MINUTES OF THE HOUSE GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Jim Morrison at 3:31 P.M. on January 16, 2007, in Room 526-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except Representatives Tafanelli, Wilk, and Kelley, all of whom were excused.

Committee staff present:
> Mary Galligan, Kansas Legislative Research
> Tatiana Lin, Kansas Legislative Research
> Renae Jefferies, Office of Revisor of Statutes
> Gary Deeter, Committee Assistant

Conferees appearing before the committee:
> Kevin Yowell, VoteTracker

Others attending:
> See attached list

Kevin Yowell, representing VoteTracker, a vendor who has contracted with the Kansas Legislature, demonstrated the features of the system. He illustrated the Quick Reference section, the Hearing Schedule, the sequential versions of a bill, the affect of a bill on specific Kansas statutes, links to profiles of local government entities and legislators, real-time actions of the legislature, bill tracking related to constituent services, and up-to-date information about federal legislation.

The Chair acknowledged that his comment at a previous meeting (January 10) about withholding budgeted funds from an agency was inaccurate, that in order to withdraw funding from an agency's current budget requires legislation.

The minutes were accepted as presented. (Motion, Representative Ruiz; second, Representative Swenson)

Staff Mary Galligan reviewed a conversation with the Chair and J. G. Scott, Kansas Legislative Research Department's Chief Fiscal Analyst; she noted issues related to the Committee's interaction with legislative budget committee (Attachment 1). Although a comprehensive review of budgets would be impractical, the Committee has the flexibility to review certain budgets in a timely manner. As a prototype, it was agreed that a process could be developed to review the Kansas Board of Regents' IT planning process, beginning with the Executive Branch in general, the Board of Regents coordinating activities, and individual institutions. She suggested a 15-minutes discussion at the end of each meeting to help identify the next level of exploration.

The Chair responded to questions, saying that the Committee's work will be under time constraints and, therefore, the Committee must limit its focus. He also suggested end-of-meeting review could form the basis for reports to budget committees and legislative leadership.

Members offered several suggestions to move the Committee forward:

MINUTES OF THE House Government Efficiency and Technology Committee at 3:30 P.M. on January 16, 2007, in Room 526-S of the Capitol.

- Meet with budget committee chairs to alert them to what the GE&T can offer;
- Request that Denise Moore, Executive Chief Information Technology Officer, and Director, Division of Information Systems and Communications (DISC), provide an overview of how DISC interacts with state agencies; and
- Invite one or two members of the Board of Regents (or perhaps Regents staff) to outline policies by which the Board provides oversight to the state's universities, technical colleges, community colleges, and area vocational-technical schools.

A member noted that, although 15 years ago the state created a centralized payroll system for all state entities, each university continues with separate payroll systems that interface with the state system. He commented that agencies sometimes build duplicative technology systems, even though inter-agency coordination and collaboration could reduce technology costs and promote the efficient use of resources.

Summary: The Committee agreed that meeting with Denise Moore would be a productive step in understanding how agencies function and interrelate.

The Chair commended members on their interaction and noted the wide range of knowledge and experience in the Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 18, 2007.

Unless specifically noted, the individual remarks recorded herein have not been transcribed verbatim. Individual remarks as reported herein have not been submitted to the individuals appearing before the committee for editing or corrections.

Page 2

HOUSE GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

GUEST LIST

DATE: January 16 2007

NAME	REPRESENTING
Emily Geier	Hein Law Firm
Nelson Krueger	Leading Edge, Ltd.
Tracy Smith	KIC : Kansas.gov

January 16, 2007

To: Rep. Jim Morrison, Chairperson

From: Mary Galligan, Kansas Legislative Research Department

Re: Government Efficiency and Technology Committee Discussion of Regents' Institutions

Yesterday during our discussion with JG Scott, KLRD Chief Fiscal Analyst, regarding procedures that this Committee might use to assist the Budget Committees with their decisions about technology expenditures, the following ideas were developed for further discussion.

- The timing of the appropriations process is such that a comprehensive review of agency technology budget requests will not be possible during the 2007 session.

  ○ If a Budget Committee seeks assistance of this Committee in regard to a particular agency budget, this Committee would provide that assistance. Any such assistance would in all likelihood necessitate alteration of this Committee's agenda.

- In regard to technology and efficiency, this Committee might adopt a goal of facilitating coordination of agency efforts and expenditures.

- As a first project, the Committee might review the Regent's IT planning processes with an eye toward coordination with other state agencies, within the Regent's system, and across the gamut of post secondary educational institutions. This project likely would occupy most of the Committee's time this session because of the large amount of background information that would be needed by the Committee. The initial background sessions might be conceptualized as exploration of three layers of activity: Executive Branch in general, Board of Regents coordinating activities, and individual institutions.

  ○ Exploration of how the Regents IT processes interface with the larger state IT planning processes might begin with a discussion with the Executive Branch Chief Information Technology Officer, Denise Moore.

  ○ That discussion could be followed with an exploration, with the appropriate staff from the Board of Regent's central office, of the central coordination and planning processes for IT functions.

  ○ That would be followed by an exploration of individual institutions' planning and coordination processes (both within the institution and among institutions).

- In terms of Committee procedures, some observations are worth discussion:
  ○ Probing questions would be in order at any time;
  ○ At the end of each meeting, the Committee might take 15 minutes or so to identify questions or an approach that might lend itself to the next "level" of exploration;

Attachment 1
GE+T 1-16-07

○ Discipline would be required to stay at the appropriate level of detail during each discussion (For most of these sessions, planning and coordination, rather than implementation of specific applications might be the appropriate level);

    - The discussion period at the end of each meeting also might be used to identify any information the Committee believes should be conveyed to the pertinent Budget Committee (those communications might be made weekly, except in the event of a time sensitive situation).

/-2