

# Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

## September 2021 INK Board Meeting September 2, 2021

### Opening

A meeting of the INK Board was called to order via online videoconference in Microsoft Teams at 10:00 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  
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  
Kristy Wilson, representing the Kansas Association of Independent Insurance Agents  
Glen Yancey, representing the Executive Branch Chief Executive Technology Officer

### Others Present

Karen Linn and Kyle George, BT&Co., P.A.; 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 August 5, 2021 INK regular board meeting, the August 24, 2021 special board meeting, the August Network Manager report, and two contracts for an over-the-counter service (KanPay Counter) to allow government agency constituents to pay for government services using credit cards at government agency locations and receive confirmation of payment, one for Goodland Public Library and the other for the Geary County Health Department. There was also a contract included with the Kansas Corporation Commission to develop an AppEngine application that would accept payment as described in the previous two agreements.

**Action Taken:** Haugh moved to approve the Consent Agenda, excluding the contracts, seconded by Burghart. There was no discussion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Sloan asked for approval of the contracts. Friend indicated that these were presented to be considered as part of the Consent Agenda that had just been approved. Sloan responded that he wanted to break that up so that they received at least a little additional attention. Friend responded that he could move those onto the regular agenda going forward. Sloan asked if Friend had any comments on the contracts. Friend deferred to Jones and Gordon, saying he understood they were fairly standard contracts for KanPay Counter and AppEngine. These are just templates – he believed the KCC one was for meeting registration for a conference. Jones indicated he had nothing to add to that explanation.

**Action Taken:** Blake moved to approve the contracts that were addressed separately by the Chair, seconded by Cook, There was no discussion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Sloan continued with regard to the KCC request. He noted that in the Board's recent special meeting, the Board has been asked to approve responding to RFPs, and he asked why this was under a Consent Agenda item. Friend responded that this was a contract, it wasn't really responding to a request for proposal. This is an

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

agreement with an agency, there was no RFP, INK is a state agency so they can contract with INK without an RFP. The other two contracts are just products INK worked with the agency to approve. Friend then asked if this were a separate motion to approve the AppEngine contract and that it had not been included in the previous (2<sup>nd</sup>) motion. Sloan indicated that was the case.

**Action Taken:** Cook moved to approve the Kansas Corporation Commission AppEngine contract that had been clarified by the Chair as not being included in the previous motion, seconded by Haugh, There was no discussion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Sloan then asked what the status was of items that were discussed the previous month, the Shawnee County contract, the Cloud contract or issue, and there was a third one.

Friend responded that the Shawnee County contract was still with Shawnee County - Jones might be able to address this as he had reached out to them and he understood they were working on it. Jones confirmed they had contacted them several times in the last week and haven't heard back. Friend added that the Board had delegated to him the ability to approve and execute that so as soon as it's ready he can do that. Sloan asked if someone else needed to reach out. Jones deferred to Gordon who said that she didn't know if it would. She was going to have Purcell on her staff reach out again next week to see if they could get a response. So far, Shawnee County has been very responsive to them. Sloan responded that if she did not get a response and Friend did not get a response to let Vicky and him know and one of them could also reach out.

Sloan asked Friend what the next item was. Friend said he wanted to be respectful of the auditors time who were on the call, but he also wanted to respond to the question about the Cloud contract to say that it was on the agenda today and has been signed by KIC, and the contract for Telegov services is back at the Department of Revenue, so when the Board gets to it as another item on the Regular Agenda, the members might talk again about how they might delegate approval for him to help expedite getting it executed. They have it, but all their changes have been incorporated in that draft and they just received it yesterday, he thought, He hadn't heard any "press" from them, that is, he though they were fine with the timeline getting it signed, so that is the status on that – it is number three on the agenda but there is nothing in the members' packet.

### **Regular Agenda**

#### ***Regular Business***

Sloan responded that, as long as he had brought that up, he wanted to go ahead and talk about it.

### **3) INK/KDOR Contract for Telegov Services**

Sloan continued asking if the Board should authorize Friend to sign the Telegov contract with Department of Revenue when complete. Friend said that the backstory was that it was pretty much a boilerplate contract, they just had to go back and forth to remove payment provisions that had been included. He continued that he would refer to Board Counsel Shultz on this, but he thought that the Board could defer to himself (Friend) working with the attorney – similar to a motion the Board has made in the past – to approve the agreement and execute it on behalf of the Board with an FYI copy back to the Board.

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

Jones addressed the Chair, saying that, to add to what Friend was saying, the KDOR attorney, Robert Challquist has already reviewed it, offered some changes that have been made and reviewed by Shultz, and he gave them a clean copy yesterday for their signature.

Sloan asked if there were any questions on this item. Hearing none, he said he would entertain a motion to allow Friend to approve and execute the contract with KDOR for Telegov on behalf of the Board.

**Action Taken:** Ortiz moved to delegate to the Executive Director the authorization to approve and execute a contract with the Kansas Department of Revenue for Telegov services, seconded by Blake. There was no further discussion. The motion was approved by all members present, with Burghart abstaining.

Sloan then asked about the Cloud hosting contract. Friend noted that it was on the agenda as the item after the auditors present. Sloan acknowledged this but said he wanted to address it.

### 2) INK Network Manager Contract Amendment 3: Cloud Hosting

Friend and Jones presented a slide regarding the purpose and provisions of the Cloud Hosting amendment *<a copy of the slide is attached to these minutes>*. Friend pointed out that this would amend the Master Contract with KIC to allow public cloud hosting of INK applications and that it required documentation of compliance to be submitted and approved by INK on a project-by-project basis. He explained that the Cloud Controls Matrix (CCM) referred to in the amendment was an approach recommended to him by the State Chief Security Officer and noted that it provided for hosting to remain in the U.S.

Sloan asked if Board members had any questions. There were none. Yancey said that while he had a chance to do a review of the underlying CCM, the thought it would be a good thing to make available to board members who were interested. Friend agreed to distribute it. He continued, saying that it aligned with his agency's (KDHE) approach to secure handling of information with the cloud vendors they work with that involve customer documents that are similar and they might even look to incorporate it in the future. There was no further discussion.

**Action Taken:** Yancey moved to approve the Cloud Hosting amendment (#3) to the INK Network Manager Master contract, seconded by Burghart.

**Discussion:** Sloan asked if there were any discussion. Jones called the attention of the Board to the fact that this amendment was tied to enabling the Telegov project / contract, so he wanted to remind them in case Secretary Burghart intended to abstain.

**Action Taken:** The motion above was then seconded by Haugh. Sloan asked for discussion.

**Discussion:** Friend asked to add some other information to clarify what the amendment enabled. While the immediate situation involved the deployment of Telegov, the existing Master Contract provides for KIC and its "affiliates" to make use of the cloud. So, this will open the case for their affiliates, namely NIC and Tyler Technologies, to use the cloud as well. So, while it is mainly cloud-focused, it has that open-ended nature so they should not have to keep revisiting it.

# Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

**Action Taken:** The motion was approved by all members present, with Burghart abstaining.

The Board then continued the meeting by addressing the remaining items in the order in which they were listed on the agenda.

## 1) Final 2020 Financial and Agreed Upon Procedures Audits

Friend introduced Karen Linn, Managing Director at BT&Co, who performed the INK Financial and Agreed-upon-Procedures audits. Linn then introduced Kyle George who was the manager on the engagement. Ms. Linn began by going over the conclusions of the audit. She said that the audit was conducted according to Generally Accepted Auditing Principles which require them to plan and perform the audit with the objective of forming an opinion about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. So, they design their audit procedures with that objective in mind.

She continued that they were able to give an unmodified opinion, which is the highest form of opinion that can be given to a set of financial statements. An unmodified opinion does state that in their opinion, the financial statements are free of material misstatement. She then described the types of things that the examine as part of the audit. In those areas, she stated, there was nothing unusual or out-of-the-ordinary that they felt wasn't handled correctly that they should bring to the Board's attention. They also made no audit adjustments, so that is an indication that the financial statements, as they are presented throughout the year, are in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles. Everything went very well during the audit process and they had great cooperation, Friend was very prepared for them and others that they worked with during the audit process were prepared and they were able to gather the information that they needed to go through the process. She said that they do appreciate that and want to bring that to the Board's attention.

She then directed the members' attention to a draft letter in the packet that was addressed to their firm, required to be signed and submitted as part of their auditing standards. It includes the representations that INK is making about the audit and she encouraged the members to read through those. The signed letter would indicate to them that everyone agrees that the financials are ready to be finalized. Once they receive the letter back, the date the letter is signed becomes the date of the opinion. She encouraged the members to take a moment to read through the letter, as it can help the members as they work to fulfill their fiduciary responsibilities toward financial accounting matters as a board member. She concluded by addressing the Agreed-upon-Procedures audit that they had also performed as part of the engagement, saying that it involved assessing contract compliance. The report was also in draft form and they did not have any compliance findings. She then ended her presentation and said she was happy to answer any questions that members might have. Sloan asked if the board members had any questions. Seeing none, he asked that if the members had read the letter, was there a motion to approve himself and Friend signing the letter on behalf of the Board.

**Action Taken:** Haugh moved to accept the audit and for the Chair and Executive Director to sign the representation letters, second by Ortiz. Sloan asked if there were any other discussion, Seeing none, he thanked Friend for his diligent work and making it a smooth process. The motion was approved unanimously.

Friend also thanked Gordon and Jones and all those who had participated in the audit.

Sloan then asked to address the fifth item on the agenda, the State Home Page update.

### 5) 2021 INK Business Plan Initiatives: State Home Page Update

Friend loaded a presentation *<a copy of this presentation is attached to these minutes>* for Jones, who had been having trouble connecting virtually via video so far in the meeting. Jones then discussed the overall status of the project and the effort expended so far, as well as next steps. He emphasized that there were some changes based on feedback they had received so far, including a meeting with Secretary Burns-Wallace. They had a good meeting with her and she had identified some things, nothing super-major, but definitely some changes that she'd like to see. He continued that, of the remaining things they need, they would like some clarity on who is signing off, as they do not want to launch any project without making sure they have the right folks to say it is acceptable or they'd like changes. This is especially true of something as subjective as a website like the portal – there's no one right way to do it, or particular set of functionality. Another element they need to look at is the search functionality – he discussed two main options here, one that focused on the site itself, or expanded more broadly to search state websites.

Sloan suggested to the Board that they talk about at least the first two items presented there, starting with the search functionality. He asked

“How do we want to provide direction or guidance? Do we want to have another meeting where we actually review the Kansas.gov as it's currently configured and play with it that way? Do we want to have some subcommittee of the Board or some subcommittee of state employees that would be technologically engaged look at this? How do you want to address it?”

Friend said that it would be helpful for him to understand what the Board thought his role as Executive Director was in these situations as well. He said that he thought he understood the answer.

Ortiz said that she was supporting the first idea that Sloan presented, that the Board have another meeting. Sloan thanked Ortiz and asked if there were any comments on that. Yancey said to Jones that he thought it would be helpful to him if the Board understood who had actually participated in their engagement from agencies and other entities that have a presence on the site. He knew that they had had some difficulty getting volunteers to carve out the bandwidth necessary to work with their staff, but it would be helpful in his case if he knew who that was so that he could understand who had actually reviewed it.

Jones responded that what was interesting was that in all the prior iterations of the Kansas.gov portal every few years, or sometimes longer, sometimes shorter – while a lot of it predates his time here – what he understood was that really there wasn't that much engagement by agencies at all. It was more like “do your best on it, get it launched” – websites can be updated at any time if they have changes or new content, but there was no real formal approval process or engagement, honestly. He continued, saying that when they approached it this first time, they went down that same path and they know everybody's busy and we are in a pandemic. So, they took the approach of just building it based on the information they had from various sources and use their best judgment based on current trends coming out of various groups, what other states are doing. But, really, it was just to build it on their own. Once they did get more feedback and engagement this time, which was great – it's always easier to build something if they know what the users want and get their feedback. Jones said that they did reach out to all the public information officers. But, they are obviously not be the only one to evaluate, he wouldn't say they were the only group that should review something like this. He thinks they should get a lot more feedback to make sure it meets all the users' needs.

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

Friend said that he would be glad to provide his feedback at the Board's direction. Jones asked Friend to move the slide to the questionnaire they used for KanSite, a website product offering. Jones said he didn't expect the members to read it, but typically when they were building a website, this was the type of information they normally gather when they would build a website.

Friend again offered to weigh in but at the board's preference. Sloan said that he wanted the members to weigh in on how much of a role, collectively, they wanted to play in this. He then asked Friend to return to the previous slide, then continued, saying he wanted to focus on the search functionality. Sloan asked the Board "How do we want to provide direction to Nolan and his team? Because I think that before we really roll it out, we want to make sure that we have provided our due diligence and guidance here."

Blake responded, saying that she was stepping into this work mid-stream. But, she had some questions about the way the Board functions, because it feels different from some of the other experiences she's had in the doing of the work. Her question was that if they have contracted to do this work and Jones and Friend are their employees to administer those directions, is it the Board's job to vet the information on the site? Or, is it our job to give them the authority to go get the appropriate partners and make sure the appropriate partners are engaged in the process?

Sloan responded that this was a good question and that the answer from his perspective was that the Board provides the overall vision and direction. As she had heard, responses are not necessarily coming in from agencies, but, on like the search functionality, he thinks that Jones was looking for what direction they should go and he thinks that is legitimately a board decision. On the next question they take up of who signs off for the customer, ultimately the Board is contracting, so that will be up to the Board. He continued that whether they delegate that to Friend is a different question. But, he wanted to go back to the search functionality. He then addressed Yancey, saying that he probably had more direct involvement in this and asked for his recommendation.

Yancey responded that he was conflicted. The reason was because the ownership of websites – the management – has evolved. Ten years ago, the design management was top down. The person who built it gathered the information and laid it out in an information architecture and deploys it. Now, it is much flatter, where the actual content providers have much more control over the look and feel and behavior of their own presence in an integrated website, so that is sort of the issue that they are confronting. In his agency, the look and feel and the content presentation is managed out of their communications office. A template is laid out in a content management system, but the actual presentation is controlled through the content management system by the groups generating the content.

He does agree that things like the approach to search clearly need to be decisions that are driven as part of a template design. Part of the challenge here is that he feels they are missing half the equation – getting the right people involved has been problematic. He agrees that he thinks the Board can lay out the design strategy, especially around search, but he does think they need to take another shot at engaging the constituent community, in this case, like, for his agency, the public affairs office. A compromise could be that the Board could help NIC define a default approach, and then kind of advertise that, so that "here's the approach" and then if an agency wanted to take a different approach, that was certainly doable, but they needed to communicate that. Sloan continued that he knew that they wanted Friend's comments, too, but said that Yancey had more succinctly stated it than he had, that if agencies are not responsive, the Board needs to make decisions so that KIC can move forward. And, he noted that people are sometimes better at responding to something specific than abstract.

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

Sloan asked what Friend wanted to say about the search functionality. He responded that he thought he had the same concerns that Blake did about where this was headed. He asked if Sloan wanted comments narrowly tailored to the search function. Sloan said yes. Narrowly tailored to that specific aspect, he said that it was being charitably discussed and the Board was discussing it in the abstract. It comes with a template. That search is not going to be adequate for the state. Friend said that he had a long, long background in web development – it isn't a matter of just searching the site. Anyone can go out and look at it, it's not going to work. So, Friend continued, it isn't a matter of what the Board thinks the scope of the search should be – which he thinks is a real question – he isn't sure what his role is. It isn't helping him to have any authority if we need to go back to the Board to find out what they think on tactical matters like that. So, he stated, it can't adequately perform either task in his opinion at present. And yet it is what comes with the template. So, if they stick with the template, then they have to stick with that. Friend said that that tells him that they would want to move away from the template. The template was picked in April when Sloan said that he wanted to deliver something in 30-60 days to Secretary Toland and that hasn't happened. Now, the group is looking for a sponsor or owner. Friend said that his role is not clear in directing them what to do. He'd be happy to reach out, he was happy to reach out to all agencies in numerous large statewide projects to get things going here. He thinks it is a question of at what level they want to set the direction for what is done. But, it sounds like the Sloan thinks the Board should be directly involved in setting the vision for a technical matter, how the website should be put together and that's fine. But, Friend continued, he is saying that he doesn't think the search can work this way – it isn't really a decision about the scope.

Blake said that she guessed her question came from the fact that she isn't the one who is going to be receiving this information. Maybe it would be more appropriate for the Board to look at their connections across the state with these associations and ask who is the right person to look at this? What information is it that they need and to have Kansas citizens directed to these kinds of information. How do we get the right people at the table? From her experience on other boards, that's the role of the board – to help the Executive Director. We hire somebody to do this work – she doesn't know Friend's job description, she hasn't seen that, but maybe the structure is a little different, and she knows that that nuance of being associated with government agencies may be part of it. So, this is just why she was asking that question.

Sloan said that things work a lot smoother when there is only one agency involved. When you are crossing state agencies and the multitude. Jones agreed. Sloan then addressed Jones and asked to go back to the search functionality and keeping in mind what Yancey was saying, and the fact that agencies have not been as creative as he would have liked, what is it that your folks think is going to be the most attractive. Jones said that he thought, and noted that Yancey raised very good points, that making the search decision on approach – and Friend is right, not good – that depending on the direction they get from a group or individual on what they want out of the site and how it looks and how it operates will naturally bake in the correct approach to search. So, gathering those people and talking about the whole gamut – for example, do they direct uses right away to an agency site, or do a recap of some information before they send them there – those sorts of things they can all think together and put together a project plan to either revamp the whole thing or finish up what they have, and get a final product out.

Ortiz said to Sloan that she thought they could move on, given everything that has been explained. That was her opinion. Sloan acknowledged this and asked if there were other comments. No one had comments, so Friend interjected that the board should know that no work had been done on the site in the previous 30 days. So, if they were going to start up, since this has become a board matter about direction in some detail, they will have to resolve what to do. He continued that since it is not clear to KIC that he has the authority

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

to direct them as to next steps, that's certainly not clear from what's been discussed so far, he doesn't think work will continue without some guidance from someone who has the authority to give it.

Sloan asked if they would want to give Friend the authority to do whatever he deems appropriate? He asked if they wanted to provide direction that Jones and his team prepare something for review by the agencies? Did they want to have Friend and Jones again try and communicate with public information officers and other agency people about what their preferences are? Butler said that she had to take a call briefly so missed some of this discussion, but it was her understanding that the current search is bad, so a better search is needed – and it is just how to determine what is good enough? Jones said that was part of it, but really they were building a brand new website to replace the current one. Search is an element and a super important one, but really it is the whole website, as well as Search that they could use feedback on. And, at the end of the day, someone saying yes, you built what we want – launch that thing.

Butler said her suggestion was to try to reach out to the agencies again and give them a date certain – we need your feedback and you have until X date to tell us you're on board. If we don't hear from you, we're assuming that you're good with it. Because she thought, otherwise, we would be stuck forever in this feedback loop – of who looks at it. And, she's not a website person. She is for Friend being authorized to do what needs to be done, including signing off if we never hear from another agency again.

Sloan asked if there were other comments. Wilson agreed with what Butler said. She is definitely not a website designer and wouldn't know the first place to really start at it, but she feels like we really need to get to the main people involved with the website and get their information. And, like Butler said, give them a date and run with it. And, she continued, she thinks we have Friend and Jones' team that have the knowledge to make this thing move quicker. Jones responded that the key thing for them was a project sponsor, like any other agency whether it's a group or an individual that guides them – not only “Did you do it?” but “Here's what I want.” They want to make sure that they're building the right thing when they put in INK's hours. Historically, they have done it on their own, but with the feedback they've received, it is important to make sure they have that sponsor.

Friend suggested that what could work here would be for him to work with Jones and his team to develop a revised approach based on feedback they had previously received – it was mentioned that they met with Secretary Burns-Wallace – certainly those changes seem valid – and to address the search issue. And, what he can do, because they have already referred to Yancey as someone who has deep experience and Friend knows him – he also represents the Secretary as Executive Branch CITO – is to coordinate with him, as he has a good sense, as Friend felt he did, about outreach in the state and how it might be conducted. He's not asking for everything to be put on him, but it is really contacting and coordinating with people and setting a direction. What Friend thought would have to happen was that they would make a short evaluation and then try to make a decision about which direction to go. He said that it basically came down to one thing – filling out the template shown in the slide deck as, even with 20 parties, there's going to need to be some negotiation. And then they will create some scenarios and do user testing. So, it would either be a motion – or they may not need one – to be satisfied that he will work with Jones and his team to move forward.

Sloan asked if there were other comments. Yancey had one final comment. He pointed out that web design was almost like interior design, it was hard to get everyone to agree on one approach. He was OK with empowering Friend and Jones to reach out and get feedback and let the Board know how that went. Sloan added that he still thought they would get a better response if they were given something to react to. Hearing no further discussion, Sloan said they would move on to the next item.



## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

**Action Taken:** None.

### 4) INK / KIC Contractual Matters (Executive Session)

Sloan opened this item by asking whether an Executive Session would be required for this item. Friend deferred to Shultz who responded that he thought the Board would want to have an Executive Session for 5-10 minutes to discuss the legal analysis of a letter. Sloan said that he would take a motion to go into Executive Session.

**Action Taken:** Butler moved to recess the board meeting of the Information Network of Kansas into Executive Session for 10 minutes from 11:00 a.m. to 11:10 a.m. 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 11:10 a.m. The attendees of the Executive Session shall be the board members or their proxy representatives, Board Counsel, and the Executive Director. Seconded by Ortiz. No further discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

The Board returned from the Executive Session at 11:10 a.m. Shultz told the Board members that the Tyler letter will be open and subject to the Kansas Open Records Act. Friend noted that the letter he had received did not imply a particular action by the Board. He reiterated to the members that they were no longer in Executive Session. He confirmed that he would file it, but that he wouldn't plan to respond unless the Board went into Executive Session and indicated to him what that would be.

**Action Taken:** None.

### 6) Proposed Agency Outreach Overview

Friend opened by saying the presentation would take about ten minutes to run through. It was pretty critical as it outlined the approach to Agency Outreach that had been talked about that Sloan brought to the Board and discussed under New Business at the previous meeting < a copy of the presentation is attached to these minutes >.

When the presentation was concluded, Sloan asked the members if there were any questions. Cook responded, asking the Chair if this was something where the Board wants the chair or a board member of the Board to help present in terms of being able to present from the INK Board perspective – this is what our vision is, this is why we're reaching out – to kind of hit on some of those really high-level pieces that some of these agencies may not be familiar with and then devolve down into the more detailed presentation from Jones about what specific services are available, that might be helpful or compatible with what the agency is doing.

Sloan said that if she were asking him, he thinks that Kate as vice-chair or he should be involved. He think it's important if they are dealing with agencies who are including their top people that INK be represented at that level also to show the investment / commitment by the Board. But, he continued, he was open to other

---

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

board members' comments as well. Yancey agreed with his statement. The outreach is the "what". And he thought what also needed to be emphasized is the "why". And that really is the INK Board purview in terms of why it's relevant, why it's important and he thinks they can certainly carry that message.

Sloan then said that hearing no further comments, Friend and Jones should proceed to set up the meetings and discussions.

**Action Taken:** None.

Sloan then said that they were down to the strategic planning section, but first he wanted to ask Friend to give the Board a quick update because last month they had talked about outreach to the Division of Water Resources, Department of Agriculture, talked about having a signed contract with the Biological Survey and there is a meeting tomorrow with the Kansas Water Office. So, he asked if Friend would just briefly talk about where things stand. Friend responded that Sloan had just summarized it. His planned update here was about the Board member terms and nominations, but as he'd just said, everyone is aware that they'd just signed a contract with the Biological Survey, there was another agreement with Dodge City – he pointed out to the members that there was a thank you note from Melissa McCoy from Dodge City in their packet. They were working with the Water Office who had a flood management project they were interested in grant funding for. Sloan also reached to KDHE, someone that he and Yancey had already met with, so now he will schedule a meeting with them. The Water Division in Agriculture has come back with a proposal but he felt it required some more detail before it came to the Board – but he offered to them that he didn't want to be a barrier and that they were still welcome to submit it directly.

Friend then continued into the next agenda item as part of this discussion.

### **7) INK Executive Director Update – Board member terms / nominations**

There are two board members, Kristy Wilson and Vicky Ortiz that this applies to. The way the Board terms work is that they are staged, so not everyone rolls off the Board at the same time. Part of that is predicated on them being filled according to that schedule, too – and what's happened in those cases is that both members have been filing out someone else's term. So, in Ortiz' case, he has talked to her and contacted the Kansas Library Association who she represents. The way the process works is that they need to nominate three people directly to the Governor's office – the Board is not involved. In both cases, they have served less than a year – six month and nine months, and she has spoken to Kristy and she is interested in continuing. So, that is a case where the Board nominates three people so he will go back to that association and see what they want to do – and then talk to two other associations and then bring forward a slate to the Board for nomination to the Governor.

Friend then added as time was running short that he had been accepted to present at an academic conference in Toronto on the same date at the same time as the next Board meeting. The presentation is virtual and while he has never asked to move the board meeting before for a personal obligation, he'd mentioned to Tom that he'd like to see if the Board would be willing to move their next meeting either a day earlier or a day later to accommodate him.

Sloan had two questions. First, did current board members serve until appointments are made? Friend confirmed that the INK By-laws said that they could. And Friend said that he had informed both of them of that. This is also how some of the positions end up being filled with partial terms as some have served over

---

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

a year waiting for the next appointment. On the next board meeting, he is not available on the first Thursday, did anyone have a problem with moving it to October 6<sup>th</sup>? Friend offered to poll the members after the meeting. He said he really appreciated it and it was a real opportunity for him.

**Action Taken:** None.

Sloan then asked Jones if he had the bandwidth in staffing to add new projects as INK outreach efforts expand if the agencies want to engage. Jones said that was a difficult question to answer because there are so many factors that go into it – the type of project, whether it is a product or they are building it from scratch. This is why with all things that they do he thinks it is very helpful to have the Board involved in staffing and where they devote their resources – the more educated the Board is, it builds their confidence. So, he thought part of it is ongoing education of the Board and their involvement in what they do that will help make sure they are devoting resources to the right items and the objectives of the Board. And, if he does need additional resources, they discuss the financials and what is needed for them to expand based on these types of projects. They've never failed on a project and he doesn't plan to ever have that happen. They also certainly don't overstaff – they are very careful to manage the level so they are efficient.

Sloan asked if there were any question for Jones on that. Seeing none, he moved to the next item.

**Action Taken:** None.

### *New Business*

#### **1) INK Strategic Planning Discussion**

Sloan began the item by noting that Friend had sent out a document on strategic planning. He recapped some of the contents very briefly and then asked the Board “How do you really want to proceed?” He noted that at his request, Friend had sent out a list of twelve possible initiatives just to stimulate discussion and thought on the part of board members, and to see if there was some initial consensus. As they might expect, there was a diversity of opinion. But, from a process or procedure standpoint he asked “How do you want to go forward?”

Cook said that she's been through strategic planning several times, and she thinks the list of initiatives are good as thought starters, especially for board members that are somewhat new – she's even been on for a few years and there are some things on the list that made her think about things a little differently. But, she wondered, when one took a step back, taking a broader perspective in terms of what INK's mission is, what its statutory responsibilities are, and get a real good handle on that. And, then, maybe consider if those need to evolve, do they need to look different than what they look like right now. It is worthwhile to ask that question. And, maybe have that broader conversation before they start going through this list, or whatever other board members might have put forward. She continued that maybe that broader overview will give the members some clarity to use in trying to pare down the list a bit.

Sloan asked Cook if she could provide some more specifics about the kind of discussion of the mission she had in mind. She responded that is was considering the mission, seeing what kind of activities fit in, whether or not they needed to make adjustments, or change the focus in any way. And, maybe even have an outside facilitator to help walk through those. She has used those and they can be challenging at times, but she thought that in each case they have ended up in a better place.

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

Sloan asked for other comments. Wilson said she would echo some of what Cook had just said. Wilson has sat through strategic planning meetings and in the end they always came out better than what they went in with. She has found that sometimes starting with a SWOT (Strengths, Opportunities, Weaknesses, Threats) analysis helps to get people thinking about strengths, weaknesses – there were a lot of opportunities in the presentation made earlier, but she also thought there were a lot of threats to keep in mind with the changes going on. So, she continued, maybe that would be a good place to start to get a better handle on how to prioritize some of the items.

Blake said that she would concur with both members' comments. One of the things she had experience with from as far as external facilitation was a process called CCAT, which is a core assessment tool that looks at the vitality of the organization and where it is in the organizational lifecycle. It looks at the functions of the board and the stakeholders and provides a snapshot with an evidenced-based practice that give them the ability to ask if they were technical issues, or adaptive challenges that they needed to come through. And, it is using those strengths, the SWOT analysis practice, and it kicks out a report that really helps guide the dialog for a strategic planning process. She then noted that it was done across the country, it's not something like a regional practice or lens on strategic planning. It is also very affordable. CAPS, the organization she works with, has used that tool and she can share that information with anyone that might be interested in seeing that. But, she does think that there is great value in stepping back so that there is a document when new board members come on to say "These are our priorities, this is the process that was used" and it helps with some of the transitional guidance when leadership is constantly changing.

Secretary Burghart asked Sloan how he felt about guiding the exercise as chairman – did he think the Board should use an outside facilitator? Sloan responded that he thought that was up to the Board. He has done strategic planning facilitation. And, having an outside facilitator can help. He has also been involved with them in terms of Zoom meeting planning – those are generally not as productive as face-to-face. He thinks that it is a board decision. Secretary Burghart continued, asking if they could tap into some of their public universities on this. He said that he knew the Cabinet has had retreats and KU has moderated those and it was very productive - KU Public Management Center. Friend responded that he knew Deb Miller up there and that they worked pretty closely on the Governor's Fellows proposal that they made to Secretary Burns-Wallace. He went back to Blake's tool and was not sure how the Board would decide which direction to go, but he did know people there at KU, if that helps.

Sloan said that he thought it might be beneficial if those members who did know of specific facilitators or firms would send them to Friend and he can share that with the Board and maybe they can do some kind of evaluation electronically. Friend asked Shultz, indicating he was always concerned about some serial meetings or open meetings and how the Board interacts during this period, and he was all for virtual evaluation. But, if he gets things from various members, he can sure send it out, but as far as how they move to the next step, he just needs to know the mechanics of how the group would deliberate – he doesn't think they can.

Sloan said that before they made a decision as to whether to hire someone or not, there would have to be a public meeting. But, the interim step of collecting information about who is out there and used and their approaches – Friend agreed that this could all be sent out. He meant if they were planning to do any kind of deliberation or discussion. He said as soon as he received it, he could get it back out. Sloan said that he could also compile a list of pros and cons for whoever is involved and get that back out. Friend said he would also approach KU.

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

Sloan asked for other comments. Ortiz said that, as Friend has said, her term on the Board ends this month and she just wanted to say thank you to everyone, she had learned a lot from them and Friend had been providing guidance with regard to the Board. And, she wanted to thank everyone who voted for the grant for the City of Dodge City. She is very happy and she would love to stay on the Board, but it is not her decision or the Board's, it will be up to the Kansas Library Association to see if she continues. But, it was her pleasure to meet all of the members and she hopes to continue to serve on the Board.

Sloan thanked Ortiz for her comments and confirmed that she could continue for sure until someone else was appointed.

**Action Taken:** None.

**Adjournment:** Ortiz moved to adjourn at 11:55 a.m. The motion was approved unanimously.