Vice President’s Report  
(Prepared by Jackie Dooley)

My activities as Vice President during January-April 2012 have focused principally on appointments. I have also done ongoing work with the Annual Meeting Task Force and the 2013 Program Committee co-chairs.

Appointments

Under the impressive leadership of Scott Schwartz, the Appointments Committee (George Bain, Su Kim Chung, Gerrianne Schaad, and Cheryl Stadel-Bevans, with 2011 Chair Karen Jefferson as ex officio) has done exemplary work. They completed their charge more than a month ahead of the established due dates. I was able to keep up with them in extending invitations to serve, and so was able to send a spreadsheet to René Mueller by mid-April that reflected all but a handful of slots having been filled. In turn, this has enabled her to send out the formal letters of appointment much earlier than usual.

The Committee recommended 79 members for appointment (out of 126 applicants), and I accepted virtually all of their well-considered recommendations. It was very interesting to see the patterns across the volunteer pool, such as number of committees for which individuals volunteered (mean of four, maximum of 24) and most popular committees (more than 20 volunteers each for AA Board, CALM, CEPC, Diversity, Education, Program [39!], and Publications). Three times as many women as men volunteered (103 vs. 37): any ideas as to why that might be the case? Only two of seven African Americans could be appointed because most applied to the Diversity Committee. Of the 42 appointments, 64% went to individuals with ten or fewer years of membership. Not a single volunteer declined appointment.

In addition, I took recommendations for new members from various committee chairs (AA Board, Publications Board, IPWG, Program Committee, CEPC, and several others) and also appointed incoming chairs or vice chairs for most of the core committees. The election results led to several more vacancies.

The three positions that are reserved for Fellows (Posner, Ham, Fellows Steering) had two, one, or zero volunteers. I suggested to Nancy Beaumont that a message be sent to
the Fellows listserv highlighting these positions at the same time that the call for volunteers is posted each fall, and she agreed to add this to the routines.

Scott and I are writing an article for the July/August issue of Archival Outlook reporting out on the process and outcomes. We’ll offer some advice about the type of information submitted that maximizes a volunteer’s chances for success.

This is a truly enjoyable VP responsibility because one is able to make so many members happy, but it was amazingly time consuming over a three-month time span (take note, future volunteers for VP). Hard to imagine what it would have been like without such a stellar Appointments Committee. René and Nancy also provided wonderful support.

2013 Annual Meeting

Robin Chandler (University of California, Santa Cruz) and Laura Tatum will serve as SAA co-chairs of the 2013 Program Committee. Julia Marks Young appointed Nancy Zimmelman Lenoil (California State Archives) as the CoSA co-chair. With excellent advice from Robin and Laura, I was able to appoint a marvelous group, more than half of whom are relatively junior members.

The New Orleans Host Committee will be chaired by Emilie (Lee) Leumas (Archdiocese of New Orleans) and Carol Bartels (The Historic New Orleans Collection), who report that the buzz among NOLA archivists is enthusiastic and energetic in anticipation of SAA’s return to their city.

We all agree that any programmatic attention to the devastation wrought by the hurricanes should focus on the city’s renewal rather than on the tragedy per se. Lee reports that they’re all pretty sick of talking about the hard times and embraced my suggestion that we instead look at successes. I would very much like to have an opening plenary speaker who has a high public profile and could speak to this. All ideas welcomed.

Annual Meeting Task Force

The AMTF progress report is on the June agenda and outlines the group’s activities to date, including the very productive meeting held in Chicago in early February. The co-chairs have repeatedly noted the challenges of operating a high-profile task force that has not yet met in person as a whole, so this meeting of the five-member general task force and the four subgroup chairs was very important. The subgroups have been moving forward individually at various levels of activity.

One issue on which I’ve worked on the TF’s behalf is that of enabling “real” blog capability from SAA’s website, on which we have a separate agenda item. AMTF members feel a strong need to improve upon the current method of enabling comments to postings on the group’s microsite. This is a high-profile group that very much wants active ideas from the membership and feedback on work in progress. Existence of the
existing “comment” capability is very subtle relative to the norm on standard blog sites. It is, however, a big leap forward that SAA’s Drupal site now includes some RSS feed functionality.

**Collaboration with ARL for DAS workshops**

I am a member of the Transforming Special Collections Working Group of the Association of Research Libraries, and issues relating to born-digital archival materials are a big item on our continuing agenda. I reported on the vast success of SAA’s DAS curriculum when we met in Chicago on May 2, and the group’s chair floated the idea of collaborating with SAA in some way to bring these workshops to ARL libraries. The nature of the collaboration could extend from simply publicizing availability of workshops, to encouraging ARLs to host workshops, to offering some sort of special discount. Solveig De Sutter is enthusiastic about the possibilities, and I will broker conversations between her and the relevant ARL staff and committee chairs. They would like to launch this in a way that will grab the attention of ARL member directors by being positioned within their strategic priorities, and so they may not act quickly with us other than at an information-gathering level. News as it breaks.

The working group also discussed in general terms its interest in more active collaboration with a variety of allied professional societies, including SAA. A DACS collaboration with SAA would be a major initial step in this direction.

**CALM**

I have remained in contact with our CALM co-chair, Su Kim Chung, on the matter of enabling virtual attendance at the meetings of all three organizations (SAA, ALA, AAM). She is gathering information about the equipment necessary and other related costs. I feel this is a necessary capability if we are to make CALM an effective joint committee. Without it, rarely can any co-chair attend the meetings of the other two organizations.

In early March, Gregor and I had a productive phone meeting with Su Kim and her committee, at her request, to discuss matters related to CALM’s effectiveness and how it could be improved. We made it clear that we both actively support working with SAA and AAM to make this happen, and Gregor’s efforts in this direction have been admirable.

**Glossary Working Group**

I reported in January that I had done lots of background work toward establishing this new working group but had not yet made appointments while investigating related issues. I set it aside while engaged in the principal work of appointments and returned to it in early May. I’ll be sending out a call for working group volunteers soon.
Possible Future Joint SAA/RBMS Conference

In January, I reported that ALA’s Rare Books and Manuscripts Section had raised the idea of holding a joint conference with SAA. I reported to the RBMS leadership that our Council discussion was both positive and realistic and asked them to follow up with me if they want to pursue it. No word since. Their immediate motivation had related to 2014, when ALA will meet in Las Vegas; the fact that SAA already had a contract in place for Washington, D.C., in 2014 obviated that possibility. RBMS tends to select its host city a maximum of two years ahead of time. I’ll be surprised if this idea moves forward, given the enormous differences in the two societies’ meeting models and approaches to planning.