
Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

October 2021 INK Board Meeting October 6, 2021

Opening

A meeting of the INK Board was called to order via online videoconference in Microsoft Teams at 11:00 a.m. by INK Board Chair Tom Sloan with the following members present:

Lori Blake, representing the Kansas Association of School Boards
Mark Burghart, Secretary of Revenue
Jennifer Cook, representing the Secretary of State
Jim Haugh, representing the Secretary of Commerce
Vicky Ortiz, representing the Kansas Library Association
Kristy Wilson, representing the Kansas Association of Independent Insurance Agents
Glen Yancey, representing the Executive Branch Chief Executive Technology Officer

Others Present

Rebecca Gillam, University of Kansas Center for Public Partnerships and Research; Sam Feather (*for Tim Shultz, INK Board Counsel*), Goodell, Stratton, Edmonds & Palmer, LLP; Duncan Friend, Information Network of Kansas; Nolan Jones and Ashley Gordon, Kansas Information Consortium, LLC.

Consent Agenda

The Consent Agenda for the meeting listed the draft minutes for the September 2, 2021 INK regular board meeting and the September 2021 Network Manager Report. Friend indicated the September minutes were not yet available and they were removed from the Consent Agenda.

Action Taken: Haugh moved to approve the Consent Agenda as amended to remove the minutes, seconded by Wilson. There was no discussion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Regular Agenda

Regular Business

1) INK Strategic Planning

Sloan welcomed Rebecca Gillam, Associate Director at the University of Kansas Center for Public Partnerships and Research who was working with Friend on a proposal to assist the Board with strategic planning. By way of introduction Friend related that he came to invite Gillam based on suggestions at the last Board meeting about investigating facilitation of strategic planning with KU Public Management Center (they partner with Gillam's group) and also a suggestion that the CCAT (Core Capacity Assessment Tool) with which Gillam was familiar might be helpful in the process.

Gillam began by saying she had been working closely with Patty Gentrup who was at the Public Management Center at KU. She was out of the office this week or would have attended. She added that, as Friend had mentioned, she had used the CCAT on a number of occasions, but she wasn't sure that is where they would want to start. One of the reasons that she thinks that isn't a good place to start is that INK is a very unique organization. She has seen it work pretty well for traditional social services organizations. She thought it would tell them that they don't have a lot of staff capacity, which the Board knows already. The feedback that they would get from the tool may not be terribly helpful given the way INK is structured.

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

She briefly summarized what she had been learning about INK so far and then said that her goal today was mostly to hear from the Board. She has received from Friend, but she would like to hear the kind of questions the members are bringing to this work. She and Gentrup have started to outline a process for the strategic planning and she felt the general outline wouldn't be surprising to them. They start with an assessment, get background information, they look at other states and best practices, talking to each of the members, with a goal of getting a better understanding of where INK is now. What does governance look like? What do operations and projects look like?

She said that she imagined that the members of the Board had done strategic planning in several days, as well as longer periods of time. Given INK's structure, she imagined that this would probably be a 6-9 month process because they all have full-time jobs and they and their partners will need to be involved in all the steps of the process. She ended by saying that had been a general overview of what the process might look like, so she wanted to stop and hear from the members about the driving questions the members and the board as a whole were bringing to this effort.

Sloan asked the members if they had questions for Gillam. In the interim while waiting for a response, Sloan acknowledged the factors driving a 6-9 month timeframe but asked if there were things that could be done that provided some kind of a path forward by the end of the year? In other words, three months? She responded that she felt three months was pretty tight, considering that, of those twelve weeks, they were already a week into it. She felt they could make pretty significant progress on the assessment portion, maybe look at some interim recommendations that are not the three to five-to-ten year plan, but are things to do "right now". But, maybe something of a pilot of sorts to get them moving while the larger process is taking place.

Sloan then asked again for questions. Blake responded that, while it wasn't a question, it was good to hear Gillam say that defining the governance roles and the board roles within this process she thought would be really helpful for all of the members to know their involvement in day-to-day operations and staff responsibility and finding that balance so that they can be effective in supporting the work of INK across the state. Secretary Burghart then noted that he didn't necessarily have a question, but the statutory basis for INK was thirty years old now. And, he guessed the question for him was "Is the model that we have the most efficient way to structure this kind of organization? Do we need to evolve in any way?" He continued, noting that lots of things have happened over the last thirty years. Maybe the work that Gillam would be doing looking at other states might shed some light on that. Gillam thanked him for the comment and said she thought it was right on. It seemed from her review of the basics of INK's work that it has almost grown the biggest in an area that maybe wasn't part of the original intent in terms of payment processing. She noted, however, that she was a novice. But, she asked, how is INK doing the public information side – is that leg of the stool the right length to really be able to drive things where the Board wants to go? And, she continued, Secretary Burghart's remarks made her wonder if the statutes needed to be looked at as well. Not something to recommend today, but probably a good question to be asking. They may be fine – or maybe they find they are 30 years old and they do need to be looked at.

Friend asked for permission to add something. When he and Gillam had talked, he had questions about the format – with the pandemic, would it be all online, or some things in person? He also understood that maybe Gentrup had some restrictions that kept her from being available during the next few months to work on the project. To this point, the mechanics really hadn't been discussed of what things would be done across the timeline and he didn't really know the answer, so he would let Gillam address it.

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

She said she didn't think she had an answer and they would work on it together. They have started to do some in-person things. She was hopeful in the coming weeks they could do more of that, but they for sure would not schedule eight-hour long Zoom meetings. The early work would be more one-on-one, small group, and behind-the-scenes sorts of things and maybe more group things would be done later.

Sloan asked when Gillam thought they would be able to start and what she thought the cost might be. She responded that they have already started in the sense of information gathering and thinking about these issues. She thought they would probably be able to start with "greater velocity" in the next couple of weeks. They haven't put together any pricing contingent upon this conversation with the Board. They will put together a full written proposal with costs and timelines and get that to the Board as a follow up to this conversation, so they would have that information in the next week or so to be able to decide.

Sloan asked if the members or Friend had any other comments or questions. Yancey said he didn't really have a question, but what he heard was good. INK has been around for a long time. The original or defining purpose of INK has naturally changed with changes in technology and the landscape. What he hopes to get out of this is defining what digital citizen engagement looks like, or what they think it is going to look like, and what they want it to look like. And then develop a better understanding of what the goals and some of the opportunities are for INK to actually achieve that. Credit card processing and things like that pay a lot of the freight for INK, but is that a strategic business opportunity for INK going forward – is that a growth opportunity – or are there other citizen engagement opportunities that they ought to be exploring and building out in their business plan for their contractor to engage with. He feels like the Board and contractor tend to be fairly tactical by default – "this is something we might go chase, or this is something we might do", but there is no real focus on trying to achieve a larger goal. If INK is going to really offer unique value or opportunities to the State, then it really needs to define the business case that it's going to live within and drive that.

Gillman thanked Yancey for the comments and agreed with him – it makes her think of several things that they may want to embed in the process. First, thinking about the different levels of stakeholders that touch INK – local organizations, state agencies, and citizens – they would have in their mind that they need to make sure they hear from those levels; 2) What does it look like to hear from young people who may not be INK's direct constituents yet but will be in the future – how do they anticipate those scenarios?

Friend noted to the Chair that they were running a little short of time, but he thought it was important to decide where the vendor or contract played in this. The statute was originally set up for the private sector to be the innovator, they are the ones who bring opportunities to the Board – it's the private side. And, they have resources to be in touch with what is going on in the private sector. He continued that he wasn't trying to tee that up as much as say, it's part of the deal, so it seems important to understand where they sit in the development of the plan. There is an accountability part, but it was designed for the state to avail itself of the unique insight they have. So, that is for the Board - whoever wants to answer it, but he doesn't think they should be left out. He said he had not talked with him at all about this to this point. Jones said he totally agrees with what's been said so far – reexamining things after 30 years is a good process and he would like to contribute to that. Another organization he thought could help was the Center for Digital Government. They have always played an important role in understanding trends – like the earlier conversation about what young people will come to expect.

Sloan asked Gillam if she had anything additional. She did not, but felt good that they were not far off in anticipating the kinds of questions the Board was asking. They will be in touch through Friend soon to get the Board a more detailed process and cost. She really appreciates what the Board is doing and helping. Sloan said they may hold a special board meeting to discuss the proposal and thanked her for coming.

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

Action: None.

Before the next item, Friend noted that Board Counsel Tim Shultz could not be on the call today and so an attorney from their firm, Sam Feather was in attendance.

2) **Contracts (7) for Bulk MVR Sales (KDOR/INK/Bulk Vendor)**

Friend introduced this item by saying that while there were seven contracts, they were identical so he had included only one from Embark as an example, but in the motion they will want to approve all seven. Jones then discussed the background and reasoning for the reworking of the contract and that they had worked closely with Department of Revenue and INK Legal as well as the vendors. Now there is a single unified contract and there was no agenda other than to update it make it as effective and appropriate as possible. At this point, all the vendors have signed it and Secretary Burghart has signed it.

Friend added that with these contracts, there were no rate changes involved, this was just an attempt to make technical and other corrections and it had been even within a year that they'd previously been sent out with some updates. Jones confirmed this.

Sloan asked if there were questions for Jones or Friend. Sloan asked if there were an end date for the contracts. Jones responded that they were indefinite. Sloan then said he would entertain a motion to approve the contracts.

Action: Cook moved to approve the seven contracts (Embark Safety LLC, Explore Information Services LLC, HireRight LLC, Insurance Information Exchange (iiX), LexisNexis Risk Solutions, SambaSafety, and Sentinel Information Systems). Blake seconded. There was no further discussion. The motion was approved unanimously with Secretary Burghart abstaining.

3) **KDOR / INK Contract Addendum – Motor Vehicle Record Monitoring**

Jones reminded the Board that there had been an addendum awhile back that modified the rates for bulk vendor fees. One price that was not adjusted was for monitoring services. This service notifies them if there had been a change to a customer's record. It doesn't tell the type of change and at that point the bulk vendor is required to purchase the full record. That fee has not been changed in many, many years. This increases the fee and also accommodates a new service for a "12-month lookback". This allows an insurance company, for example, who wants to see if there had been any changes in the last twelve months to "look back", essentially at twelve times the monthly fee. They will work with Department of Revenue's IT staff on this.

Friend then noted that there was a memo in the packet from himself, mostly with input from Jones – they'd done this on the previous rate changes – that includes estimates about the potential impact on revenue. He continued that, as always, these are information markets so no one is obligated to buy anything if something changes. So, that memo is included, too.

Sloan asked if there were questions from members. Wilson called attention to a fee listed in the contract for \$16.10 and asked if it just applied to bulk records for vendors, or is that for everyone? Jones responded that the fee she asked about is not being adjusted, but, yes, that is for bulk vendors and it is slightly higher for individuals that obtain single records.

Action: Yancey moved to approve the addendum. Haugh seconded. There was no further discussion. The motion was approved with six yes votes, Wilson voting no, Secretary Burghart recusing.

4) KBI Scrap Metal Project Change Order: LEO Enhancements

Jones summarized the nature and history of the Scrap Metal Project. This change order related to some changes requested by the KBI for increasing access and functionality for law enforcement officers – it should be about 94 hours of effort and they’ve worked with them to define the changes. Friend asked – this was the second month there had been a change order – what the “future forecast” was for these changes. Jones responded that there was likely to be one more project, again focused on law enforcement functionality.

Action: Burghart moved to approve the change order. Seconded by Wilson. There was no further discussion. The motion was approved unanimously.

5) Q2 INK Financial Reports

Friend began by saying that the Board accountants, MizeCPAs was moving to migrate to a new system to produce the financial reports. So, the next quarter would look a little different, but they are calculated the same way. He is reviewing drafts of those now. At a high level, the most important thing to talk about in the limited time, INK is solvent and that it is building up significant reserves from its share of the revenue being produced by operations. Friend then briefly walked through the Statement of Financial Position. There had been investments in the previous year, but those investments have ended and the interest rates have dropped. He also summarized the situation with each of the outstanding grant balances and noted the funds reserved for continued work on the Kansas Business One-Stop. He then reviewed the report showing the contribution of various agencies to the net revenue of INK and closed by noting that while the Board had previously approved the reports, they had moved to just noting that they were “accepted” and that the Board had received a briefing about them – this is with the idea that these financial reports are not independently audited, and the audited annual reports are approved by the Board – so there isn’t necessarily a motion to be made on this.

Sloan had a question previously about resolving some of the outstanding issues with the financials and asked when he thought that might be complete. Friend outlined some of them in terms of getting agencies to release balances and close out grants, and resolve refunds. They aren’t insurmountable and he intended to have them completed in Q4. Friend agreed that it needed to be cleaned up. Sloan asked the members if any of them had an issue accepting the report as presented. There were no comments.

Action: None.

6) Grant Program: Proposal Evaluation / Possible Policy Revisions

Friend began by noting that all the members should have received the grant application in their packet of materials and provided a brief summary of the grant request, along with noting the endorsement letters that had been included. He continued saying that there were several pieces to this topic as he saw it that he was prepared to address at the Board’s direction: The grant itself; the ranking against the Granting Policy and Procedures evaluation criteria that he and Sloan had performed; the funds remaining in the annual grant budget the Board had established at the first of the year; and then a fourth thing. The fourth item was about policies generally. For example, that the standard grant windows in the INK policy were May and November. He indicated he had let KSU know about that. Yet, he had assumed – speaking for himself – from previous conversations with the Board...maybe not with all the current members in a formal motion – that – perhaps due to the Board developing significant reserves – the message he was to convey was that if an agency had a proposal and could present it professionally, the Board might entertain it outside that window. Those conversations have also occurred with other agencies, like Agriculture’s Division of Water

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

Resources, the Kansas Water Office. So, this is why the Board has the proposal, but yet it is not November. The exception process in the policy is that if there is real urgency, say, if the applicant needs matching money for a federal match. The last part is that, in reviewing grants recently and applying the criteria, Friend expressed that he sees that the grant criteria is starting to get a little out of sync. He doesn't think it needs to be modified at the meeting today, but he wanted to let the Board know that he is occasionally seeing criteria that don't fit what is being proposed, or say, reflect an older strategy of the Board that, as the members talked about earlier, is going to be revisited. The Board doesn't want to chain them to a strategy from 2012 or 2014 strategy. He closed by saying that he did wish to obtain a motion from the Board to clarify the situation on the May / November windows vs. the "take all comers" approach so he will know what to tell agencies.

Sloan asked to begin with the proposal itself. Friend reminded the members that the evaluation criteria in the grant included such items as whether or not the project aligns to state or agency planned initiatives, expand public information, aspects of the technology used, the proposed level of market adoption and those types of things. The ranking approach uses the following point system: *1 – Does not meet expectations, 2 – Meets expectations, or 3 – Exceeds expectations*. He continued that the combined ranking between Sloan and Friend for the proposal was 2.28. But, he thought that both he and Sloan ranked it across all the criteria as meets or exceeds expectations with the exception being the one about producing Revenue. The applicants suggest they don't want to charge for access, but they are open to talking about it and have a few suggestions. So, there was a little difference there in the rating between them. To summarize, they had ranked the proposal above "Meets specification", so they were recommending it for approval. He deferred to Sloan to express his opinion.

Sloan said that he had raised the revenue issue. It was more in terms of the applicant wanting this to be a dynamic, ongoing process so that they are updating their files, therefore updating information that would be available through INK and other sources. He continued that he doesn't think that they have taken into account that there are costs associated with doing that. And, he doesn't think that he wants them coming back to INK for a grant to fund an update. So, from his perspective, he thinks the project is worth doing, and he thinks it is appropriate for INK to assist, but he also thinks that there should be conversations with them about how they are going to support it in the future. He then said he would be happy to open it up for questions. Friend added that there hasn't been a written or documented strategy for what INK charges for – or doesn't – yet the Board is in charge of all fees. So, the other question is that normally, the board has tried to avoid fees to the public in the past and instead put them on business. He said he wanted to provide this as context for talking about fees and that it would be nice as part of planning to get a general working philosophy on that.

Blake said that as a school board member that relies on property valuation for agriculture, this was the hardest mill levy to determine as they were setting their budget, so she definitely sees the need for this. It would be very helpful to them to have the tool available to them to use. The only question she had was whether INK's grant Policy and Procedures contained guidelines specifying a ratio of fringe benefits to salary. 32% seemed like it might be a little high for that – it just sort of stood out to her in the proposed budget.

Friend responded that he could take this question back to them. And, to answer her question, he said that there was not a provision in the grant policy addressing the ratio of fringe benefits to salary. Historically, INK had not worked a lot with the universities and funding people. More often it is a situation like "Dave Johnson, contractor" who is going to build something for an agency, or it is a situation like the kiosk project

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

for Dodge City. So, these are somewhat new situations for the Board in terms of the scope of grant applications. He added that he felt it was certainly a legitimate question. Yancey also agreed with the idea that it would be important to ask the applicants about how they planned to fund the ongoing upkeep of the dataset. The question overall is one of sustainability of the project.

The Board then talked about whether or not an award decision should be made on the grant during the current month or to wait until November. Yancey indicated he didn't feel strongly about it either way. Friend said he wanted to mention and get clarification on whether the Board wanted to continue with the "Hey, anytime!" approach or the May/November windows as part of what is decided. Yancey then said that he had a couple questions. He thought he had heard a question for the applicants about the 32% fringe rate. He noted that they don't yet have that answer and he would like to know that before he voted on it. He would like to know what the university puts in that – he knows what goes in his own fringe benefits.

Sloan continued and said that if that was the general consensus about what they wanted to know before they decide, then Friend might as well ask them how they intend to fund the ongoing upkeep of the application. Yancey agreed that the latter question was appropriate also because typically one of the questions that get asked of any grant proposal was "how would this be sustained." And, he assumes that having worked at Revenue, he knows it's quite possible that the landscape around the calculations the tool performs could change. And, entities using the tool, like Blake's, may come back and say "This is great...but what we really need is this, and you have all the data to perform that calculation". So, what he thinks the applicants ought to understand is that the Board's expectations are that they should explain that and address it rather than come back in two years and ask for another grant.

Friend said that, while it didn't change anything Yancey had said, he did have that conversation with them. And, he thought that they had made a statement in the grant proposal to some effect to address that. Friend was unable to find it at that moment, but he did understand the nature of the question and was happy to ask them. Yancey noted that another thing was that if the tool didn't remain relevant and they just take it down, or it's not used any longer, that wouldn't be a desired outcome either.

Sloan asked the members if there were any other questions that would like Friend to pose to the applicants. There were none. Yancey added that his thoughts on it were that he was surprised there wasn't already a tool that does this and that he thinks that this is certainly an important need. Having worked in the Department of Revenue, he knows that the Secretary has a team of analysts that are constantly bombarded by what-if scenarios by the Legislature – and having a tool like this would hopefully improve their life, but more importantly allow constituents to understand this better and they can do the what-if planning to maximize income and tax collections. He thought it was a very worthy endeavor.

Friend interjected that he wanted to emphasize to the Board that the proposed application would not use the exact "algorithm", that they are intentionally approximating the results. They offered that they could work with Department of Revenue to create something for them, or behind a firewall, that used the exact one. They do know the exact one. So, he can't explain the logic behind making the approximation, but from the layman's point of view, it seems like there is a risk of people printing this off and bringing it into the tax office. So, he wanted to make sure everyone understood that in case there were questions. The Secretary suggested that no matter how it is done, people are still going to be showing up with documentation to the Board of Tax Appeals.

Sloan confirmed that he saw consensus around the questions Friend would take back to the applicants. Then,

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

he would bring back the answers to the Board for the November meeting and then the Board would revisit the proposal at that time. Friend asked if the Board was then OK with staying with the May/November approach for now – because November was coming, it might not be an issue and can be talked about then. Sloan responded that he thought for the moment that was fine.

Action: None.

7) **2021 Business Plan: Q3 Status Update**

Jones opened this item saying that given the remaining time, he thought he would skip the slide deck and just speak to status. Overall there are 28 initiatives – the specifics are identified in the business plan and all of them are tied directly to the statute. One initiative he emphasized was Court Records and the Judicial Branch’s move away from INK to making the records available for no charge. He discussed work with Corrections and closed by noting that there was work ahead to prepare for the INK 30th anniversary, something he had recently discussed with his corporate marketing team and NIC/Tyler about ideas that they have.

Friend added that he thought there were better ways that this could be reported to the Board. In this case, there was a lot going on during the month and they had trouble getting the slide deck up on the screen. But, they are tracking this as well as doing some other things. He thinks it is worth emphasizing for the members that the business plan is the contractual method the Board has to control and outline the work for the vendor. Historically, things have come up, and KIC has been willing to incorporate doing them. For a while, which has not been the history, Friend tried to get a motion to amend the business plan to include new initiatives as they come up. So, despite what is going on at present this year, the contract requires that the new business plan be completed by December 1. Normally Friend is already working with Jones on that and this is just a heads up to say that even though strategic planning may stretch into a longer period of time, the plan for what they are going to do in 2022 is shortly upon the Board. They will probably just base the suggestions on the INK statutes, although there is an array of twelve possible initiatives that the members have seen. So, to summarize, that is the origin of this plan for members that weren’t here at the start of 2021. And, while they will continue to report on the 2021 plan, when Jones says some initiatives are exploratory, then depend on agencies. So, some may stretch into or be carried over into the 2022 plan. For example, Friend continued, there is an explicit initiative included in the current year’s plan to roll out mobile technology in the form of an app and doing that is not something INK necessarily controls. So, this was just to give the Board some color on it – he didn’t want to spend any more time unless the members had questions on it.

Sloan asked if there were any questions for Friend or Jones. Sloan asked if it was important enough for the two of them to meet with the head of the Office of Judicial Administration about what INK’s role could be / should be going forward? Is that a meeting that the chair and or vice-chair should solicit to show that they are concerned?

Jones responded that they had discussions with their CIO and they had very clear discussions that when they received the funds from the Legislature for the system they’re implementing, one aspect of that was that the records would now be provided by them out of the new system at no cost. Friend has advocated for exploring alternatives and Jones has tried to advocate internally with Tyler, KIC’s parent company that is providing the system. Jones closed by saying he didn’t necessarily think it would be a bad thing to have that sort of conversation with them if they were willing.

Friend added that he’d talked to the head of IT at Judicial early on to let him know that they supported the Office of Judicial Administration’s goals, but wanted to see if they could get an extract so they could build a

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

value-added product on for other audiences. He has been super-busy, and they ended up handing Friend off to Tyler to sign a non-disclosure agreement with them. In turn, their CIO was busy and he ended up bringing that back to the Board. Jones had been trying to work with them as well, but he didn't think he had been getting the kinds of answers he wanted. He asked a question of Yancey, who he knew was familiar with their CIO. Friend said that it would be good to reach out, but he was worried about disrupting relations with them or the other officials in this area. So, does he need to reach out to him and kind of pre-sell this in versus cold-calling his bosses' boss on this. Yancey agreed with the approach, especially as the status of OJA's relationship with Tyler was different at that time than it is presently with the issues that had been occurring. Friend said this was all he was suggesting, not that it wouldn't be helpful to engage them at a higher level – he agreed with that.

Sloan noted that it was important to INK revenue-wise, but it was probably even more important to the district courts that shared that revenue. His suggestion was that as the contact the OJA, Friend could tell them that they wanted to help make sure the district courts didn't go in and take issue with their financial losses with the Legislature. Friend responded that this was a very sensitive area, but he understood what Sloan was saying. He didn't see that a motion would be needed – he would reach out again to them. Sloan suggested that once he had told their CIO about this, he, Friend, Jones and Butler could draft a letter saying INK wanted to be part of the solution to help district courts and how do we help them and the people of Kansas.

Action: None.

8) 2021 Business Plan Initiatives: State Home Page Refresh Status

Jones said there were two things he saw as required to complete this project. They need to finalize the edit and feedback they've received. Then, they need to do a final outreach to the individuals who were previously involved, the public information officers and others to make sure they are all comfortable and then get the site launched. Sloan asked what the timeframe was for that – a “hard” timeframe. Jones responded that the technology and content would take another two weeks. But, the unknown would be how long the PIOs and other parties, including the Secretary of Administration might take, respecting their schedules, to review it and provide additional feedback. He said it could be a month – or less. Sloan then asked if, realistically, by November 1, this would be sent to the Board members and others. Then, given there would be Thanksgiving and the holidays, he'd assume he would be saying to respond by November 15. Jones thought this would be a doable timeframe.

Sloan asked if the members had additional questions. Hearing none, he asked Friend to see that it was completed by November 1 and sent out to the Board and PIOs, etc.

Action: None.

9) Agency Outreach: Progress Report

Jones began with providing an update on how the agency outreach effort had been proceeding. Jones listed a number of agencies where contacts or presentations had been made that included the Department of Agriculture, Highway Patrol, Commerce, and others. He continued, talking about a meeting they had with the State Fire Marshal. There had also been some discussions with KDHE and the Kansas Water Office on grants. Finally, independent of the directed initiative, they'd make a presentation to Department of Labor on the Telegov product that included the Secretary and Deputy Secretary. Friend noted that while the meetings had been focused on what kinds of services INK provided now, he was hopefully that as things progressed

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

with strategic planning, they would be in a position to focus more on what they were interested in doing and services they could offer going forward, while still building relationships based on the services they offer now. Sometimes the agency they are meeting with is one INK already provides services to, sometimes the meetings are not with the agency head but delegated to someone else like the CIO. It is also coming out that for IT as a whole – Friend noted that he had worked in state IT for a long time, they face a lot of challenges, but some of them are not really ones INK is able to address as they are “back office” things not involving public information, and some might be.

Sloan added that what Friend and Jones said was accurate. In some cases, agencies don’t know what they don’t know, or there’s an area that maybe isn’t INK’s highest focus that will lead them to a more fruitful and ongoing set of discussions. He continued, saying it was kind of like getting the first date.

Action: None.

10) Network Manager Report (*Telegov*)

Telegov launched today for the DMV for KDOR and while the project had gone well, he was, of course, interested to hear feedback about how things went in Production. The other topic he wanted to address was that many, many years ago, state agencies could not get a “Kansas.gov” URL, so INK used “accesskansas.org”. It has been a long process of migration but they have finally gotten off of that.

Friend asked if Jones had talked about the subject of fees in his earlier mention of the product. Jones said he had not. The KDOR instance was provided for no charge as KDOR was an important partner for INK and the state. Also, when they began rolling out the tool it was fairly green. For future instances of this, Jones did want to present to the Board – he doesn’t have any details now – a proposal for charging for that service. It does require some resources to configure, do analysis and train people on it, and provide support. He did note that in other states it was a fee services, but he doesn’t have details now and a lot would depend on the size, scope and complexity of the implementation. There wouldn’t be a charge for the public.

Sloan asked if there were any questions from the Board members. Sloan said that he had one. In discussion with the OJA and courts in general, would it be useful for them in scheduling hearings, depositions, and whatever else is going on. Jones responded that the solution they are getting from Tyler may have some elements of that, but it is a good question and one he’d like to raise with them. Even if it is not for that, he was certain that there would be some uses. Sloan mentioned that perhaps the letter he’d suggested earlier could include in it what had been discussed previously, but also include something like Telegov so INK is coming in to show additional value they may not be aware of. Sloan closed by saying that he and Friend, Jones, Butler, and maybe Yancey could have some discussions about how to approach OJA.

Action: None.

New Business

1) INK Staffing

Sloan began by saying that this topic is an issue that he raised with Friend and wanted on the Board agenda. He continued that it has troubled him since he was first appointed that INK has a one person staff. This was not an indictment of Friend’s performance, but if he got hit by the “proverbial” bus, or got a job offer that he couldn’t turn down, or something else came up, he thinks that they would be lost, from his perspective. So,

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

he believed that, particularly as the Board was looking to expand its content with state agencies - they had a little briefing on that indicating they were getting a positive response from multiple agencies – that Friend needs to be focused more on strategic operations rather than the day-to-day.

So, he continued, it was his suggestion for Board discussion that “we need a second employee.” And, if the Board would agree with that then obviously they would work through the Department of Administration to jump through the hoops and find someone for that. He then asked how the rest of the Board felt.

Yancey asked what the portfolio of the person would be and what would their reporting structure look like. Sloan responded that the reporting structure would be to Friend. What the job responsibilities would be, obviously Friend would have to take the lead in laying that out. He continued that it’s one of those things where he thinks it’s an insurance for the agency, as well as – INK is expanding the opportunities for us to interact with other agencies and he thinks Friend’s value is more in terms of helping with those strategic activities than just following up and making sure reports are filed.

Yancey said that he was supportive of the idea – he thought that INK was understaffed. What he would like to see was a couple of things. INK was about to engage in a strategic planning effort and he thought that adding a staff person and defining a portfolio for that person ought to be a part of that strategic discussion. And, he thought that as a part of that, they could outline roles and responsibilities and actually go about drafting a position description and identifying skills and competencies that they would search for in that person. But he is supportive of the idea that INK needs more real-time on the ground hands and eyeballs in the organization.

Sloan asked for other comments. Secretary Burghart said that he was also in agreement with the Chairman that it seems like things have been a lot more active lately and going forward that is going to be the case, and he thinks that INK absolutely needs some additional manpower – this is too much for one person to be able to handle everything effectively. So, he would be very supportive of moving forward with increasing the staffing. Sloan then asked board members if they had other comments. Cook said she would agree as well. With where the Board wants to go, regardless of whether they have started their strategic plan, she said they certainly have some ideas about where INK needs to go and that continuity of operations that INK needs to have is critical. So, she would absolutely support adding an additional staff person.

Sloan asked again for comments. Friend said that he felt the need to comment. He continued, saying that, no one, to be frank, other than suggesting that their needs to be someone to be there in case he gets hit by a bus – which to him is more of a contingency planning approach – there hasn’t really been discussion with him. Sloan mentioned it, he told him what his ideas were about contingency planning. But, he does see two things that he did mention, and he’ll defer to the private board members, from the outside to see what their take is on this. That is, if it is for the short-term, to understand what happens if Friend gets “hit by a bus” to make sure that financial transactions are approved, primarily, and get some level of comfort for the Board. This has been an issue – there’s not been a support person for INK in all its time...the previous Executive Director did not have anyone, but it is an issue, the contingency part. So, he thinks there are things that can be done in the short-term to address that. In the longer term, what he’d like to do if members want to move forward with this is – he certainly doesn’t want to work only with the chair, he’d prefer there would be a personnel committee. He added that there were a lot of things with the Board from a governance perspective, there isn’t a personnel committee, there isn’t an Executive Director evaluation, there isn’t board self-evaluations, and it’s been raised earlier in the meeting about the distinction between the role of the chair and board members versus the role of the Executive Director. He said that he had been in the state system a

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

long time and as supervised people and bringing someone into an environment – especially right now with the pandemic, his office is set up for one person – there’s some issues to be sorted out. So, he gets the idea of starting the process, and he is certainly happy to have some help. But, he’d like to be working with more than one person, and also he really agrees with Yancey that maybe this could be put into the strategic planning process. If the Board has short-term concerns, they can address them via a variety of things – backups, the INK accountants, other people. So, that’s what he is saying. He doesn’t have any problem giving up duties to other people and getting help in doing his work. What he wants to do is to leave things better than he found them and make sure, for example, he doesn’t have another person who is encountering management issues, or – he doesn’t want to bring them into a world that he doesn’t think is straightened up enough for them to be successful. That was his two cents – he didn’t know if Blake or Wilson, or others from the outside had some perspective based on what they’d seen.

Wilson stated that she would agree, she understands the concern and has been in organizations before and Friend has a huge amount of knowledge that is just not going to pass on to the next person, so it makes sense to get somebody in there to start learning some of that and taking some of it off his hands. She continued that she does think it makes sense that they build it into their strategic planning as well, though, She knows is going to take a little bit longer than maybe what some others think, but they want to make sure they get the right person and not just fill the spot.

Blake said she would just concur with the statement that Wilson just made, as well as what Yancey said. Putting an organizational plan together and looking at what the need is, she thinks Friend will need to do some legwork on the functions and sharing the job description. And, she agrees that for a healthy organization, they’ve got to have an evaluative process and that’s really part of that succession planning and strategic planning that the Board is starting to engage in. But, she would encourage Friend to start doing some of that legwork so that as the Board is working through that, those needs will have been identified and it can be expressed to the whole board.

Friend responded saying that he could do that, if there were particular things that they wanted him to bring back to the Board. He reiterated that if he were going to work in any formal capacity he would prefer to work with a committee of the Board. But, it is the Board’s call, so if what they wanted to do was to give him some to-do’s and he could bring them back to the next board meeting, he would be glad to do that. Or, he could “self-generate” that list of things as well.

Sloan asked if there were additional comments. Sloan is uncomfortable with the fact that the strategic planning process is going to take six-to-nine months. Even if it were just six months from now before they started to look for a person, so they would be nine-to-twelve months out. He would prefer that Friend takes a first cut at building a job description of what he does. Friend interjected, saying that he had a position description. Sloan said that it would change if they added a second person. So, what he is suggesting is that maybe Friend bring to the Board in a November meeting what Friend would like to see his revised position description look like and what a proposed second employee’s position would look like and then the Board can continue this discussion.

Sloan asked the Board members if that was an acceptable path, at least for the short term. Yancey said he was fine with that – until the Board gets something on paper, it was a little hard to evaluate in the abstract. He added that while he did think staffing was certainly an important consideration in any kind of strategic planning discussion, he wasn’t suggesting that this would be a nine-to-twelve-month kind of thing. But instead, that they really need to consider the position in light of what the Board’s thoughts are in terms of

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

the strategic direction for the organization. To him, it's got to be more than just having someone there that knows the ropes so if Friend decides he is tired of them and walks away, that there's continuity of operations. Yancey then noted that Friend had brought it up – that in addition to working on the position description, skills, attributes, those kinds of things that they'd expect for any kind of hiring committee to use as part of the materials for a hiring process – would be to direct Friend to start putting down his thoughts about the continuity of operations in the event that he was not available and what that would look like as well. Friend agreed and said he supported that – it made him feel better. Friend said that he did think that's primarily the financial piece, but he could draft something up, a hierarchy of things based on what he thought might be more damaging to operations and what he thought they might do about it.

Sloan asked if there were any additional comments. Seeing none, he asked if there was a consensus that, for the November meeting, Friend would rough out two positions descriptions, one for himself in terms of how he sees strategic management and one for a possible second employee who would report to him and become knowledgeable enough for continuity of operations but would mostly be working on administrative things. He continued that the second part was that Friend would bring back in November an outline of short-term continuity issues to be addressed. Sloan asked the members if that was a consensus. Yancey said he supported that. Two members said they were fine with it. Blake said that her only concern would be that not knowing the strategic direction that the organization is going from a strategic planning perspective – there hasn't been a discussion about where the Board wants to go – she thinks it is hard to write a new job description for someone that is going to complement the work that Friend is doing. So, she doesn't want to waste his time and energy. They know what the needs today are, so she thinks that in the short-term that's an OK thing to do, but to say that they might be able to craft a job description in the next month that they would be hiring might be a little unrealistic.

Sloan responded that job descriptions change over time anyway – but he thinks that they need to start somewhere. He asked if there was a consensus that this is what they would expect by the November meeting. Cook said that she thought that it would be helpful to have that recognizing the points that have been made about how the Board would incorporate this into strategic planning. If they do have a consensus that another person would be helpful – obviously position descriptions change over time as Sloan had mentioned – having even something rough-drafted out and whether or not they have that person on board and what that looks like – still incorporating that into their strategic planning process is also a way to think about this. Sloan then pointed out that when they started the meeting, Rebecca Gillam from KU made a presentation and at least three times, by his count, she mentioned that they were understaffed, just in the cursory look that she gave.

Friend said that what he could do would be to try to document very lightly the assumptions that he is making – they should become apparent – he felt he would have to make some strategic assumptions about what their direction might be when he does this. He can add that in so they will understand what he was thinking.

Action Taken: None.

Adjournment: Blake moved to adjourn. The motion was approved unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 12:48 p.m.