I. Introductions and Announcements

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 by Charles Arp, State Archivist. Committee members introduced themselves to the group.

Eric Silver, representing County Boards of Mental Retardation/Developmental Disabilities (MR/DD), talked about how the county Boards of MR/DD are hesitant to accept e-signatures. He is seeking documentation that would authorize the county Boards of MR/DD to use e-signatures.

Arp announced that Dr. David Larson will be resigning from the ERC and also the ERC Membership Committee as a result of H.B. 95 abolishing his position within the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) and reassigning him to another branch of state government. In late July, Arp will ask another ERC member from DAS to take Larson's position on the Membership Committee. The selection will be finalized by an ERC vote via listserv.

II. Report on Web-Site Statistics

Pari Swift reported on ERC web-site statistics for January through May 2003 in comparison to the same months in 2002. Overall hits to the ERC web-pages are up over 2000 hits from the same time in 2002. The homepage has been hit almost 750 more times. The Imaging and Database Guidelines as well as the General Schedule remained steady, while the Email Guidelines were down slightly. The Electronic Records
Guidelines are up approximately 100 hits per month and the TIS is showing increased hits as well. These statistics are the first time the Web Content Guidelines have been available in final form. Swift reminded the group that several of the Guidelines exist in another form on the Local Government Records Program website. Hits to those guidelines were not taken into account in these statistics.

III. Report of the Imaging Sub-committee

Mark Schmidbauer began by thanking the committee for their hard work. Schmidbauer reported that the committee had updated some of the technical procedures contained within the original Imaging Guidelines. As well, the committee reorganized the guidelines into four central sections, including a new section for Archiving and Long-term Maintenance. The glossary, links, and bibliography were expanded on. Joe Dickman was credited for creating the two spreadsheets to assist in the cost-analysis section.

Arp thanked Swift and Carol Thomas for their editing efforts. Arp commented that the Ohio ERC's Digital Imaging Guidelines are impressive compared to similar documents. After no response to a call for comments on the document, Arp called for a vote to approve the Revised Digital Imaging Guidelines, which were unanimously approved.

IV. Report on the Survey of Executive Branch Agencies

Arp reported that, until recently, the ERC only had web-site statistics and anecdotal evidence of the use of products created by the ERC. David Larson and Raimund Goerler wanted more proof, so Arp and Larson created a plan to survey 20 executive branch agencies. Only 7 agencies were completed before Larson's reassignment. Arp hopes to interview more agencies in the future.

The results indicate that although most agencies are aware that the public record laws apply to electronic records, most electronic records are not scheduled. Six out of the seven agencies knew of the ERC and use its products. The ERC and its publications are held in high regard by the agencies because of the breadth of membership composition. The ERC was shown a video that the Ohio Bureau of Worker's Compensation had made to train its employees on how to schedule email, based on the ERC's Guidelines for Managing Electronic Mail.

V. Report on the Electronic Records Activities of the Court

Mary Beth Parisi talked about the Courts Technology Policy and Planning Committee, which is broken down into three subcommittees. The first subcommittee is researching national standards for courts, including a uniform case numbering system. The second is the Policy Committee, which makes decisions on what is appropriate, in court records, for public access. They would like to create one policy that includes both paper and electronic records. The last subcommittee is charged with making the courts interoperable. Currently, there is no infrastructure in place connecting Ohio's courts and local law enforcement agencies. 99% of Ohio's courts are automated. The subcommittee would like to create a centralized data center for information to feed into. The proposed funding would come from a $3.00 per case filing fee increase.

VI. Report on the San Diego Super Computer Center NHPRC Grant

The San Diego Super Computer Center (SDSC) submitted a NHPRC grant in June 2003 for $251,830 with a cost share of $214,035. The goal is to demonstrate the generality of the data grid approach to the implementation of a preservation environment and the automation of archival processes, through application to electronic records collections. The Ohio Historical Society (OHS) is one of five institutions that would team with SDSC based on a large email collection held by OHS.
VII. Report on the NHPRC Grant Submitted by OHS and the Ohio Super Computer Center

The grant, titled "A Systematic Approach to Defining Public electronic records of Enduring Historical Value," asks for approximately $350,000 to create an appraisal survey, a decision-making matrix, and a cost model so that archivists can better quantify and build the business case for their efforts to preserve electronic records of enduring historical value.

VIII. Closing

Arp announced that the formation of new subcommittees was being put on hold until at least August 2003 because of the uncertainty caused by the Society-wide reduction in force.

Ideas for future subcommittees include guidelines for instant messaging, guidelines for the digitization of audio/video tape, technology and the Open Meetings Act, revision of the Email Guidelines, and a comparison of various DoD 5015.2 software programs.

The next ERC meeting is scheduled for 4 December 2003 at 1:30.