<div align="center">

MINUTES
RECORDS MANAGEMENT INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCIL
MEETING
September 7, 2010

</div>

The Records Management Interagency Coordinating Council (RMICC or Council) held a meeting on Tuesday, September 7, 2010 at the Capitol Extension in Room E1.010.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Cathy Hartman, Interim Chair
Jan Ferrari (representing Peggy D. Rudd), Member
Julie Leung, Member
Hope Morgan, Member
Dan Procter, Member
Stephen Quick, Member
Kim Scofield, Member
Simon Skedd, Member

GUESTS

Maryrose Hightower Coyle, University of Texas at Austin
Chris Foster, University of North Texas System
Margaret Hermesmeyer, Office of the Attorney General
Sarah Jacobson, Texas State Library and Archives Commission
Angela Ossar, Texas State Library and Archives Commission
Martha Richardson, Department of Information Resources
Tiffany Shropshire, Texas Supreme Court

I. **CALL TO ORDER**

A quorum being present, Interim Chair Cathy Hartman called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m.

II. **INTRODUCTION OF COUNCIL MEMBERS AND/OR SUBSTITUTES**

The Chair called for the introduction of RMICC members. As shown above, the record of the meeting reflects that Ms. Jan Ferrari represented Ms. Peggy D. Rudd at the meeting. Ms. Rudd joined the meeting while it was in progress.

III. **APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 1, 2010 MINUTES**

Minutes to the Council meeting held June 1, 2010 were approved as follows:

MOTION made by Mr. Dan Procter, seconded by Ms. Kim Scofield, and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the meeting of the Records Management Interagency Coordinating Council held June 1, 2010, as presented.

IV. **AGENDA ITEM 3 – PROGRESS UPDATE FROM THE BEST PRACTICES COMMITTEE**

Ms. Martha Richardson of the Department of Information Resources (DIR) presented the progress update from the Best Practices for Managing Digital Information Committee.

- Ms. Richardson announced her resignation as chair of the Best Practices Committee, due to her coming retirement from DIR. She thanked the Council for the opportunities to serve the state given her by the Council. She added her hope that DIR will continue to emphasize the need for electronic record management in the future.
- Ms. Richardson indicated analysis of the responses received from the Information Resources Deployment Review has been ongoing. The IRDR looked at common information management practices and not electronic records management specifically. Policies and procedures can be put in place through information management practices that can help or hinder electronic records management.
- Areas studied were information governance, life cycle management of data and information, email management, e-discovery, digital preservation, and database platforms. Data was grouped and analyzed by agency type and agency size as well as by articles of government. A subset of the information collected that pertained to health and human services agencies only was analyzed separately as well.
- Ms. Richardson contacted an analyst from Gartner Group whose expertise is in electronic information management and records management for help in analyzing the data collected.
    - The Gartner Group analyst indicated the data collected showed a good baseline that there is no consistency among agencies' data management practices. Ms. Richardson indicated this finding was not unexpected.
    - The analyst suggested the data should be analyzed to identify agencies that are following good data management practices at this time. Many agencies surveyed listed ongoing or projected projects for information management, and some indicated they would like to receive guidance from the Council regarding electronic records management. DIR will continue to work with the Gartner Group to analyze the data and identify agencies with good practices for further consultation.

- o Ms. Richardson suggested some possible action items for the Best Practices Committee to consider in the future:
    - ▪ Continue analyzing the IRDR responses to identify agencies with good practice
    - ▪ Recognize agencies with good practices and disseminate information about these practices statewide
    - ▪ Survey records managers statewide, with survey questions similar to the IRDR sent to information technology personnel, and compare the answers
    - ▪ Encourage all entities within organizations (information technology personnel, records managers, legal departments, business units, etc.) to work together to achieve records management goals
- o Ms. Richardson encouraged the Council to seek ways to engage the legislature in promoting statewide records management procedures. Consistent statewide records management could result in cost savings for the state.
- o Ms. Richardson noted her disappointment that she was unable to complete the Electronic Records Management Extension for the Texas Project Delivery Framework. She will continue to provide assistance for the project until her retirement.
- o For the Best Practices for Digitization Committee, Ms. Richardson will pass on information collected to the new committee chair. She expressed her hope that the Council will continue its work with this committee.
- o Mr. Simon Skedd inquired about the data center consolidation project. Since this project will be up for bid again soon, he wondered if any of the concerns raised in the data collected through the IRDR would be addressed in the new contract. Ms. Richardson noted this is not her area of responsibility at DIR, but she hoped the information collected would be considered.
- o Ms. Cathy Hartman asked that any other analyses of the IRDR data be forwarded to the Council. Ms. Richardson confirmed that further analysis will be shared with the Council.
- o Ms. Hartman inquired about the ongoing status of the workgroups of the Best Practices Committee. Ms. Richardson indicated her belief that the groups will continue, although there may be some staff changes. Ms. Hartman inquired about the possibility of separating the groups rather than keeping them under the same umbrella. Ms. Richardson noted that would be a decision for the Council to make, She added that the workgroups have evolved over time, and that three separate groups were not the original intent. Ms. Hartman shared her concern about the continuation of the workgroups over time, and asked about DIR's level of commitment to the groups' efforts. Ms. Richardson noted that while she can not speak for DIR, it is included in the agency's

strategic plan to continue working with the Council and to develop the extensions for the Texas Project Delivery Framework. Ms. Hartman reiterated her support for the work being done by the groups, and suggested the Council might discuss how to support its continuation.

- Ms. Hartman noted her appreciation for Ms. Richardson's longtime service and many contributions to the Council. Mr. Dan Procter noted Ms. Richardson's contributions to the Council span more than a decade, beginning with the electronic records survey in 1997. Mr. Procter expressed the Council's gratitude for her many contributions, and presented her with a certificate of appreciation from the Council.

V.   AGENDA ITEM 4 – PROGRESS UPDATE FROM THE UNIVERSITIES RECORDS MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Mr. Chris Foster of the University of North Texas presented the progress update from the Universities Records Management Committee.

- Mr. Foster noted the creation of a steering group to guide the activities of the committee. The steering group is made up of Mr. Foster, Ms. Sarah Jacobson and Ms. Angela Ossar of the Texas State Library and Archives Commission (TSLAC), Ms. Mary Lou Carpenter of The University of Texas System, Ms. Marylou Hightower Coyle of The University of Texas at Austin, and Mr. Leon Yanez of the University of Texas at Brownsville.
- The steering group met in August to discuss the purpose of the committee as well as plans for extending committee membership opportunities to all universities and university systems. The steering group wants to ensure full representation on the committee from all Texas public universities. During the meeting, the steering group selected about 12 potential committee members from a wide variety of universities.
- The steering group discussed ways to disseminate information about the committee to all interested records management personnel in Texas universities. The group agreed to use the online communication tools hosted by the State and Local Records Management Division of the TSLAC as a way to get information to individuals interested in the committee.
- Mr. Foster indicated the committee will be sending out information about the committee to all records management personnel currently subscribed to any of the TSLAC email lists. Interested individuals will be asked to contact Mr. Foster or Ms. Jacobson about membership.
- The steering group discussed the scope and goals of the committee in August. The group added four characteristics that will be evaluated when the committee examines the status of university records management programs. These four characteristics are:
    - o organizational records and information management philosophies
    - o organizational structure

- o ability to influence organizational change
  - o evolution of records management programs over the past 15 years
- In July, Ms. Jacobson and Ms. Ossar presented the first ever university records management workshop. The workshop was presented at the University of Texas at Arlington. The workshop focused on the basics of setting up records management for universities as well as unique challenges faced by university records managers.
- The committee is exploring the possibility of including a roundtable discussion of university records management professionals in the 2011 TSLAC e-Records conference. This kind of discussion could facilitate collaboration and information sharing among university records managers. The committee will coordinate with the planning committee for the e-Records conference.
- The committee will begin work on developing a new university records retention schedule. The goal is to replace the existing Texas State Records Retention Schedule with a schedule that more adequately reflects the diverse records sets created in state universities. The committee has received positive feedback from university records managers about this project and looks forward to working with TSLAC to bring it to fruition.
- Mr. Foster indicated the committee intends to conduct a baseline assessment of all current university records retention programs. Data collected from this assessment will drive future projects of the committee, and will facilitate development of a model university electronic records management program.
- Proposed future projects were discussed by the steering group:
  - o evaluation of the current records management officer guidelines, specifically as they relate to university records managers.
  - o continue working with the Best Practices Committee to evaluate records management practices. Ensuring there is an information management plan for enterprise information systems may be a particular area of focus.
  - o analysis of how university records managers are reaching out to their communities regarding awareness of records management concerns, training and communication.
- Mr. Foster called the Council's attention to the committee's report. In the second section on page four, the committee added item number four. Additionally, Mr. Foster noted the current membership roster for the committee on pages five and six of the report. He indicated the committee is still seeking members, and will forward additional member information to the Council.
- Ms. Julie Leung asked about the projected timeline for developing a new university records retention schedule. Ms. Jacobson indicated she expected a draft schedule would take about a year to develop. The committee is investigating information from Georgia and Alabama. Both states have university-specific records retention schedules. Additionally, local records

retention schedules are being compiled from committee members to create a common list.

- Ms. Leung asked about subsets of records in the schedule--for instance, records common to health science centers or technical colleges. Ms. Jacobson said these types of records will be included in the new schedule, and indicated many common university program records are not included in the current state retention schedule.
- Ms. Leung asked about the inclusion of community colleges in the project. Ms. Jacobson answered that community colleges are included in the current local government junior college schedule, and would not be included in the project at this time.
- Ms. Cathy Hartman expressed the Council's appreciation to the committee for their work. Mr. Foster pointed out a strong level of support for the project among the universities the committee has contacted. Ms. Hartman noted this strong level of interest indicates the challenges faced by university records managers.
- Mr. Simon Skedd asked about future plans to include members other than records managers-such as information technology personnel-on the committee in the future. Mr. Foster said the committee has made an effort to include archivists as well as records managers, but had not included information technology personnel at this time. Mr. Foster noted that information technology personnel could be included in the future.
- Ms. Leung noted that there is a high level of interest in the subject of electronic health records at this time, and asked if any committee members were specialists in these types of records. Mr. Foster noted that an employee of a health science center will be joining the committee, at least in an advisory role.

VI.   AGENDA ITEM 5 – DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF THE BIENNIAL REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

- Ms. Cathy Hartman asked the Council members to focus on the content of the rough draft of the report in their meeting materials and asked for any items that needed to be changed or included in the report and for suggestions to improve the report.
  - o Ms. Julie Leung asked about the recommendation listed under Part I of the table of contents. Ms. Leung felt Part I would be more meaningful if it were just a summary of the report and did not include a recommendation. Ms. Hartman asked if the recommendations for all parts of the report should be moved to their own section of the report. Ms. Leung felt the current format placed too much emphasis on the recommendation in Part I, and the recommendations should be separate from the other parts of the report. Mr. Dan Procter felt placing the recommendations in their own section might draw more attention to them. Mr. Procter noted

that the table of contents could be reformatted to highlight the recommendations as well.

- Ms. Kim Scofield inquired about an executive summary for the report. She noted that many times the executive summary is all that gets read of a report, and the recommendations could be included in an executive summary. Ms. Hartman noted the introduction of the report served as an executive summary and could be renamed as such. Ms. Leung concurred that "executive summary" is more standard language, and suggested all the recommendations be included in the executive summary.
- Mr. Procter noted that one recommendation asks the legislature to amend the statutes. He indicated that the inclusion of the recommendation in the report would not be enough to facilitate legislative action, and asked how such recommendations had been implemented in the past. Ms. Peggy Rudd noted that the last time the Council asked for legislative action amending the statutes, it was included in an omnibus bill with other requests designed to update statutory language. She noted the legislative changes the Council desires could be pursued through an appropriate legislative committee.
- Mr. Procter noted the Council needs a plan of action soon to pursue such legislative changes due to the anticipated volume of bills for the upcoming session. Ms. Rudd agreed that it would be beneficial to pursue prefiling any such recommendation if at all possible. Ms. Hartman noted the changes are on page six of the report and inquired if Ms. Rudd could be of assistance in advancing these changes to the appropriate committee. Ms. Hartman and Mr. Procter noted these changes are of a "housekeeping" nature and are to make the statutes align with the new Council charter as well. Ms. Rudd agreed.
- Ms. Hartman asked Ms. Martha Richardson and Mr. Chris Foster to forward short summaries of their respective committee's projects and accomplishments to her to include in the report. These short summaries would be included in the executive summary.
- Ms. Hartman asked for discussion regarding the recommendation of Council support for the Texas State Library and Archives Commission 2012-2013 LAR Exceptional Item Request. Previous Council discussions have indicated support for the item. Ms. Hartman asked if the Council was in favor of the recommendation and if so, was the text of the recommendation in the report adequate to indicate the Council's level of support.
    - o Ms. Rudd explained the exceptional item in more detail. TSLAC is requesting funding for additional staff positions to maintain an electronic records archive. Currently, TSLAC does not have sufficient staff with the right skill set for this type of project. She noted the availability of federal matching grants for this kind of project. These federal grants will require additional state resources to be allocated.

- o Ms. Jan Ferari explained the TSLAC plan for utilization of the federal matching funds in more detail. The initial plan is to ask for just under $200,000 to support a part-time records management consultant in 2012, additional records management employees, consultation with an implementation expert, and related expense. Ms. Ferrari noted she expects to travel to other states along with the state archivist and the records management consultant to get information on other states' electronic records management archives. Funds will be applied for in 2012 to support the initiative in 2013-2014.
  - o Mr. Simon Skedd asked if the new archive proposed by TSLAC would be onsite at TSLAC or if it would utilize the data management centers in San Angelo or Austin. Ms. Ferrari did not know at this time. Ms. Ferrari noted that part of the initial research for the project would point towards what type of storage is most appropriate for the archive. The first year of the project will focus on developing best practices and an overall strategy for the project.
- Ms. Scofield expressed a need to stress the importance of the development of an electronic records management archive to the legislature. Ms. Ferrari agreed, and noted that Ms. Richardson had been of assistance in the past with clear language expressing the importance of this concern. Ms. Ferrari agreed to forward this language to Ms. Hartman for inclusion in the report.
- Ms. Rudd pointed out the information from the latest survey of state agencies included a startling amount of electronic records being produced and stored in a large variety of ways. Initial work on developing an electronic records management archive will have to come to terms with this complexity and determine the scope of the problems it creates. Ms. Hartman reminded the Council that one of the key findings from Ms. Richardson's analysis of the survey was that data management practices "vary widely" among state agencies.
- Mr. Stephen Quick noted the State Auditor's Office recommended development of an electronic records archive as well. He suggested emphasizing this finding as it might carry more weight than just a recommendation from the Council to the legislature.
- Mr. Procter inquired about the logistics of finalizing the biennial report as the Council did not have another meeting scheduled before the due date of the report. He asked if the Council could approve the changes that needed to be made, and then allow a subcommittee to finalize the report for the Council's approval. This would allow the report to be finalized without the need to schedule another meeting of the full Council. He noted the Council had approved this course of action with prior reports. Mr. Skedd, Ms. Ferrari and Mr. Quick indicated their support of this plan of action.
- For Part II (Background) of the report, Ms. Hartman noted the information included was historical in nature and would be updated as needed.

- For Part III (Administrative and Recommended Statutory Updates for RMICC), Ms. Hartman noted the inclusion of the new Council charter approved in March.
    - Mr. Procter and Ms. Scofield were charged by the Council with updating the Council's administrative rules found in Title 13 of the Texas Administrative Code to be consistent with the new charter. Mr. Procter and Ms. Scofield felt the best course of action would be to repeal the current administrative rules and replace then with new rules consistent with the new charter. Since the Council has rulemaking authority, a request to the legislature does not need to be made to make these changes. The changes would follow the normal course of rulemaking, including a public comment period. Comments received would be addressed when the rules were adopted. Mr. Procter noted that any proposed rulemaking should take into account the Council's meeting schedule so the Council would have an opportunity to address public comments received.
    - Ms. Leung inquired about the documents included in Part III. She suggested these documents should be more properly placed in the appendix to the report. Mr. Procter agreed. Ms. Hartman noted the committee reports should be moved to the appendix as well, with expanded descriptions in the executive summary for clarity.
- Ms. Hartman asked the Council members to forward information to her about any kind of electronic records management training or conferences to be included in Part V of the report.
- Ms. Hartman asked about the due date for the report and inquired about publishing of the report.
    - Mr. Procter noted the Comptroller's office had been of assistance in the past with publishing the report. Mr. Procter brought up the idea that the report might be distributed electronically rather than in print format. Ms. Hartman added the report could be placed on the Council's website, but asked if print copies were necessary for the official submission to the legislature. Mr. Procter noted the report is due November 1, and added a copy needed to be filed with the Legislative Reference Library. He did not know if the Legislative Reference Library would accept an electronic copy or if it would required print copies.
    - Ms. Scofield asked if the report needed to be sent to the state publications clearinghouse, and asked if the clearinghouse would accept an electronic copy. Ms. Rudd sad three copies would need to be sent to the clearinghouse, and noted that at least a handful of paper copies of the report would need to be printed. Ms. Hartman asked if a printout of the electronic file would be acceptable.
    - Ms. Rudd added that a paper copy of the report might facilitate easier discussion of the report with interested parties such as individual legislators.

- o Mr. Quick indicated he would check with his office about printing a small number of copies of the report. The Council agreed that 30 copies should be sufficient.
- o Ms. Hartman noted the report will be included on the Council website as well as the University of North Texas state records site. Mr. Quick said he will find out about getting the report placed on the Comptroller's Window on State Government site, and Ms. Rudd noted that the report would be picked up by the Texas Records and Information Locator (TRAIL) site as well.
- o Ms. Hartman asked Mr. Quick to let her know when his office would need the final version of the report to have it printed in time for the November 1 due date.
- o Mr. Procter said he will find out what other individuals the report will need to be distributed to, such as the governor, lieutenant governor, and some legislative committee chairs. Ms. Hartman asked Mr. Procter and Mr. Quick to work out a plan for distributing the report. Ms. Leung noted that some interim committees might be interested in the report.
- Ms. Leung had a question about the layout of the report. Ms. Hartman noted that all documents included in the report were being moved to the appendix for clarification. Ms. Leung noted that recommendation included in the executive summary might need its own section in the report. Ms. Leung offered her assistance to Ms. Hartman to help format this part of the report.

MOTION made by Ms. Kim Scofield, seconded by Mr. Dan Procter, and carried unanimously to approve the changes to the biennial report.

VII. AGENDA ITEM 6 – APPOINTMENT OF NEW CHAIR OF THE BEST PRACTICES COMMITTEE

- Ms. Cathy Hartman noted the need for a new chair due to the upcoming retirement of Ms. Martha Richardson.
    - o Ms. Jan Ferrari asked if the new chair needed to be a member of the Department of Information Resources staff, as was Ms. Richardson. She noted the committee was specifically a Council committee, not a DIR committee. Ms. Richardson said she did not think the new chair needed to be a DIR staff member.
    - o Mr. Simon Skedd asked if there was a process in place for a current committee member to fill the chair position when Ms. Richardson retires. Ms. Richardson said she did not think this would take place.
    - o Ms. Kim Scofield noted the amount of time required by the position. With current staffing levels, there are not enough full-time employees who could devote themselves to the position as

fully as Ms. Richardson was able to do. The Council needs to find a way to encourage agencies to allow a staff member to devote the time needed to the position to give the committee the import it deserves.

- o Ms. Richardson noted the time needed to devote to the position depends on the level of agency support for the committee. She had envisioned the committee as made up of several workgroups with active chairs, and the committee chair only needed to oversee the workgroups. However, this has not been the case.
- o Ms. Hartman asked the council members if any of their agencies had a possible candidate to take on the committee chair position. Ms. Jan Ferrari indicated her interest in participating in the committee but noted her availability is limited as well. She asked if the Council might want to look at restructuring the chair's duties in some way.
- o Ms. Hartman noted she felt the workgroup on digitization could be split out easily, and then feed information to the committee as appropriate. Ms. Richardson noted that several individuals had been active in the digitization workgroup in the past, and might be good resources to contact.
- o Ms. Hartman asked for volunteers from the Council to work with Ms. Richardson in developing a plan to continue the committee's work after Ms. Richardson's retirement. Ms. Ferrari and Ms. Scofield agreed to meet with Ms. Richardson to further this goal.

VIII. AGENDA ITEM 7 – DISCUSSION OF NEW RMICC OFFICERS

- Ms. Cathy Hartman noted the Council will need to elect a new chair at the Council's December meeting. She indicated she will be ending her term, and asked for volunteers to fill the office. Ms. Hartman briefly outlined the duties of the chair, and noted Mr. Dan Procter and Ms. Peggy Rudd both have served as chair in the past.
- Mr. Procter noted that at the current time, neither Ms. Hope Morgan or Mr. Simon Skedd are eligible to serve as chair as they are auxiliary members of the Council. He noted the need for the proposed statutory change to allow both permanent and auxiliary members to serve as chair. Ms. Hartman is an auxiliary member of the Council as well, and became interim chair when Brian Rawson left the Council. Mr. Procter noted that the term is two years, although Teresa Morales served for one year only prior to Brian Rawson. Ms. Kim Scofield noted that at the present time, the Council does not have a vice-chair due to Ms. Hartman's elevation to chair.
- Ms. Hartman asked that the Council members be prepared to elect a new chair at the December meeting.

IX. AGENDA ITEM 8 – DISCUSSION OF RMICC PRESENTATION AT e-RECORDS CONFERENCE

- Ms. Kim Scofield will be speaking at the e-Records conference on behalf of the Council. She has met with Tim Nolan of the Texas Water Development Board, Mr. Dan Procter and Ms. Jan Ferrari, and plans to meet with Ms. Martha Richardson as well. She welcomes any suggestions from the Council as to the content of her presentation. She is scheduled to give a 15 minute presentation, and feels this a good opportunity to provide information about the Council to individuals who may not even be aware of the Council's existence.
- Ms. Cathy Hartman noted that information and recommendations from the biennial report might be included in the presentation. She indicated she thought this was a good opportunity to promote the Council's work and hoped for more opportunities like this in the future.
- Mr. Simon Skedd noted that Ms. Scofield might want to mention the work of the Council's committees. This could be a good way to increase interest in and/or membership of the committees. As a past attendee at the e-Records conference, he noted the makeup of attendees encompassed more than just records managers. Ms. Scofield agreed this was important information to include in the presentation.
- Mr. Skedd also recommended that Ms. Scofield provide contact information such as the website address for the Council in her presentation. Ms. Scofield noted that a handout of the presentation will be given to attendees.

X. OTHER BUSINESS

No other business.

XI. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

MOTION made by Mr Dan Procter, seconded by Mr. Simon Skedd, and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting. In the absence of any further business, the meeting stood adjourned at 11:52 a.m.

_____
CATHY HARTMAN, INTERIM CHAIR
Records Management Interagency Coordinating Council