



## **CNIC Peer Communications Group Meeting Minutes – April 22, 2005**

Approved 5/6/05

### **Attendees:**

Paula Allen, DOR; Dan Christensen, ODF; Brooke Crager, DAS/NOC; Shawn Dawson, ODOT; Wes Ford, DHS; Dennis Green, Employment; Raelynn Henson, CNIC Project Office; Natalya Ishenin, DHCS; Julie Mallord, CNIC Project Office; Dominic Rivera, DCBS. Minutes by Cathy Hoffman, DAS IRMD.

### **Review & Approve Minutes**

The minutes of the April 8 meeting were read and approved as presented.

### **Review Draft CIO Message**

Raelynn distributed a draft memo for CIOs to use as a sample in communicating with staff about the process for CNIC questions. The draft reflects the process agreed to by Peer Communications on April 8. The document will be distributed to CIOs on Monday, April 25. Committee members are to review the document and submit any comments to Raelynn by noon on Monday. Comments made at the meeting included:

- Individuals need assurance that their name will remain confidential. The name of a staff person reporting an issue or rumor will remain confidential with their agency Peer Communications representative. When a Peer member forwards rumors, questions, etc., staff names should be removed from e-mails or any other communication tool and should not be disclosed to anyone.
- The statement, “not stifle the flow” seems a bit negative. Perhaps there is a way to rephrase it.

### **Debrief on Work Group Summary**

The March Work Group Summary was the first and feedback on the process was requested. Raelynn asked if individuals felt they had enough time to accomplish their assignments or would they do things different the next time? Discussion ensued. It was decided that the process would be the same for the April summary.

### **Maneuverability of Portal**

At the April 8 meeting, a request was made for an opportunity to discuss the ease of maneuverability on the portal. Discussion included:

- Methods of distributing information about the Web portal.
- Frequency of publishing frequently asked questions and rumor control information.
- Process for getting answers to the individuals asking the questions prior to publishing.
- Identification of QuickPlace links.
- Addition of the photo gallery.
- The intended function of the portal. It was set up as a listing (also referred to as a launching pad or diving board) and when people use it they should expect to leave the page to access the information they desire.
- Interest level of Web users. It would probably be easiest for some to start with the CNIC Web site (Internet) and if they can't find what they want, send them to the CNIC Web portal (Intranet).
- The reason for different locations. There are different levels of communication (public, state employee, sensitive) with different levels of security.

### **Status of April 27 Tour**

All slots on the tour schedule are full but there is a possibility that a few more could be accommodated if necessary. Raelynn distributed brochures that tour participants will receive. The method of announcing the tours was discussed. The process includes sending listserv messages and going through various committee loops. The rationale of some agencies prioritizing tour invitations was discussed.

### **All Hands Meeting May 5, 2005**

Raelynn stated the agenda has not changed since presented at the last meeting. Each work group will give a brief update, Julie Mallord will provide an overview of Phase Two, and a CIO panel will field



questions. Peer Communications was tasked with making sure information about the meeting is distributed to staff. A request was also made for advance questions; if there are questions members feel their staff is interested in, send to Raelynn or be ready to initiate the question at the meeting.

**Review and Discuss Rumor Responses/FAQs**

Shawn stated that the answer to Rumor 2 will probably not be received well by individuals in his department. Although the answer to the rumor is accurate, different perceptions exist based on how the CIOs of the various departments chose to handle discussions with staff whose jobs are within the scope of CNIC. The consensus is that it is not too sensitive a subject to publish but should perhaps include a clarifying statement about CIO meetings with department staff.

The meeting adjourned at 11:22 a.m.