



OHIO ELECTRONIC RECORDS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

<http://www.ohiohistory.org/ohiojunction/erc/>

DATE: 14 JANUARY 2004

LOCATION: RHODES OFFICE TOWER

COMMITTEE MEMBERS					
Interim Chair:	Richard Whitehouse	✓			
Members:	Doug Alt			Mary Beth Parisi	
	Deborah Archie	✓		John Runion	
	Sol Bermann			Mark Schmidbauer	✓
	John Blair	✓		Karen Shaffer	✓
	Galen Bock			Christian Selch	✓
	Kevin Callaghan			Eric Silver	✓
	Tamar Chute			Martin Susec	
	Judy Cobb	✓		Pari Swift	✓
	Carol Crofut	✓		Carol Thomas	
	Barbara Floyd	✓		Dino Tsiboruris	✓
	Rai Goerler	✓		Daryl Weir	✓
	Yvonne Harris	✓		Jane Wildermuth	✓
	David Landsbergen	✓		Judith Wise	
	Andrea Lentz	✓		Tony Yankus	
Alternates:	Pattie Doyle		for Martin Susec	✓	
	Mike Dressel		for Mary Beth Parisi	✓	
	Jim Mendel		for Mary Beth Parisi	✓	
GUESTS:					
Rodger Whaley					

I. Welcome and Introductions

Interim-Chair Richard Whitehouse welcomed members to the special meeting of the ERC. The purpose of the meeting was to determine if the ERC should continue and if so, in what direction and capacity.

Immediately there were concerns over the role of the Ohio Historical Society with the ERC given the vacant State Archivist position and the meeting being held outside of the Ohio Historical Center. Pari Swift reported that the Ohio Historical Society (OHS) sees the ERC as an independent committee of which OHS has members. OHS acknowledges the benefits of a relationship with the ERC. The search for a new State Archivist is ongoing.

Members were divided into three groups to discuss the issues. The groups then presented their thoughts on the topic to the committee as a whole. Following a lunch break, the committee reconvened to for open discussion and debate on the issues.

OHIOERC: REFORMATTED 2011
PAGE 1 OF 7



OHIO ELECTRONIC RECORDS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

<http://www.ohiohistory.org/ohiojunction/erc/>

What follows includes items discussed in the small groups and further discussed with the committee as a whole.

II. Who is the ERC?

There is concern over the current lack of leadership from OHS, the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) and the Office of Policy and Planning (OPP). OPP, an original co-founder of the ERC, no longer has representation on the ERC. DAS did send their attorney to the meeting, although they are no longer a centralized group that can provide leadership.

a. Relationship with the Ohio Historical Society

- OHS is the only agency that each member deals with and should serve as the coordinator of ERC activities, but should not dictate the direction that the committee takes.
 - Umbrella agency
- OHS should be one of many partners in the ERC
- OHS should take on a leadership role
 - State Archivist should serve as chair
- OHS is a neutral organization and should be used as a resource
- OHS has an interest in preserving government records
 - Most agencies and local government represented eventually have an issue that relates to OHS
 - The archival problems presented by electronic records is the reason the committee was first formed.
- Ohio Historical Records Advisory Board (OHRAB) should help facilitate a partnership between the ERC and OHS.
- Currently the biggest problem with OHS is available resources
- Need to wait until new State Archivist hired to see what direction (s)he wants to go
- Will new upper-level administration make a difference?
- If the State Archives didn't care about the direction of the committee and DAS doesn't enforce the guidelines created by the committee, where is the motivation for agencies and local governments to develop policies using the best practices?

b. Other sponsorship(s)

Consensus was that the ERC should remain an independent committee at this point and should not seek sponsorship from other agencies. Although having a sponsoring agency might allow the committee the ability to have an internal effect on an agency by actually working with staff and applying some best practices, it could also be limiting when it comes to other agencies and local governments. An independent committee would speak to a broader audience. The field of records management, especially



OHIO ELECTRONIC RECORDS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

<http://www.ohiohistory.org/ohiojunction/erc/>

where electronic records are concerned, is fluid, so the ERC too should be fluid.

The chair and possibly co-chair positions should not represent sponsorship by particular agencies and affiliations.

c. "Public" meetings

At this point in time, the ERC meetings do not fall under the public meetings statutes. The ERC is not a group of policy and decision makers.

d. Organization structure

Before any decisions on structure can be decided, the ERC must determine or clarify its mission.

- **Chair/co-chair**

The idea of adding a co-chair to the ERC was suggested and met with the approval of many committee members. A chair and co-chair would allow for continuity of the ERC and its institutional knowledge in the event that one of the leaders would leave the group. Two leaders would also help to spread the workload out.

Suggestions for chair and co-chair:

- State Archivist (chair)/Elected (co-chair)
- State Archivist (chair)/Representative from ITSD or DAS (co-chair)
- Records Manager (chair)/IT Representative (co-chair)

The roles of the chair and co-chair were not discussed in great detail except to say that they would help to develop a healthy agenda for the committee.

- **Steering Committee**

Consensus was that there is not currently a need for a Steering Committee, though that may change if the size of the ERC as a whole would grow.

- **Standing Committees**

Currently, the Membership Committee is the only standing committee. The Membership Committee, though down a few members, should remain, although there need to be guidelines for them to follow concerning what types of representation the ERC would like and what types of procedures to follow as far as applying for membership or retraction of membership to the ERC.



OHIO ELECTRONIC RECORDS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

<http://www.ohiohistory.org/ohiojunction/erc/>

One suggested additional standing committee was an Education Committee charged with developing ways to promote the ERC and its products.

Another additional committee that was suggested was a Research Committee. The Research Committee would help to determine what types of projects the ERC should take on based on the needs expressed by the constituents of the ERC. The Research Committee would be charged with determining these needs. Two potential areas of need already suggested are security issues involving electronic records and the impact of recent legislative changes that affect electronic records.

A committee on structure and by-laws was also suggested.

- **Members**

There was discussion about whether limits or composition goals should be set for the ERC. Several felt that those goals should not be codified, but that there should be a balance. The groups said that the ERC needs to analyze its current membership and identify possible stakeholders who should be members of the committee. The committee should include members who have roles pertaining to electronic records and who can provide added value to the committee. It was reiterated that vendors can attend meetings but not vote due to potential conflict of interest.

Possible stakeholders:

- State agencies from all branches of government (executive, judicial, legislative)
- Local governments-representation needed on committee to understand their needs
- State universities

III. Where is the ERC going?

- a. **Mandate**

Some felt that there is an even greater mandate for the ERC now that DAS is not actively involved. The ERC needs to assist with coordination among agencies. Electronic Records have a "connectivity" that needs to be harnessed. The ERC needs to help people use electronic records as resources.

The ERC's mandate is to be a clearinghouse for best practices and standards for managing electronic records.



OHIO ELECTRONIC RECORDS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

<http://www.ohiohistory.org/ohiojunction/erc/>

b. Mission

Most groups agreed that the mission of the ERC was to create and make available best practices concerning the creation, maintenance, preservation and access to electronic records. Individual agencies and local governments should develop their own policies and implement them based on the best practices produced by the ERC. The ERC does not have the authority to become involved in enforcement and compliance. The ERC and the best practices that it produces should provide a dialog between records managers and information technology staff. Through this dialog, the ERC needs to determine if implementation of the guidelines is feasible. It should also be impressed that agencies have a direct responsibility to Ohio's citizens to manage and care for records of all formats.

The ERC's current mission statement is as follows:

"The goal of the Electronic Records Committee (ERC) is to draft model policies, recommendations, and guidelines for the creation, maintenance, long term preservation of and access to electronic records created by Ohio's state and local governments."

Suggested changes to the mission statement included:

- Advocate for best practices
- ERC serves as a resource
- ERC educated constituents
- Remove policy from the mission statement

c. Issues: What is the next "new thing"?

Ideas for the ERC's next "new thing":

- Gap analysis
- How does new records legislation affect what the ERC does?
- Electronic records security issues
- Survey of who uses ERC documents and what the results have been
- Establish a dialog between records managers and IT professionals

Priorities:

- Resources
- Education
- Visibility



IV. What does the ERC do when were get there?

a. Implementation

The committee agreed that the ERC does not have the authority to implement the guidelines that it produces.

It was suggested that the ERC might co-produce a case study with a state agency or local government that has implemented any of the guidelines. This would help the ERC to judge if the guidelines are being implemented, how they are being implemented, what kind of success the implementation has had and serve as an additional resource for other agencies or local governments looking for implementation guidance.

b. Authority

The ERC does not have the authority to ensure compliance or enforce policy. The products of the ERC are best practices for those seeking information. If agencies or local governments have questions they will seek out the ERC.

c. Compliance

One group felt that it should be up to the agencies that sign off on retention schedules (Auditor, DAS, OHS, local records commissions) to enforce compliance to the guidelines produced by the ERC.

d. Education

The groups agreed that education should be a part of the ERC's mission. The ERC needs to get the message out that issues with electronic records exist and that the ERC offers resources to assist with those issues. Getting out in the field and providing education is the only outlet to see that the goals of the ERC are met since the ERC has no implementation authority. This would provide the ERC with feedback opportunities.

It was suggested that a standing committee on education be formed to look into how to proceed.

Other education ideas included:

- Members serve as speakers or give presentations
 - Develop a common slide show and script to ensure that each speaker covers the same material and states points in the same manner
 - Road show



OHIO ELECTRONIC RECORDS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

<http://www.ohiohistory.org/ohiojunction/erc/>

- Use avenues that already exist (County Commissioners Association, Municipal League, Judicial College, Township Association, Ohio Association of School Business Officials, etc.) to spread the word through presentations at meetings and conferences.
- Draw attention to the ERC website
 - Link from DAS RIMS site
 - Ask agencies to provide links from their sites
 - Ask associations to provide links from their sites
 - Write articles for state publications and include link
 - Put educational slide show on the ERC website
 - Include evaluation surveys following each ERC produced guidelines to get feedback

v. Closing

Swift and Whitehouse will compile detailed minutes of the meeting and forward them to the listserv for discussion. The discussion should identify key issues that need to be addressed as well as establish goals and priorities for the ERC. 30 days will be allowed for discussion.

The next ERC meeting will take place in March 2004 (TBA).