

STATE OF MONTANA

STATE RECORDS COMMITTEE MINUTES

MINUTES

DEC. 18 2014

1:30 P.M.

RIM

MEETING CALLED BY	Joe DeFilippis, Secretary of State-Records and Information Management
TYPE OF MEETING	State Records Committee Meeting
FACILITATOR	Joe DeFilippis, State Records Manager
NOTE TAKER	Connie Rigney
ATTENDEES	<p>Kyle Hilmer Department of DOA-SITSD, Joe DeFilippis, Secretary of State-Records and Information Management, Deborah Butler, Legislative Branch-Legislative Audit Division and Jodie Foley, Montana Historical Society-State Archives.</p> <p>Not present is the Attorney General member who has not been appointed at this time.</p>

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME:

Discussion: Joe introduced himself to all of the members as they arrived. Joe talked about his vision for SOS RIM and the SRC as well. His vision is to see us move toward better customer service, simplifying how work is done and improving how RIM is viewed.

Meeting was called to order at 1:30.

Approval of Minutes: No minutes to approve.

OLD BUSINESS:

ITEM ONE: RECORDS DISPOSITION DELEGATION AUTHORITY AGREEMENT GUIDELINES (RDDA)

Discussion:
<p>SRC discussed the Records Disposition Delegation Authority Agreement Guidelines. Several items were brought up. They are as listed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RDDA not posted to web site • Expecting agency to have an emergency action plan before being able to give authority to destroy. • Too hard, no one will qualify • DEQ and MDT have good Records Plans in place and still do not qualify. • Agencies are responsible for their records; if we give them authority they are then responsible. • Question is they send disposals to the SRC and we approve and we do not require the entire list of requirements, so why are we asking for more than we require for the disposals we approve already.

- Audit history, action plan, EPA plan, and Essential record planning all items we do not require for disposals.
- Why would we audit after the fact, make the agency do an update each year.
- If an agency fails an audit done by Legislature or by the SRC they would then lose their delegation right.
- The biggest benefit from doing the RDDA is giving the agency the responsibility
- Change language on the REAP maybe to essential records, require a statement of a plan for records.
- Why do we need record audits, there is no reason. That is why when Deborah signs off she should be reviewing that part. She has only had one issue where records were not protected. The standing member of the SRC would know this. Should be on our list to look for.
- Approved retention schedule-why would we require an agency approved schedule, not everyone has one and they do not need one. Many use the General Schedule.
- Migration and preservation plan only required if they have an agency schedule or they are imaging. Not everyone has to do this. Agencies need to know that is not required, only if you have records that are digital and over ten years required for retention.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	
Review the RDDA and look at all the requirements and decide if they are really all required . Go over language and add in clarifying language before putting on web-site.	Connie/Joe	As soon as can be accomplished, send to SRC for review than post

NEW BUSINESS:

ITEM ONE: HOUSE BILL 123

Discussion:
<p>Joe discussed the fact that the Secretary of States management was not aware of this bill and had not reviewed it. After reviewing it was discovered that the language for fees that was included will need to be changed as SOS is a fee based operation. He will be working with SOS's legal staff and they will be turning in amendments to this bill. A discussion was held with the SRC about the possibility of adding an amendment in concerning the time frame it takes for the SRC to complete disposals, retentions, and exceptions. The following was the items discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Giving one week for each person to approve/disapprove • Ten days for an exception-make decision and review boxes • State to finish on any agency request to be 45 days • Agencies are being billed for boxes held at RIM waiting for exceptions to be reviewed-can be several months waiting-need to shorten this time <p>Decision made was that nothing will be added to the bill but language will be put into the SRC policy concerning the above. SOS will start pulling the boxes held on an exception and staging them for the Historical Society and will stop billing agencies for the storage as soon as the boxes are pulled for staging (next billing month will be removed). SOS will notify HS that the boxes are pulled and ready to be reviewed, HS will make an effort to come and review in a more timely matter.</p>

	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	
Amendments to HB123 Add language to SRC policy	Joe	

ITEM TWO: WORK FLOW FOR SRC DOCUMENTS

Discussion:		
<p>SOS is going to be working on developing an electronic work flow process for all of the required forms that the SRC has to sign. Joe is going to be working with the SOS IT staff; they are looking at using the SharePoint site as a possible place to put the work flow. One concern is the signatures; Joe explained how they do this with the SIMS project that is in place at SOS. He will be looking at language that can be added onto the form in place of the electronic signatures. Also SOS will need to have a migration plan in place when this happens as these records are the original and the retention is 30 years. Once this is in place it should help with the time frame for processing all forms and in doing so will improve customer service. All forms at this time are fillable and on the SOS web site and can be completed electronically. Another concern mentioned was when SRC members are gone/vacation other members need to be notified. With a work flow in place each member can review without waiting for member who is gone to complete, this will help with the time frame as well.</p>		
	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	
Work Flow process for forms	Joe/Connie	As soon as possible

ITEM THREE: GENERAL RETENTION SCHEDULE-NEW FORM FOR UPDATES/CHANGES

Discussion:		
<p>A new change for the General Retention Schedules was suggested by Joe and Connie to the SRC members. They would like to develop a new form for adding a new record series or changing a record series to the General Schedules (GS). This would allow agencies to complete the form requesting to have a record series added/changed to the General Schedule rather than adding an item to their own agency schedule. It would also stop a record series that is used by many agencies from having to be added to their own schedules by adding to the GS. This will be the first time that agencies will have the opportunity to add record series on their own to the GS. It should not matter how many items are on the GS what should matter is how to make it better for all agencies to use. It was decided by the SRC to go ahead with the two new forms and once the forms are done SRC will review, once approved they will go onto the web site with instructions on how to use them and notifications will be sent out to the record custodians.</p>		
	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	
Develop forms	Connie-SRC for approval	

ITEM FOUR: NEW MEMBER FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL

Discussion:		
<p>Joe told SRC that he is in contact with the Attorney General's office and is working with them on getting someone assigned to take Greg Noose's place.</p>		
	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	

NEXT MEETING: To be announced. Four meetings will be held in 2015.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Connie Rigney
Secretary of State-Records and Information Management