I. Introductions

Raimund Goerler, Interim Chair, called the meeting of the OERC to order. Each member present was asked to introduce themselves and what agency they represent.

Goerler then noted that at the 6 December 2004 meeting, the committee passed Bylaws and that one of the purposes of today’s meeting was to elect a leadership structure as set forth in the bylaws. Once that is accomplished the committee can work on its future direction.

Goerler called for comments and corrections for the minutes from 6 December 2004. After a few typos were noted, Goerler called for a motion to approve the minutes. John Runion motioned and Andy Lentz seconded the motion. Upon a vote, the minutes were unanimously approved.

II. Election of Officers

Candidates for Chair, Vice-chair and Secretary were each given an opportunity to make statements as to why they wanted the position and what direction they would like the ERC to take. Following the statements, Goerler reviewed the duties assigned to each position in the bylaws. Ballots for voting were distributed. Barbara Floyd agreed to collect and count the votes. The results of the election were as follows:
Chair - Mark Schmidbauer, Ohio Bureau of Workers' Compensation
Vice-Chair - John Runion, Stark County Records Center
Secretary - Pari Swift, Ohio Historical Society

Goerler thanked all those that had volunteered to serve in elected positions.

III. Formation of Membership Committee

Goerler explained that the bylaws also call for a membership committee to review applications for membership and generate interest in membership. The vice-chair serves as the chair of the membership committee. In addition to the vice-chair, which is a non-voting role, the OERC needed to select volunteers representing various segments of OERC members. The membership committee, as unanimously approved by the OERC, is as follows:

John Runion (Chair) - Stark County Records Center
Andy Lentz - Ohio Department of Jobs and Family Services
Kevin Callaghan - Lucas County Clerk of Courts
Judy Cobb - Online Computer Library Center

IV. Survey Committee Report

David Landsbergen reported results of the on-line survey "Electronic Records in the State of Ohio" [links to presentation and report]. State agencies were contacted directly to take the survey. To get local governments to respond, email messages were sent to various professional organizations asking them to forward the email, which included the link to the survey, on to their listservs. Landsbergen stressed that the results of the survey are benchmarks and can be used to make others aware of the successes of the OERC. It is also important to note that institutional barriers such as funding, staff and training were more important than awareness and knowledge of electronic records issues.

Angela Crandall noted that the results of her study on electronic records initiatives from other states would be posted to the website.

Following the report, discussion ensued over how the OERC should respond to and apply the results. Mary Beth Parisi noted that the OERC has come full circle and seems to be back to the same point it was at over a year ago in deciding whether the committee should seek more authority and make policy recommendations. Mark Schmidbauer and Martin Susec suggested the OERC could find middle ground in compiling information and producing resources that could influence legislators. Perhaps the legislature is another customer that the OERC needs to educate. It was agreed that the results showed that local and state governments have electronic records needs that need to be addressed. Parisi stressed that we need to have clear lines to know how far to take "communication and education." Schmidbauer suggested that the OERC needs to aggressively market its products, but ultimately let governments come to the committee for additional help. Barbara Floyd noted that although the State Archives has some authority over records management, the OERC does not have any authority. It was determined that the OERC cannot interpret the law. Instead legal council for each government has that responsibility. Kevin Callaghan stated that from his experience, local
government officials do not appreciate being told what to do. Since several members of the OERC work for elected officials, those members may not want to be a part of lobbying and policy-making in order to protect their personal interests. Susec noted that the OERC’s tools tend to be used once a government has gotten itself into trouble. He also noted that the media and public might be interested in the OERC's products because it would ultimately lead to better access to records. These groups could persuade governments to take proper care of their electronic records. Silver and Parisi disagreed with Susec on this issue.

V. Action Steps

The OERC agreed to the following three action steps:

Marketing

The OERC agreed that the committee's products needed to be marketed more aggressively. Suggested ideas include taking a presentation around to various professional associations, assign a communications representative to distribute the OERC's message to Gongwer and other communication outlets, and put a new survey on the website asking new customers' needs. It was decided that a subcommittee was needed to come up with short-term and long-term solutions for making people more aware of the OERC and its products. The following persons volunteered for the subcommittee:

Laurie Gemmill
Raimund Goerler
David Landsbergen
Martin Susec
Pari Swift
Daryl Weir

Case Studies

As a follow-up to the survey, the OERC wishes to gather case studies on the use of OERC guidelines. Landsbergen and Crandall volunteered to work on this based on the results of the survey. Swift will contact County Archivists and Records Managers Association (CARMA) for possible case studies. The OERC would like to see the case studies touch on lessons learned through the implementation of an OERC product, barriers to implementation, institutional backing, costs, what problems were being addressed through implementation, and how long it took to implement. Landsbergen will send a template via the listserv. The volunteers will collect what information already exists. Agencies will not be asked to do additional research for the purpose of composing a case study. The OERC is looking for case studies where challenges were successfully overcome. The committee is also interested in whether or not the outcome is what the committee expected from the guidelines. Case studies will be posted to the OERC website.
Membership

The membership committee will begin work on bringing in members from municipalities, townships and other local governments. One suggestion was to invite officers from various professional organizations to apply. The officers should be active in their respective associations, interested in the OERC, have a knowledge of electronic records issues and be close to Columbus. As chair of the membership committee, John Runion will work with Landsbergen and Crandall on this since they already have working relationships with professional organizations. Judy Cobb also encouraged the membership committee to seek representation from the State Library of Ohio.

VI. Closing

Cobb informed the group that the Library of Congress received grant money to work with state and local governments to develop strategies for the preservation of significant government information in digital format. States are being called on to identify their preservation needs and priorities using a toolkit developed for the project. Ohio will be sending Angela O'Neal, Digital Projects Manager, and Pari Swift, Assistant State Archivist, from the Ohio Historical Society and one representative from the State Library.

Goerler asked the survey subcommittee to do some follow-up work with educational institutions, accessibility and privacy of electronic records, and training.

The next meeting of the OERC is set for June 22, 2005 from 1:30 to 4:00 at the Ohio Historical Center in Columbus.