Meeting brought to order by Lisa Mendoza at 8:32 a.m.

1. **Introductions and announcements**: The group discussed the latest update about KEEP.

2. **Minutes from previous meeting**: Ms. Michaelis moved approval, Mr. Veatch seconded; unanimous approval of minutes as presented.

3. **Kansas Board of Regents – revised series**: Craig Haugsaess explained that the general educational development (GED) process in Kansas and the nation has recently solidified, necessitating changes to the records series 0106-561. Starting in January 2014, the paper-and-pencil test will no longer be available; instead, all test-takers will take the computer test. Those centers only offering the paper-and-pencil test and unwilling/unable to convert to the electronic version will be closing, their paper records coming to the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR). KBOR staff have started a validation process to ensure all records received will be consistent and correct, checking that the computer and paper records agree or that unduplicated paper information is entered into their database. Once the validation project is complete, KBOR requests that the paper copies be destroyed and the data remain as the official copy.
   **Motion**: Mr. Veatch moved, Ms. Michaelis seconded; unanimous approval of revised retention schedule entry as submitted.

4. **Kansas Department of Administration**: The department had no series scheduled for waiting lists for parking lots owned and used by State of Kansas employees in downtown Topeka. The board questioned what was superseded or updated on the lists and whether the entire waiting list was updated or just certain names changed. The entire list is superseded.
   **Motion**: Ms. Michaelis moved, Mr. Veatch seconded; unanimous approval of new retention schedule entry as submitted.

5. **Office of the Attorney General**: Ms. Mendoza in her capacity as records officer has been cleaning up her agency’s schedule as she can, so there are a variety of schedule entries presented. She discussed the new series coming before the board, explaining that creditors will
send the Attorney General’s office information about class actions and bankruptcies if they think Kansas entities are involved. This leads to a set of possible actions, most of which lead to destruction of the information, unless the Attorney General’s office becomes actively involved. At that point the records become part of a case file, a separately scheduled record series.

Ms. Mendoza also described the revised series presented to the board, explaining that several retention and disposition schedule entries provide information about the destruction of paper records only after they have been scanned, with the scanned documents to be retained permanently. This information was based on a workflow that has not come to pass in most divisions, so Ms. Mendoza is revising pertinent schedule entries to allow for differing record copy formats and to ensure that all formats are appropriately scheduled. This will be an ongoing effort. Scanning continues in some divisions, such as Consumer Protection and Criminal, but not in LOGIC or other divisions.

The Attorney General’s office may serve as general counsel but not prosecuting counsel when working with other state agencies, boards, and commissions, Ms. Mendoza explained in conjunction with series 0050-082. Ms. Michaelis wanted to know whether a general schedule entry existed for these types of records for all state agencies. Such records generally fall under a variety of schedule entries, such as policy-related or routine correspondence, or open records requests. Ms. Mendoza also noted that interlocal cooperation agreements are maintained by the Secretary of State’s office and the Attorney General’s office does not need to hold onto these documents for a long time.

Over time, recordkeeping practices have changed at the Attorney General’s office, and now working and final opinion files are kept together. Ms. Mendoza explained the differences between formal and informal opinions. The board discussed the thoroughness of the schedule entry for the Opinion files and how useful it would be to understand better government process.

**Motion:** Ms. Michaelis moved, Mr. Veatch seconded; unanimous approval of all new, revised, and superseded retention schedule entries as submitted.

6. **Kansas Historical Society – revised series:** Due to space constraints, the Heritage Trust Fund grant files will be placed in the State Archives rather than remaining interfiled with the National & State Register of Historic Places records. Program staff indicated these grant files are not pulled as frequently so it will not become a burden for archives reference staff. Discussion revolved around the electronic copy, which remains a convenience copy.

**Motion:** Ms. Mendoza moved, Mr. Veatch seconded; unanimous approval of schedule entry as presented.

7. **Local records: Noxious Weeds – revised series:** These records were recently newly scheduled at the state level and determined to have archival value when compiled by the state weed specialist. Therefore the local schedule entry was revised to allow the county noxious weeds directors to destroy their copies of the records, rather than retaining them permanently.

**Motion:** Ms. Michaelis moved approval, Mr. Veatch seconded, unanimous approval of revised schedule entry as submitted.

8. **Housekeeping changes:** Ms. Wiget explained that the Kansas Historical Society’s database administrator was able to revise the housekeeping report to categorize changes by housekeeping edits, superseding to general schedule entries, and obsolete schedule entries, in order to improve the report’s accessibility. The report will continue to be voluminous as records management staff work with agencies to clean up their retention and disposition schedules.

The board accepted the report and appreciated records management staff’s effort.
9. **Other business:**

   **Social media:** At its last meeting, the board had requested a report on social media for state government. Mr. Garwood presented on the topic. Social media has become a major force in communication largely since 2000, when content became mobile, and particularly since 2008 when interaction became more prevalent and possible, such as through Twitter and Facebook.

   The board agreed that under the Public Records Act, K.S.A. 75-3501 *et seq.*, social media sites are government records. Many other states also note in statute and policy that social media sites are public record and may be retained for the long-term or permanently.

   The board also agreed that social media sites should be appraised and scheduled in Kansas. Discussion followed regarding how to appraise these records. Suggestions included surveying records officers before the records officers’ meeting in November and asking records officers to attend and discuss their ideas on how to handle these types of records. Discussion also revolved around appraising at a macro-level for the entire state and generating a general schedule entry or appraising at a micro-level and looking at each agency’s use of social media and scheduling specifically for individual state agencies. Mr. Veatch urged the board to consider the differences in communication available through social media between the state and its citizens, and that this communication is worth keeping for its enduring value.

   The board discussed how to preserve social media sites. ArchiveSocial is the leading entity working with government agencies to preserve this type of media; Archivelt from the Internet Archive is also used. Concerns revolve around how to collect the sites, to what extent information can be followed from the preserved data (such as preserving live links), and how to preserve the functionality of sites. Data can be exported from many social media sites now but it is stripped of its look, feel, and context. If the board determines that such data should be preserved for the good of the state, then it will also need to determine policy for procedures and practices to follow when preserving such data.

   The board looked at North Carolina’s ArchiveSocial site. This company allows various social media sites to be presented together in a single entity.

   Ms. Mendoza suggested first creating guidance for agencies to follow and later, after gathering records officers’ input, discussing more formal retention requirements. The board discussed potential questions to go on the survey.

   **Motion:** Mr. Veatch moved that records management staff will formulate a records officer’s survey on social media and implement it. Motion unanimously approved. Staff will put out the survey in September to provide preliminary results at the October State Records Board meeting and to discuss with the records officers at the November meeting.

   **Short-term records and their record copy format:** Discussion arose regarding whether differing record copy formats need to be noted formally in a retention schedule entry for short-term records to be destroyed. This was specifically related to series schedule entries that only dealt with electronic records, not with legacy paper records. Suggestions included creating a static field in the database, seen publicly, for every entry noting that retention requirements apply whether it’s paper or electronic, but there were concerns with taking this step. Instead in the specific instance under discussion, records management staff will make an internal remark that will appear on the housekeeping report.

   **Local records management official joining the Electronic Records Committee (ERC):** Records management staff wanted to ensure that a local county official joining the ERC would not be a problem. Ms. Mendoza thought that having a local voice would be beneficial for the
ERC and agreed that Teresa Anderson from Johnson County should join the committee, which is informally invited by Matt Veatch to convene.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.