

MINUTES
RECORDS MANAGEMENT INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCIL
MEETING
September 11, 2012

The Records Management Interagency Coordinating Council (RMICC or Council) held a meeting on Tuesday, September 11, 2012, at the Lorenzo de Zavala State Archives and Library Building, 1201 Brazos Street.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Peggy D. Rudd, Chair
Cathy Nelson Hartman, Member
Margaret Hermesmeier, Member
Daniel Julien, Member
Julie Leung, Member
Hope Morgan, Member
Lori Person, Member
Dan Procter, Member
Stephen Quick, Member

GUESTS

Erinn Barefield, Texas State Library and Archives Commission
Chris Foster, University of North Texas System
Maryrose Hightower-Coyle, The University of Texas – Austin
Sarah Jacobson, Texas State Library and Archives Commission
Thomas Johnson, Department of Information Resources
Craig Kelso, Texas State Library and Archives Commission
Dan McGowan, Texas Department of Family and Protective Services
Angela Ossar, Texas State Library and Archives Commission
Nanette Pfiester, Texas State Library and Archives Commission
Kay Steed, Employees Retirement System of Texas
T. J. Wasden, Texas Department of Family and Protective Services
Martha Whitted, Employees Retirement System of Texas
Steve Woodall, The University of Texas Health Science Center

I. CALL TO ORDER

A quorum being present, Chair Peggy D. Rudd called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 12, 2012 MINUTES

The minutes to the Council meeting held June 12, 2012 were approved as follows:

MOTION made by Ms. Cathy Nelson Hartman, seconded by Mr. Dan Procter, and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the meeting of the Records Management Interagency Coordinating Council held June 12, 2012, as presented.

III. AGENDA ITEM 2 – REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITIES RECORDS MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Mr. Chris Foster of the University of North Texas and Ms. Angela Ossar of the Texas State Library and Archives Commission presented the progress update from the Universities Records Management Committee (URMC).

- For the past two quarters, the URMC has focused on develop of the university records retention schedule (URRS). The URRS is intended as a supplement to and not a replacement for the state records retention schedule, Mr. Foster said. The URRS will add program records common to many universities and will attempt to create standardization among the state universities.
- All URRS records series were input into the JIRA database tracking system provided by the University of North Texas, Mr. Foster said. Currently, logins are being created for approximately 30 representatives of public universities across the state so they may login to the system and review the draft URRS. The JIRA tracking system allows users to comment on the draft and vote on whether an item should be included in or excluded from the draft. The system should be available for the representatives to access by the end of September, Mr. Foster said.
- A series of announcements have been sent out to all the members of the URMC. The announcements explain the JIRA tracking system and how the members will interact with it, Mr. Foster said. A video showing the benchmarking process in JIRA was made for the URMC members and will be made available to Council members as well, he said.
- Ms. Ossar noted that benchmarking of the draft URRS occurred in August. The draft URRS was compared with current schedules from The University of Texas, Texas State University, The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, Texas A&M University and Texas Tech University. Additionally, the draft URRS will be benchmarked against schedules from South Carolina and Oklahoma.
- The URMC consulted the Council of State Archivists guidance for all states. Five states (Colorado, Florida, Kentucky, Oklahoma and South Carolina) have current university-specific records retention schedules. Information from these schedules was included in the draft URRS.
- The URMC included information from other state schedules as a way to give useful guidance to Texas universities, Mr. Foster said. For years, many universities have had their own records retention schedules. URMC's hope is to help university records managers to develop their

schedules as well as standardize them across universities. The URM steering group is nearly prepared to turn over the draft URRS to the full URM membership for review and feedback, he said.

- Ms. Peggy D. Rudd noted that while the URRS is being prepared for public universities in Texas, are there plans to share it with private universities in Texas as well? Although private universities do not fall under the purview of the state records retention schedules, Ms. Rudd noted, they might benefit from the URRS as well. Mr. Foster noted the URM had received some feedback from private universities. Once the URRS is finalized, private universities will be included in announcements and information about the schedule, he said.
- Ms. Rudd asked about plans for periodic review of the URRS once it is finalized. Regular review of the schedule would ensure it remains current with the needs of the universities, she said. Ms. Ossar and Mr. Foster agreed with the need for regular review of the schedule. Mr. Foster hoped the schedule would be reviewed on a similar cycle to that being used for the current state and local schedules. Continued existence of a university records management group would help this review process, he said. Ms. Ossar noted that Texas State Library and Archives Commission (TSLAC) keeps note of suggested revisions to the current schedules and reviews the schedules as needed.
- Ms. Julie Leung asked about a question on page three of the URM report regarding expanding the membership of the URM to include representatives from the State Auditor's Office and the Texas State Library and Archives Commission. She noted the State Auditor's Office is a non-voting member of the Council.
- Ms. Rudd complimented the URM on their work on the URRS, and noted she will be in touch with the URM regarding information to be included in the Council's biennial report.

IV. AGENDA ITEM 3 – REPORT FROM THE BEST PRACTICES COMMITTEE

- Mr. T.J. Wasden of the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services presented the report from the committee. He began his report by noting the day's date and asking everyone present to remember those lost on September 11, 2001.
- Mr. Wasden presented the Council with the final report from the BPC. The report represented the work of more than 30 individuals over the course of more than a year, he said. He thanked the Council members who had provided feedback about the report while it was in its draft stage. Additionally, he recognized the efforts of Ms. Nanette Pfiester, Ms. Erinn Barefield, Ms. Sarah Jacobson, and Mr. Dan McGowen. These individuals were instrumental in taking a voluminous report and distilling it into a manageable and reasonable size, Mr. Wasden said. The BPC hopes the report provides the Council with adequate information to disseminate to legislators, he said.

- The report contains four parts, Mr. Wasden said. Each of the BPC workgroups--the Electronic Records Management Workgroup, the Email Records Management Workgroup, and the Social Media Records Management Workgroup--is represented in a part of the report, as well information from the BPC Electronic Records Management Survey.
- Mr. Wasden focused on six recommendations in the report that he wanted to bring to the Council's attention:
 1. **Improve strategic organizational alignment.** Records management officers are often at different levels in organizations. Records management goals should support and complement an agency's operations. Records managers need a "seat at the table" when major products, especially information technology projects, are being planned.
 2. **Develop electronic records management partnerships.** Cross-functional internal partnerships should be created at the executive level in agencies to further records management goals.
 3. **Ensure long-term access to electronic archives.** Paper documents can be stored for decades or even centuries, but electronic records can quickly become unreadable. Obsolescence becomes an issue when information with a long-term legal, historical or fiscal value needs to be archived. A long-term plan needs to be established with standards for acceptable formats and storage options.
 4. **Develop compliance monitoring and enforcement capability.** Compliance is one of the more difficult challenges faced by records managers and can be hard to achieve. A recent National Archives and Records Administration survey of federal agencies noted that a large majority of survey respondents are at a high to moderate risk of compromising the integrity, authenticity and reliability of their records. Metrics for the progress and success of records management programs should be developed and regularly reported to agency executives and staff.
 5. **Provide Records Management Officers with training similar to that for Information Resource Managers (IRMs).** A wide range of training for RMOs exists across agencies. The BPC recommends a comprehensive training program for RMOs be developed by the TSLAC, including core competencies. Additional staff is needed to achieve this recommendation.
 6. **Add resources to the Texas State Library and Archives Commission to assist other state entities in managing electronic records of all types.** Significant cost savings can be achieved by appropriate records management. While such cost savings may not be readily apparent, improper records management can result in significant costs for items such as litigation that might have been avoided or reduced with proper management.

- Mr. Wasden presented the Council with information about the BPC Electronic Records Management Survey. The survey was sent to 160 agencies and received 88 responses. Survey responses reflected concerns discovered by the BPC workgroups, he said. According to the survey responses, there is not enough management support for records management functions, not enough funding and personnel are available for records management functions, records management functions are separate from information technology more than is helpful, and users rather than trained professionals decide the status of records.
- E-records, email and social media policies need to be developed as well as the infrastructure to support their use and compliance, Mr. Wasden said.
- Ms. Julie Leung inquired about the definition of “public organizations” as used in the title of the report. Mr. Wasden noted the title was meant to convey that the report focused on public as opposed to private organizations. Ms. Leung noted that there are many public organizations that are not government agencies.
- Ms. Cathy Nelson Hartman commented about concerns relating to capturing social media records. She noted it is difficult to capture such records, and building the infrastructure to do so is might be more efficiently accomplished at the state level rather than on an agency by agency basis. Ms. Jacobson noted that there is ongoing discussion regarding expansion of the Texas Records and Information Locator (TRAIL) system to include social media records. Such expansion would require additional funding, she said, as well as a determination as to whether or not such records are agency publications. Ms. Hartman noted that many people would assume that an agency’s social media records are government records. Ms. Jacobson noted the distinction between government records and agency publications, as TRAIL was designed to capture agency publications.
- Ms. Peggy D. Rudd asked if the BPC needed a formal action from the Council to accept the information presented as the final version of the report. Ms. Leung noted in the past the Council had reviewed the report and then formally accepted it from the BPC. Mr. Wasden noted the BPC felt it had met its obligation to provide the report to the Council and the version presented at the meeting was the final version. Ms. Hartman asked if the BPC could still edit the report if needed after the Council had reviewed the report. Mr. Wasden said that would be possible, and assumed the report would not be forwarded in its entirety to the legislature. Ms. Rudd concurred but noted the entire report would be made available on the Council website.

MOTION made by Ms. Hope Morgan, seconded by Ms. Cathy Nelson Hartman, and carried unanimously to accept the report of the Best Practices Committee.

V. AGENDA ITEM 4 – UPDATES FROM TSLAC REGARDING UPCOMING E-RECORDS CONFERENCE, TWO CONTRACTS, AND TWO STATEWIDE REPORTS

- Ms. Nanette Pfiester of TSLAC noted the annual e-Records Conference will be held on November 1, 2012 at the UT Austin Commons JJ Pickle Conference Center. The conference is co-hosted by TSLAC and the Department of Information Resources (DIR). Many of the points in the state strategic plan will be covered by speakers at the conference, she said. Mr. T.J. Wasden of DFPS is the keynote speaker, Ms. Pfiester said. Topics to be covered include the Public Information Act; computer forensics; a panel discussion of policies and challenges of social media, cloud, and mobility; and enhanced search.
- Ms. Pfiester noted two contracts from the Council on Competitive Government that TSLAC is involved with as subject matter experts. Ms. Pfiester said the contracts recently have changed significantly and wanted to make the Council aware of the changes.
 - The digital imaging services contract focused on Austin-based state agencies in the past. In January of 2011, the contract became a state-wide contract and expanded to include eight vendors in three service categories. TSLAC's role as subject matter experts ensures vendors and customers follow records management procedures when completing a digitization project.
 - Ms. Julie Leung asked what the three service categories of the digital imaging services contract entailed. Ms. Pfiester noted the three categories are project based, preservation and flat rate. Project based services could be any type of small digitization project, while preservation services focus on older, more fragile records. Flat rate services could include conversion of large amounts of records into images without a lot of indexing or other work required for those records, Ms. Pfiester said.
 - The secure document destruction contract was originally let in 2005 with a single service provider, TIBH Industries. Stakeholders identified the need for services outside of the Austin area, resulting in an expansion of the contract to statewide this year, Ms. Pfiester said. All new vendors for the contract must be AAA certified by the National Association for Information Destruction, Ms. Pfiester said. In the current fiscal year, approximately 5.5 million pounds (6.1 million sheets) of paper have been shredded under this contract, she said. Other types of media such as microfilm and non-document items are included in this contract, as well as recycling of e-waste.
 - Ms. Lori Person of DIR asked about the end date of the current contract. Ms. Pfiester indicated the end date was 2020. Ms. Person asked if the contract included flexibility as new technology

develops that might require different destruction methods. Ms. Pfiester noted the contract can be amended to allow for new products and/or new destruction methods to be added.

- Ms. Pfiester said the Required Reports Prepared by State Agencies and Institutions of Higher Education project is on track to be published by mid-November 2012. The 2011 edition included 1477 reports, while the draft 2012 edition includes 1187 reports. The Legislative Budget Board took the last edition of the report to the Legislative Council to draft a repealer bill. Similar bills were filed for higher education and health agencies as well. In the current draft, 354 reports were identified as repealed or expired, while 79 new reports were identified. A budget rider for TSLAC requires the report to be published by January 1, 2013, but the Legislative Budget Board had asked for the report to be published by mid-November 2012, Ms. Pfiester said.
- Mr. Dan Procter asked if the obsolete and redundant reports information required by HB1781 would continue to be collected in the future. Ms. Pfiester noted the report required by HB1781 was a one-time report. The information required by HB1781 was helpful in compiling the required reports information, she said. A similar bill, HB326, required agencies undergoing sunset review to prepare a list of the agency's required reports and do an assessment of those reports. The assessment would be used by the Sunset Advisory Commission to present information about the agency undergoing review to the legislature, she said.

VI. AGENDA ITEM 5 – DISCUSSION OF NEW RMICC OFFICERS

- Ms. Peggy D. Rudd noted that Ms. Kim Scofield of the Office of the Attorney General recently retired from state service. Prior to her retirement, Ms. Scofield was the vice-chair of the Council. Ms. Scofield's retirement creates a vacancy in the vice-chair position. The current term for Council officers expires in February 2013, Mr. Dan Procter noted.
- Ms. Rudd asked for a volunteer to fill the vacancy in the office of vice-chair and noted that auxiliary members of the Council were not eligible to be chair. Mr. Procter said there had been prior discussions about allowing auxiliary members to serve as chair, but that change would require legislative action to amend the statute.
- Ms. Cathy Nelson Hartman noted that it was her understanding that both the chair and vice-chair were elected every two years, and the vice-chair did not automatically become the chair after service as the vice-chair. Mr. Stephen Quick asked if the vice-chair could be an auxiliary member. Mr. Procter and Ms. Hartman indicated that was permissible. Ms. Hartman had served as vice-chair in the past.
- Ms. Rudd said the Council will need to elect a new chair and vice-chair at the Council's December meeting. Terms for those officers will begin February 1, 2013. Until that time, the vice-chair will remain vacant.

- Ms. Hartman asked the Council to confirm the date of the December meeting so travel arrangements could be finalized for out of town attendees. Ms. Hope Morgan noted that she had a conflict with the proposed date of December 11. She suggested an alternate date of December 4, but indicated most members would need to consult their schedules after the meeting. Ms. Rudd agreed and suggested an email poll to confirm the date of the December meeting.

VII. AGENDA ITEM 6 – DISCUSSION OF WORKPLAN FOR BIENNIAL REPORT

- Ms. Peggy D. Rudd said the biennial report to the Legislative Budget Board and the Office of the Governor is due in October. She noted the excellent support received in preparing the report from the URMC and BPC.
- Ms. Rudd proposed that the format of prior reports be used to create the current report. A proposed outline and list of responsibilities for the report could be distributed to the Council in the next week, Ms. Rudd said. She would meet with TSLAC staff to assign responsibilities for preparing the report and create a timeline for finalizing the report. Additionally, Ms. Rudd asked for input from the Council members about the workplan for the report.
- Ms. Cathy Nelson Hartman noted she felt the most important part of the report would be the specific recommendations from the Council. In past reports, the Council's recommendations had been outlined in the executive summary of the report. She proposed that same format be followed as many recipients of the report might only read such a summary and not the full report.
- Ms. Rudd said TSLAC would have exceptional item requests for additional staff in the upcoming legislative session. The BPC report included this same recommendation. If the state wants to proceed with an electronic records management plan, she said, more staff with appropriate education and training will be required. TSLAC will ask for more staff in the state archives as well, she said.
- Ms. Rudd noted she believed the Council recommendations could be culled from the work done by the BPC as well as the URMC workgroups and then presented to the Council for approval or disapproval.
- Ms. Hope Morgan asked about TSLAC's plans regarding an electronic data repository. Ms. Rudd noted plans for such a repository had not been put into a legislative appropriations request at this time. A plan for a state repository needs to be created in conjunction with other state agencies, Ms. Rudd said. Such a multi-agency partnership could create a plan and then put forth the needed legislative appropriations request, she said.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

- No other business.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

- Public comment was received from Ms. Kay Steed of the Employees Retirement System of Texas (ERS). Ms. Steed currently serves as the Records Management Officer for ERS and has spent 23 years in records management in Texas state government, including nine and a half years with TSLAC. Ms. Steed noted she has trained records managers on how to implement a records management program and has implemented such programs in three different state agencies.
- Ms. Steed indicated there is a need for change in the TSLAC administrative rules, as these rules were written at a time when the majority of state records were maintained in paper. Current rules need to be updated to help state agencies manage their records in electronic format, she said.
- Ms. Steed made the following recommendations to the Council:
 - Revise the records retention schedule found in 13 TAC §6.10 to streamline and consolidate records series, reduce the total number of records series, and use “plain English” descriptions of records series to help users understand the contents of the records series.
 - Amend the current records retention schedule so that it is designed around a “big bucket” theory. Such organization would combine multiple records series into a small number of high-level functional categories, helping state agencies to develop taxonomies and metadata.
 - Remove 13 TAC §6.8, regarding documenting final disposition of state records, from the Texas Administrative Code. This rule was implemented when most state records were in paper format, she said. Additionally, the Local Government Records Act has no such requirement. This requirement is burdensome and almost impossible to enforce, she said. Documentation of disposition of records is important, she said, but should be a best practice rather than a legal requirement.
 - Amend 13 TAC §§6.91 – 6.97 to delete obsolete rules, include new forms of storage media developed since the rules were adopted, and provide information about transfer of archival state records to TSLAC. Best practices should be developed for topics such as a migration strategy, email management, social media, websites and mobile devices, Ms. Steed said.
 - Develop training for records management officers and records coordinators. This could be done in a template format that could be customized by individual agencies, she said.
 - TSLAC and DIR share responsibility for managing electronic records, but this shared responsibility is not well-publicized. Both agencies should provide information on their websites about the other agency,

including links to the other agency's website. This would promote awareness of the connection between the two agencies, Ms. Steed said.

- Ms. Steed noted to the Council that the above recommendations are hers alone and do not necessarily reflect the ideas and/or opinions of ERS. They are her own personal comments and recommendations based on her experience as a records manager. She offered her assistance to TSLAC regarding implementing her recommendations as well.
- Mr. Stephen Quick noted that the Council did not have the authority to change TSLAC administrative rules. She might want to petition TSLAC regarding any such changes, he said.
- Ms. Peggy D. Rudd thanked Ms. Steed for her input and noted her recommendations would be considered by TSLAC. Ms. Steed expressed her appreciation to the Council for allowing her to present her recommendations.

In the absence of any further business, the meeting stood adjourned at 11:58 a.m.



PEGGY D. RUDD, CHAIR
Records Management Interagency Coordinating Council