Agenda Item II.A.

Society of American Archivists
Council Meeting
August 1, 2016
Hilton Atlanta, Atlanta, Georgia

Consent Agenda: Ratify Council Interim Actions
(Prepared by Executive Committee Member Lisa Mangiafico)

BACKGROUND

Current parliamentary policy agrees on validating board decisions made remotely, and ratifying the Council's online and conference-call decisions via the Consent Agenda does not conflict with any existing SAA policy.

DISCUSSION

Given the Council's robust use of an e-mail discussion list to function as a group and make decisions remotely, approving interim Council actions via the Consent Agenda contributes to streamlining the group's work and improves access to the interim decisions of SAA's elected decision makers.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the following interim actions taken by the Council between May 25, 2016, and July 12, 2016, be ratified:

- Revised the SAA Bylaws, Section 9 – Parliamentary Procedure, so as to now follow *Robert's Rules of Order* as SAA's parliamentary authority (see Appendix A). (May 25, 2016)
- Unanimously adopted the May 11-12, 2016, SAA Council meeting minutes. (June 3, 2016)
- Granted one-year extensions to the terms of the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Public Service Metrics (see Appendix B) and the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Holding Counts Metrics (see Appendix C). (June 26, 2016)
- Approved revisions to the Standards Committee's Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard to include a "fast-track" procedure for SAA expert groups (see Appendix D). (July 12, 2016)

Interim Reports

- Reviewed SAA Representative Peter Gottlieb's report on the May 19, 2016, meeting of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission. (See Appendix E)

Appendix A

Society of American Archivists
Council Interim Report
May 23, 2016

Motion to Change SAA's Parliamentary Authority

(Prepared by Lisa Mangiafico)

BACKGROUND / DISCUSSION

For many years, SAA has followed Sturgis's *Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure*. This text has now become a defunct text in the governing community. Therefore, it would be in SAA's best interest to adopt the current, widely-used Robert's *Rules of Order* (latest revised edition).

MOTION

THAT the SAA Bylaws, Section 9, Parliamentary Procedure, be revised as follows (strikethrough = deletion, underline = addition):

9. Parliamentary Procedure
~~Sturgis' Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure~~ <u>Robert's Rules of Order (latest revised edition)</u> shall govern the proceedings of the Society, except as otherwise provided in the constitution, bylaws, and special rules of the Society.

Support Statement: Sturgis' Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure is now defunct and Robert's Rules of Order is widely used as guidance to ensure that appropriate parliamentary procedure is followed.

Fiscal Impact: None.

Appendix B

Society of American Archivists
Council Interim Action
June 17, 2016

Extension Request for the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for the Public Services of Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

**(Prepared by Amy Schindler, SAA co-chair, and
Christian Dupont, ACRL/RBMS co-chair)**

BACKGROUND

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for Public Services in Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries is responsible for development of a new standard defining appropriate statistical measures and performance metrics to govern the collection and analysis of statistical data for describing public services provided by archival repositories and special collections libraries.

The Task Force was organized in 2014 for a two year term. Members met for the first time at the 2014 SAA Annual Meeting, ahead of the formal commencement of the Task Force's September 2014 official start. Members have held fifteen meetings since August 2014 as a committee as well as additional small group work sessions. Meetings at ALA and SAA meetings have been open to guests and have offered opportunities for the Task Force to solicit input on specific questions as well as general needs and interests of archivists and special collections librarians. The Task Force indicated in its September 2015, report to the SAA Council that the Task Force would request an extension in 2016.

DISCUSSION

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Public Service Metrics requests an extension of one year to complete their work. The Standards Committee supports the extension, as it would give the Task Force time to review feedback and revise the proposed document before submission for formal adoption as a standard by SAA and ACRL/RBMS. ACRL/RBMS has already reappointed its Task Force members for a one-year extension.

The document will be published online for the first round of public comment on June 22, 2016, with comments, via email or website, due by August 22, 2016. An open meeting soliciting feedback will be held at the ALA Annual Meeting. A joint lunch forum with the Joint Task Force on Holdings Counts and Measures will be held at the SAA Annual Meeting along with a Task Force meeting that will also be open to the public. Version 2 of the document will be released in the winter with webinars planned to share the revised document with and solicit further feedback from archivists and special collections librarians. In-person feedback will also be solicited at ALA Midwinter 2017. The next version of the proposed standard will be completed and published in time for a hearing at the 2017 ALA Annual Meeting and an open forum at the 2017

SAA Annual Meeting followed by submission to the standards bodies of ACRL/RBMS and SAA for approval. The Task Force is also exploring sessions at meetings of regional associations in 2016-2017 to solicit further in-person feedback.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the term of the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for the Public Services of Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries be extended to August 30, 2017.

Support Statement:
Extending the appointment of the Task Force will enable the solicitation of multiple rounds of feedback and ensuing revision for the proposed public services standard. Multiple opportunities for individual archivists and special collections librarians to engage with the proposed standard along with the related publicity of the proposed standard will increase awareness of and interest in adopting the standard across the profession.

Impact on Strategic Priorities: The proposed extension will enable the Task Force to meet Goal 3.1 (Identify the need for new standards, guidelines, and best practices and lead or participate in their development), which will allow for the measure of public services measures and metrics that can be used to meet Goal 1.1 (Provide leadership in promoting the value of archives and archivists to institutions, communities, and society) and Goal 1.2 (Educate and influence decision makers about the importance of archives and archivists).

Fiscal Impact: None anticipated.

Appendix C

Society of American Archivists
Council Interim Action
June 20, 2016

Extension Request for the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

(Prepared by Emily Novak Gustainis, SAA co-chair)

BACKGROUND

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (hereafter "JTF-HCM") is responsible for the development of guidelines that will provide metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying the wide range of types and formats of material typically held by archival repositories and special collections libraries, including analog, digital, and audio-visual materials.

The Task Force was organized in 2014 for a two-year term, with a one-year extension option. Members met for the first time at the 2014 SAA Annual Meeting in advance of the official September 1, 2014 start date. Subsequently, over the past twenty-two months, JTF-HCM members have met, either in person or via conference call, twenty-eight times. This includes: two open meetings at SAA annual conferences in partnership with the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Public Services Metrics (2014, 2015) and the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on Primary Source Literacy (2015); four open meetings at ALA (one Annual, two Midwinter); and one full-day meeting on January 8, 2016. Forthcoming open meetings at ALA (June 2016) and SAA (August 2016), as well as one full-day working meeting on August 3 during the upcoming SAA Annual Meeting have also been scheduled. Open meetings have served to introduce ALA and SAA memberships to the work of the task force and its progress, as well as offer an open forum for questions and answers.

In its October 2015 annual report to the SAA Council, the JTF-HCM indicated that it anticipated needing a one year extension to complete its work. ACRL/RBMS members have already been reappointed as Task Force members for a one year extension through August 2017.

DISCUSSION

The JTF-HCM requests an extension of one year to complete its work. This would give the Task Force time to review feedback on its Minimal (or Level I) counting requirements, revise and expand the guidelines to include Optimal (container/item counts or Level II) counting guidelines, as well as articulate the work necessary to draft Added Value (special attributes or Level III)

holdings counts and move the guidelines closer to becoming a standard for adoption by SAA and ACRL/RBMS. The Standards Committee supports the one year extension request.

The draft guidelines will be published online via the SAA JTF-HCM microsite for the first round of public comment in late July in advance of the 2016 SAA Annual Meeting. Comments on the guidelines, via the website or email, must be received by August 31, 2016. In advance of the release, we will encourage attendance at the upcoming ALA Annual Meeting in Florida on June 25 to test the categorization of materials using definitions established as part of the guidelines. The exercise, in addition to the feedback from the SAA Annual Meeting, will be used to revise the guidelines in advance of soliciting volunteers to test them in their own repositories and inform the second version.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the term of the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries be extended to August 30, 2017.

Support Statement:
Extending the appointment of the Task Force will enable the JTF-HCM to recruit repositories to engage, test, and provide feedback on the guidelines. Additionally, it will enable the JTF-HCM to articulate its proposed "Optimal" and "Added Value" counts.

Impact on Strategic Priorities: The proposed extension will enable the Task Force to meet Goal 3.1 (identify the need for new standards, guidelines, and best practices and lead or participate in their development), which will promote the consistent compilation of holdings information at the local level, as well as provide a low-barrier approach to aggregating data about holdings across the profession. It is the Task Force's hope that this work will enable the Society to ultimately express the extent of the cultural heritage stewarded by its membership (Goal 1.1, Provide leadership in promoting the value of archives and archivists to institutions, communities, and society and Goal 1.2, Educate and influence decision makers about the importance of archives and archivists).

Fiscal Impact: None anticipated.

Appendix D

Society of American Archivists
Council Interim Action
June 29, 2016

Standards Committee: Revision to Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard

(Prepared by Standards Committee Co-Chairs Meg Tuomala and Carrie Hintz, and SAA Council Liaison Tim Pyatt)

BACKGROUND

Best practices and guidelines are flexible procedures, strategies, and recommendations that can be applied to produce a desired result. They are not necessarily formal, but they are effective and widely accepted—often considered de facto or ad hoc standards.

Most of the standards developed by SAA are best practices or guidelines created by an expert group to meet the needs of the archives community[1]. They are indeed effective and widely accepted. They reflect a need for both expert guidance and recommendations and flexibility in applying that guidance to our day-to-day work.

Including the fast-track option for certain standards, including best practices and guidelines, has allowed SAA to strike a balance between being able to quickly respond when the need to create a new standard arises while ensuring that all SAA-developed standards follow a consistent process that is administered by the Standards Committee.

By motion of the SAA Council at their May 11-13, 2016, meeting, the Standards Committee was directed to create a fast-track procedure for best practices and guidelines developed by internal SAA groups. This request was in response to the Committee on Education's (CoE) proposal to shepherd the development and review of two education related guidelines—Guidelines for a Graduate Program in Archival Studies (GPAS) and Archival Continuing Education (ACE) Guidelines—without submitting to the Standards Committee for review.

The Council determined these guidelines should be reviewed by the Standards Committee, as this procedure ensures that all SAA-developed, adopted, and/or endorsed standards are broadly disseminated and included in the SAA Standards Portal. They asked the Standards Committee to either create or modify a procedure to fast-track best practices and guidelines developed by expert groups that are internal to SAA.

[1] Thirteen standards in SAA's Standards Portal are best practices or guidelines, three are technical standards (http://www2.archivists.org/standards#.V2mDTHkUUaX).

Since 2014, at least two other guidelines have been shepherded through the review and approval process using a "fast-track" approach—Best Practices for Internships as a Component of Graduate Archival Education[2] and Best Practices for Volunteers in Archives[3].

In both these cases the Council initiated and convened a group to draft the standard, working with the Standards Committee to ensure the appropriate procedures were followed. This included gathering member comments and feedback, vetting of the development process/recommendation to Council by the Standards Committee, and dissemination of the standard through the Standards Portal.

DISCUSSION

Adding expert groups to who can initiate standards development under the fast-track procedure as part of Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard further expands the process and ensures that all standards—including best practices and guidelines—go through proper consultation and review. This includes gathering member comments and feedback and vetting by the Standards Committee.

Expanding to include expert groups will further facilitate standards creation while minimizing unnecessary overhead and administrative work. It will confirm that standards under development are being monitored, but not driven, by the Standards Committee. This ensures ongoing tracking, timely feedback and status updates throughout the process, prompt delivery to Council for discussion and approval, and ultimately, wide dissemination through the Standards Portal.

As a fast-track procedure already exists as part of Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard (Section VI), the Standards Committee decided to simply revise the procedure to include expert groups as one of the groups who may initiate a fast-track standard.

If adopted, the fast-track procedures should be applied only to best practices and guidelines. Fast-tracking of technical standards is not advised by the Standards Committee.

Expert groups will be identified by Council.

During our review of the procedures we also noticed a revision that was never put into process—completion of a Standards Approval Application form (Section III.B.). We have removed that from the procedures as it is not necessary to the approval process and the form does not actually exist.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

THAT the revisions to Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard as submitted by the Standards Committee (Appendix) be adopted.

---

[2] See http://www2.archivists.org/standards/best-practices-for-internships-as-a-component-of-graduate-archival-education#.V2l8lXkUUaU for full text of standard and history of its development.
[3] See http://www2.archivists.org/standards/best-practices-for-volunteers-in-archives#.V2l8wnkUUaU for full text of standard and history of its development.

Support Statement: Revising the Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard to include expert groups to the list of groups who may initiate fast-track best practices and guidelines will allow for the quick and efficient development and review of best practices and guidelines, while still following an established procedure and ensuring broad-based member comment and vetting by the Standards Committee. Expanding who can initiate fast-track procedure for standards to include expert groups will facilitate standards creation and maintenance while minimizing unnecessary overhead and administrative work. Additionally, removing the unnecessary step of the Standards Approval Application Form will further streamline the standards approval process.

Impact on Strategic Priorities: Revising the procedure for fast-tracking standards will allow SAA to rapidly and efficiently respond and adapt to our evolving knowledge-base, and is in alignment with two of SAA's strategic priorities—Goal 3: Advancing the Field; and Goal 4: Meeting Members' Needs.

Fiscal Impact: Minimal. The updated procedures will need to be communicated to SAA membership via the Governance Manual and website by the SAA Governance Coordinator and Web and Information Systems Administrator, resulting in a minimal direct cost to SAA.

Appendix

Please note, changes are noted with ~~strikethroughs~~ (deletions) and <u>underlines</u> (additions). Revisions are only being made to Sections III and VI.

Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard

I. Submission of a Proposal for a Project to Create, Revise, or Review an SAA-Developed Standard

Proposals must be submitted by official groups within the SAA. Individuals interested in the development of a standard may consult with the Standards Committee about groups that are appropriate for submission of a standards proposal.

I.A. The proposing group shall:

Complete and submit the PROPOSAL FOR STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT form. The form shall include:

- Name of sponsoring group and name of individual to contact;
- Concise statement of identified need for standard;
- Expected effect/impact on individuals and institutions;
- Scope of coverage/application;
- Anticipated format and content of the standard;
- Known existing standards that are closely related to or affected by the proposed standard;

- List of other SAA subgroups, outside organizations, and experts who will be consulted during the development or will be asked to review the standard before it is submitted for adoption by the SAA Council;
- Time table for development process; and
- Budgetary implications for SAA, including direct costs for meetings, travel, copying, and postage as well as indirect costs for SAA staff time.

I.B. The Standards Committee co-chairs shall:

I.B.1. Acknowledge receipt of the STANDARD PROPOSAL FORM to the proposing body and notify the Standards Committee of the proposal submission.

I.B.2. Distribute copies of the STANDARD PROPOSAL FORM to the other members of the Standards Committee, including the subgroup chairs and the SAA Council liaison. Subgroup chairs may distribute the proposal to their technical subcommittee or development and review team for comment.

I.B.3. Collect comments and suggestions from members of the Standards Committee and other subgroups to which the proposal was distributed.

I.B.4. If comments warrant further discussion, arrange for communications to determine if there is a consensus to endorse the proposal.

II. Standards Committee Action in Response to Proposal

The Standards Committee will take a formal vote in response to the proposal, and will take one of the following actions in response to a proposal, as appropriate:

II.A. Return for revision

The Standards Committee will return to the proposing group a STANDARD PROPOSAL FORM that is incomplete or that requires revision and request that it be revised and resubmitted.

II.B. Decline proposal

The Standards Committee may decline to recommend undertaking a standards project because

1. A similar standard already exists;
2. The proposed standard is in direct conflict with an SAA-adopted standard or policy;
3. Another group is already working on a similar standard (in which case the Standards Committee will suggest that the two parties work together toward common ends);
4. There is insufficient demand or potential benefit to SAA members to warrant the expense of its development;
5. The proposed standard does not fall within the scope of the Standards Committee.

The Standards Committee will forward all declined proposals to the SAA Council along with the reason why the Standards Committee does not recommend the proposal. The proposing group may file an appeal with the SAA Council within 60 days of notification by the Committee.

II.C. Submit request for Council approval to undertake project

If the Standards Committee is satisfied with the proposal, it will be submitted with a recommendation by the Committee to the Council for final approval. The Standards Committee will send the STANDARD PROPOSAL FORM and any accompanying correspondence or other documentation to the SAA Council for approval to undertake the project.

If the SAA Council approves the project, the following actions shall occur:

II.C.I. Announcement of standards project.

The Standards Committee will publish a “Notice of Intention to Initiate a Standards Development Project” via all appropriate SAA media. This step is taken to notify the membership that a project will soon be under way and to solicit comments and participation from interested parties. Official project approval will be granted automatically 30 days after publication of the "Notice" unless the comments received by the Standards Committee co-chairs are such that the proposal warrants reconsideration, in which case the Committee will refer the proposal and comments back to the proposing group for review and response.

II.C.2. Make assignment to primary group for development.

For approved standards development projects, the Standards Committee co-chairs will prepare a draft charge for the development and review team and make recommendations for its membership. In most cases, the members of the proposing group will be included in the recommendation for membership of the development and review team. The charge must then be approved by the SAA Council before the SAA vice president / president-elect appoints the chair(s) and members of the development and review team. Once the standard is adopted, the team will be disbanded by the SAA Council and the Council will create a technical subcommittee to maintain and review the adopted standard (see V.C.I.).

III. Standards Development Process

In the course of developing a new standard, development and review teams shall complete the following actions:

III.A. Consultation with other SAA subgroups and external organizations

The development and review team will engage in extensive consultation with interested parties inside and outside of SAA that are essential to the development of standards, and must submit to

the Standards Committee evidence that such consultation has taken place. The development and review team must address all written comments sent to the group and all comments made at an SAA open meeting. The Standards Committee will assist the development and review team in publicizing the project and identifying consultants.

Consultation should be pursued through several means, such as:

III.A.1. Letters sent at the beginning of the project to heads of organizations known to have an interest in the standard under development, inviting their comments and/or participation in the development process, as appropriate.

III.A.2. Publication of notices in the newsletters or on the websites of these organizations about the intention to develop the standard and, later, providing updates on the progress of the development project.

III.A.3. Publication of the draft standard in appropriate SAA media.

III.A.4. Publication of the draft standard in external publications and/or circulation of the draft standard to heads of interested organizations.

III.A.5. Circulation of the draft standard to groups and individuals, inside and outside of SAA, with particular interest or expertise in the topic, including posting on electronic networks.

III.A.6. Joint meetings with interested organizations to discuss common concerns. These meetings could occur at the outset of the project or after circulation of a draft standard.

III.A.7. Open forums or hearings at the SAA annual meeting.

III.B. Preparation of the package containing the final draft of the standard and supporting documentation

Once it has completed the consultation process and prepared the final draft of the standard, the development and review team will compile a package to forward to the Standards Committee for its review. This package will include:

~~III.B.1. Completed STANDARDS APPROVAL APPLICATION FORM [in development as of 4/5/12].~~

III.B.1. Full text of the proposed standard.

III.B.2. Introductory narrative.

This section must include the scope of application, in particular:

- The purpose or objective of the proposed standard and
- The specific audiences, circumstances, or techniques to which it is directed.
- It should also contain background and other supplementary information, as necessary, that can provide a context for understanding how the standard was developed and when and how it will be used, including
- Brief history and methodology of its development,
- Participants in the development process,
- Relationship to predecessor documents,
- Significant changes from earlier versions,
- Glossary or definitions of terms, if necessary,
- Illustrations or examples of how the standard can be applied, and
- Bibliography, if necessary.

III.B.3. Documentation of the consultation process.

The development and review team must submit documentation that the consultation process has taken place and that a reasonable agreement has been reached on the contents and intent of the proposed standard. This evidence may take the form of:

- Copies of correspondence from other organizations supporting the proposed standard;
- Clippings from publications and/or websites that publicized the development project or published drafts of the standard;
- Copies of correspondence discussing areas of dispute in the proposed standard;
- In case of unresolved disputes, explanations from the group responsible for development of efforts made to accommodate the expressed concerns and/or justification for approving the standard in the absence of universal agreement.

III.B.4. Maintenance and review plan.

The development and review team must recommend a plan for maintenance and review of the standard it has developed. Standards developed by SAA will be assigned to a component group, such as a technical subcommittee, for necessary maintenance and review. Each will be either assigned to a review cycle of no more than 5 years, or approved for ongoing review. At the end of a set review cycle, the SAA Council will be asked by the Standards Committee to reaffirm, revise, or rescind the standard. The "Maintenance and Review Plan" will suggest the appropriate subgroup for assignment and type of review process. (See V.C. - V.E.)

III.C. Notice of abandoned project

In the event that the development and review team fails to reach general agreement on a draft standard or, for whatever reason, chooses to discontinue its work on the proposed standard, it shall notify the Standards Committee that it has abandoned the project. The Standards Committee shall publish a notice in appropriate SAA media that the project has been discontinued.

IV. Standards Committee Review of Draft Standard

Upon receiving the final draft package from the development and review team, the Standards Committee will take the following actions:

IV.A. Review package

The Standards Committee will review the package to ensure that it is complete and that adequate consultation and review have taken place. It may return the package to the development and review team if significant elements are missing.

IV.B. Notice of project completion/publication of revised draft standard

IV B.1. Notice of project completion.

When the final draft package is deemed complete, the Standards Committee will publish a notice in the appropriate SAA media announcing that the standards development project has been completed and the draft standard has been forwarded to the Council. (See IV.C.)

IV B.2. Publication of revised draft standard.

Based on the substance of the revisions, the potential breadth of impact, and any apparent remaining substantive conflicts on content, the Standards Committee may determine that the entire revised text should be published via an appropriate SAA medium in order to ensure the broadest possible participation in and awareness of the standards development process. The Standards Committee will accept written comments on the revised draft addressed to the Standards Committee co-chairs within 30 days of publication of the revised draft or notice of the availability of the revised draft.

If additional comments received after publication of the revision indicate widespread disagreement about the revised draft within the SAA membership, the Committee may determine that the draft should be referred back to the development and review team for response. Substantive changes to the draft standard as a result of these additional comments may require publication of a new "Notice of Completion" and notification or publication of a new revised draft.

The Standards Committee may determine that issues raised in the additional comments were already addressed adequately during the development and consultation process. The Standards Committee will then publish the notice of completion and forward the package to the SAA Council.

IV.C. Recommendation to the SAA Council

At the conclusion of the development process, the Standards Committee will send to the SAA Council a report on the process and a recommendation.

IV.C.1. Recommendation to consider adoption.

When the Standards Committee is satisfied that the development and consultation process has been completed satisfactorily it will, after publication of the notice, forward the package to the SAA Council with a recommendation that the Council consider adopting the draft document as an official standard of the Society of American Archivists.

IV.C.2. Report on "irreconcilable differences."

After reviewing all documentation, the Standards Committee may determine that disagreements raised represent substantive irreconcilable differences of views or professional positions. In this situation, the Standards Committee will forward the package to the SAA Council with an explanation of the remaining problems and, depending on the type of standard and breadth of impact, may or may not recommend that the Council consider adopting the draft as an official standard of the Society of American Archivists.

V. Promulgation, Maintenance, and Review of Adopted Standards

The Standards Committee shall ensure that the following actions are taken for each standard that is formally adopted by the SAA Council. Often the group that developed the standard will be actively involved in or have primary responsibility for these activities.

V.A. Publication of the standard

V.A.1. Full text in the SAA newsletter.

The preferred method of publication will be to publish the full text of the adopted standard in the Society's newsletter and on the SAA website.

V.A.2. Notice of availability in newsletter.

Some standards may be too long to publish in the newsletter. For these, a notice of their approval and a summary of their contents will be published in the next SAA newsletter and/or on the SAA website, along with information about how to obtain a copy from the SAA website.

V.A.3. Added to Standards Portal webpage.

SAA staff will post all formally adopted standards on the Standards Portal webpage with the following information: 1) the name of the standard, 2) a description of the standard, 3) a link to the full text of the standard or a description of where the standard can be obtained, 4) the date on

which the standard was adopted, 5) next review date of the standard, 6) information about how comments and feedback for revision can be submitted, and 7) any additional supporting documents or information.

V.B. Promotion of the standard

V.B.1. Notice to heads of allied professional organizations.

The SAA president and/or executive director will send a letter and copy of the adopted standard to all interested outside organizations to notify them of SAA's action. The Standards Committee will assist the group that developed the standard in drafting the letter and identifying which groups to contact.

V.B.2. Press release to editors of professional journals and newsletters.

The executive director will, in cooperation with the Standards Committee and development and review team, ensure that a press release is distributed to editors of allied professional journals and newsletters to announce the development and approval of the standard, providing its full text when possible.

V.B.3. Other publicity.

For standards of interest beyond professional circles, the executive director, Standards Committee, and development and review team will determine how best to publicize their approval. Working in concert with the Program and Education committees and the SAA staff, the Standards Committee will assist the subgroup in developing workshops, conference sessions, or public forums on the new standard.

V.C. Maintenance of the standard

Immediately upon adoption of an SAA standard, the following actions shall occur:

V.C.1. Technical subcommittee responsible for maintenance and review assigned.

As part of the approval process, the SAA Council will assign the standard to an ongoing SAA component group for maintenance and review. An SAA technical subcommittee may be established for this maintenance and review. The Standards Committee co-chairs will prepare a draft charge for the subcommittee and make recommendations for its membership. In most cases, the members of the development and review team who were actively involved in the development of the standards will be included in the recommendation for membership of the technical subcommittee. The charge must then be approved by the SAA Council before the vice president / president-elect appoints the chair(s) and members of the subcommittee.

V.C.2. Review cycle set.

All adopted SAA standards will be either assigned a review cycle of no more than five years, with a formal review commencing no later than three years following adoption or reaffirmation (section V.D.), or approved for ongoing review (seciton V.E.). However, in both stituations, comments and revisions to the standard and proposals to revise adopted standards may be submitted at any time. At the end of an assigned review cycle, the SAA Council will be asked to reaffirm, agree to revise, or rescind the standard.

V.C.3. Monitoring and promulgating use begins.

The maintaining technical subcommittee will be responsible for promoting the proper and effective use of the standard and will regularly obtain comments and feedback on the standard for future review and revision.

V.D. Cyclical review of the standard

At least two years before the review cycle expires, the Standards Committee will notify the maintaining technical subcommittee that it should initiate a formal review of the content and use of the standard. The following actions shall be taken:

V.D.1. Review plan prepared.

In consultation with the Standards Committee, the technical subcommittee will prepare a plan that will ensure consensus using the same kinds of broadly based consultation and review that occurred when the standard was originally developed. The plan may include:

- Other SAA subgroups and interested organizations outside of SAA that the technical subcommittee plans to consult;
- Proposed joint meetings with some of these subgroups and/or organizations to discuss proposed revisions;
- Proposed public hearings at the SAA Annual Meeting;
- Proposed publications, websites, or other communication media via which comments and proposed revisions will be submitted and be made publicly available; and
- Financial resources needed for review, such as travel or editorial support.

V.D.2. Standards Committee and SAA Council review plan.

The technical subcommittee will submit the plan to the Standards Committee, at which point the Standards Committee will decide whether the review process is adequate. If significant financial resources are required for review, the Standards Committee will forward the plan to the SAA Council with a recommendation for funding.

V.D.3. Recommendation to revise, reaffirm, or rescind the standard.

Once the review plan has been approved, the technical subcommittee will commence the formal review. When adequate consultation has taken place, the technical subcommittee will recommend one of the following:

Revise the standard: Revision will be necessary if substantial changes to the standard are required.

Reaffirm the standard: The technical subcommittee may decide that a standard does not need revision at this time if comments are relatively minor and the standard is still current and widely used. The technical subcommittee may also delay revision while awaiting the development or revision of another standard or project that may affect the standard under review.

Rescind the standard: The technical subcommittee may recommend rescinding the standard if the standard is no longer relevant or another standard has replaced it.

V.D.4. Recommendation to the SAA Council

The maintaining technical subcommittee will submit a package to the Standards Committee containing its recommendation to reaffirm, revise, or rescind the standard along with documentation about the review process (as in III.). If the technical subcommittee recommends revision, the technical subcommittee will also submit a completed proposal form (as in I.A.2.).

V.D.5. The Standards Committee will review the package to ensure that the review plan was adequate. Assuming that no procedural questions remain unresolved, it will forward the package to the Council with the recommendation to reaffirm, revise, or rescind.

V.D.6. The SAA Council votes on whether to reaffirm, revise, or rescind the standard.

If the Council votes to *revise* the standard, the technical subcommittee will continue the revision work. Once the revision has been completed, the technical subcommittee will follow the same process for submission and approval of a new standard, as outlined in sections III.B. and later.

If the Council *reaffirms* the standard, a new review cycle will be set, which may be shorter than five years. A new technical subcommittee may be appointed, if necessary. The technical subcommittee and the Standards Committee will inform all relevant parties that the standard has been reaffirmed and does not require revision at this time.

Should the Council vote to rescind the standard, the technical subcommittee and the Standards Committee will inform all relevant parties that the standard has been rescinded. The Standards Committee will then either remove the standard from the standards webpage or mark the standard as "rescinded."

V.D.7. Notice and publication of reaffirmed, revised, or rescinded standards.

An information dissemination process similar to that outlined under V.A. and V.B. for new standards will be followed to ensure broad awareness of SAA actions concerning reaffirmed, revised, and rescinded standards.

V.E. Ongoing review of the standard.

Proposed revisions to a standard approved for ongoing review are reviewed and addressed as they are received by the assigned technical subcommittee. Ongoing review is particularly conducive to standards that are electronically published and thus easy to update. In order to respond adequately and in a timely manner to proposals for change, the following actions should be taken:

V.E.1. Proposal for changes received.

Proposals may be submitted by SAA component groups (i.e., sections, roundtables, committees, task forces, or working groups), by interested external organizations (e.g., the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section), or may be generated by the technical subcommittee itself. Proposals should include:

- Name of the sponsoring group;
- Identification of the component of the standard to be changed;
- Brief description of the proposed change, and justification;
- Expected effect/impact on individuals, institutions, and supporting systems;
- Known related standards affected by the proposed change.

All proposals should be submitted to the chair of the technical subcommittee responsible for the maintenance of the standard.

V.E.2. Technical subcommittee reviews proposals.

Upon receiving a proposal, the chair of the technical subcommittee shall:

- Conduct a preliminary review of the document to ensure that it is complete. Incomplete proposals will be returned to the submitting body. If there are no problems with the document, the chair will acknowledge receipt to the proposing body.
- Distribute copies of the proposal to the other members of the technical subcommittee for their review and comment.
- Determine the extent to which the proposal should be distributed for public comment.

V.E.3. Consultation with other SAA subgroups and external organizations.

External groups, particularly those directly impacted by a proposal, must be consulted during the review process. This should include informing the Standards Committee co-chairs of the proposal submission. Consultation should be pursued through several means, which may include:

- Publication of the proposal on the technical subcommittee's SAA microsite.
- Letters sent to heads of organizations or organizations, or to individuals, inside and outside of SAA, known to have an interest in the standard under revision, inviting their comments on a particular proposal.
- Publication of notices in the newsletters or on the websites of these organizations about the proposed change.
- Publication of the proposal in appropriate SAA media.
- Publication of the proposal in external publications.
- Joint meetings with interested organizations to discuss the proposal.
- Open forums or hearings at the SAA Annual Meeting.

V.E.4. Recommendation to revise the standard.

Based on comments received from the community, the technical subcommittee may either reject the proposal, or develop a recommendation for revisions to the standard. The draft revisions may be based on both the original proposal and amendments developed during the review process. Revision proposals should document changes in the standard in relation to the current text. Significant changes in the initial proposal by the technical subcommittee may require an additional period of consultation. The review and consultation process should be completed within six months of the submission of a proposal.

Once the draft revisions have been finalized, it should be forwarded to the Standards Committee together with documentation of the submission and consultation process.

V.E.5. Standards Committee review of recommended changes.

The Standards Committee will review the package to ensure that it is complete and that adequate consultation and review have taken place. It may return the package to the development and review team if significant elements are missing.

V.E.6. Recommendation to the SAA Council.

The Standards Committee will send to the SAA Council a report on the process and a recommendation. This may be either a recommendation to consider implementation of the draft revisions, or a recommendation against adoption. The decision to accept changes to official standards of the Society of American Archivists can only be made by the SAA Council.

When the draft revision documentation is deemed complete, the Standards Committee will publish a notice in the appropriate SAA media announcing that the draft revision has been forwarded to the Council.

V.E.6. Promulgation of revised standard.

If a draft revision is accepted by the SAA Council, the Standards Committee will publish a notice of the approval of the changes in the appropriate SAA media.

V.E.7. Major revisions or rescinding the standard.

In addition to managing proposals for revision, the technical subcommittee may also determine that the standard is no longer relevant or has been superseded, and may recommend that the standard be considered for major revisions or rescinded. The guidelines for cyclical review should be followed in developing such recommendations (see section V.D.). The SAA Council may also establish a deadline for reviewing the applicability and maintenance of standards at their discretion.

VI. Council and Expert Group Fast-Track Procedures

In some cases the SAA Council may initiate, or encourage/approve a component group to initiate, the standards development process for best practices documents without seeking prior approval from the Standards Committee. In these cases a subgroup of the Council functions as the standard development and review team and the standards approval process begins at step III as described above.

SAA Expert Groups (as identified by the Council) may also create best practice and/or guidelines as supports the mission of the Society and its members. In these cases the Expert Group functions as the standards development and review team and the standards approval process begins at step III.

Revised June 1995, February 2010, January 2012, August 2013, May 2014, August 2016

Appendix E

Society of American Archivists
Council Interim Report
June 6, 2016

National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) Report on May 19, 2016, Meeting

(Prepared by SAA Representative Peter Gottlieb)

The meeting on May 19 was attended by guests from several other federal agencies that grant funds to libraries and archives, NEH and CLIR. This meeting was also unusual in having a full complement of Commissioners in attendance, including US Senator Dan Sullivan of Alaska and a representative from US Rep. Andy Barr's (Kentucky 6th District) office.

The main (and only substantive) agenda item was discussion and adoption of a new NHPRC strategic plan. A planning team of three Commission members and NHPRC staff created the plan through several drafts, two successive versions of which were sent to NHPRC stakeholder organizations for comments and suggestions.

Planning Committee chairperson Stephen Randolph presented the final draft of the plan to the Commission, with assistance from several NHPRC staff. The plan represents a distinct departure from previous NHPRC plans and priorities. Through four leadership initiatives, it aims to identify, disseminate and fund solutions to sustainable digital publications of historical documents, best practices in preserving and providing access to digital records, public engagement with the American historical record, and more effective state historical records advisory boards. The plan marks a shift away from an emphasis on funding as many projects as possible to increase access to historical records to a concentration on discovering solutions to longstanding stewardship issues and making those solutions easier for archives and documentary editing projects to adopt. While the Commission will continue to fund projects among a revised array of programs, it will leverage the grant funds it has by focusing them on solutions. Also notable in the version of the plan presented on May 19th is the marked emphasis on collaboration with other federal funding agencies (NEH, NEA, LC, IMLS, CLIR, etc.), on bringing the National Archives staff into the process of finding solutions, and on seeking supplementary funding for key projects from private foundations.

The Commission generally responded positively to the final draft of the plan. Members pointed to the paucity of NHPRC grant funding to carry out the plan (Executive Director of NHPRC Kathleen Williams talked about opportunities to seek an increased appropriation for grants

programs). Some wondered how staff could add new roles of organizing symposia, nurturing collaborative work, and writing white papers to their current work of reviewing and analyzing grant proposals. There was practically no questioning about what were perhaps the most recognizable changes in the plan, such as collapsing three access grants programs into one new one or broadening the effort to get records users involved in helping make documents more accessible through crowd sourcing work.

The Commission unanimously approved adopting the plan. The earliest scheduled implementation steps will take place during the summer of 2016.