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From OHRAB

Ohio Historical Records Advisory Board Meeting Minutes, May 06, 2005

Board members present: William K. Laidlaw, Jr.; Charles Arp; John Fleming; Barbara Floyd; Laurie Gemmill; Raimund Goerler; Marjorie McLellan; Julie McMaster; James Oda; Julia Michael Scott; Carol Tomer

Board members not present: Joanne Budler; Kermit Pike

OHS Staff present: James Strider, Pari Swift, Betsy Butler

OHS Staff Not Present: Rachel Tooker

1. Welcome

Mr. Laidlaw called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. He thanked Mr. Fleming for hosting the meeting at the Cincinnati Museum Center and introduced new board members Marjorie McLellan and Julia Scott.

2. Approval of minutes of January 21, 2005 meeting

After noting a few minor changes to the January 21, 2005 meeting minutes, Mr. Laidlaw requested a motion to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Fleming motioned for approval of the minutes; Mr. Arp seconded the motion.

3 (a). Review of Strategic Plan Activities: Public Records Subcommittee Update

Following Mr. Arp’s overview of OHRAB’s recent efforts regarding H.B. 9, Ms. Scott observed that although the state collects approximately $110 million from filing fees, filings are down statewide. She also mentioned that $50 million of that revenue goes to the state’s general fund. Mr. Goerler added that OHRAB’s efforts should focus not on raising filing fees, but on directing a portion of that $50 million to local government records management.

Mr. Arp added that although some funding is possible as a result of H.B. 9, OHRAB should be more aggressive, forthright and consistent in advocating for this issue. For example, the board should be scheduling meetings with Larry Long of the County Commissioners Association of Ohio, Rep. Bill Seitz, and the Ohio Newspaper Association. Mr. Strider agreed, citing the importance of being more proactive in providing information to legislators in order to acquaint them with the issue.

Messrs. Arp and Fleming agreed that it will be difficult to get information about how much money is needed to fund this initiative, since it is hard to define how much money local governments could need. Ms. Gemmill suggested using a case study of a county, village, or township to determine the amount. Mr. Arp observed that it would be difficult to obtain that amount in such a limited time.

After Mr. Laidlaw asked Ms. Scott for her suggestions, she responded that the Athens County Recorder microfilms not only for in-house county offices, but also for outside entities. In many, but not all, counties, a microfilm board has been established.
Mr. Laidlaw asked if Ms. Scott could estimate how much a program like this would cost. Mr. Arp and Ms. Swift suggested that the Ohio County Archivists and Records Managers Association (CARMA) might be another source of information about the cost of this project. Ms. McLellan suggested that estimating costs and fines through those reported in newspaper articles could also illustrate what counties would be paying.

Mr. Goerler summarized by saying that regardless of the flaws in the bill, OHRAB considers this worth supporting because it provides access to public records, even if there is no revenue stream in place to fund it.

To conclude discussion of this issue, Mr. Laidlaw summarized that OHS would: (1) schedule a meeting with the Ohio Newspaper Association through one of the three OHS board members affiliated with newspapers or through Mike Curtin; (2) contact Larry Long; and (3) develop cost estimates.

3 (b). Review of Strategic Plan Activities: Board Appointment

Mr. Laidlaw asked the board for suggestions on how to orient new OHRAB members and their individual needs. Both Ms. Scott and Ms. McLellan expressed the helpfulness of observing during the meeting. Ms. Gemmill suggested that new board members read past meeting minutes that are available online, in order to get a sense of public records issues. Mr. Oda observed that reading agendas for upcoming OHRAB meetings helps board members become familiar with key issues. Mr. Strider mentioned that OHS staff had provided new board members with background information on OHRAB and state historical records advisory boards.

Past meetings included discussions about a mentorship program for new members. Therefore, Mr. Laidlaw asked the board whether that was something in which members were interested and willing to do, or whether OHRAB members should focus on matters such as H.B. 9 and mentoring NHPRC applicants and leave orientation to OHS staff. He also reminded board members to continue to suggest ways to improve meetings.

3 (c). Review of Strategic Plan Activities: Encouraging Grant Proposals

Mr. Strider called the board’s attention to the evaluation and summary comments regarding the grant-writing workshop that OHRAB sponsored during the April 2005 Society of Ohio Archivists conference. After noting that the workshop was well received, Ms. Gemmill noted that she attended the workshop in order to encourage NHPRC grant proposals and reported that Miami University expressed interest in the program.

Mr. Laidlaw invited the board to comment on the draft of the NHPRC funding checklist that was included in the materials to be reviewed during this meeting. Ms. Floyd suggested sharing it with an NHPRC program officer, while Mr. Goerler stated that proposals should include a statement of their national significance and ability to address unmet needs across the state.

Mr. Fleming stated that NHPRC grant applicants should have some response from OHRAB before they appear in front of NHPRC. Ms. Floyd commented that having applicants meet with OHRAB 60 days before the NHPRC deadline is not enough time, because of OHRAB meeting schedules. Further, she commented that this checklist will help potential applicants understand what the time schedule is and that the process takes a long time.

Finally, Mr. Oda suggested that OHRAB meetings either focus entirely on grant proposals or current business, keeping review and business meetings separate in order to concentrate on the topic at hand. Alternatively, he suggested keeping OHRAB business to a minimum when grants need to be reviewed.

3 (d). Review of Strategic Plan Activities: Ohio Electronic Records Committee

After calling the board’s attention to the draft minutes of the Ohio Electronic Records Committee’s most recent
meeting, Ms. Floyd observed that the committee is still trying to determine its goals and objectives. She mentioned that ERC concluded that it is not there to write policy, but to prepare best practices for governments at all levels to use in developing electronic records projects and management.

Further, Ms. Floyd called attention to the Glenn Institute’s recent survey on how much ERC guidelines are used by governments around the state, and its findings that local governments were using the guidelines and best practices more than had been anticipated. In order to have the committee’s expertise best utilized, Ms. Floyd stated that marketing efforts are under way to reach more levels of government. Additionally, case studies will demonstrate how organizations are adapting to electronic records and what current issues are.

Mr. Goerler observed that the Ohio ERC has gone through a renewal process and indicated his desire that a new leadership structure was ready to take on some hands-on projects.

3 (e). Review of Strategic Plan Activities: NHPRC Advocacy

Discussion about NHPRC’s funding situation began with encouraging individuals to communicate with Congressional officials about this matter. Mr. Laidlaw mentioned that the House Appropriation Subcommittee’s recent meeting to review the National Archives budget was very positive, specifically as a result of Rep. Ralph Regula’s attendance and verbal support of NHPRC at that meeting. Mr. Laidlaw reminded the group that it should be continuing to encourage others to communicate with legislators.

Mr. Arp suggested that OHRAB or OHS wrote Rep. Regula a letter thanking him for his support of NHPRC. Ms. Gemmill asked about OHS’s “History Is Right Here” Web site initiative for legislative action and suggested that information about State Archives and local government records needs also be added there.

Mr. Laidlaw summarized additional ways that OHS was working to obtain support for NHPRC funding. Discussion ensued about OHRAB’s fate if NHPRC was eliminated from the federal budget.

4 (a). Future Meeting Dates

The group discussed OHRAB’s future meeting dates and agreed that they would take place on:

July 15, 2005
October 14, 2005
January 27, 2006
April 12 or 19, 2006 (depending on the Society of Ohio Archivists’ Spring meeting)
July 14, 2006
October 27, 2006

All meetings would take place at the Ohio Historical Center in Columbus.

4 (b). Visit from NHPRC in Spring 2006

Mr. Strider led discussion of inviting Richard Cameron or Max Evans from the NHPRC to participate in a joint meeting with OHRAB and the Society of Ohio Archivists in Spring 2006. Ms. Gemmill mentioned that NHPRC was changing its grant guidelines, so this would be a timely presentation. She also stated that SOA’s new council met recently and is beginning to think about planning ideas for the Spring 2006 meeting, so the SOA program committee would be happy to have a program speaker resolved.
Mr. Strider reported that he and Mr. Oda would meet on May 19 to begin working on the OHRAB bylaws again. He would also be speaking with OHS staff and OHS legal counsel, Fritz Milligan, regarding related issues. Messrs. Strider and Oda intend to present general recommendations at the next OHRAB meeting.

5 (b). State Archivist Search

Mr. Strider distributed the revised State Archivist draft job description, acknowledging the board’s concern that OHS has not moved more quickly on filling this position. He also distributed a list of resources and organizations that have been targeted for the search. He reported that he talked with a number of OHRAB members and other individuals regarding the management and consolidation of State Archives functions. He also provided a timetable for the recruiting and hiring process. Additionally, Mr. Strider mentioned that OHRAB would be a critically important part of the search, with at least one member serving on a screening committee to look at initial applicants, one or two members serving on the formal interviewing committee, and the entire group participating in candidate presentations.

After mentioning that the job description was based on a study of relevant job descriptions from other states, together with a competitive and equitable salary range, Mr. Strider invited the group to share their comments on the job description. He indicated that the position emphasizes more responsibility on expressing leadership and coordinating management responsibilities.

5 (c). OHRAB Administrative Update

Mr. Strider asked the board whether it wanted to provide any support for Archives Week, sponsored by the Society of Ohio Archivists. Ms. Gemmill seconded this request by stating that OHRAB goals and objectives include coordinating with SOA on archival training and helping SOA publicize Archives Week. She also mentioned that SOA was considering offering a morning workshop on general copyright, then concurrent sessions on licensing, permissions, and digital watermarking in the afternoon during its Fall 2005 meeting. If OHRAB is interested in supporting these initiatives, she suggested that SOA could develop a more formal proposal. Mr. Goerler mentioned that bringing in speakers from out of state is something SOA needs to be doing, and this is a way OHRAB can help SOA achieve this goal.

After Mr. Strider asked whether members would be willing to spend some administrative funds on this initiative, Mr. Arp stated that OHRAB should consider any formal request by SOA, but needs to have some idea about how much funding OHRAB has. Discussion ensued about some of SOA’s initiatives.

Mr. Strider asked Ms. Gemmill if SOA could present a more formal proposal to review at OHRAB’s July meeting.

5 (d). National Funding Initiative

Mr. Laidlaw mentioned that he has been invited to serve on an AASLH committee pursuing federal formula funding, similar to what IMLS provides for libraries, but in this case for museums. While the request would be included in the Fiscal Year 2008 budget, efforts are under way to draft a case statement for a $200 million pool of funds that would be divided proportionately to the way funds could be applied to other states. Mr. Laidlaw also mentioned continuing efforts to resurrect a project focusing on digitizing historical resources that would be supported by Congressional funds.

5 (e). Member Institutional Updates
During lunch, OHRAB members provided updates on recent activities and accomplishments at their respective institutions. Mr. Laidlaw introduced several staff members from the Cincinnati Museum Center who had joined the group for lunch, including Anne Kling, archivist; Ruby Rogers, director of the Cincinnati Historical Society Library and Community History Program; and Dan Hurley, assistant vice president for history.

6. Conclusion

After thanking Mr. Fleming and his staff for their efforts in hosting today’s meeting, Mr. Laidlaw reminded the group that its next meeting would be held at the Ohio Historical Center on July 15. The meeting concluded at 1:00 p.m.
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