

# Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

## May 2021 INK Board Meeting May 6, 2021

### Opening

A meeting of the INK Board was called to order via online videoconference in Microsoft Teams at 10:01 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  
Kate Butler, representing the Kansas Bar Association  
Jennifer Cook, representing the Secretary of State  
Jim Haugh, representing the Secretary of Commerce  
Vicky Ortiz, representing the Kansas Library Association  
Tom Sloan, representing the Kansas Rural Water Association  
Kristy Wilson, representing the Kansas Association of Independent Insurance Agents  
Glen Yancey, representing the Executive Branch Chief Executive Technology Officer

### Others Present

Tim Shultz, INK Board Counsel; Duncan Friend, Information Network of Kansas; Nolan Jones, Ashley Gordon, and James Adams, Kansas Information Consortium, LLC.

### Consent Agenda

The Consent Agenda for the meeting included the draft minutes for the April 1, 2021 INK regular board meeting, the draft April 13, 2021 INK special board meeting minutes, the April 2021 Network Manager Report, and a contract for development of a website for the Kansas Board of Accountancy using an online content management system (CMS) which includes hosting and use of the CMS editor. Development and support of the service will be provided at no charge.

**Action Taken:** Cook moved to approve the items on the Consent Agenda, seconded by Burghart. There was no discussion. The motion was unanimously approved.

### Regular Agenda

#### *Regular Business*

Before beginning regular business, Sloan and Friend welcomed Lori Blake, recently appointed by the Governor to serve on the Board as a representative of the Kansas Association of School Boards and asked if she would introduce herself. Ms. Blake lives in Assaria, Kansas, just south of Salina, and has served 13 years on the school board Southeast of Salina and is the current president of the Kansas Association of School Boards. She works in Salina and she noted that her organization, Child Advocacy and Protective Services works with every state agency (except the Department of Transportation) through the work that they do with government grants and contracts, which should be an advantage in being on the board. She closed by saying she was excited to join the board and to learn more about the operation of INK. Sloan again welcomed Blake to the Board and asked Friend to send out the contact information for the board members to the Board now that the membership was complete and reminded the Board that under the Kansas Open Meetings Act, the members can't do serial communications, it would have to go through Friend in order to comply.

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

Friend then ended the discussion by mentioning the background of the Content Management system contract for the Board of Accountancy and Jones briefly discussed the work they did and the standard contract approach.

### 1) 2021 INK Business Plan Initiatives: State Home Page Update

Sloan asked Jones to address this item. Jones explained that they were in the process of updating the “Kansas.gov” website – he would often refer to it as “the portal”, but this is what he is referring to. They have managed the portal site for many years, but it has evolved over that time – for example, it seems like not that long ago, mobile access wasn’t really considered and now it is the primary way that users access information on many INK sites and services. So, every few years they reexamine the portal – the last version from a couple years ago that is in place right now was ranked fifth in the nation by the Center for Digital Government. The goal had been to complete this last year, but the COVID-19 pandemic had caused them to put this on hold. In the iteration they were working on, they wanted to move to having some more curated content, not just a “link farm”. They have completed the infrastructure and are now working on content and navigation.

Jones turned the presentation over to James Adams, the KIC Director of Technology to present the work in progress and discuss the new approach to the website. Adams then walked through some of the aspects of the site via a shared screen in Microsoft Teams, emphasizing that the approach to navigation had changed and that they had also been focused on accessibility (Section 508) and security in the build. They were also including an area for “power users” to get directly to what they need. Friend interrupted to explain to the Board about INK’s paying subscribers and their need to get to particular services they use. It is a significant source of revenue to INK and they are driven to a different interface to do a larger volume of doing things like driver record searches or obtaining court records. He also emphasized that the new site would still have a search available. He then showed a page that addressed Natural Resources and Land, demonstrating that it had expanded beyond just links to include more context for the information provided. He then stopped to see if there were any questions. Friend added for reference for the Board that this was an initiative from the 2021 INK Business Plan. Natural resources has been an area in which INK has been looking to expand investment in – Education is another. The approach decided upon was to do this in an iterative way. Jones and his staff were going to work with the Governor’s office to get any feedback they might have as far as priorities.

Sloan asked Jones, Adams, and Friend if there was a way to put access to the site somewhere that the Board members would be able to access later and give it more attention, taking a look and providing feedback through Friend? Adams said it would be easy to do, so Friend confirmed that he would send out the link. Adams gave the caveat that it was still a construction site. Friend also asked if they wanted to talk about timing. Jones said that the goal was to do several iterations – they are still getting feedback from several groups. His expectation is that the site would be launched in the next four weeks, but he wants to make sure that the right groups get their chance for input and get content plugged in where they’d like. Adams also noted that, as far as the content goes, that is entirely being cultivated by Gordon who is on the call.

Sloan concluded by asking that, as Board members took a look at the site, if there were links in their organizations that would naturally tie in, please let Friend know and he will pass on to Adams and Jones. He then asked if any Board members had questions. Hearing none, he moved to the next agenda item.

**Action Taken:** None.

## 2) Kansas Open Meeting Act (KOMA) Overview

The Board's attorney, Tim Shultz noted that Friend has asked him to provide a brief overview of the KOMA as there were several new members and noted that he was probably "preaching to the choir" as many of the members already had served on public board in some capacity. Shultz covered what was considered a meeting under KOMA, and talked about the potential issues with serial communications if individual board members began to serially confer with each other, talking individually to other board members about board issues. He continued that he always advised people that the best way to comply with KOMA is to keep in mind its underlying intent, and that is to keep the public informed about what's going on with governmental agencies and bodies. So, if a member is discussing anything regarding the Board, they need to evaluate whether or not this is something the public has a right to know. And, generally, if it's board issues, they have a right to know it. The next step is to look at "who am I communicating with"? If there is just a single conversation with the Executive Director and that's where it ends, that would not constitute an open meeting. But, he continued, if a member gets into a string of emails, and phone calls, and texts - and today it encompasses a wide variety of technologies that ten years ago many didn't even have - it would be very easy to get into a violation of KOMA. He stressed that it was also important to be aware of KOMA issues at social events. A lot of violations occur in these situations and there has been a lot of high-profile incidents in recent years. Several members who know each other from the Board end up over in an area together talking and suddenly an issue of the board comes up - maybe only a couple are at the social event, but afterwards one or two of them goes and texts or emails someone after about the issue and all of the sudden now there is a majority of the board involved in that discussion.

Shultz then talked about something the board had been dealing with more lately, executive sessions. There is a list of allowable reasons in statute and while he would not go over them all in this discussion, two that would be common for the board would be personnel matters and consultation with the board attorney. In the latter case, it could be contract issues, like with the Network Manager contract, and the board wants advice from their attorney, then that is something that they can go into executive session to do. However, the board doesn't have to do this. If they are fine with the public hearing his advice to them and board members questions and discussions of a legal nature, that can be done in public. So, his advice is to always be judicious about what they choose to go into executive session for because it is actually an exception to the intent of the Kansas Open Meetings Act. Shultz covered several other exceptions, and noted that another possibility would be security measures, like the security of the Network or other issues the board was involved with. Shultz then asked Friend if he had anything else he thought should be covered. Friend responded that his main addition was that this was why the Board agenda would have an item that said "possible executive session", as it was the Board's choice as to whether or not to do that. He also noted that many years ago, as part of a post-audit of INK, he believed there had been an issue identified with executive sessions and the language and motions used to come in and out of it, so it did get scrutinized from time-to-time. There was no further discussion.

**Action Taken:** None.

## 3) INK / KIC Contractual Matters

Friend began by stating as background, for either members who had missed a meeting or were new, the general subject of the agenda item was that Tyler Technologies, a fairly large technology company out of Plano, Texas, acquired the parent company of KIC, the Kansas Information Consortium, LLC, called NIC. KIC is INK's business partner - Jones, Adams, and Gordon who have been on these calls are all employed by them. The whole thing started in Kansas and eventually rolled up into the company NIC from multiple

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

states, so KIC pre-dates that. NIC is mentioned in the network manager contract between INK and KIC, so over the last few months that it took to wrap up their acquisition by Tyler, the Board has talked in Executive Session several times and made motions about what INK would need from them, or what the Board would like related to the acquisition. This resulted in the Board asking for the Executive Director and attorney to meet with Tyler to get a few things straightened out, including Tyler's relationship to the INK network manager contract. This then prompted a request to send a letter to NIC / Tyler to say that INK wanted a meeting with them as soon as their acquisition was completed, and that did occur. So, any executive session would be to discuss contractual issues with Board Counsel coming out of that meeting. Friend ended by saying that this was the general summary, but, coming out of the meeting, he assumed that it would be something the Board would have things they would want Counsel's input on. He then deferred to Shultz.

Shultz said he thought they could split a fine hair and just discuss facts of the meeting, then continued. Coming out of the last meeting, the Board had asked Shultz and Friend to meet with NIC and Tyler, and they'd actually had that meeting. The discussion was around the current network manager contract and, specifically, limitations on KIC's parent company, currently still NIC, and restrictions on it essentially competing in areas that INK could participate in in the state of Kansas. They met with the general counsel for NIC and they basically said they felt comfortable that there would be no real competition. They didn't want to limit Tyler's activities in the state of Kansas. And, they felt that it would be somewhat inherently contradictory for Tyler to compete with KIC as network manager for INK. They didn't really anticipate there being a problem, so they did not want to enter into an amendment of the network manager agreement to put restrictions similar to those that are on NIC onto Tyler Technologies. He asked if Friend had any additional facts of the conversation to add. Shultz added that what the Board does with those facts would be discussed in Executive Session with counsel. He then stopped and noted that Jones was on the call and asked if he had any facts to add, that would be fine.

Friend responded that, perhaps to add some nuance, he felt that the attorney for NIC / Tyler was really saying that she wasn't in a position to do an amendment like that. He said Shultz could add to this, but it was more like "We didn't come here today with authority to sign and amendment" or anything like that. So, it wasn't that kind of a meeting where they said flat out that this would never be done. Also, they pointed to some language addressing affiliates in the network manager contract. He continued that he felt this was relevant as a fact because of the question of, say, Tyler products and whether they could come in through the network manager contract or not. So, they pointed to that language and – he thinks it is stating a fact – that they thought that INK should look at that language because they thought that might mean that they could bring products in through the contract. He then deferred to Jones to see if he had anything to add.

Jones responded that he felt the recounting of the facts by Shultz were accurate. The only thing he would add was that it was emphasized that NIC has been in Kansas 30 years, it is the birthplace of e-government, and there's a strong emphasis on not damaging the relationship that NIC has cultivated over these three decades. It was very important to NIC to be a good partner and not mess that up. He said this was all he had.

Sloan then indicated that one of the issues they had talked about as well was whether or not the office in Topeka was going to be moved. And, the Board was strongly suggesting that this was not to happen. Jones responded that he wanted to be careful not to delve into things that the Board had addressed in Executive Session, but he will try to address it if he can. He will go so far to say that the former CEO who was thinking hard about that is no longer with the company – he retired at the time the acquisition was complete. He would venture to say that he absolutely expects that they will remain, with an office in Topeka, but they are still working through the logistics. He said it was premature to say that they were doing anything other than keeping an office – where in downtown, he doesn't know, maybe in the same place, maybe in the same

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

spot. But, they are working through that. The intent at this point is to continue that discussion about their location, but he will take it off the table that there's any discussion at this point about not having an office (in Topeka). Friend added that there was no discussion of that subject in the meeting with the NIC attorney.

Sloan asked the board members if there were any questions. Seeing no questions, Friend stated that while it may not require an executive session, there is still the question of how to proceed – for him, and the board attorney. Friend asked if Shultz wanted to state the facts around how things were left at the end of the meeting, in terms of what would happen next. Shultz said that as he recalled, his impression was that the next steps were first, that there were still a lot of moving parts between Tyler and NIC that they are trying to get settled down because the transaction closing was so recent. And, he thought that they were somewhat hamstrung because of these moving parts were not settled yet. But, at least his impression was that they didn't see a need for amendment of the network manager contract and they weren't concerned about Tyler competing with KIC/INK in Kansas. He had asked if that was a final "no" or ongoing discussions that they could have. His recollection was that it could be ongoing discussions. He thinks they are getting familiarized with Tyler and contacts at Tyler, what their authority is and isn't. But, what Friend and he are unsure of where the Board wants to go from this point forward. They have fulfilled the responsibility of the last resolution to have the meeting, but they don't know what the board wants to do. If they want his input on what the Board should or should not do, that should be in Executive Session.

Blake asked what the length of the existing contract was. Friend responded it ended in 2022 with two, 2-year renewals available (he confirmed this with Shultz and Jones). There is a longer history with this that Friend said he would not go into at the time, but he believes there is a provision requiring six months' notice if INK intends to terminate. He continued that he could provide more information on the mechanics of that if desired.

**Action Taken:** Hearing no further discussion, at 10:44 a.m., Sloan moved to recess the board meeting of the Information Network of Kansas into executive session. The subject of the executive session will be to discuss matters related to the master contract between the Information Network of Kansas and the Kansas Information Consortium, LLC, NIC, and Tyler Technologies and other matters of attorney-client privilege pursuant to K.S.A. §75-4319(b)(2) of the Kansas Open Meetings Act which authorizes consultation with attorneys on matters deemed privileged under the attorney-client privilege. The open meeting will be reconvened via the current Microsoft Teams video conference at 10:55 a.m. and that the attendees of the executive session shall be the board members or their proxy representatives, Board Counsel, and the Executive Director. Seconded by Blake. No further discussion. Motion passed unanimously.

The Board returned from Executive Session at 10:55 a.m. No action was taken during the Executive Session, but Sloan indicated that the Board would like to return to Executive Session to continue discussion with its attorney.

**Action Taken:** At 10:56 a.m., Sloan moved to recess the board meeting of the Information Network of Kansas into executive session. The subject of the executive session will be to discuss matters related to the master contract between the Information Network of Kansas and the Kansas Information Consortium, LLC, NIC, and Tyler Technologies and other matters of attorney-client privilege pursuant to K.S.A. §75-4319(b)(2) of the Kansas Open Meetings Act which authorizes consultation with attorneys on matters deemed privileged under the attorney-client privilege. The open meeting will be reconvened via

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

the current Microsoft Teams video conference at 11:11 a.m. and that the attendees of the executive session shall be the board members or their proxy representatives, Board Counsel, and the Executive Director. Seconded by Blake. No further discussion. Motion passed unanimously.

The Board returned from Executive Session at 11:11 a.m. No action was taken during the Executive Session. Sloan indicated that the Board would like to return to Executive Session to continue discussion with its attorney.

**Action Taken:** At 11:11 a.m., Sloan moved to recess the board meeting of the Information Network of Kansas into executive session. The subject of the executive session will be to discuss matters related to the master contract between the Information Network of Kansas and the Kansas Information Consortium, LLC, NIC, and Tyler Technologies and other matters of attorney-client privilege pursuant to K.S.A. §75-4319(b)(2) of the Kansas Open Meetings Act which authorizes consultation with attorneys on matters deemed privileged under the attorney-client privilege. The open meeting will be reconvened via the current Microsoft Teams video conference at 11:16 a.m. and that the attendees of the executive session shall be the board members or their proxy representatives, Board Counsel, and the Executive Director. Seconded by Yancey. No further discussion. Motion passed unanimously.

The Board returned from Executive Session at 11:16 a.m. No action was taken during the Executive Session.

**Action Taken:** Yancey moved that the INK Board request that the Executive Director contact the other NIC states to learn their thoughts on the Tyler Technologies acquisition of NIC and whether or not they are working to include Tyler as part of their contracts with NIC; and that Board Counsel and the Executive Director reengage with Tyler on discussions of an amendment to include them as part of the network manager contract that INK has with KIC and NIC – and to perform research and provide the Board with options to proceed, including any draft language to circulate that would be appropriate to amend the contract. Seconded by Wilson. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

#### 4) Network Manager Report

Jones open by saying that he would keep things brief given the limited time remaining. It was a busy time of year for them as it was tax filing season, annual report filing season, and property tax filing season. But, one of the things they do is to provide a survey at the end of each application for customers to provide feedback. They do read all of them and use the information to improve things. He gave the example that the sign-on process on property tax was too difficult in a previous year, so they worked with the county treasurers to improve that. He then generally discussed some of the positive feedback, how the survey worked, and what they did with the ratings and comments. He closed by talking about some of the little-known services that INK was involved with that was provided by Department of Commerce, including regulation of mixed martial arts, the license required to be a “corner man” for one of those fights, and promoter and physician’s licenses. He then spoke briefly about the Tyler acquisition and noted that they had not been very careful about any integration and not interrupting their operations – he had not even talked with them yet about this. Sloan had a question about how the comments from the website via surveys were handled. He asked if they were acknowledged when received. Jones responded that they did not. While they are allowed to provide

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

their contact information, he would say that 95% of them do not provide it. They don't respond to people acknowledging their comments unless there is something that requires a response. For example, something they're mistaken about or a problem with a filing. Sloan asked that they give thought to acknowledging them, especially if they've taken time to fill out the questionnaire. Jones agreed, especially if they'd provided the contact information. He said he would make a note of that and it's definitely something he can follow up on. There was no further discussion.

**Action Taken:** None.

Before Jones began a presentation on the next item, Friend noted to the board members that there was only about five minutes remaining in the regularly scheduled meeting time and he wanted to know whether they wanted to compress these items or extend the meeting. Sloan asked if the members were OK with continuing past the 11:30 a.m. deadline. Cook said that she could stay. Burghart expressed that he had a legislative matter that would require him to leave at 11:30. Sloan asked that the meeting continue with the scheduled agenda items.

### 5) **Demonstration: INK Telegov Solution**

Jones introduced the topic by explaining that, as part of the pandemic, agencies began to want to more closely manage and coordinate walk-in traffic to their offices due to staffing and health considerations – and to make it more convenient, any prep needed is handled, etc. It was originally developed by the Maryland affiliate of NIC/Tyler and now was rolled out in five or six of their operations across the county. In general, it is more about the backend solution for the state agencies in terms of scheduling than it is even for the citizen on the front end.

Jones played a short video providing an overview of the solution, which allowed individuals to schedule visits online or in-person and to submit any required materials ahead of time, provides text and email notifications, and allows the agency to manage appointments and available slots on the back end. It does support scheduling visits via Microsoft Teams as well.

<a copy of the video is not available for the minutes>

After the video, Jones gave some examples of use, including vaccination scheduling in Alabama, about 650,000 appointments. Friend added that he understood New Jersey was using it for DMV to the tune of hundreds of thousands of appointments every month – Jones confirmed. Friend added that why he thought this was important for the Board was, while some members might see a use for their office, it represents a couple opportunities. One, it shows that one advantage of the public-private model is that Kansas can bring things in from other affiliates. Second, it can probably be provided to agencies at no-charge. Third, it is an “enterprise” application, meaning statewide, that can be used by multiple agencies for a common approach at the state where it fits, to avoid 8 or 9 ways a citizen would have to approach scheduling appointments with government. Sometimes those are integrated with other systems or involve things that TeleGov couldn't do, but the concept is there. Sloan asked the members if they had any questions. Seeing none, Sloan asked what would happen for example if he wanted an appointment at 9am at the Lawrence at the DMV and it was taken. Jones responded that the appointment wouldn't be offered. There is a lot of configuration available to match that up to availability of the staff appropriate to the task as well. He then asked if the backend configuration was complicated and Jones assured him that it was not – it was designed to make it simple for the agency to handle and to make it so NIC affiliate staff only had to intervene occasionally.

Finally, Sloan asked Jones and Friend how they planned to market this to Kansas agencies. Jones responded

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

that the focus was on Department of Revenue at present as they were going through an RFP process to evaluate solutions and see if this was a good fit for either their tax or DMV side or both. Once that is complete and they understand their resource requirements. Friend added that they hadn't yet developed a marketing plan for it, they just wanted to start by getting it before the Board and explaining its capability and their interest in rolling it out – he felt they could do some research to identify which kinds of agencies it might be of most benefit to and start from there. He added that estimating the size of the rollouts was important as well as this was a very “citizen facing” application and critical to agency business, so they wanted to make sure they were prepared to support it.

**Action Taken:** None.

**Note:** Secretary Burghart left the meeting at 11:30 a.m. (the scheduled end of the meeting) due to a prior engagement. **Note:** Butler left the meeting at 11:45 a.m.

### 6) Grant Program – Update on Recent Activities, Governor’s Grant status

Friend indicated there were two aspects to the update. The first was a matrix provided at the end of the Board packet that summarized budget and expenditures to-date for the Governor’s COVID-19 Pandemic Response Public Communications and Supporting Activities grant. Friend briefly went over the status and items on the report. He indicated he would come back to this a little later if they wanted to locate and review it in their packet.

The other item was the INK grant program itself. While he had not briefed the entire board yet on the grant process, his topic today was that the procedures themselves specify how grants applications are evaluated and who they can be provided to. It is not a statutory process of INK but was developed working with a previous attorney to allow for granting for projects that align with the goals in INK’s mission. The way the process works is that a budget is set in January – this year, it was \$620,000, and the Board does have the discretion to raise it. And, then May and November are the open grant periods where agencies apply with ideas following the proposal process. The proposals are sent to a committee that evaluates them, then the results of the evaluation are brought back to the Board for a decision.

As Friend had noted before, he continued that this year he had suggested the process focus more on environmental information. Sloan represents the Kansas Rural Water Association so he had worked with him to use his connections to meet with various parties including Kansas Geological Survey and their Data Access and Support Center (DASC), the Kansas Biological Survey who have already drafted some ideas, and Stanley Adams at the Department of Commerce who is the head of the state’s broadband program, which leverages some of Sloan’s previous connections and expertise. The idea would be that some of those could come forth in grant applications in May. He then stopped for questions and deferred to Sloan.

Sloan then said that, as he understood it from conversations with Friend, in the past a committee made up of the Chief Information Technology Officers from each branch performs the evaluation. He continued that, candidly, he didn’t see why the Board would want people from the courts or Legislature or from wherever else reviewing grants that INK might make. He continued that he felt that, for the Board’s discussion, there are a couple of options: A committee, say, composed of three board members, could be created, with Friend to advise, that could look at the applications, rank them, and bring them to the full board with recommendations, or: The Executive Director and the Chairperson, whoever that is going forward, could do that function and then bring it to the full Board – the full Board would still be able to see everything and evaluate it. His intent was to 1) expedite the process somewhat, knowing that everyone was busy, and 2) bring the review more in-house as opposed to having outsiders involved in the process as much as it has



## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

been in the past. With that, Sloan asked if there were any comments, suggestions, or direction from the Board members.

Friend added that historically, the involvement of the three CITO's had been more to evaluate the technology involved in the proposals and to make sure it was in line with the state. He asked if Yancey, who had participated in some of those meetings as a delegate of the CITO, was still on the call. They did use a defined process to rank the grants, vs. just voicing their opinion. Yancey said that he couldn't speak for others that were involved in reviewing grants, but for him, it was always about making sure that what was being proposed aligned with the technology initiatives of the state, and that that was also in alignment with the INK Board mission. But, as Sloan had said, it was just kind of a "check with me" rather than an approval or denial step. Friend briefly displayed the evaluation matrix on the screen for the Board to emphasize that this came from the INK Grant Policy & Procedures and it is meant to hew to the statute. So, there is a formal framework that is used, they are ranked against these dimensions and a score presented back to the Board.

If the process is changed, the general process is in the policy and procedures, so they would likely need to amend the document. Friend asked if Board Counsel had any input. Shultz said not really, that if this is just the process to get the grant to the Board. Obviously, they need to avoid any appearance of impropriety, so in everything that's done, there needs to be arm's length evaluations and that it appears that way, and not putting too much power into the hands of too few people. Sloan's concern is that he thinks the Board and staff should be making the evaluation, not the decision, which stays with the Board, instead of the CITO's. The Board members can evaluate whether this fits the mission and the state's goals. Friend added that he had looked in the interim and that the policy only refers to a committee, not the CITO's, so it looks like the Board could make that change as far as directing how the evaluation would be performed without adjusting the policy if they kept a committee.

Cook noted that it seems to her that if they were reviewing a grant and they had a question beyond the scope of knowledge of those reviewing, at that point they could do outreach to someone with some more technical experience – but still try to meet with the Chair as suggested. Sloan agreed, as did Yancey. Yancey continued that historically utilizing the CITO's in this fashion was a mechanism to try to engage a wider section of IT leadership in the state of Kansas and try to ensure their continued participation and buy-in to the mission of INK. That was probably more important years ago than it is today – when INK was a new concept and trying to corral the agencies, having a focal point to engage the CITO's in the strategic direction of INK. He doesn't necessarily have a position on how important that is going forward. And, it did seem like there was an awful lot of re-education and re-discussion whenever the committee meant about what the committee was, what they were there to do, and kind of talking more about what INK was doing. Friend concurred. Sloan asked for further comments.

Cook said that it seemed like it would be most efficient to have the Chair and the Executive Director do the initial review, rather than trying to find the time to get a group together to do the review. Yancey added that he knew that Friend always had a hard time convening the group or matching schedules, which tended to extend the time between when someone applied and when it got in front of the Board. He felt like having the Chair and Executive Director review the grants, perform a preliminary ranking, engaging with technical resources as appropriate to get any questions answered, and then bringing it before the Board works for him as an approach. Friend noted that the policy may have to be changed and just wanted to make sure they were straight on that.

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

**Action Taken:** Yancey moved that the Chair work with the Executive Director to revise the INK Grant Policy and Procedures to change it so that the Chair and Executive Director are performing the initial review and ranking of all grant proposals and that they are empowered to consult with relevant expertise both on and outside the INK Board as necessary to fully vet a proposal, and that they would then bring the completed evaluation including any vetting materials to the Board for consideration. Seconded by Cook. There was no further discussion. The motion was approved unanimously.

### 7) INK Strategic Planning: Background, Discussion

The meeting had run significantly over on time, so this item was postponed to a future meeting. There was no objection.

Friend closed by redirecting the members to the summary document related to the Governor's Pandemic Communications grant and asked that if any members had questions to be sure to contact him directly. The background is that the overall grant was approved by the Board, along with many or most of the sub-projects, and then they delegate to Friend the authority to approve further subgrants as long as they met the criteria for the grant in the proposal, which he has done.

**Adjournment:** Yancey moved to adjourn the meeting. Blake seconded. There was no further discussion. The motion was approved unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 12:03 pm.