


## TOPICS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. IRC HISTORY
2. IT HISTORY
3. IRC SUMMER PROJECT
4. IT STRUCTURE - FUTURE




## 1. IRC HISTORY

- A. IT COMMITTEE
- B. ROLL OF HOUSE CLERK AND SENATE SECRETARY
- C. PROJECT COORDINATION
- D. PROJECT SUCCESS



## 2. IT HISTORY

- A. INFORMAL COMMITTEE
- B. FORMAL COMMITTEE – STATUTE STRUCTURE
  - 1) ALL USERS AS EQUAL PARTICIPANTS
  - 2) SHORT COMINGS – MANAGEMENT ISSUES
- C. ADULTERATING STATUTORY STRUCTURE
  - 1) ONE USER COMMENDING IT STAFF
  - 2) LACK OF COOPERATION – NON-EQUAL PARTICIPANTS



## 3. IRC SUMMER PROJECT

- 1. ORIGINATION – CAPITAL BILL
- 2. HISTORY OF PROJECT
- 3. STATUS OF PROJECT – SUCCESS AND DISAPPOINTMENT
- 4. DEBRIEFING MEETING
- 5. FINGERPOINTING AND CONFRONTATIONAL NEED OF ASSIGNMENT OF BLAME

## OUTCOME OF SUMMER IRC PROJECT

1. NO LONGER VIEWED AS PARTNERS OR TEAM
2. DAMAGE TO RELATIONSHIP WITH IRC
3. IMPORTANCE OF RELATIONSHIP
  - A) INTERGRAL NATURE OF IRC
    - 1) HOUSE/SENATE
    - 2) WEB-SITE
    - 3) INTERGRATION SO COMPLETE WITHOUT LEGISLATURE WILL NOT FUNCTION
  - B) ALTERNATIVE PRODUCTS

## 4. IT STRUCTURE – FUTURE

1. IMPERATIVE CURRENT NON-AUTHORIZED STRUCTURE AND MANAGEMENT MUST CHANGE
2. APPROACH AND STRUCTURE MUST BE:
  - A. COOPERATIVE
  - B. NON-AUTHORITARIAN
  - C. NOT IN THE HANDS OF ONE USER
    - EITHER JOINTLY MANAGED BY ALL USERS OR OUTSIDE OF ALL USERS
  - D. IRC MUST BE CONSIDERED A PARTNER – NOT AN ADVERSARY
  - E. PREFERRABLY BUDGET SHOULD BE SEPARATED – NOT INTERGRATED INTO A USER'S BUDGET

## IT STRUCTURE – SOME SUGGESTIONS

1. PLACING IRC IN HOUSE CLERK AND SENATE SECRETARY CONTROL
2. REVISING LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MANAGEMENT TO INCLUDE HOUSE CLERK AND SENATE SECRETARY
3. REVISING IT STATUTE TO MAKE IT SEPARATE MORE WELL-DEFINED ENTITY
4. SPLITTING LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL INTO TWO ENTITIES
  - a) Drafting and research
  - b) Legislative Service