Agenda Item 1-III.C.

Society of American Archivists
Council Meeting
August 17–18, 2015
Renaissance Cleveland Hotel
Cleveland, Ohio

Archives and Archivists Discussion List Terms of Participation

(Prepared by Geof Huth, Lisa Mangiafico, Melanie Mueller, and Matt Black)

BACKGROUND

For the past two years, the SAA Council has responded to controversies on the Archives and Archivists (A&A) List, and the terms of participation for that list have been officially modified once. Those previously revised terms included a few imprecise rules as well as statements that did not quite amount to rules, so all issues regarding the management of the list had not been completely addressed. Additionally, Melanie Mueller, the List Coordinator, was spending more time than in the past addressing prohibited behavior on the list. In response to these issues, the SAA Council charged Geof Huth and Lisa Mangiafico with revising the terms of participation, distributing them for outside comment, collecting and assessing the comments, and producing a proposed new set of terms to be voted on at the SAA Council meeting in August 2015.

To that end, Mangiafico and Huth held a telephone meeting with Melanie Mueller and Matt Black, SAA's web and information systems administrator, to develop revisions to the terms of participation. After the completion of these revisions, we posted a call for comments to various places on line, including SAA's website and the listserv itself. Subscribers, members, and interested parties were given until August 3, 2015, to submit responses to the proposed draft via a SurveyMonkey form.

As the comments were received, we arranged them by topic to better assess the comments received. The comments were arranged in a table (see Appendix) that listed the topic, the respondent's name, the comments, a column for Yes (meaning "Agrees with that portion of the terms"), and a column for No (meaning "Does not agree"). On August 4, we reviewed the comments, discussed the value of each of the proposed changes to the draft, considered how better to organize the terms, and produced a revised and streamlined set of terms of participation. (Note that this organized set of comments received is provided in this document—but with all authors' names excised. Almost every respondent provided his or her name.)

DISCUSSION

During this process we made a few structural changes to the terms of participation document:

- Moved the section on “Responsibility of Participants” from the bottom to the top of the document, using this to open the discussion of the general rules governing listserv participation.

- Moved the section on “Netiquette” above the section on “Rules,” to clarify that netiquette constitutes the general attributes of polite online behavior and that the rules constitute the precise means by which SAA requires these rules to be followed on the A&A List.

- Took a paragraph on the procedures for banning of subscribers and expanded it into a section on general “Enforcement” of the terms of participation.

We also implemented a large number of revisions that were suggested by the respondents to the SAA call for comments:

- Added to the principal audience “special collections librarians.”

- Added “archival practice” to the list of expected interests of subscribers.

- Added a notice stating that by posting to the listserv a subscriber is thus giving SAA a perpetual license to keep, manage, and distribute that posted information.

- Added to the “Scope of the List” a sentence that clarifies that the terms of participation are not meant to constrain professional discourse but that a respectful manner is required of subscribers to the list.

- Removed the proposed rule that messages must be designed to trigger discussion, since the posting of announcements or news is as much a valuable contribution to the list.

- Rewrote some rules to focus on what posting and discussion are allowed, rather than what are not.

- Clarified a few potentially ambiguous statements.

- Added a couple of lines of general netiquette.

- Increased the number of allowable original postings to the list from three to five in any twenty-four-hour period, and clarified that there were no limits to the number of responses to postings to a list in a twenty-four-hour period.

- Continued to require the posting of full URLs to any outside content (for archival reasons), but also changed the rule to allow the addition of shortened URLs (for short-term use and ease of use).

- Eliminated one of the proposed “headings” (Query) to use to identify types of postings and allow for quicker assessment of postings by subscribers. (The team decided to keep the rules requiring the use of Announce, Job, and News, because the team believed it important to test

the efficacy of this idea. However, a number of respondents suggested that the use of any such headings was not a good idea.)

- Softened the rule requiring the deletion of extraneous text in messages, based on the fact that this is difficult to do in mobile environments, and promised that SAA would re-evaluate and possibly eliminate this rule entirely once it had the technical infrastructure to address this itself from its end.

- Softened the requirement that messages not be formatted in HTML code, since it is a default setting in many email environments.

We also copy edited the terms to make them shorter, less redundant, and clearer and moved some rules to general Netiquette and some provisions of Netiquette to Rules.

We believe that the resulting rules are fair, provide a balanced compromise position on many fronts, and will help ensure a better professional environment on the A&A List. We ask that the SAA Council approve the amended terms of participation.

Based on the comments of one respondent, we also suggest that the Council consider conducting a simple evaluation of the efficacy of these changes. For the Council's discussion:

> It would be beneficial to create an evaluation/assessment plan and specific benchmark-able outcomes to analyze the effect that having a ToP [terms of participation] has on the listserv to answer whether or not this is successful for the end goal of being a place "to foster discussion of archives and archives issues, including all aspects of the theory and practice of the archives profession." This could include the number of emails, original posters, response rates, diversity of users, etc. This could also be the data that SAA uses to prove what works/what doesn't with regards to its current audience pool and also can help inform individual users what the bigger pictures looks like.

FOR COUNCIL DISCUSSION OR ACTION

1. Are the revisions of the terms of participation acceptable to the Council, with or without further changes?

2. Should the SAA Council conduct an evaluation of the success of the revised terms of participation?

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Archives and Archivists List Terms of Participation, as revised, be adopted ([ ] = deletion, underline = addition):

Revised Archives and Archivists List Terms of Participation

(Revised as of 6 August 2015)

NB: The base text of this document is the text of the July 2015 revision to the terms of participation. Text proposed for removal appears within square brackets, and text proposed for insert is underlined. A clean version of the revised text, one not showing the edits, follows this version.

Background [and Mission]

The Archives and Archivists (A&A) List was established in 1989 by Donna Harlan and John Harlan as an open forum for all topics relating to archival theory and practice. Over the years, A&A has had various homes. In late 1993, the list [was] migrated to Miami University. In 1998, the Society of American Archivists (SAA) assumed sponsorship of the list as a service to the archives profession. It remained hosted at Miami University under the stewardship of Robert M. Schmidt until September 2006, at which time SAA assumed full ownership of the list and responsibility for its ongoing maintenance.

Audience

The principal audience[s include] <u>for the list is</u> archivists, <u>special collections librarians</u>, archival educators, and students enrolled in graduate archival education courses and programs. The list is open to all individuals with an interest in the archives profession, <u>archival practice</u>, and [in] the preservation and promotion of archival materials. SAA membership is not required for participation in the list. [Participants are required, however, to "register" with the Society of American Archivists. Please see "Responsibilities of Participants" below.]

Responsibility of Participants

Participants agree to restrict their messages to the scope of the list, to follow SAA's Code of Conduct (<u>http://www2.archivists.org/statements/saa-code-of-conduct</u>) and generally accepted principles of netiquette, to respect the interests and rights of other participants and of the Society of American Archivists, and to respect the law. Participants are solely responsible for their postings.

By subscribing to the A&A List, participants grant SAA permission to record essential contact information (e.g., names and email addresses) in its central database. Personal contact information will be administered in strict accordance with SAA's Privacy and Confidentiality Policy (<u>http://www.archivists.org/privacy.asp</u>).

<u>Anyone posting to the list grants SAA and the list subscribers a perpetual, non-exclusive, irrevocable license to display, copy, publish, distribute, transmit, print, preserve, and use such information or material in any manner without payment or any other compensation to the posting party.</u>

Scope of the List

The purpose of the list is to foster discussion of archives and archives issues, including all aspects of the theory and practice of the archives profession. These terms of participation are not intended to constrain scholarly or professional presentation, discourse, or debate, so long as subscribers exchange information in a respectful manner.

Messages [that are] unrelated to the archives profession, such as the following, are off topic and [are] prohibited[.]: [Prohibited subjects include the following:]

- Discussion of the listerv itself or the behavior of individual posters. (Direct complaints or concerns about the list or list netiquette [individuals on the list] to the [list administrators] List Coordinator.)
- Commercial advertisements for goods [and/]or services. (Vendors [are not prohibited from posting] may initiate messages or post responses to list messages, but such postings must [contribute in a useful way to an existing discussion or line of inquiry without attempting] not attempt to sell goods or services.)
- Messages directed to specific individuals, except when these are responses to a posting and intended for the entire list. [(Instead, contact them directly).]
- Personal attacks.
- Political speech unrelated to archival issues, including but not limited to endorsing or attacking a particular political candidate or party, or the views of any candidate or party.
- Virus warnings.

[For those interested in following archives-related news content, we recommend the "Archives in the News" list: https://groups.google.com/forum/#!forum/archives-in-the-news.]

Netiquette

Participants are expected to follow these core rules of listserv netiquette[.]: [See an excerpted version from the book, *Netiquette*, by Virginia Shea at http://www.albion.com/netiquette/corerules.html. Some key points are summarized below *(based on the SAA Visual Materials Section List Terms of Participation)*:]

- [Messages must be designed to trigger discussion through a question or observation, or must further a discussion by adding something new.]
- [Participants must k]Keep in mind that [other] readers may receive and interpret messages in a different context from the author's.
- Participate, but don't dominate. Make space for everyone to contribute to discussion.
- Ensure [Messages, especially] responses[, must be] are long enough to be understandable and [they must] include enough of the original message to provide context.
- Avoid inflammatory remarks of a personal nature[. Similarly], and be slow to take offense when reading a message. [In general, a]Assume that an individual has good intentions when posting a message but that the medium [the rapidity of the medium, the lack of visual cues, and other factors] may make an [otherwise] innocent message seem insulting.

- [Participants must c]Consider whether [their reply] a message is of interest to the list as a whole before posting it.
- Ensure subject lines accurately represent the content of the message.

[General] Specific Rules

All list subscribers must follow these [general] specific rules to [help] ensure the value of the list to all subscribers:

- [Do not post more than three] Post no more than five original postings to the list in any twenty-four-hour period. There are no limits to responses to postings.
- [Do not post shortened hyperlinks to the list (such as those produced by bit.ly, Google URL Shortener, or TinyURL).] When pointing to an online resource, [A]always [use] include the entire original URL[on the original site], which allows subscribers to see where the link is sending them and which documents the original source for archival purposes. In addition, shortened hyperlinks (by bit.ly, Google URL Shortener, TinyURL, etc.) may also be included for ease of use.
- To help [other] subscribers quickly evaluate their interest in a posting, include the following headings[, when appropriate,] at the beginning of the subject lines of [relevant] applicable postings:
    - "ANNOUNCE:" at the front of any announcement for a conference, workshop, exhibition, or other event or release
    - "JOB:" at the front of any job posting
    - "NEWS:" at the front of any news item
    - ["QUERY:" at the front of any posting asking a question of the list]

  [Note that these headings must be used for all relevant postings, but headings do not otherwise need to be used. However, participants] Subscribers [can] may also create and use other short headings if they believe them to be helpful to others.
- [Links to external content (such as articles, news, blog posts, and announcements) without relevant commentary intended to promote are prohibited.]
- Delete extraneous text from [the previous] a message[s] when you are responding to make reading the message easier for [the] other subscribers. [Do not include the full text of long messages.] (Given that deleting such text can be onerous in mobile environments, SAA will correct a poster for breaking this rule only in extreme circumstances. SAA currently does not have the technical capability to address this issue at its end. Once it does, SAA will re-evaluate this rule and consider its elimination.)
- Avoid posting [styled text (]messages formatted with HTML code[) to the list], if possible, as many email readers and the list's digest readers are unable to read these messages easily.

Copyright

As a professional association concerned with protecting intellectual property rights of authors whose works are held in archival repositories, SAA expects participants to set a high standard of respect for copyright. Copyrighted material beyond brief quotations must not be posted to the A&A List without first securing the appropriate permissions.

Enforcement

The Archives & Archivists List is a professional forum. If a subscriber breaks any of the rules of the list, the List Coordinator will remind that person of the rules off list. If a subscriber breaks the rules persistently, the List Coordinator will send the individual subscriber a warning. All enforcement of the rules of the list will be conducted off list.

SAA reserves the right to block or permanently remove participants if off-topic or abusive messages threaten to disrupt the functioning of the list. SAA may also block or remove participants for violating the copyright of others or for any other actions that do not conform to these Terms of Participation.

Punitive action is rare and generally follows wanton and/or persistent disregard for these Terms of Participation. In order to ensure due process, punitive action shall take place only after formal notification of an infraction and initiation of a 90-day probation period. Upon additional misconduct within the 90 days, an individual may be banned by approval of the Council. Misconduct after the 90 days will result in a one-year probation. (Upon misconduct within this longer probationary period, an individual may also be banned by approval of the Council.)

A banned subscriber may petition the Council for reinstatement after one year. Such appeals must be accompanied by a written and signed statement agreeing to comply with the Terms of Participation.

List Ownership

The Archives & Archivists List is owned by the Society of American Archivists. The SAA Council is charged with setting policy on the list. Two Council members are assigned the responsibility of monitoring the list and making recommendations for responses on behalf of the Council when issues arise. The A&A List Coordinator, reporting to SAA's Executive Director, oversees the daily operations of the list, including assisting participants with their subscriptions and enforcing the Terms of Participation.

A&A List Coordinator: Melanie Mueller (mmueller@archivists.org)

Disclaimer

The opinions expressed on the Archives & Archivists List do not necessarily represent those of SAA and are not endorsed by the Society.

Revised Archives and Archivists List Terms of Participation

(Revised as of 6 August 2015)

NB: This is the clean version of the text.

Background

The Archives and Archivists (A&A) List was established in 1989 by Donna Harlan and John Harlan as an open forum for all topics relating to archival theory and practice. Over the years, A&A has had various homes. In late 1993, the list migrated to Miami University. In 1998, the Society of American Archivists (SAA) assumed sponsorship of the list as a service to the archives profession. It remained hosted at Miami University under the stewardship of Robert M. Schmidt until September 2006, at which time SAA assumed full ownership of the list and responsibility for its ongoing maintenance.

Audience

The principal audience for the list is archivists, special collections librarians, archival educators, and students enrolled in graduate archival education courses and programs. The list is open to all individuals with an interest in the archives profession, archival practice, and the preservation and promotion of archival materials. SAA membership is not required for participation in the list.

Responsibility of Participants

Participants agree to restrict their messages to the scope of the list, to follow SAA's Code of Conduct (http://www2.archivists.org/statements/saa-code-of-conduct) and generally accepted principles of netiquette, to respect the interests and rights of other participants and of the Society of American Archivists, and to respect the law. Participants are solely responsible for their postings.

By subscribing to the A&A List, participants grant SAA permission to record essential contact information (e.g., names and email addresses) in its central database. Personal contact information will be administered in strict accordance with SAA's Privacy and Confidentiality Policy (http://www.archivists.org/privacy.asp).

Anyone posting to the list grants SAA and the list subscribers a perpetual, non-exclusive, irrevocable license to display, copy, publish, distribute, transmit, print, preserve, and use such information or material in any manner without payment or any other compensation to the posting party.

Scope of the List

The purpose of the list is to foster discussion of archives and archives issues, including all aspects of the theory and practice of the archives profession. These terms of participation are not intended to constrain scholarly or professional presentation, discourse, or debate, so long as subscribers exchange information in a respectful manner.

Messages unrelated to the archives profession, such as the following, are off topic and prohibited:

- Discussion of the listerv itself or the behavior of individual posters. (Direct complaints or concerns about the list or list netiquette to the List Coordinator.)
- Commercial advertisements for goods or services. (Vendors may initiate messages or post responses to list messages, but such postings must not attempt to sell goods or services.)
- Messages directed to specific individuals, except when these are responses to a posting and intended for the entire list.
- Personal attacks.
- Political speech unrelated to archival issues, including but not limited to endorsing or attacking a particular political candidate or party, or the views of any candidate or party.
- Virus warnings.

Netiquette

Participants are expected to follow these core rules of listserv netiquette:

- Keep in mind that readers may receive and interpret messages in a different context from the author's.
- Participate, but don't dominate. Make space for everyone to contribute to discussion.
- Ensure responses are long enough to be understandable and include enough of the original message to provide context.
- Avoid inflammatory remarks of a personal nature, and be slow to take offense when reading a message. Assume that an individual has good intentions when posting a message but that the medium may make an innocent message seem insulting.
- Consider whether a message is of interest to the list as a whole before posting it.
- Ensure subject lines accurately represent the content of the message.

Specific Rules

All list subscribers must follow these specific rules to ensure the value of the list to all subscribers:

- Post no more than five original postings to the list in any twenty-four-hour period. There are no limits to responses to postings.
- When pointing to an online resource, always include the entire original URL, which allows subscribers to see where the link is sending them and which documents the original source for archival purposes. In addition, shortened hyperlinks (by bit.ly, Google URL Shortener, TinyURL, etc.) may also be included for ease of use.
- To help subscribers quickly evaluate their interest in a posting, include the following headings at the beginning of the subject lines of applicable postings:
    - "ANNOUNCE:" at the front of any announcement for a conference, workshop, exhibition, or other event or release

    - "JOB:" at the front of any job posting
    - "NEWS:" at the front of any news item

  Subscribers may also create and use other short headings if they believe them to be helpful to others.
- Delete extraneous text from a message when you are responding to make reading the message easier for other subscribers. (Given that deleting such text can be onerous in mobile environments, SAA will correct a poster for breaking this rule only in extreme circumstances. SAA currently does not have the technical capability to address this issue at its end. Once it does, SAA will re-evaluate this rule and consider its elimination.)
- Avoid posting messages formatted with HTML code, if possible, as many email readers and the list's digest readers are unable to read these messages easily.

Copyright

As a professional association concerned with protecting intellectual property rights of authors whose works are held in archival repositories, SAA expects participants to set a high standard of respect for copyright. Copyrighted material beyond brief quotations must not be posted to the A&A List without first securing the appropriate permissions.

Enforcement

The Archives & Archivists List is a professional forum. If a subscriber breaks any of the rules of the list, the List Coordinator will remind that person of the rules off list. If a subscriber breaks the rules persistently, the List Coordinator will send the individual subscriber a warning. All enforcement of the rules of the list will be conducted off list.

SAA reserves the right to block or permanently remove participants if off-topic or abusive messages threaten to disrupt the functioning of the list. SAA may also block or remove participants for violating the copyright of others or for any other actions that do not conform to these Terms of Participation.

Punitive action is rare and generally follows wanton and/or persistent disregard for these Terms of Participation. In order to ensure due process, punitive action shall take place only after formal notification of an infraction and initiation of a 90-day probation period. Upon additional misconduct within the 90 days, an individual may be banned by approval of the Council. Misconduct after the 90 days will result in a one-year probation. (Upon misconduct within this longer probationary period, an individual may also be banned by approval of the Council.)

A banned subscriber may petition the Council for reinstatement after one year. Such appeals must be accompanied by a written and signed statement agreeing to comply with the Terms of Participation.

List Ownership

The Archives & Archivists List is owned by the Society of American Archivists. The SAA Council is charged with setting policy on the list. Two Council members are assigned the

responsibility of monitoring the list and making recommendations for responses on behalf of the Council when issues arise. The A&A List Coordinator, reporting to SAA's Executive Director, oversees the daily operations of the list, including assisting participants with their subscriptions and enforcing the Terms of Participation.

A&A List Coordinator: Melanie Mueller (mmueller@archivists.org)

Disclaimer

The opinions expressed on the Archives & Archivists List do not necessarily represent those of SAA and are not endorsed by the Society.

Appendix

Responses to SAA Proposed A&A List Terms of Participation

Received as of 4 August 2015

The following is a list of all the responses received by SAA to its July 2015 call for comments on the proposed new terms of participation for the Archives and Archivists List. These comments have been stripped of their authors' names and arranged by topic for better assessment. Note that a check in the column for Yes means that the respondent was generally in agreement with that part of the new terms of participation and that a No means the respondent was general opposed to it.

Issue	Yes	No	Response
General		X	My general feeling is that these rules and its enforcement are too strict. I feel that the social environment that these terms of participation creates is not participatory or inclusive and it makes me hesitate to respond to the list, as I feel anxiety over whether or not I'm following rules. Overall, I feel that these terms may end up stifling more voices, instead of promoting an equal platform, which would be the opposite of what ToP originally intended. In my opinion, if you want to create a policy that ensures ease of use to a certain user group (in this case, digest subscribers), then you must consider equal ease of use to another user group (e.g., mobile users), and if you can't accommodate that, whether financially or technically, then the policy inherently is biased and results in one group being marginalized in favor of another.
General		X	1. I have been a dues paying member of SAA for over 40 years. The List is now my primary benefit. And the value of the List decreased significantly with the last revision of terms of service and this proposal is likely to be the last straw in persuading me not to renew.
General		X	Overall: Nice try, but the tone is insufferably absolute. The comments of the moderator are frequently the same. Can't you be a little more positive? I subscribe to a number of lists, all of which get along without the constant interference and self-reflection that this list seems to suffer from. I used to subscribe to Ex Libris and dropped it in the 1990s because some people were so unpleasant. It has now improved, and I resubscribed. I subscribe to A&A because I need the information on it to properly supervise my department, but at this point in time I have very little interest in ever meeting the people who post on it.
General		X	Why did someone spend time writing this? The more you limit discussion on the list the more I want to leave. I hope you will

Issue	Yes	No	Response
			reevaluate your priorities instead of having a bunch of rule hungry contributions.
General		X	I think some of these changes (bitly, no more than 3 posts, etc.) seem to be directed towards the actions of a few specific individuals and to me are in particularly bad taste. I belong to a lot of lists as that is an easy way to see/read/share info but all the fuss over this one is not only making me think about whether to continue subscribing (even though I find the posts, especially Peter's, interesting) because of the restrictions that keep appearing. I'm also rethinking my SAA membership because most of this seems petty and unnecessary and if this is how SAA chooses to reflect its actions, not sure I want to be affiliated with this group any longer. This is the most restrictive list I've ever seen and it just keeps getting worse. Yet it was founded in the spirit of sharing information about the broader world of archives which certainly no longer seems to be the driving force behind it. I really don't get the point and why people don't just choose to use delete for anything they don't want to read. That's the way the real world works. But this is really getting tiring and reflects poorly on SAA in my opinion. This is supposed to be an information forum but it seems to be anything but for the past few years as people get punished for trying to share information in an efficient way. I don't read every article in the daily newspaper either and I certainly don't expect them to publish only things I might be interested in. I skip the things I'm not interested in and read those that I am. Will think long and hard when I get my renewal this year. Perhaps I just found a way to save some money. I do not support these additional restrictions that are being proposed and truly find this effort most distasteful.
General		X	I would comment but I don't feel it would do any good. You have made the decisions just like you made them in the past. Too bad. The list used to provide a sense of community for archivists. But let's face it, Friday funnies and flowers were toxic. Couldn't have that now could we??
General		X	Yes, we also should learn to use better subject labeling, and yes, we should learn to delete the excess conversations when replying and yes, I should floss each and every day. Archivists are human, and we often fail. Concentrate on the treating others decently. Concentrate on the talking about archives.
General		X	overall SAA's attempts to control the A&A list have done nothing more than slowly strangle a once vibrant community because a minority of individuals didn't believe it was "professional". Rules have been put in place and yet everyday the rules are ignored.

Issue	Yes	No	Response
General	X		Overall, I think the terms look good.
General	X		Looks pretty good to me. To emphasize the fact that meaningful debate and honest statements of disagreement are permitted on the email list as long as they stay on topic and don't get personal,
General	X		I generally think these terms of participation are good.
General	X		The terms as listed seem very clear to me and require only common sense for successful interpretation.
General	X		I think these are very good guidelines.
General	X		My thanks to whomever has compiled this draft, it's been a long time coming.
General	X		My only concern with the revised terms is the following statement, in the Scope of the List section:
General	X		I think this is a very good draft of the rules which, if applied, would create a listserv I'd be happier to be a part of.
General	X		Excellent. Understadable. And, I look forward to shorter message strings.
General	X		I applaud these terms of participation.
General	X		I think this is a fantastic revision, and hope it will improve the listserv.
General	X		I applaud this revision which tightens SAA's control over the list to attempt insuring that the list does not unduly undermine SAA's professional stature and mission given it is the list owner. I expect SAA will receive a number of VERY angry reactions to these new terms, but I hope Council will remember that no matter how many such messages it receives they will still represent only a tiny fraction of list subscribers much less those who (like me) monitor the list archives or SAA members who have turned their backs on the list in disgust.
General	X		I support all aspects of SAA's proposed new version of the A&A Listserv Terms of Participation (ToP). They appear to me largely to be efforts at clarifying existing elements in the current ToP. As with the terms approved last year, I appreciate SAA's efforts to make the Listserv a safe, welcoming professional space for discussion of a wide range of records, archives, and related issues. We subscribers can help by doing what we can. I explain in a blog post about information asymmetry and the limits of "crowd correction" why mitigation is necessary and what individuals can do in posting to the List.

Issue	Yes	No	Response
			https://nixonara.wordpress.com/2015/08/02/its-highly-individual/ The issue of context is especially important, given the harm done by posting context-free partisan commentary. The op ed I mention in my blog post is this one about AOTUS David S. Ferriero, posted by a subscriber on July 29, 2014. http://forums.archivists.org/read/messages?id=130914#130914 As I mention in my blog post, curation of shared news links is highly individual. Inflammatory content of that type, shared without the poster explaining how the Federal Records Act and NARA work, is particularly troubling. We in Fedland can't always respond and sometimes simply let such pitches in the dirt fall as they may. But we can lead by example and post our own news links with context. This I have sought to do in the last year and hope others will, as well. Thanks again for your good efforts and continued work to ensure professionalism and inclusiveness on A&A.
General	X		Love it! I don't think it'll change A&A List behavior and SAA may end up needing to opt for time-consuming moderation of the type done for the ExLibris list, but the revised Terms of Participation for the A&A List are clear and to the point.
General	X		Thank-you for all the work to draft these revised terms of participation. You have outlined clear expectations which will hopefully bring the A and A list back to a space where productive communication within the profession may occur. I fully support these changes and look forward to rejoining the list.
General (Suggestion: "Should" instead of "Must")		X	Netiquette - I note a lot of 'should' has been replace by 'must'. In virtually all these cases using 'should' would be preferable. Shortened hyperlinks - use of such should not be prohibited as long as a full version is also provided. Message Headings - use of them would be best described as a strong request rather than a 'must' requirement.
General (Suggestion: "Should" instead of "Must")		X	5. Instead of using the term "must follow," you should use a phrase such as "should usually follow." Sometimes it is good to think and act outside of the box.
General (Reference to Humor)	X		I think this revision is excellent. I'm glad to see that archives-related humor is no longer banned :)
General (Suggestion:	X		2. General rules, it would be preferable to change the phrases to a positive statement, then to start with "Do not..."; this is a very important message conveyed to teachers-in-training when discussing classroom discipline and getting children to comply... eg "Refrain

Issue	Yes	No	Response
Rephrase General Rules)			from posting more than three"... conveys the same message, but is more likely to achieve compliance.
General (Suggestion: Eliminate Contradictory Rules)	X		However, the rules still contradict themselves. You can't say postings are limited to JOB, ANNOUNCE, and NEWS and then say: "Messages must be designed to trigger discussion through a question or observation, or must further a discussion by adding something new." By definition posting a JOB or ANNOUNCEMENT is not designed to trigger discussion, but to promote information that a variety/majority of subscribers are interested in knowing about.
General (Suggestion: Add Special Collections Librarians as a Principal Audience)	X		Under "Audience," I've included additional verbiage in CAPS. I felt that the field should be expanded to cover these groups: The principal audiences include archivists AND SPECIAL COLLECTIONS LIBRARIANS IN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS, archival educators, and students enrolled in graduate archival education courses and programs. The list is open to all individuals with an interest in the archives profession, ARCHIVAL PRACTICE, and in the preservation and promotion of archival materials. SAA membership is not required for participation in the list. Participants are required, however, to "register" with the Society of American Archivists. Please see "Responsibilities of Participants" below
General (Suggestion: Evaluate Success of ToPs)	X		2) It would be beneficial to create an evaluation/assessment plan and specific benchmark-able outcomes to analyze the affect that having a ToP has on the listserv to answer whether or not this is successful for the end goal of being a place "to foster discussion of archives and archives issues, including all aspects of the theory and practice of the archives profession." This could include the number of emails, original posters, response rates, diversity of users, etc. This could also be the data that SAA uses to prove what works/what doesn't with regards to its current audience pool and also can help inform individual users what the bigger pictures looks like.
General (Suggestion: Steer Away from Strict Rules)	X		1) Please steer away from strict rules and reframe the expectations of list participation as less absolute - e.g., more "netiquette," less "rules." This will provide some room for diverse circumstances, resulting in less anxiety about admonishment and more participation by a variety of voices. As part of this, please reconsider the communication methods to those who may forget the netiquette. While well-meaning, the individual emails/responses when someone forgets to delete all text can feel very shaming and discourages diverse participation.
3-Post Limit		X	1. If the list is to be an "open forum for all topics relating to archival theory and practice" then do not limit postings. The "three original

Issue	Yes	No	Response
			postings in a 24 hour period" requirement is just ridiculous. Besides the futility of trying to monitor these, it reeks of censorship.
3-Post Limit		X	"Do not post more than three original postings to the list in any twenty-four hour period."
3-Post Limit		X	2. The proposed 3-original message per 24-hour period is silly. Many current and past participants regularly have more to contribute on any given day.
3-Post Limit		X	I do not agree with the following changes: Do not post more than three original postings to the list in any twenty-four hour period.
3-Post Limit		X	POSTING LIMIT: I think this would hinder discussions on "hot" topics. Let the list itself do some regulating, because people who post too much do get gently chided by others.
3-Post Limit		X	Not sure why you need to limit to 3 postings per person per day.
3-Post Limit		X	I do not understand the intent of the first General Rule "Do not post more than three original postings to the list in any twenty-four hour period." The implication is that professional archivists will never have four or more interesting things to say in the same day, which is probably easy to disprove.
3-Post Limit		X	I don't understand the restriction to three original posts per day. I have found when dealing with archival issues in the past, rather than write out a predicament and all of my questions and difficulties, I get a better response if I split my questions into parts and send out requests for help related to part of the problem or issue. This restriction seems designed to limit rather than encourage dialogue. Who wants to worry about they number of emails they've sent when they have a problem to resolve?
3-Post Limit		X	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the A&A List Terms of Participation. I suggest that these terms be eliminated: "Do not post more than three original postings to the list in any twenty-four hour period." This restricts those that may have relevant issues to discuss with fellow archives professionals, and has an element of censorship;
3-Post Limit		X	I do not agree with limiting posts to 3 original posts within 24 hours. Yes, there are some VERY active participants on the listserv, but if people don't want to read their posts they can filter them or just delete

Issue	Yes	No	Response
			them - that's what I do. Sometimes I do read a post or two from the very active users.
3-Post Limit		X	Only 3 postings in 24 hours? I disagree with that one, especially,
3-Post Limit		X	However, there should not be a limit on the number of unique posts within any specified period. Should archivist have to chose whether to announce an event or ask a question because they have posted too often to the list on a particular day? No. There should be no limit on professional discussions and notices for the good of the archives community. All other provisions in this latest proposed version of the listserv's terms of participation seem similar or exactly the same as previous versions.
3-Post Limit		X	1. (from Scope of the List) "For those interested in following archives-related news content, we recommend the 'Archives in the News' list: https://groups.google.com/forum/#!forum/archives-in-the-news" and (from General Rules) "Do not post more than three original postings to the list in any twenty-four hour period" imply that the RAIN postings by Peter Kurilecz (and others) are no longer welcome. Not a good choice: these collections of news provide valuable information which would be difficult or time-consuming for others to obtain. And no, it is NOT convenient to go to the Google group instead!
3-Post Limit		X	Yet more restrictions about "the" list. I really have concerns about only allowing 3 posts per day for any one individual member. Yes, there are folks that post more than others, but people, like me who lurk, listen to the exchanges and learn--or delete. If there is a thread of interesting information on a problem or a current event, the discussion should go on. An arbitrary rule of three per day seems low. And what is a day...a work day...a 24-hour period from what hour to what hour?
3-Post Limit		X	Procedurally, it would be a lot easier to review the new version if we could have a redline copy that showed what was changed. I think that should be standard procedure for this kind of thing. Overall, though, I think these are solid recommendations. I would, however, strike the item "Do not post more than three original postings to the list in any twenty-four hour period" -- this seems needlessly micromanaging and difficult to enforce.
3-Post Limit		X	After receiving numerous private emails asking me what is going on, I'm honored that SAA wants to put into effect two new rules that are aimed directly at me "Do not post more than three original postings to the list in any twenty-four hour period." yes I will occasionally post more than one message to the list. those that are annoyed by my postings should just set up a rule that automagically deletes my messages before they even see them. I do this for a couple of

Issue	Yes	No	Response
			individuals and it is not hard to do. Now if this rule is because of technology issues then SAA should make people aware that that is what is the problem, but then why not limit the number of replies that someone can post. I suspect that this is not the case.
3-Post Limit		X	Two changes in the listserve guidelines do cause me some concern. One is the limit of three messages in a 24 hour period. There has been some interesting discussion of issues pertaining to copyright and other issues that have fostered dialogue, and helpful dialogue. Plus folks like Peter K. do share relevant news articles and there can be more than three in a 24 hour period. While I can understand the abuse that could engender such a rule, I have not seen it on this list!
3-Post Limit		X	"Do not post more than three original postings to the list in any twenty-four hour period." -- This seems arbitrary and unnecessary. I presume the intent is to limit so called spam but comes across as limiting open discussion and sharing of information.
3-Post Limit (Suggestion: Raise Limit to 5)		X	I don't see the need for the requirement for only three original postings a day. My understanding is that SAA's purpose in changing the listserv last year was to encourage more discussion and participation and to reduce clutter that might impede more participation. By moving most of the news items to the Google list, I think the activity level was reduced. I haven't seen increased discussion and participation since then, however. If you want to include a restriction for daily original postings, I would suggest a limit of five.
3-Post Limit	X		I especially like the 'no posting 3 original posts in a 24 hour period' and prohibiting the use of URL shorteners, as that is a security concern.
3-Post Limit	X		The "no more than three in 24 hours" is most welcome!
3-Post Limit (Suggestion: Rephrase Slightly)	X		I also concur with the limit to 3 original posts in 24 hours - I think that's more than reasonable. I would ask only for a one word insertion and that would be the following: Where the terms say: Links to external content (such as articles, news, blog posts, and announcements) without relevant commentary intended to promote discussion are prohibited. Would it be possible to add the word "original" between relevant and commentary so that it reads as follows?: Links to external content (such as articles, news, blog posts, and announcements) without relevant original commentary intended to promote discussion are prohibited. I find simple inclusion of lead-in article text rarely promotes discussion without a comment on why that article stands out to the person posting it or how it might affect or be of interest to the archival community reading the post. Furthermore that language seems not to have resonated thus far. As to the current

Issue	Yes	No	Response
			rants about these terms that are going on right now on the list - more reason to implement the new terms. I believe the list has been more than gracious by directing people to the google group for strictly news-related commentary. The news articles can be of value, but the way we are inundated with unidentified sources and selective excerpts really has no place on a general archival discussion list. And I have noticed an uptick in questions and civil discourse since the current terms were implemented. I would expect things to continue on that track with the implementation of these updated terms. Thank you very much. I heartily support these terms of participation.
Define Public Record Status	X		4. Your revised Rules do address this question: Is the material posted on the list considered a "public record"?
Delete Strings		X	As a concrete example, I think that these terms are fashioned to an audience who primarily reads/responds to emails on a computer. To someone reading and responding to emails via mobile device, the accidental "Reply All" is incredibly easy to do, as the reply address is the group, not the OP address (copying/pasting email addresses is not easy in many mail clients). Additionally, trying to go through and delete previous email text is not only challenging to physically complete, but also very difficult to remember when text is hidden in most mobile email clients (out of sight, out of mind).
Delete Strings	X		Also, I appreciate the reminder to snip the rest of the message thread when replying to a post: that's just a nightmare when you read in digest form! Thank you for refining the rules.
Delete Strings (Suggestion: Revise Rule on Quoting Text)	X		I would recommend changing the beginning of the second General Rule to read "Do not quote the full text of long messages." This will clarify the intent.
Delete Strings (Suggestion: Revise Rule on Quoting Text)	X		I completely support the rule about not including full texts in messages. In fact, I would specifically note that no post will be published if it includes the full text.
Don't Include Full Text of Long Messages		X	The only beef I have with the revised terms of participation is with this provision: "Do not include the full text of long messages. Delete extraneous text from the previous messages to make reading the message easier for the other subscribers." Unless there is a storage reason why we'd be required to do this, I don't like this idea. I like having the full thread of a discussion in one email. I can read the last email in the thread and have a full record of what has been discussed. Digest subscribers that find this annoying should be advised to subscribe to the list via RSS feed or to create a rule in their email

Issue	Yes	No	Response
			client that redirects individual messages from the inbox to another folder. I know old habits die hard, but these are clearly superior ways to engage with the listserv. Thanks for asking!
Enforcement of Rules (Suggestion: Clarify Enforcement Mechanisms)	X		I unsubscribed to the listserv a little over a year ago because of how ridiculous the discussion got, although I still check in on the webpage with all of the posts, and if rules like these were enforced, it would make the listserv better. What are the mechanisms for enforcement, though? Will complaints about a person's behavior lead to any result? Will it be easy to find who to contact about someone who isn't following the rules, and will that person be reprimanded? How many times does someone have to break the rules before they get banned, if that would ever happen? It would be good to know these sorts of things. Thanks.
Enforcement of Rules (Suggestion: Clarify Enforcement Mechanisms)	X		I'm slightly concerned about the amount of list management that may be necessary to bring the list in line with the new formatting rule for headings.
Enforcement of Rules (Suggestion: Clarify Enforcement Mechanisms)	X		Also, Peter K's passive-aggressive behavior about wanting to see these comments and the knowledge that he's often attacked people in the past means I'm glad you did this as private comments. I also think he is the biggest reason why that listserv doesn't get better use, because he knows he can act however he wants, talks snidely, etc., and does so. So people leave. His actions regarding these comments being closed are just a microcosm of why he's so toxic and why I've barely stayed subscribed. He periodically scolds people about conversations taking place in other locations, but he's the #1 reason I'm disinclined to use the listserv. Can he be moderated? Will he actually be temporarily banned if he doesn't follow the rules so that he knows they apply to him?
Headings		X	4. Use of headings - there are very few posts that I find that the subject line does not already convey that information. If these headings stand, under which would Maarja's posts belong? Would Announce be used for a new OCLC report for example? Or would they not get a heading at all? It's not that clear.
Headings		X	3. Use of subject lines such as "ANNOUNCE, JOB, NEWS". I see it's listed as a suggestion. I don't post to the list enough to remember to do this so please don't ban anyone from the list for not using your prescribed terms. As the Terms state, this is a "professional forum."

Issue	Yes	No	Response
			Let's quit the childish antics and knee-jerk reactions. This professional has had enough.
Headings		X	I think that this is a bit of overkill. I'm never going to remember to add the little subject titles into my email subject line. I'm not sure what's driving the need for this change. As a museum archivist, I subscribe to several listservs both in and out of SAA. I quickly scan and delete any irrelevant message when I go through my email. I agree in principle with the other ideas other than the three email limit. What's that all about? Do as you will, but if the rules become childish, I'll just unsubscribe.
Headings		X	AND we don't need a heading such as "NEWS" to tell us that it's news.
Headings		X	1. I query the wording of the prohibited subject, "Messages directed to specific individuals. (Instead, contact them directly)." If I ask a question to the list (which I have done), on one level any answers are directed to me specifically. I also subscribe to several UK listservs and find it disappointing when questions are asked of the list, people reply directly to the requester, so the list subscribers as a whole miss out on the variety of answers and perhaps some new learning.
Headings		X	Also under "General Rules", the requirement that any question to the list have the QUERY at the beginning of the subject line seems unnecessary. As the list is intended to be a resource for discussions of archival practice, questions and requests for input about particular input would be expected to be the most common types of postings. Having to tag them with QUERY seems redundant and burdensome.
Headings	X		The idea of topic headings - e.g., JOBS - is excellent.
Headings	X		Brief comments on the proposed changes: I think the headings suggestions for the subject lines are good and would be helpful.
Headings	X		I like the suggestion of headings for different post types. As someone who receives the digest version, it would make it much easier to quickly glance at the post titles to see what posts are about and if they are useful to me.
Headings	X		I really like the headings idea, I think that'll help a good bit in figuring out what posts are about. I might even be willing to subscribe on an individual post basis if that takes off.
Headings (with Revision)	X		While I support the idea of using specific words in subjects of messages to help categorize them (though it may take us a while to build to that point), this part confuses me: "Note that these headings must be used for all relevant postings, but headings do not otherwise

Issue	Yes	No	Response
			need to be used." Are you trying to say that headings aren't necessary for things that aren't news, job, announcements, or queries? Because the way it reads now is that if a post isn't relevant to the A&A listserv, you don't need to use the specified heading--but if a post is not relevant, you shouldn't be posting it to the listserv at all, according to the terms of participation. So I'm suggesting you reword that sentence to clarify.
Headings (Suggestion: Renaming Headings in Replies)	X		Also, I do not see any rules regarding renaming headers in subsequent replies (the two big times it comes up are when the subject of a discussion changes significantly, or when replies made to digest emails are automatically titled after the digest by one's email client). I consider that a relatively minor issue, but it's one I've seen come up in other listserv discussions.
Headings (Suggestion: Headings to only Job and Announce)	X		HEADINGS: Can we limit this to just Job and Announce? It seems Query and News are the whole purpose of the list. Then you might as well say every post must use a standard form.
HTML Code in Messages		X	3. (from General Rules) "Avoid posting styled text (messages formatted with HTML code) to the list, as many email readers and the digest readers are unable to read these messages easily." The default setting on my Outlook system is for styled text; if I have to switch back and forth between Plain Text and Formatted Text, I'm not going to bother posting messages on the list.
Netiquette	X		Netiquette: Acceptable.
Netiquette (Suggestion: Clarify Requirement to Trigger Discussion)		X	Under "Netiquette", the terms state that "participants are expected to follow the core rules of netiquette," and the first bullet point states that under these core rules "messages should trigger discussion... or should further a discussion..." However, the previous section in the terms ("General Rules") indicates the permissibility of certain types of postings that might not be expected to trigger discussion, including announcements and job postings. Some clarification of this bullet point in the "Netiquette" section might be in order.
No Discussion of List		X	4. The rule against discussing the List on the List is beyond my comprehension. Open and frank discussions (including criticisms) facilitates improvements. Prohibiting such discussions is censorship and contrary to our values.
No Discussion of List		X	I think there's room to have a productive discussion of the list itself. It led to all of this, so it's useful. However, I did delete many of the discussions because they became too negative.

Issue	Yes	No	Response
No Links to External Content w/o Commentary		X	Links to external content (such as articles, news, blog posts, and announcements) without relevant commentary intended to promote discussion are prohibited.
No Links to External Content w/o Commentary		X	This seems extreme: "Links to external content (such as articles, news, blog posts, and announcements) without relevant commentary intended to promote discussion are prohibited."
No Links to External Content w/o Commentary		X	Promotion of newly-processed collections and related blog posts or news announcements about them should not be required to "promote discussion." I appreciate knowing what new collections and finding aids have cropped up, as I can make notes about ones that may have a bearing on my own work, and I won't necessarily have anything to say about them at that moment. Likewise, I like to be able to post links to newly-processed collections and have had people email me thanks for posting them, even though nobody responded to it on the list.
No Links to External Content w/o Commentary		X	"Relevant commentary?" No, this is completely unnecessary and merely clogs up the posting. If I believe a link to an article is relevant, that and the title is enough. We are archivists are smart enough to figure it out from there
No Links to External Content w/o Commentary		X	"Links to external content (such as articles, news, blog posts, and announcements) without relevant commentary intended to promote discussion are prohibited." no matter how much commentary is associated with a post a discussion will not ensue..you can take a horse to water but you can't make them drink. What happens when an individual posts a long message and now discussion ensues? is that allowed? how is that different from posting a snippet of a news stories with a link? I prefer not to post commentary because I wish not to influence people. they need to read the article then if they have an opinion about they can post a response pointing out what they like or don't like. I first started posting news stories back in 1996 (I joined the list well before then), so i'm at the end of 20 years of sharing with other "professionals". This is the only list that I belong to where there has been an active campaign against me. (no i'm not paranoid, just realistic especially when people refer to information as spam). The various rules, codes whatever are nothing more than an effort to slowly strangle a once vibrant sharing community. Congratulations you're almost there.
No Links to External		X	"Links to external content (such as articles, news, blog posts, and announcements) without relevant commentary intended to promote discussion are prohibited." -- This seems at cross purposes to the stated goal of fostering "discussion of archives and archives issues".

Issue	Yes	No	Response
Content w/o Commentary			If no discussion is generated, is that the poster's fault? Also, "relevant commentary" is open to interpretation. While I understand this is intended to moderate list behavior it would seem to leave things terribly open ended and would stifle the sharing of information rather than enhance it.
No Links to External Content w/o Commentary		X	Again, under "General Rules", prohibiting links to external content without commentary that will (or is intended to) promote discussion is an approach that is intended to resolve a particular issue but which will have unintended consequences. Scenario 1: I know about a job posting that might not be considered a traditional archives job, but which I am confident would be of interest to some archivist job-seekers. Knowing that it is not widely posted, or is not posted in the places archivists are likely to searching, I wish to post a brief message with a link to the job posting to alert my fellow archivists about the opportunity. It is not something that I would expect to elicit discussion on the list. I'm not really posting the job announcement since I'm not going to copy and include the full job posting when I just happen to know about the job-- it's not at my organization and all I want to do is send a brief notice to share the information with others. Therefore, what I would be posting would be a link to external content with a very brief comment about what the job is and why it might be of interest to archivists/would benefit from someone with archival experience and training-- there would be no expectation of promoting discussion. According to the rule as written, I would be prohibited from sharing this link with my fellow archivists and we would lose the opportunity of potentially broadening the reach of the archival profession. Scenario 2: One of our archival colleagues in Canada has passed away. I read ARCAN-L, so I learn of his or her passing, and since it he or she is a well-known archival practitioner I am certain that my fellow archivists would like to know the news. Over a week has passed and I have not seen any mention of the news on A&A or from SAA, so I think that I could post a brief message with a link to an obituary or the announcement on the Assn of Canadian Archivists' site. However, only knowing the individual from his or her writings and a conference keynote address, I don't feel that I have any commentary that I can make about the individual. Therefore, I prohibited from sharing an item of interest to the list: although I have some expectation that there may be discussion as a result of my post from other archivists who can share memories and stories about the individual, I'm not allowed to post without commentary (and simply saying "I'm sure my fellow archivists would be like to know that X has passed away" is really not commentary).

Issue	Yes	No	Response
No Links to External Content w/o Commentary	X		Also, I support the posting of news articles when the poster has a comment to make or question to raise about the article or the broader issue at stake--as a subscriber to both the "Archives in the News" and the A&A daily digest, I personally don't need to see the same content twice unless we're going to talk about it via A&A. I do realize this situation is delicate, as the wonderful Archives in the News Content is provided by one individual who may stop at any time, so I hope you'll get useful comments from folks who see this from different perspectives.
No Links to External Content w/o Commentary (Suggestion: Define Relevant Commentary)	X		"Do not post shortened hyperlinks to the list". Shortened hyperlinks are convenient and helpful.; and, "Links to external content without relevant commentary intended to promote discussion are prohibited". This is a very subjective term of participation. What is relevant to one individual may be superfluous to another. Respectfully,
No Links to External Content w/o Commentary (Suggestion: Rephrase)	X		Hi all - I didn't notice this in the draft stage, but you might revisit the wording where it says "Links to external content (such as articles, news, blog posts, and announcements) without relevant commentary intended to promote discussion are prohibited." People post announcements all the time without commentary intended to promote discussion. They might post a link to a job or an event, with commentary explaining the event but not particularly to promote discussion. Splitting hairs, I know, but I can think of someone or two who will jump on that.
No Political Speech Unrelated to Archives	X		The rule about political speech specifically addressing non-archival issues is good, since we need to talk about Walker's recent actions and Clinton's email servers but I don't want that kind of thing to devolve.
No Shortened URLs		X	2. "No shortened hyperlinks". Have you seen the length of some of these website addresses? Please. Let people use bit.ly or you'll be getting complaints about the long web addresses mucking up the listserv.
No Shortened URLs		X	I would definitely like to throw my support behind the decision to disallow shortened URLs. Regardless of how much I might trust the person doing the linking, the services themselves aren't necessarily secure (bit.ly got hacked in 2014, cli.gs in 2009) and they make old emails less useful (when a forwarding service goes down, so do all of its shortened URLs; at least emails with the full URL will tell me where a story was originally posted, even if it moves or becomes unavailable). Additionally, I don't like clicking on links if I can't see where they're taking me. Since there's no 140-character limit to

Issue	Yes	No	Response
			emails, I don't really see the benefit of allowing them. Thanks for all of your hard work!
No Shortened URLs		X	3. The idea of prohibiting shortened hyperlinks is ill considered because they are easier to cut and paste than many full links.
No Shortened URLs		X	3. I don't understand what the problem is with shortened hyperlinks (I have seen bit.ly used on other SAA lists)
No Shortened URLs		X	Personally, I find short URLs fairly helpful. Peter K generally gives both long (so you can see the origin of the post) and short versions.
No Shortened URLs			I especially like the 'no posting 3 original posts in a 24 hour period' and prohibiting the use of URL shorteners, as that is a security concern.
No Shortened URLs		X	Do not post shortened hyperlinks to the list (such as those produced by bit.ly, Google URL Shortener, or TinyURL). Always use the entire URL on the original site, which allows subscribers to see where the link is sending them.
No Shortened URLs		X	Disagree with the no shortened URL/bit.ly etc. because otherwise you get grotesquely long URLS that get chopped up in the message and can't be easily followed by a click.
No Shortened URLs		X	I disagree with that one, especially, and the one about full URLs.
No Shortened URLs		X	2. (from General Rules) "Do not post shortened hyperlinks to the list (such as those produced by bit.ly, Google URL Shortener, or TinyURL). Always use the entire URL on the original site, which allows subscribers to see where the link is sending them." I do understand the security issues behind this requirement but, OTOH, the full-length URLs tend to be fragile.
No Shortened URLs		X	"Do not post shortened hyperlinks to the list (such as those produced by bit.ly, Google URL Shortener, or TinyURL)." once again since i'm virtually the only individual who posts messages using bit.ly I suspect this is directed towards me. I know that some phishing campaigns use shortened hyperlinks to trap people, but have any of the links i've provided done this? no. the problem is that people don't want to click on a link that will expose their minds to information that may be contrary to their political beliefs.
No Shortened URLs		X	I do find the inclusion of tiny URLs very helpful as well as other links that folks put up. I'm not sure how you define the "accompanied by relevant content" . . . its sounds a little draconian. So instead of

Issue	Yes	No	Response
			saying "Here's the link to the latest newsletter of the Council of Archives"....I now have to write a long paragraph about some of the articles in the linked article?? How does that improve the readability and 'shortness' of the list?
No Shortened URLs	X		I'm very glad to see "Do not post shortened hyperlinks..." That always drove me nuts. Seeing the full URL is a big help as a quick gauge of the quality of an article. Instituting the use of subject line tags is great too (I hope people use them) -- most of the other professional lists I'm on use them and they're very helpful. Nicejob :)
No Shortened URLs	X		I do like the change of providing the actual link to a website, article, etc. instead of a shortened link. My overarching comment is that people on all sides seem way too invested in getting frustrated or mad at each other over a small listserv in a small profession. Our energy could be spent in much more productive ways.
No Shortened URLs	X		I also agree about seeing the original URLs rather than shortened hyperlinks. I think the latter would be helpful for identifying news sources that are behind paywalls, etc., rather than confusion about site identities.
No Shortened URLs	X		Thank you for asking for complete URLs - I raised that issue with Melanie Mueller a while back and I appreciate her bringing that up as that has been an ongoing concern for me. I like to know if I'm visiting Bloomberg news or the Cleveland Plain Dealer or whatever the source may be. It is very reasonable to want to know what site you are clicking on in advance. I am happy to publicly "own" that complaint if it were to remove heat from the list administrators. Knowing your source is something middle school students are admonished about when they start to do research online. What could possibly be wrong with that?
No Shortened URLs	X		I support the requirement to use full website links. I cannot access the shortened, anonymous links from my work computer.
No Shortened URLs (Suggestion: Require Full Links, Allow Shortened)		X	I would make the following suggestions: Under "General Rules", I would suggest changing the third bullet point to allow including shortened hyperlinks as long as the full original URL is also provided. The full URL does indeed allow readers to see where the link leads before clicking on it (and in some organizations, individuals may not be able to follow shortened links because of IT security rules). However, shortened hyperlinks can also serve a useful purpose: many URLs are long and unwieldy and e-mail systems may not render them correctly. Allowing posters to include a shortened hyperlink *in

Issue	Yes	No	Response
			addition to* the full URL may save interested readers the hassle of having to cut and paste and could be quite useful.
No Shortened URLs (Suggestion: Require Full Links, Allow Shortened)	X		Requiring the inclusion of full links is OK; prohibiting shortened links is not.
Peter Kurilecz (comment on)			In case @EvilArchivist didn't submit their comments Evil Archivist @EvilArchivist 3h3 hours ago @archivists_org I think all the problems with the list would be solved by banning @RAINbyte. #submitted got to love diversity
Political Speech Unrelated to Archives	X		"Political speech unrelated to archival issues" if one makes political commentary tangential to an archival issue is that okay? apparently so when someone can make statements about climate change when linked to archives issues. in recent months people have complained because I posted a story that was on a conservative website (rarely do I see complaints if the story is to a liberal site). you would have thought I had shot their pet dog. SAA and its members profess a desire for diversity and yet that is rarely exhibited on the A&A list. I know for a fact that numerous archivists who are politically conservative will not post responses to postings that they disagree with politically or philosophically for fear of ruining their careers. eg the recent project arcc posting contained opinions about climate change that many disagree with.
Scope of List		X	6. Archives affect all aspects of society, so our postings policy should be liberal. The List was richer when we had debates on historical interpretations, humor, and even Friday Flowers. This section should be rewritten to prohibit spam and discourage flame wars--but not much else. 7. Expanding my Comment #6, members of the List are a community and we are naturally interested in one another personally. Discussing our first jobs, hobbies, values, etc. contributes to the value of the list. The present and proposed rules thwart that value. 8. Finally, when one compares postings from a few 4-5 years ago with those today, it becomes obvious that those discussions were more insightful, useful, interesting, and even humorous than the current ones. Let's learn from the history of this List and become more tolerant--not less.

Issue	Yes	No	Response
Scope of List		X	Scope of list: Acceptable General Rules: I have never seen the following clause observed on the A&A list and believe it to be folly to require it: "To help other subscribers quickly evaluate their interest in a posting, include the following headings, when appropriate, at the beginning of the subject lines of relevant postings: "ANNOUNCE:" at the front of any announcement for a conference, workshop, exhibition, or other event or release. "JOB:" at the front of any job posting "NEWS:" at the front of any news item "QUERY:" at the front of any posting asking a question of the list" A decision to read a post is much more likely to be based on the complete subject line or geography or similar points rather than the above. Besides the categories of News and Announcements have considerable overlap.
Scope of List (Suggestion: Reword)	X		Suggested rewording in the second bullet point in the list of prohibited subjects (under "Scope of the List"). "Complaints or concerns about the list or individuals on the list should be directed to the list administrators" reads a bit better than the proposed text ("Direct complaints or concerns...") I had to read that sentence twice because it simply did not read clearly to me.
Scope of List (Suggestion: Clarify Rule on Posting News Stories)		X	My only concern with the revised terms is the following statement, in the Scope of the List section: " For those interested in following archives-related news content, we recommend the "Archives in the News" list: https://groups.google.com/forum/#!forum/archives-in-the-news." This statement comes after a list of topics that are prohibited, but it is not clear if archives-related news content is in fact prohibited. Is the intent simply to discourage archives-related news content? If so, I think that is a poor decision. Archives-related news content is the primary reason I am subscribed to the list, and sharing of such content should be strongly encouraged. You should clarify the Scope of the List to indicate whether archives-related news content is allowed or prohibited.
Suggestion: No Links as Subject Lines	X		I would add one more rule for posting, which is that members not be allowed to use links as the subject of their message. I assume this happens when someone forwards an article to the list from a website, but it's ugly and impossible to tell from the subject line what the article is even about.

Issue	Yes	No	Response
Suggestion: No Self-Promotion of Blog Posts	X		I'd like to see another change added to stop people from posting about their own blog posts. That should fall into netiquette and self-promotion, but the list is clogged with absurdly long posts about personal blog posts which have little to no bearing on anything remotely relevant.

Suggestion: Include Statement on No Intent to Constrain Scholarship	X		I think it might be helpful to add something like the following statement from the SAA Code of Conduct: "This policy is not intended to constrain scholarly or professional presentation, discourse, or debate, as long as these exchanges are conducted in a respectful manner."
Suggestion: Add Location to Job Postings	X		JOB: MUST INCLUDE GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION, too many people assume everyone knows where they work.
Vendors		X	And, vendors? Am I not a vendor? And, not replying to people personally? Sometimes the personal response will benefit the entire List.
Vendors (Suggestion: Tighten Rules for Vendors)	X		VENDORS: I find it annoying that Vendors post sales pitches to the list, especially around the time of the Annual Conference. I know selling the email list to vendors is a source of income to SAA, but I think the vendor posting rules need to be tightened.