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A Message From the President’s Desk

Dear members, friends and colleagues:

The new Chapter year brings a new board, new challenges, and new opportunities. We are already off to a flying start with a wide variety of professional and social events. I’d like to take this opportunity to put a “spotlight” on a few of the Board’s Committees by describing what they are currently working on to make this a successful Chapter year!

The Professional Development Committee is focusing on a wider range of subject matter but with a central theme of information governance. In addition to delivering quality presentations, the meetings will focus more on member interaction and participation.

In order to continue delivering value to members, the Sponsorship Committee is actively looking for additional sponsor partners. I am pleased to announce that Nuix, the outstanding IG and e-Discovery company, became our first annual significant sponsor across the entire year!

Finally, I am really excited to announce the creation of the Chief Information Officer role. In addition to recrafting and managing the technology infrastructure of the Chapter, CIO Gene Stakhov and his Committee members are also working on some technology surprises to more efficiently service our members.

Our ambitious mission this year would be unattainable without the chemistry and camaraderie that fuels non-profit organizations. We aim to dial up the fun and enjoyment factor as we progress through the year.

Bryn Bowen, CRM
President, ARMA Metro NYC Chapter
RECHARGE YOUR CAREER

Need a boost to help you move your career forward? ARMA Metro NYC can provide the assistance you need to re-energize professionally and jolt your career.

Visit www.armanyc.org to learn how to become a member. Join by November 30, 2014 and receive a $65 savings off annual membership fee.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 8th</td>
<td>Evening Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 21st</td>
<td>ARMA@Noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 13th</td>
<td>Evening Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 18th</td>
<td>ARMA@Noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15th</td>
<td>Networking Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27th</td>
<td>ARMA@Noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 11th</td>
<td>Evening Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24th</td>
<td>ARMA@Noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10th</td>
<td>All-Day Educational Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24th</td>
<td>ARMA@Noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 16th</td>
<td>Evening Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 28th</td>
<td>ARMA@Noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14th</td>
<td>Evening Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19th</td>
<td>ARMA@Noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 10th</td>
<td>End of Year Event</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Watch this video to learn more about what’s happening during the Chapter year:
"Home Depot said on Thursday that the account information of 56 million cardholders was compromised in what is the largest known breach of a retail company’s computer network" – NY Times September 18, 2014

"Target Puts Data Breach Costs at $148 Million, and Forecasts Profit Drop" – NYT August 5, 2014

"Community Health Systems data breach affects 4.5M” – the Tennessean – August 18, 2014
Although the concept of incorporating privacy requirements into Records Retention Schedules and Records and Information Management (RIM) Programs is not a new, the proliferation of well-publicized data breaches and the focus on the multitude and complexity of privacy requirements in the US Federal and State laws has intensified the focus on records retention requirements with respect to privacy and personal information.

Retaining records containing sensitive information (including personal information) is imperative for a variety of reasons, including tax, audit and other business and legal purposes. Retention schedules must address personal information, the levels of sensitivity and records types. Policies and procedures must then address how the information is maintained securely and how it is also securely deleted. These determinations will require working together with the Information Security Officer and the Information Privacy Officer, among other business functions.

US Privacy Law is very complex. To give you an idea of the federal laws governing privacy, here is a sample (not exhaustive) list:

- Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act (COPPA)
- Controlling the Assault of Non-Solicited Pornography and Marketing (CAN-SPAM)
- Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA)
- Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
- Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA)
- Gramm-Leach-Bliley (GLBA)
- Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health Act (HiTECH)
- Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPPA)
- Stored Communications Act (SCA)
- Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA)

The oversight of federal privacy enforcement and policy is spread over several U.S. Agencies. The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) is the primary Agency, and
oversees unlawful “unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce” and the COPPA and the CAN-SPAM Acts. The Office of Civil Rights, Health and Human Services (HHS) oversees the enforcement of HIPPA and HiTECH. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFBP) is the federal financial regulators for GLBA, the Department of Education oversee FERPA; the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and the FTC oversees TCPA.

In early 2012, the Obama administration issued a report entitled, “Consumer Data Privacy in a Networked World: A Framework for Protecting Privacy and Promoting Innovation in the Global Digital Economy (“White House Report”). President Obama signed the preface which defines the “Consumer Privacy Bill of Rights” based upon traditional fair information Practices. It includes:

(1) individual control;
(2) transparency;
(3) respect for context;
(4) security;
(5) access and accuracy;
(6) focused collection; and
(7) accountability.

Shortly afterwards, the FTC issued a similar report entitled, “Protecting Consumer Privacy in an era of Rapid Change: Recommendations for Businesses and Policymakers” (“FTC Report”). The FTC Report has many similar themes to the White House Report, which are (1) privacy by design, (2) simplified consumer choice; and (3) transparency.

In addition, most states have their own privacy laws. One cannot just go by federal laws when defining requirements. California and Massachusetts are the two states with some of the strictest laws which are often used for reference purposes when defining privacy and personal information requirements for companies doing business across the country.

In a September 2014 ARMA Washington Policy Brief article entitled, “States Take the Lead on Breach Notification Legislation in 2014”, it notes that “while privacy legislation languishes in Congress, a number of states enacted new laws in 2014 to strengthen the data breach notifications in the wake of highly publicized data breaches at Target Corp., Nieman Marcus, and other retailers. Three states- Florida, Kentucky and Iowa enacted new
laws in 2014, with another one in California on the verge of being signed.”

To provide an example of how costly a data breach to an organization’s reputation alone can be, in the event of a breach of unsecured health information, if the breach affects more than 500 or more in the same jurisdiction, it must notify the media. A breach applies only to “unsecured” information, and a covered entity can avoid liability if it utilizes encryption software to secure the information.

The foundation of any good Information Privacy and Information Security program is a well designed and implemented Records and Information Management Program. It is important to know where the organization’s personal information is located (information inventory), and the retention periods and levels of classification and sensitivity assigned to the records.

Organizations should retain the information needed for the purposes intended for which consent has been given and for only as long as is necessary to fulfill its stated purpose. Retention schedules assist in assuring that the information is properly categorized and classified, and that the personal information is only retained for as long as it is appropriate.

**Author Notes:**
For more information on becoming a Certified Information Privacy Professional (CIPP), consult the International Association of Privacy Professionals website: [https://privacyassociation.org/](https://privacyassociation.org/)

This article is intended to provide an overview of the US Private-sector privacy, and to provide an idea of the legal areas to review when devising and revising record retention schedules and records management programs. Stay tuned to the privacy space, as it is an evolving and dynamic arena, and one where records management professionals can definitely make an impact.


Note: This article is provided for educational reference purposes only and should not be relied upon without first seeking independent legal advice.
Information Transparency™

with Nuix

Make fact-based decisions

Information governance is about developing strategies and then implementing business processes to contain costs, mitigate risks and ensure compliance.

The Nuix Luminate platform, built on the patented Nuix Engine, gives organizations transparency into the content and value of their data so they can take action.

Start with the facts. Start with Nuix.

Find out more: nuix.com/information-governance
Most of the rest of the world does not draw a distinction between archives and information management. There is just archives or archival enterprise with an array of specializations, of which information management is but one, albeit a significant one.

The all encompassing profession of the archivist goes back centuries, if not millennia. David B. Gracy, professor emeritus at The University of Texas at Austin, jokingly called it the "second oldest profession". It was, and still is the archivist's purpose to manage information of an organization or entity. Only now, really since the just middle of the 20th Century, has the specialization of managing the active, inactive and non-permanent records spun off unto its own and left archival enterprise with permanent and historical.

This divorce, in my opinion, hurt both the archivists and the newly minted records management communities. To be fair, the divorce mostly took place in the U.S. and in the United Kingdom and Australia. France, China, the Netherlands, Trinidad, and most other countries only have archivists. This is not to say that these countries don't do much to manage their information. Rather, it is just that the role of archivist covers the entire information lifecycle. While the divorce impeded both sides from working together as one, it also enabled the nascent information management community to focus on specific issues. Conversely, it also allowed the archivist community to do the same. While the records managers sought to solve problems stemming from the management of massive volumes of information, archivists tightened up processes for managing and preserving permanent materials.

The split was not entirely detrimental. It enabled each side to grow and mature in ways they
probably could not have done together. The information managers sought to and continue to seek improvements to what we've come to call "big data" that include computer assisted search and retrieval, document management systems, analytics, and integration with technological and legal systems, to name a few. The archivists focused on improved descriptive standards and classification of data sets, long term preservation, and access to digital and tactile materials. Now that each side is more matured and confident in their areas of expertise, we should be joining forces so we can better complement each other and strengthen our singular profession. In the spirit of the Blues Brothers, it's time to get the band back together.

More than anything, the divorce has pushed information managers towards the corporate sector, and the archivists toward academia and non-profit. These "opposing" sides instigated a rivalry that promoted antagonisms.

As a graduate student at the University of Texas at Austin, the records management focused students were not embraced by the archives students. When a classmate announced that she was going to be hired by a big petroleum firm in Dallas, a few classmates joked that she went to the "dark side", and not because it was a big oil company. After class she told me she didn't mind the jibes for she secured a good position with a salary that would take most archivists several years to achieve. Since then, I've witnessed many more instances of one side putting down the other and it is one reason I shifted from an academic archival career to a corporate information management professional.

It is time for the back-biting and petty squabbles to end and to reunite archives with information management. George Depres,
Brandeis University's Records Manager wrote an elegant two-part article on his blog this past summer entitled, "Archivist Meet Records Manager, Records Manager Meet Archivist". In it, Depres chronicles the differences, all negligible, that have kept these two groups apart, and the shows how they are similar and can learn and benefit from each other's research, analyses and practices.

In early September, I presented on this very subject at the Information Governance Conference in Hartford, Connecticut. While preparing my materials, I came across George's blog and his two-part article cited in the previous paragraph. It was exactly what I planned to present, only better. To be honest, I was a little stumped about what to present. What I made sure to do was to circulate copies of the articles for what he wrote has the depth and substance that I could only scratch the surface in the time allotted for my presentation.

When you finish reading this article, I implore you to read George Depres' blog and then do something to help reunite archives with information management. Reach out to a local Society of American Archivists Chapter, volunteer at a nearby historical society, or offer ideas to the ARMA Metro New York City Chapter that we can develop into ongoing and hopefully permanent connections with our fellow professionals.
When Galina Datskovsky, Ph.D., CRM and Mark Moerdler, Ph.D. first started their company providing records management software, most of the world was concerned with tracking paper files. Then came the DOD standard and electronic records were introduced, but everyone still talked about records. Later came the information avalanche and carried them with it, erasing traditional boundaries and burying organizations in information.

Join us on this exciting journey through time and learn how they - and current businesses - approach IG.
What are your thoughts about how Information Governance has evolved over the years?
The past year has seen important federal court decisions relating to the scope of preservation and collection, what triggers the duty to preserve, required steps for crafting search terms and what conduct by parties and their lawyers is sanctionable.

Michael Landau (VP, Professional Development, ARMA NNJ Chapter) and Gail Gottehrer of Axinn, Veltrop & Harkrider LLP discuss the top cases from the past year and the lessons learned from them.
How will the recent Court decisions affect your organization?
The Right to Be Forgotten: Sandra Serkes
A new European regulation permits citizens to request the removal of outdated or irrelevant information about themselves.

Big Data, Information Governance and Records Management: Barclay T. Blair and James Lappin
In this podcast from the Information and Records Management Society, Barclay T. Blair and James Lappin discuss the relationship between big data, information governance and records management.
HELP OUR TEAM AS WE JOIN THOUSANDS OTHERS TO STAMP OUT MS. Over 400,000 people in America are living with MS. **On Sunday, October 5, 2014**, the ARMA METRONYC Cycling Team, “BIKE KARMA” will participate in a 30 mile ride around New York City to raise money and awareness to fight this disease. Last year our team raised over $9,800, and was ranked #48 in fundraising. This year we have committed to raising $10,000.

This year’s team includes Bryn Bowen, Zaheer Bowen, Lucinda Donaldson, Rebecca Gallei, Wendy Glickman, Daniel Seucan, Eugene Stakhov and A RMA NNJ Chapter representatives Linda Cerone, Sofia Empel and Lucy Rieger.

We need your support!!! Please consider **joining the team** or **making a donation** in support of the team and this worthy cause. Contact Team Captain Mary Sherwin with any questions. Click [here](#) to access our team site:
As the volume of electronically stored information (ESI) being generated continues to eclipse the number of hard copy documents being created, the focus of modern discovery is on electronic documents. In the not too distant future, most of the information produced in discovery will be electronic and any distinction that may now exist between “discovery” and “eDiscovery” will have disappeared.

With the wide range of electronic devices and software being used by companies to conduct business, in addition to social media, the Internet and the cloud, the preservation and collection of electronic data from all the necessary sources can be a daunting task. While discovery sanctions are issued in only a small percentage of the cases filed each year, concerns about being sanctioned for spoliation of evidence are legitimate and cannot be ignored. Fortunately, courts have made clear that perfection is not the standard parties are held to in discovery. Courts expect litigants to have a reasonable, repeatable, defensible process for preserving, collecting and producing ESI.

While each case is different, certain approaches can be taken and certain fundamental principles applied by companies to comply with their discovery obligations and reduce their chances of spoliating evidence.

**Designing the Litigation Hold**

When a company reasonably anticipates that it will be bringing a lawsuit or that it will be sued, it has a duty to preserve relevant documents and ESI. Often, it is difficult to determine exactly when a company “reasonably anticipates” litigation and when the duty is triggered. In-house counsel should be made aware of facts and circumstances that lead employees to reasonably
Facing e-Discovery?
Get a Handle on Your ESI

By: Gail Gottehrer, Michael Landau and Paul Garrison

believe that the company could be sued or could have a basis to sue someone. In-house counsel can then confer with outside counsel to determine if a litigation hold should be implemented.

Determinations about the scope of a litigation hold and the people who should be subject to the litigation hold are best made by a team consisting of outside counsel, in-house counsel, people at the company who have knowledge of the facts of the case, and members of the IT department.

The employees and agents of the company are in the best position to provide information about the facts underlying the dispute, the people at the company who were involved, how those people communicated with others (both inside and outside of the company) about the issues in dispute and what electronic documents relate to the dispute.

This information will help counsel identify the people at the company who need to receive the litigation hold notice; the names and email addresses of the people inside the company and outside of the company whose data should be searched for to locate documents relevant to the case; the devices that will need to be preserved and searched, such as tablets, company-issued cell phones and personal cell phones; and the types of ESI that will be relevant in the case, such as emails, text messages, voicemail systems and audio recordings of customer calls.

The IT department can provide information that is critical to an effective litigation hold. This includes the number of servers where the relevant ESI exists and where those servers are located; the devices that have been issued to the likely custodians, including laptops, cell phones, tablets and external hard drives; which custodians use personal
devices for work purposes (and, therefore, their devices may contain ESI that will be subject to the litigation hold); the company’s policies and procedures for backing up data and the location of relevant backup tapes; any cloud storage vendors used by the company; and the steps that need to be taken to suspend the auto-delete functions on the company’s computer systems and devices where relevant ESI may be located.

A lesson to be learned from the recent In re Pradaxa case, is the importance of understanding how the company's data is maintained, what automatic deletion processes are in place, and which devices are issued to which employees. In that case, the court sanctioned the defendants for failing to suspend a program they had installed on the cell phones they issued to their sales representatives that automatically deleted text messages on those devices. In addition, the initial litigation hold notice defendants sent to their sales representatives did not expressly tell them to preserve text messages, even though a document showed that the defendants had directed their sales representatives to use text messages to communicate with their supervisors, district managers and others.

It is also advisable to consult with the company’s Human Resources department to find out whether a custodian will be retiring or leaving the company soon. They can then be interviewed by counsel before they leave the company, who can decide whether to image the employee’s laptop and can make sure that their laptop and cell phone are not wiped and given to another employee.

All this information will assist counsel in determining the scope of the factual information that is relevant to the case and must be preserved, where that information resides, the custodians whose information is subject to the hold, and the types of devices that must be preserved and searched. Based on their analysis of the legal issues in the case and the arguments they anticipate making on behalf of the company, counsel can identify additional categories of information that should be preserved and other custodians who should receive the hold notice and preserve their ESI.

Once counsel drafts the litigation hold notice, the team members who are not lawyers are an invaluable resource for assessing the clarity of the notice. If the
feedback from the non-lawyers is that they don’t understand what the notice is telling them to do or that it contains too much legalese, counsel should revise the notice to remedy those problems. Counsel also plays an important role in making sure the custodians receive the litigation hold notice, understand it and comply with it.

**Data Preservation Decisions**

In determining what data should be preserved, many litigation technology consultants and providers will advise companies to “preserve wide and process narrow,” meaning, in part, to include a broad group of custodians in the litigation hold but, at the initial stage of the litigation, process the data of only the key custodians, as identified by the team.

Through custodian interviews and input from the IT department, the company’s attorneys will confirm the types of technology and electronic devices used by the key custodians for work purposes. They then can formulate a plan for preserving and collecting data from those sources. In circumstances where there appear to be data gaps or ESI appears to have been deleted from a device used by a custodian, the team should evaluate whether to take a full forensic image of the devices and related storage drives. The team may decide to image the data portion of the drive as well as empty or free space, as this may enable data to be recovered, undeleted or restored in the future.

**Legal and IT Input**

It is advantageous to have the team collaborate on developing the specifications for the processing and production of the data. Examples of those kinds of specifications include instructions to include or exclude data by date ranges, file types and source folders; to include or exclude hidden files and columns; and how to handle spreadsheets, calendar items and system files. It is important that the team understand the specifications that will be used before the data is processed, either by the company or by a service provider.

The way in which data is
processed and produced generally varies depending on a variety of factors including the type of case, the type of data, the preferences of the attorneys involved, and the forum in which the case is being litigated. For example, agencies such as the Department of Justice and courts, like the U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, have specific requirements for how data must be produced in matters pending before them.

Regardless of the type of case or the forum in which it is being litigated, it is critical in every case that the specifications are determined at the outset of the matter, that they are documented, that they are clearly communicated to the person who will process the data (whether that is someone within the company or a service provider) and that the team verifies that the person tasked with processing the data has an accurate understanding of the specifications.

Miscommunications can result in the data being processed incorrectly and needing to be re-processed, which causes delay and increased costs. The team may consider using a service provider that offers a database for processing specifications that is connected to the processing engine, which reduces the risks of transposition errors and omissions when the specifications are inputted. The same considerations and systems should be used for production specifications used to create and QC document productions. Those systems can also help with documentation, as they create online records detailing the specifications that were used to process each set of data. Those records can be used if the company’s review process is challenged in the litigation.

**Team Approach to Searching**

In cases involving ESI, the company will want to consider trying to reach an agreement with the opposing party on a list of search terms that both parties will use to search their databases to
identify electronic documents that are likely to be relevant and should be produced.

In order to ensure that the search terms are appropriate and likely to identify the information that is relevant to the case, the company’s outside counsel, in-house counsel and the people at the company who have knowledge of the facts of the case (and who will most likely be custodians of the relevant information) should work together.

The employees, who will include the individuals who drafted and read the documents that are being sought, are in the best position to advise the lawyers on the business terminology that was used: the keywords, abbreviations and project names that were used; the names of the people who were involved in the matter; and the connectors that can be used to increase the chances of locating relevant documents while limiting the number of irrelevant documents that get pulled in by the search.

After the list of search terms is created, the company’s IT department should be brought in to give their input on the number of “hits” that each search term will generate. If certain search terms are likely to generate an unexpectedly large volume of data, the team can discuss ways to refine the search terms to try to reduce the number of irrelevant documents and focus in on the relevant documents.

The team should collaborate on the analysis of the search terms proposed by the opposing party. The custodians will be able to direct the lawyers’ attention to terms that may not be relevant to the issues in the case. Some of the search terms may remind custodians of a fact, conversation or document that they had not thought about before and that the rest of the team should know about, since the opposing party is interested in it.

Based on the search terms, the lawyers may notice a new legal argument that the opposing party is pursuing and they can then get information about it from the custodians. The IT department should also review the search terms requested by opposing counsel. If they identify requests that are likely to yield an unduly burdensome number of hits, the IT department can provide outside
counsel with detailed information about the burden and cost associated with those requests. Armed with that information, outside counsel can meet and confer with opposing counsel to try to get them to modify or withdraw those searches. If an agreement cannot be reached, outside counsel will use the information provided by the IT department to explain to the Court why the company should not be required to run those searches or why the costs associated with those searches should be shifted to the opposing party.

**Leveraging technology early in the case can help the team control costs, manage budgets and refine its litigation strategy.**

The importance of custodians participating in the creation of the search terms is underscored by a recent order in a federal court case in Florida, *Procaps S.A. v. Patheon Inc.* There, the court held that a company’s outside counsel had failed to get input from the company’s ESI custodians about the appropriate search terms for the case. Due to that failure, the opposing party had to file a motion to compel them to do so. The court granted that motion and awarded the opposing party $3,750 in attorney’s fees, $1,000 of which the court ordered had to be paid by the company’s lead attorney and the remaining $2,750 of which had to be paid by the company’s outside law firm.

**Focus on Quality Control**

At every stage of the process, it is important to document and verify the workflow and the technology being used. The technology that has previously been used to select, filter and cull data based on search terms is now being used to validate those terms prior to a “meet and confer” and prior to the processing and review of documents. This technology enables the team to run “what if” scenarios and develop metrics on the precision and recall of search terms as well as the volume of responsive and non-responsive documents captured by the search terms. The validation workflow can also allow the team to see how many responsive documents are not being included in the search results. Leveraging technology early in the case can help the team control costs, manage budgets and refine its litigation strategy.

**Conclusion**

The production of electronic data has become an accepted part of the discovery phase of litigation.
The focus on electronic evidence will likely only increase as more companies conduct business online and communicate with their customers and employees through email, text messages, social media and other forms of technology.

As new devices that run more applications and have more storage capacity come on the market, the challenges associated with preserving, collecting and producing corporate data will surely increase. This will also increase the importance of bringing outside counsel, in-house counsel, members of the IT department and business people together in teams so they can share their knowledge, experience and perspectives in order to achieve the best, most cost-effective outcomes for their companies.

To learn more about the authors, click here.


About the Contributors

Barclay T. Blair is an advisor to Fortune 500 companies, software and hardware vendors, and government institutions, and is an author, speaker, and internationally recognized authority on information governance. He is the president and founder of ViaLumina and the Executive Director and founder of the Information Governance Initiative.

Stephen Cohen is the records and information manager for MetLife's corporate counsel and compliance departments. Prior work includes establishing and leading Yale University's first ever records management program, where he also served as a university archivist. Stephen earned a master's degree in information science from The University of Texas at Austin, and became a CRM in 2013.

Galina Datskovsky, Ph.D. CRM is currently CEO of Covertix in North America. Formerly Vice President of Information Governance at Autonomy, an HP Company. She is Chair of the board of ARMA International (2012-2013), a not-for-profit Records and Information Management education organization.

Paul Garrison is the Director of Corporate Litigation for Infinity Insurance Company.

Gail Gottehrer is an attorney with Axinn, Veltrop & Harkrider, LLP.

Michael Landau is a Regional Manager with Kiersted Systems.

James Lappin is an independent records management consultant and founder of Thinking Records Ltd.

Sandra Serkes is the President & CEO of Valora Technologies. She is a dynamic leader with an extensive background spanning over twenty years in software marketing, product management and corporate strategy, particularly in document processing, computer telephony and speech recognition.

Mary W. Sherwin, IGP, CIPP/US, has 10 years of experience in Records and Information Management and over 25 years in the field of information technology. Additionally, she is a Board Member and the Executive Vice President of the Chapter.
Committee Reports

Advertising and Promotion Committee, VP Alex Campbell
The following is a summary of what we have been working on as a Committee thus far:

Rate Increase. We have decided to increase sponsorship rates in order to offset the rising cost of space in NYC and to allow us to decrease prices for our membership for all related events. Prices for ARMA@Noon meetings and evening meetings have been raised by $100.00.

Special Events. In addition to our 30+ sponsor slots for evening, ARMA@Noon and networking events we are also committing to two special events: The Golf Outing and an Information Governance Event at Columbia University. Proceeds from both events will go toward initiatives that support students.

Newsletter. The Sponsorship Committee will work with exchange Editor Jennifer Best to ensure that all of our advertisements are current and that sponsors are properly renewing. We will also work to expand our advertiser community.

Event Presence. Our Committee is dedicated to ensuring that sponsor attendees at events are given the highest level of attention and that they derive maximum value.

New Sponsors. As a goal, we have committed to reaching out to 1-2 potential new sponsors per month. We have a nine point checklist to streamline this process.

Membership Committee, VP Anita Castora, CRM, IGP
Membership - The Chapter currently has 317 members. We had 6 new members join and membership renewals in December and January. We continue to give all new members that attend their first meeting a Chapter Membership Booklet, portfolio and pen, and pin.

Mentor Committee – The Mentor Committee (Lauren Barnes, Fred Grevin and Anita Castora) continue to meet. We are still recruiting and matching protégées and mentors for 2014 Winter Mentor/Protégé Program.

Student Internship Program – We are in the process of determining guidelines and a plan for the Chapter.

Student Education Scholarship
As a team, we decided to offer a
$500 scholarship to Queens College this year from the funds collected in 2013. Queens College was selected due to the Chapter’s successful, close relationship with them through the adjunct professors who are also active committee members.

The scholarship is for students who are interested in pursuing an education in Records Management. Candidates are required to be currently enrolled in Queens College Graduate School for Library and Information Studies or having received their Queens College MLIS within the past twelve months.

The scholarship may be used for pursuing professional development, membership in an applicable professional organization, tuition, books, ARMA Chapter meetings and/or the Chapter’s annual educational conference. The successful candidate is required to write a records management article for exchange, the Chapter’s award-winning Newsletter.

Chief Information Officer, VP Gene Stakhov
Currently, the Chapter’s website platform is being evaluated; there have been several Committee brainstorming sessions thus far. The Committee is also working on a few special Projects regarding the development of a Chapter downloadable mobile OS app and webinar broadcast technology.

Communications Committee, VP Jennifer A. Best
I am pleased to announce that the Newsletter has gone digital! In addition to written articles, the Newsletter now also features video and audio content. Please send me your feedback and ideas; I can be reached at jenniferabest@yahoo.com.

Professional Development Committee, VP– Rudy Moliere
No new activities to report.

Finance Committee, VP Carol Trapano
No new activities to report.

Webmaster, VP Stephen Cohen
No new activities to report.

Collaboration and Public Relations, VP Maribel Rivera
No new activities to report.
Lets Hear from You:
The Reader’s Wall