies and consolidate them as one comprehensive Record Management Program policy.</p> <p>In addition, suggestions for implementing a comprehensive record management program include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Running the record management program as a city-wide project.</li> <li>• Assigning a project lead who will develop milestones/ deliverables, track progress, and generally direct the record management effort on behalf of the City.</li> <li>• Creating a record management team comprised of participants from each City department.</li> <li>• Conducting periodic team meetings to discuss goals, progress, challenge points, and other general knowledge sharing opportunities.</li> </ul>	<p>City Clerk’s Office agrees with the recommendation and will work with City Attorney’s Office to review the record management related policies and determine whether a consolidated comprehensive record management program policy should be implemented. Additional resources may be required in order to implement a citywide record management program.</p> <p>A final determination whether or not to implement will be made by December 31, 2017.</p>

Item	Observation	Recommendation	Management Response
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Priority 3</p>	<p>2. With the assistance of an external consultant, the City developed a record retention schedule in 2004. Nonetheless, 7 of 14 (50%) departments stated they do not have a record retention schedule and they do not provide record retention instructions to employees. As well, 11 of 14 (79%) departments stated they have never performed a record inventory to ensure the schedule is applicable and up to date.</p>	<p>In order to keep the record retention schedule as accurate and relevant as possible, it is recommended that City Clerk’s Office ensure City departments perform a complete inventory of the records within their possession. The inventory should include electronic records. The retention schedule should then be updated accordingly. Changes made to the schedule should follow the appropriate approval process.</p>	<p>City Clerk’s Office agrees with the recommendations and will work with the City Attorney’s Office to implement the following:</p>
	<p>Additionally, the schedule is missing a number of key elements such as stating the media type (electronic or paper), identifying the record owner, stating the record location (as opposed to just stating the department), and identifying if the record is considered critical for disaster recovery purposes.</p>	<p>It is also recommended that the columns in the record retention schedule be expanded to include media type, record owner, record location, and designating whether the record is critical for disaster recovery purposes.</p>	<p>However, additional resources may be required in order ensure this task is completed on a city-wide basis.</p>
<p>Furthermore, the City's draft Record Management Program policy does not make mention of the financial and/or legal ramifications of keeping records past their useful life. Rather, the draft policy limits the reason for compliance to “space” by stating, "Since records are constantly being</p>	<p>Finally, the financial and/or legal ramifications of not following the record retention guidelines should also be noted in the draft policy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure record retention schedule is up-to-date based on complete inventories, including electronic records, performed by City departments. Any changes made to the schedule will be properly approved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand the columns of the record retention schedule by June 30, 2018.</li> <li>• Revise the draft Record Management Program policy to include the financial and/or legal ramifications of not following the record retention guidelines by June 30, 2018.</li> </ul>

Item	Observation	Recommendation	Management Response
	<p>created and space for storage is limited, an orderly and legal method of disposing obsolete records and minimizing the amount of space needed to store vital records is necessary.”</p> <p>This approach was reflected from the internal survey result where 6 of 14 (43%) departments stated they have last performed a record cleanup three or more years ago. Further, 4 of the 6 stated that they were not sure when the last record cleanup was conducted. This indicates a lack of understanding of why record retention/destruction is important.</p>		



Item	Observation	Recommendation	Management Response
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Priority 3</p>	<p>3. The primary focus of the City’s draft Record Management Program policy is paper records. Adequate attention to electronic records is not given. The draft Record Management Program policy does not address:</p>	<p>It is recommended that the City Clerk’s Office work with City Attorney’s Office to expand the Record Management Program policy to include the subject of electronic records as follows:</p>	<p>City Clerk’s Office agrees with the recommendation and will work with the City Attorney’s Office to review the record management related policies and determine how best to incorporate the recommended additions. The anticipated completion is June 30, 2018.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to identify the record owner and how to assign responsibility for record management with electronic records maintained in a shared environment (shared drives, emails, cloud storage, etc.)</li> <li>• Naming and filing conventions for electronic records.</li> </ul> <p>These observations were supported by the following internal survey responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9 of 14 (64%) stated they do not provide employees guidance on how to manage records (both paper and electronic) in a shared environment.</li> <li>• 6 of 14 (43%) stated they do not manage electronic records the same way as paper records.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a conceptual description of what electronic records are (email attachments, PDF’s, Word/Excel files, etc.) and why they are important to properly manage.</li> <li>• Describe the importance of consistent naming and filing conventions for electronic records.</li> <li>• Emphasize that electronic records in a shared environment are subject to same record management expectations as non-shared records.</li> <li>• Provide criteria for identifying the official record owner of shared records, as he/she will be responsible for managing the record in accordance with the record retention schedule.</li> </ul>	

Item	Observation	Recommendation	Management Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 9 of 14 (64%) stated they do not provide guidance to employees on naming conventions and/or filing methods for both electronic and paper records</li><li>• 10 of 14 (71%) stated electronic records were either not included or they were unsure if they were included in the last record cleanup</li><li>• 12 or 14 (86%) stated they do not have a policy to manage electronic records</li></ul>		

Item	Observation	Recommendation	Management Response
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Priority 3</p>	<p>4. Inconsistencies were noted between City’s Electronic Use and Internet Use policy (APM 7-6) and current practices on retaining emails.</p> <p>APM 7-6 states emails are not public records and are not retained by the City. Additionally, both APM 7-6 and the record retention schedule states that emails will be deleted after seven days. However, in practice emails are not purged according to the established timelines. The emails in this context are referring to those that are retained in employee “Inbox” or “personal folder”, not deleted emails in the “Deleted Items” folder.</p> <p>In addition, according to the internal survey results, 10 of 14 (71%) departments stated they either did not or were not sure if they included electronic records, including emails, in their last record clean-up. Therefore, it appears emails are in fact being retained by most of the city departments, which is contrary to the APM.</p> <p>Failure to follow City guidelines systematically may result in adverse legal/financial consequences.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the City Clerk’s Office work with City Attorney’s Office to re-evaluate the statement within APM 7-6 which refers to emails as not being public records and not being retained. If the statement is accurate as written, detailed procedures should be developed to ensure emails are not being retained.</p> <p>Otherwise, if it is determined that emails should in fact be retained, the records management program policy should be updated to include guidance on email management.</p> <p>It is important to note an email is not considered a record in and of itself nor categorized as a record type. Retention or disposition of email messages must be related to the individual records within each email.</p>	<p>City Clerk’s Office agrees with the recommendation and will work with the City Attorney’s Office to determine whether or not the City will retain its emails. The comprehensive Record Management Program policy will then be updated accordingly.</p> <p>The anticipated completion is June 30, 2018.</p>

	Item	Observation	Recommendation	Management Response
Priority 3	5.	<p>Confidential and private information should be physically and/or electronically safeguarded. In instances of breach of confidential information, there should be guidance on how and who to contact both internally and externally. However, this information was not found within the record management policies and guidelines of the City.</p> <p>The importance of this observation was supported by 12 of 14 (86%) departments stating they have confidential documents in their possession.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the City Clerk's Office expand the Record Management Program policy to include instructions on how to handle breaches of confidential information.</p>	<p>City Clerk's Office agrees with the recommendation and will work with the City Attorney's Office to include how to handle breaches of confidential information in the comprehensive Record Management Program policy.</p> <p>The anticipated completion is June 30, 2018.</p>

Item	Observation	Recommendation	Management Response
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Priority 3</p>	<p>6. The draft Record Management Program policy mentions various positions including the Record Manager, City Attorney, and City Clerk. However, the policy does not clearly define the roles and responsibilities, as they relate to records management, for each of these job classifications.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the City Clerk's Office revise the Record Management Program policy to include a section defining the roles and responsibilities of the personnel involved in the record management process.</p>	<p>City Clerk's Office agrees with the recommendation and will work with the City Attorney's Office to define roles and responsibilities of the personnel involved and to reiterate the importance of having adequate resources to effectively manage the department's records in the comprehensive Record Management Program policy.</p>
	<p>The lack of defined roles and responsibilities reflected by the inconsistencies noted in the internal survey where 4 of 14 (29%) stated they have no resource at the City level to contact for record management related questions. Of the 10 that stated they do have a resource, responses varied between the City Attorney's Office and the City Clerk's Office.</p>	<p>Additionally, the importance of having adequate resources available to effectively manage the department's records should be formally reiterated in the policy, such as requiring backup record custodian within each department .</p>	<p>The anticipated completion is June 30, 2018.</p>
	<p>Additionally, 5 of 14 (36%) departments stated they do not have a designated backup and/or analyst to assist in the record management function.</p>		

	Item	Observation	Recommendation	Management Response
Priority 3	7.	<p>Regarding destruction of duplicate copies, the draft Record Management Program policy states, “any duplicate copy (including any record which has been replaced by a “Trusted Copy”) <b>may be</b> destroyed by the Custodian of Records...”</p> <p>The use of ambiguous phrases such as “may be” is in contradiction to the California Local Government Record Management Guidelines which states, “In general, records should be retained only as long as they serve the immediate administrative, legal and/or fiscal purposes for which they were created. When records no longer serve these purposes, they <b>should be</b> disposed of or preserved for archival purposes, whichever is appropriate.”</p> <p>In addition, the California Electronic Records Management Handbook states, “Convenience copies of documents should be kept only as long as needed to meet the purpose for which they were created, and no longer than the record copy. This requires knowledge of where the record copy is being maintained in</p>	<p>It is recommended that City Clerk’s Office revise the Record Management Program policy to include stronger wording and clarify when and who shall instruct employees to delete records, including drafts and duplicates, when they are no longer needed.</p>	<p>City Clerk’s Office agrees with the recommendation and will work with the City Attorney’s Office to include stronger wording and clarify when and who shall instruct employees to delete records in the comprehensive Record Management Program policy.</p> <p>The anticipated completion is June 30, 2018.</p>

Item	Observation	Recommendation	Management Response
	<p>the agency and procedures to inform staff on the proper disposition of records. Unmanaged duplicates or convenience copies also pose a serious risk of litigation to an agency.”</p> <p>The phrase “may be” is also in contradiction to the City’s record retention schedule which states, “Drafts and versions of documents <b>should be</b> destroyed unless otherwise specified in this records retention schedule.”</p>		

**Records Management Audit  
Internal Survey Results  
Appendix A**

Question Number	Question	Answer Options	Responses	
1	Is there a designated backup or analyst to assist you in the records management process?	Yes	9	64.3%
		No	5	35.7%
2	Do you have a resource at the city you contact for record management related questions?	Yes	10	71.4%
		No	4	28.6%
3	Does your department have a formalized/documented record management program and/or process (policy/procedure, scheduled clean-up days, employee training, etc.)?	Yes	4	28.6%
		No	10	71.4%
4	Do you have a separate policy/procedure specifically for managing electronic records?	Yes	2	14.3%
		No	12	85.7%
5	Are electronic records (emails, email attachments, Word documents, Excel spreadsheets, etc.) managed the same way as traditional paper records?	Yes	8	57.1%
		No	6	42.9%
6	Does your department provide guidance to employees on how to manage electronic and/or physical records that are shared? For example, if a share drive is shared between more than one department, email cc's, or other instances in which multiple copies of the record are in circulation, are guidelines given to assist in identifying the official record owner who is responsible for managing, safeguarding, and destroying the applicable records?	Yes	5	35.7%
		No	9	64.3%
7	Does your department provide guidance to employees on naming conventions and/or filing methods. For example, is guidance provided on how to name records in a shared drive (for electronic records) or filing cabinets (for hard copy records) to facilitate the identification of the record when needed?	Yes	5	35.7%
		No	9	64.3%
8	Has a complete inventory of the various types of records (financial, personnel, customer, electronic, hard copy, etc.) within your department ever been performed?	Yes	3	21.4%
		No	11	78.6%
9	Does your department have a record retention and destruction policy/schedule (something that shows the various records within your department and how long each record should be retained prior to destruction)?	Yes	7	50%
		No	7	50%



**Records Management Audit  
Internal Survey Results  
Appendix A**

Question Number	Question	Answer Options	Responses	
10	Are employees (new and existing) provided instruction on record retention requirements?	Yes	7	50%
		No	7	50%
11	When was the last time your department has conducted a record clean-up to destroy and/or archive records?	< 1 Year	1	7.1%
		1-2 Years Ago	7	50%
		> 3 Years	2	14.3%
		Not Sure	4	28.6%
		Never	0	0%
12	During the record clean-up, were electronic records (emails, Word documents, Excel spreadsheets, etc.) included in the exercise?	Yes	4	28.6%
		No	5	35.7%
		Not Sure	5	35.7%
		Never	0	0%
13	Does your department have any confidential/private/sensitive (social security numbers, tax id's, addresses, etc.) records?	Yes	12	85.7%
		No	2	14.3%
14	Do you have a legal liaison to facilitate public record requests?	Yes	14	100%
		No	0	0%
15	When a public record request is made, who reviews/redacts the information prior to public release?	City Attorney's Office	10	71.4%
		Depends on Record Type	2	14.3%
		Employees Responsible for Document	2	14.3%

**Records Management Audit  
Internal Survey Results  
Appendix A**

Question Number	Question
16	Please provide any suggestions/comments to improve the overall record management program either within your department or citywide. <b>Note: 9 responses were received.</b>
	A policy on record retention would be great: electronic and paper.
	We need a Citywide records destruction PO.
	It would be ideal to have an individual assigned to the Records Management Program who would be responsible for guiding, advising, and/or taking the lead on creating and managing the records schedule and subsequent destruction of records, in particular the electronic records.
	It would be great to implement a policy Citywide that all departments follow. This would include electronic files. Thank you!
	Lack of storage is always an issue. A centralized records management would be plus.
	A citywide initiation of records destruction so that every department is on the same schedule and properly destroys documents timely.
	1. Develop a policy to be used citywide for records management
	2. Develop a policy for electronic mail retention and enforce mailbox grooming and elimination of PST's (Personal Storage Tables).
	We greatly need assistance to develop an updated standardized filing and record management policy. Lack of available staff time has prevented the Department from developing and implementing a record management system. Perhaps there could be a training session with recommendations and suggestions on how to maintain files. However, continued flexibility is suggested.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any document available online should not be maintained in hard copy.</li> <li>• Consistent naming conventions should be used throughout the City.</li> <li>• A records management ambassador for each department to be appointed.</li> </ul>
	Updating a Citywide Policy and sending it to departments as a reminder.
	Need an updated Citywide Records Retention and Destruction Policy which incorporates FileNet. Need an updated Citywide Records Retention Schedule.

**Records Management Audit  
External Survey Results  
Appendix B**

In order to compare the City of Glendale's record management practices to other cities, a survey was sent out to various cities within the Glendale City Clerk's email distribution list. The survey was meant to assess the maturity and overall record management practices of other cities and to determine how they compare to Glendale's record management practices. The following 21 cities responded to the survey:

City	City Type	Population *	Number of Full Time Employees *
Saratoga	Contract City	30,907	54
El Centro	Charter City	43,763	235
Torrance	Charter City	148,495	1,400
Stockton	Charter City	302,389	1,300
Santa Ana	Charter City	334,909	1,100
Berkeley	Charter City	118,853	1,400
Irvine	Charter City	248,531	900
Santee	Charter City	57,052	80
Burbank	Charter City	105,368	Unknown
Pasadena	Charter City	140,881	2,500
Anderson	General Law City	10,209	52
Los Gatos	General Law City	30,735	200
La Habra Heights	General Law City	5,466	13
El Cerrito	General Law City	24,599	160
Vacaville	General Law City	95,856	534
Lakeport	General Law City	4,776	49
Cupertino	General Law City	60,668	171
West Sacramento	General Law City	51,847	350
Chowchilla	General Law City	18,909	65
Chino Hills	General Law City	77,005	155
West Hollywood	General Law City	35,883	315

\* Source: <http://www.city-data.com/>

The survey responses received from the participating cities were summarized in the tables starting on the following page. The City of Glendale Internal Audit would like to thank all participating cities for their support and assistance provided.

**Records Management Audit  
External Survey Results  
Appendix B**

Question Number	Question	Answer Options	Responses	
1	Is there a dedicated records manager for your city?	Yes	10	52.6%
		No	9	47.4%
		Answered Question	19	
2	Is there an official custodian for public records in your city?	Yes	18	90%
		No	2	10%
		Answered Question	20	
3	Do individual departments within your city manage their records independently or is there a centralized record management function?	Each department manages their own records independently.	3	14.3%
		Each department manages their own records as determined by a city wide policy.	14	66.7%
		Records are centrally managed (not managed at the departmental level).	2	9.5%
		Other	7	33.3%
		Answered Question	21	
4	Does your city have a formalized/documented record management program?	Yes	10	47.6%
		No	11	52.4%
		Answered Question	21	

**Records Management Audit  
External Survey Results  
Appendix B**

Question Number	Question	Answer Options	Responses		
5	Relating to the records management program, please check all that apply:	We have documented records management policies/procedures.	13	81.3%	
		We have regularly scheduled clean up days for removal of physical records.	5	31.3%	
		We have regularly scheduled clean up days for removal of electronic records.	2	12.5%	
		We provide ongoing employee training for records management.	7	43.8%	
		We provide new employee training for records management.	5	31.3%	
		Answered Question		16	
		6	Are electronic records (emails, email attachments, Word documents, Excel spreadsheets, etc.) managed the same way as traditional paper records?	Yes	12
No	9			42.9%	
Answered Question				21	

**Records Management Audit  
External Survey Results  
Appendix B**

Question Number	Question	Answer Options	Responses	
7	Does your city provide guidance to employees on naming conventions and/or filing methods. For example, is guidance provided on how to name records in a shared drive (for electronic records) or filing cabinets (for hard copy records) to facilitate the identification of the record when needed.	Yes	7	35%
		No	13	65%
		Answered Question	20	
8	Does your city provide guidance to employees on how to manage electronic and/or physical records that are shared? For example, if a share drive is shared between more than one department, email cc's, or other instances in which multiple copies of the record are in circulation, are guidelines given to assist in identifying the official record owner who is responsible for managing, safeguarding, and destroying the applicable records?	Yes	3	14.3%
		No	18	85.7%
		Answered Question	21	
9	Do you have a separate policy/procedure specifically for managing electronic records?	Yes	4	19%
		No	17	81%
		Answered Question	21	
10	Has your city reviewed the electronic data backup and retrieval capabilities to ensure consistency with the timelines noted in your retention schedule?	Yes	6	28.6%
		No	5	23.8%
		Do not know	10	47.6%
		Answered Question	21	

**Records Management Audit  
External Survey Results  
Appendix B**

Question Number	Question	Answer Options	Responses	
11	Regarding the development of your records management policy, please check all that apply.	We utilized the California Secretary of State Guidelines.	8	40%
		We searched the internet for best practice documentation.	3	15%
		We researched the practices of other cities.	6	30%
		We do not have a records management policy.	1	5%
		Other:	13	65%
		Answered Question	20	
12	Has a complete inventory of the various types of records (financial, personnel, customer, electronic, hard copy, etc.) within your city ever been performed?	Yes	9	45%
		No	11	55%
		Answered Question	20	
13	Does your city have a record retention and destruction policy/schedule (something that shows the various records within your city and how long each record should be retained prior to destruction)?	Yes	18	85.7%
		No	3	14.3%
		Answered Question	21	

**Records Management Audit  
External Survey Results  
Appendix B**

Question Number	Question	Answer Options	Responses	
14	How does your city safeguard confidential/private (social security numbers, tax id's, addresses) records? Please check all that apply.	We utilize encryption technology.	3	14.3%
		Electronic files are password protected.	5	23.8%
		Hard copy files are kept within locked filed cabinets.	13	61.9%
		Other	11	52.4%
		Answered Question		21



**Records Management Audit  
External Survey Results  
Appendix B**

Question Number	Question
15	<p>Please provide any accomplishments and/or challenges with your city's record management program that you would like to share: <b>Note: 13 responses were received</b></p>
	<p>We are currently in the process of upgrading our Document Imaging System to a new ECMS application that runs on a SharePoint platform and utilizes KnowledgeLake Capture software to scan and upload documents to the sharepoint storage site. We are currently in Phase I (City Clerk, and Records Center) of the project and expect to convert more databases over to the new system over time. This will enable us to provide more access to City employee's and manage our records better by allowing for electronic retention scheduling, and a portal for public records to constituents.</p>
	<p>We are currently on track with our ECM/RIM plans. The biggest challenge is the transition to electronic records.</p>
	<p>We are currently in the process of completing the process of updating our records retention schedule; which has not been updated since 2006. We are working on digitizing all property files, including development agreements, encroachment permits, and other related documents. We are also conducting quality control to ensure vital records are complete and legible.</p>
	<p>The following are a list of challenges our City is currently facing in regards to our records management program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Lack of training for new employees on our records management program, system and process</li> <li>-Ensuring copies and drafts are completely deleted/destroyed once they are approved for destruction</li> <li>-Lack of manpower to carry out other records management related duties. Our records staff consists of one person.</li> </ul>
	<p>We are upgrading from SIRE to OnBase, but are just at the beginning of the project. We are currently updating all City retention schedules. We respond to approximately 4,000 records requests per year. We have about 15 million images in SIRE, which is growing daily. We are the last year of a 10 year project to convert all microfilm to image. We are an office of 10 but could use several more people!</p>
	<p>We are in the process or archiving over 2000 rolls into our imaging system so that they can be destroyed. This has been a large process.</p>
	<p>Due to technology changes, we have records across several systems and mediums. Also, because each department is responsible for their own records, they have all developed their own in house processes that don't match with the main city records. This can make locating things for use or destruction very time consuming.</p>

**Records Management Audit  
External Survey Results  
Appendix B**

Question Number	Question
15 Continued	We're getting better, but it's still challenging to get everyone on board. People come and go and knowledge gets lost and it's important for me to keep up with each department to make sure they are trained well to know what to do with records. Each new employee receives the Records Retention schedule and procedures so that at least the seed is planted that there is one. It would be great for you to share tips and success stories. Good luck!
	As you can see, we are in need of a complete RMS to be developed. Anything you can share would be greatly appreciated.
	Our city incorporated in 1921. There has never been a formal records management program and the retention schedule hadn't been updated in over 15 years before I was elected. We have adopted a new Records Retention Schedule last year, have retained Diane Gladwell to update it yearly are getting ready to adopt the update this year.
	My main challenge now is to get all the records organized such that we will only have to be dealing with new documents. However, until that happens the challenge is to bring all the old records into the system and get them organized within the City's records room and at the same time remain current with new documents coming into the system.
	Challenges are it's a cumbersome process which is why departments are not keeping current. When we update the process, our intent is to streamline it to make it more manageable so departments will keep up to date.
	We store permanent documents electronically on Laserfiche, where all employees can access them.