



# OHIO ELECTRONIC RECORDS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

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

**DATE: 17 SEPTEMBER 2009**

**LOCATION: OHIO HISTORICAL CENTER**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS					
<b>Chair:</b>	Daniel Noonan	✓	<b>Vice Chair:</b>	Darren Shulman	✓
<b>Secretary:</b>	Janice Schulz	✓	<b>Past Chair:</b>	John Runion	✓
<b>Interim State Archivist:</b>	Louise Jones	✓			
<b>Members:</b>	Marlys Bradshaw	✓		Kevin Loving	
	Craig Brown			Sharon Montgomery	✓
	Barbara Floyd			Florence Murray	
	Stephen French	✓		Karen Shaffer	✓
	Dave Keener	✓		Pari Swift	✓
	Bob Johansen			Chris Wydman	✓
	David Landsbergen				
	<b>Alternates:</b>				
OHS STAFF:					
Jillian Carney	Angela Manella				
GUESTS:					
Marsha Blair	Barba Brown		Cynthia Hansen	Melba Ann Fey	
Teri Fretz	Gillian Marsham Hill		Mary Johnston	Lt. Daniel Ogilvie	
Maureen Serbu	Karen Turnau		Richard Walker		

## 1. FOCUS GROUP SESSION - AUDITORIUM

### 1.1 Introductions

Focus group participants and OERC members introduced themselves.

### 1.2 Focus Group Presentation of Website Management Guidelines

Dave Keener conducted the Website Management Guidelines presentation.

Participant comments and OERC response:

Terms may be too technical

There is too much information on each slide. Notes are running too long.

It would be helpful to provide attendees with copies of the actual guidance document

The presentation does not provide an actual policy or procedure to follow. *OERC Response: This is designed as a resource for attendees to take back and develop their own policies and procedures. Audience seemed to be looking for more detailed step-by-step instructions.*

OHIOERC: REFORMATTED 2011
PAGE 1 OF 6



## OHIO ELECTRONIC RECORDS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

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

What is the audience? *OERC Response: The full-blown presentation is intended for a general audience. It will be cut down for administrators and other audiences.*

Images of a website would be helpful

The presentation does not tell how to manage a website that would be legally admissible. *OERC Response: It is not intended to do that, but gives guidelines for agencies to figure that out.*

This is a “jumping off point” or starting point for agencies to begin to develop their own policies and procedures.

Dan Noonan asked what audience we should be going for. Responses:

- The presentation started broad-based, but became technical towards the end. It needs to be shorter and “dumbed down” to a broad audience. It may be too technical for some people to present.
- This document represents a combination of expertise. It is a great document to ask for help in maintaining a website by law. Show how it affects each player and their records. It encourages collaboration of IS, RIM, and Legal.

Dan Noonan asked if there is a place for the full-blown presentation or should a shorter one be used as a “bridge.” Responses:

- For smaller agencies one presentation that covers the whole range would be helpful for the whole staff.
- A presentation geared toward a smaller subset of technical agencies would be helpful
- Consider a phased-in presentation. 1. Liabilities – why should agencies do this? 2. Summary of guidelines 3. Full-blown details

A best practices guideline, or a good, short bulleted list, would be helpful to take to technical folks. The best practices could be taken to the agency’s own audience and altered to fit. For example, a list of things that are required to keep. This will help to explain in layman’s terms to those responsible.

What are the requirements for outsourced web development or a site that sits on a vendor’s server? Records management requirements should be identified in the contract.

There are three important elements to managing a website as a record:

1. Why should it be done?
2. What kinds of records are contained on a website?
3. Technical how-to

Breaking the presentation down like this may help to organize for each type of audience member.

Technical requirements are so different among agencies that an attempt to cover them would probably be too vague.



Guidelines would give broad categories of what to look at:

- How is the IT department managing it now?
- What are the components that you have?
- What are the RIM appraisal decisions?
- Are existing records maintained elsewhere?
- Is the site dynamic or static?

There are no cut and dry instructions

A website audit checklist would be helpful for RIM people. Could something like that be put together? *OERC Response: It is a possible thing to look into.* Working with a website and standards for management give people the opportunity to interact with other departments.

This does feel daunting. You need to find a point to fix on and work from there.

An application, example, or case study could make it easier to understand.

## 2. REGULAR MEETING – THIRD FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM

### 2.1. Agenda Review

We have a full agenda for the regular meeting, but have used quite a bit of meeting time for the focus group. It was suggested that we consider conducting focus groups separate from our regular committee meetings.

### 2.2. Approval of minutes 11 June 2009

Stephen French motioned to accept the minutes as presented

Darren Shulman seconded

All ayes

The minutes were approved.

### 2.3. State Archives Update

Louise Jones, Interim State Archivist, gave the State Archives Update. Louise is the Research Services Department Head and since the reorganization of the State Archives also oversees access to the historical objects collection. The functions will be merging. There will also be reorganization within the Collections Division with history curators and State Archives staff.

Other staff news:

- Angela Manella is the Local Government Records Archivist
- An archivist position is open and will be filled
- Charles Wash, PhD, is the Taft Processing Archivist
- Jillian Carney is the Electronic Records Archivist
- The budget has room for one fully funded position for Taft records



- Looking forward to program to manage local government records and state records

Five legislators are on board with PAHR and a sixth has expressed interest.

Bill Laidlaw's memorial service is to be held on Saturday, September 19, 2009

There will be a delay of two years before permanently staffing the State Archivist position.

#### **2.4. Discussion Hybrid Microfilm Guidance document**

John Runion announced that the guidance is out for discussion and approval.

A question was asked as to who would be responsible for testing the finished film. That would be the responsibility of whoever is processing the film, whether that is in house or a contracted vendor.

John thanked Dan Noonan, Dave Keener, and Craig Brown for help on the guidance.

Darren motioned to accept the document

Stephen seconded

Discussion was closed and the committee voted with all ayes

The motion passed.

John asked for comments within two weeks.

#### **2.5. Follow-up/timetable for conversion of other "guidance documents" into PPT presentations**

Dave Landsbergen forwarded the TIS draft to Dan who will share it with the committee. Because the focus groups take so much time it was decided that they should be the same day as our meetings, but earlier in the day.

#### **2.6. Reports by Local Arrangement & Program Committees OERC/OHRAB Workshops**

The first dry run will be on October 7<sup>th</sup> for the Ohio Municipal Courts. We need someone to present. We have a three-hour time slot and Email and Imaging will both be presented. We need to fill the entire three hours as that is the requirement for clerks to receive credit. Steve needs handouts to be included in the program binder. All necessary equipment will be available.

The Local Arrangements Committee and the Program Committee had a joint phone conference and made the following determinations:

- We will have two half-day sessions of the same content, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. Both the Email and Imaging presentations will be given as well as a one hour panel with Q&A. We will try to solicit questions in advance. We need two presenters plus panel members for each



## OHIO ELECTRONIC RECORDS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

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

morning and afternoon session. One panel will cover both the Email and Imaging presentations.

- One short introduction presentation about the OERC and its work will suffice rather than repeating that information in each presentation.
- Audience will be limited to 50 people.

We have three major areas: Columbus, Dayton/Cincinnati, and Cleveland.

The Columbus workshop will be March 18. The room has been reserved.

The Dayton/Cincinnati workshop is April 27. The Dayton Madison Lakes Conference Center has been reserved. Both the Cincinnati and Dayton ARMA chapters are on board. All necessary equipment is available.

Planning for the Cleveland workshop is still in progress. John Runion tried to get a room at Case Western but the facilities were not large enough and they charge \$700 to rent a room.

Additionally, parking would be extra. The Ocasek Building in Akron is a possibility. It has an auditorium that seats 102 people. No eating is allowed in the auditorium, but food can be provided outside. There is also plenty of parking. We need to get a projector if using this facility. The facility is near Akron, rather than Cleveland and it is unsure whether the Cleveland ARMA chapter would be on board, but that is not a “make or break” issue. Finding a facility in Lorain County is a possibility as well. John will finalize and is looking at an April or May date.

The SNAP grant includes money for speaker travel.

### **2.7. Recommendation options for revising and updating ERC website**

Dan Noonan suggested moving the OERC website to an Ohio State University server. He can set up a guest account. This will allow us to brand and be more flexible. We can also purchase our own domain.

Dan motioned that we move the website to an OSU server and purchase an ERC domain.

Stephen French seconded.

Darren asked if we have money to do this since we would have to pay for the domain. (The server space would be free.) and motioned that we amend the motion to just moving the server.

Discussion regarding the motions ensued. The cost of a domain would be minimal and several people expressed willingness to donate to the cause. Moving the website to OSU would be contingent on there always being an OSU staff member on the committee. The site is currently out of date and Chris Wydman had offered to help with maintenance.



## OHIO ELECTRONIC RECORDS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

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

---

After discussion, Darren retracted his motion and Dan's original motion was on the table and seconded. The committee voted on Dan's motion. The motion passed with all ayes.

### **2.8. Listserv<sup>®</sup> discussion thread on Twitter/Facebook/Social Networking issues**

Some committee members have been working on this topic. Stephen and Dave Landsbergen can investigate and discuss the topic on the Listserv.

### **2.9. Other new business from the floor**

Should we create a discussion forum for the public to discuss ERC topics? Dan said that this is where we are headed with the new website. Focus group participants who attended the meeting expressed interest in it.

The next meeting date has not been set. Dan will suggest meetings dates for January, June, and September 2010 through Doodle. Thursday is no longer a good day for several members.