## **Annual Meeting agenda**

Wednesday, August 3, 2016 4-5:30 pm

Agenda:

1. Welcome and intro (5 minutes)
2. Business meeting (10 minutes)
	1. Announce new roundtable Co-Chair, Steering Committee member, and Council Liaison
		1. Sam Winn, incoming co-chair 2016-2018
		(Emily Vigor, outgoing co-chair)
		Tricia Gilson Incoming steering committee member 2016-2019
		(Wendy Hagenmaier, outgoing steering committee member)
		Courtney Chartier, Incoming council liaison
		(Lisa C. Mangiafico, outgoing council liaison)
		Continuing leadership:
		Aliza Leventhal (co-chair, 2015-2017)
		Suzi Noruschat (steering committee member 2014-2017)
		Joanna Groberg (steering committee member 2015­-2018)
		Tim Walsh (web liaison)
	2. Website
		1. Update on forum by Tim Walsh
			1. Google Site (https://sites.google.com/architecturalrecordsroundtable.com)
			Tim is working to set up forwarding from Google Sites discussion forum and formal listserv. This will allow the website to provide easier access to the discussions on our listserv. Previously these were separate discussions. Tim is also resolving the ownership issues, as our site was originally set up by a student worker under a previous co-chair.
	3. Volunteers
		1. Attendees were able to sign up if they were interested in being involved during the year to work on issues of shared concern. If you're interested in being actively involved in developing training, reference resources, outreach plans (with vendors and records creators), or other topics not mentioned, please sign up here.
	4. Portman Archives Walking Tour
		1. Thank you to Andy Richardson from the Portman Archives for giving the ARR a private tour of several of the hotels and connected spaces designed by Mr. Portman. For those who missed it please check out the handout Andy's office provided, you can use this for a self-guided tour of the buildings the next time you are in Atlanta.
3. Presentations
	1. Presentation from Zach Vowell and Jessica Meyerson (10 minutes)
		1. The SPN began in October 2015 as an IMLS grant funded project with the goal of building a community around the issue of preserving software, and doing research to evaluate needs for future tools, platforms, guidelines, etc. They hosted their forum on Monday, August 1, 2016, where a variety of topics were covered ranging from legal issues, to defining the word software, to developing case studies and an actionable roadmap for the group to move forward.
		To learn more about SPN, you can visit their website: http://www.softwarepreservationnetwork.org/
	2. CAD/BIM taskforce (40 minutes)
		1. (see meeting's slides, as well as slides from Session 309)
		Major themes and takeaways:
		Education: 50% of respondents had attended some kind of training, but majority were unhappy with or unconfident when it came to digital design records. This looks like an opportunity for ARR to engage with SAA's education programs.
		Preservation practices: most are haphazard and bit-level focused. This is an area to provide some scalable solutions for the files and the related software.
		Access/Use: Archivists need training and basic level understanding of the various software in our collections. There was discussion at the SPN Forum about bringing software into the reading rooms, and not offering it to a larger public over the internet, may cover some of the licensing and copyright issues for in-house viewing.
		Copyright - This has been a significant concern for the CAD/BIM Taskforce, but the majority of respondents noted that they had not experienced copyright issues yet, and their donor agreement clauses do not include copyright stipulations for their donated materials. We are left with the question why/how are people not concerned about copyright stipulations?
		Partnerships - This is an area we want to be focusing on, and is an area everyone can be engaging. Think about how can we leverage our existing expertise and connections, especially in design world and international community. It's time to reach out and start gathering perspectives, and start gauging the interest or willingness to form relationships with vendors.
	3. Final thoughts (20 minutes)
		1. Outcome/Future Steps: How do we see digital records as different from physical? How do we see researchers using them, and what will we need to do to support them?