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

Agendas and background materials for SAA Council meetings are publicly available via the SAA website at: http://www2.archivists.org/governance/reports. Each Council meeting agenda comprises Consent Items, Action Items, Discussion Items, and Reports, and the number/letter in the minutes (e.g., II.A.) corresponds to an item listed on the agenda. The minutes summarize actions taken and the outcomes of discussions. Reports generally are not summarized in the minutes, but provide a wealth of information about the work of appointed and component groups and the staff. To view the reports–and all other background materials–see the SAA website.

President Kathleen Roe called the meeting to order at 4:04 pm on Monday, August 17. Present were Vice President Dennis Meissner; Treasurer Mark Duffy; Executive Committee Member Tanya Zanish-Belcher; Council members Pam Hackbart-Dean, Geof Huth, Michelle Light, Lisa Mangiafico, Tim Pyatt, Helen Wong Smith, and Rachel Vagts; SAA Executive Director Nancy Beaumont, Publications Director Teresa Brinati, Finance/Administration Director Peter Carlson, Education Director Solveig De Sutter; and Web and Information Systems Administrator Matt Black. Not present: Council Member James Roth.

Guests throughout the meeting were Amy Cooper Cary, Kris Kiesling, Nancy McGovern, and Cheryl Stadel-Bevans, who were elected to the Council but would not be seated until the August 22 Council meeting. Invited to meet with the Council on Tuesday, August 18, were National Historical Publications and Records Commission Executive Director Kathleen Williams and SAA Intellectual Property Working Group Chair Aprille McKay. Joanna Groberg of Georgetown University attended a portion of the August 17 session and Committee on Advocacy and Public Policy Vice Chair Dennis Riley attended a portion of the August 18 session.

I. COUNCIL BUSINESS

A. Adoption of the Agenda

Roe introduced the agenda with one addition to the Action agenda (III.E.1. Librarian of Congress Qualifications) and one addition to the Reports agenda (V.M. Report of the Representative to the World Intellectual Property Organization / Standing Committee on Copyright and Related Rights [confidential]). Agenda Item III.D., Elect Class B Members of the Foundation Board, was moved to the August 22 session of the Council to follow the Foundation Board meeting.

The Council accepted these additions and further agreed to re-order several agenda items to accommodate guests and enhance the efficiency of the meeting. (Agenda items are presented in these minutes based on the original sequencing to minimize confusion.) Huth moved adoption

of the agenda as revised, Mangiafico seconded, and the agenda was adopted unanimously **(MOTION 1)**.

B. May 2015 Council Meeting Minutes

Roe noted that the minutes of the Council's May 28–30 meeting were adopted via online vote of the Council on June 18, 2015, and were posted on the SAA website immediately. SAA members were notified of availability of the minutes via *In The Loop*, the website, and social media.

II. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

Pyatt asked that Agenda Item II.D., Issues and Advocacy Roundtable Bylaws Revision, be removed from the Consent Agenda. It was considered on the Action Agenda as item III.E.2.

The following items were adopted by consent **(MOTION 2)**.

Move Consent Items: Huth
Second Consent Items: Duffy
Vote: PASSED (unanimous) (Absent: Roth)

A. Ratify Interim Council Actions

THAT the following interim actions taken by the Council between June 1 and August 7, 2015, be ratified.

- Unanimously adopted the May 28-30 SAA Council meeting minutes.
- Approved Revision Proposal for Encoded Archival Description (EAD3) submitted by the Standards Committee. (July 16, 2015) (See Appendix A.)
- Adopted recommendations that three individuals be awarded the 2015 Council Exemplary Service Award. (July 17, 2015) (See Appendix B.)

B. Ratify Interim Executive Committee Actions

THAT the following interim actions taken by the Executive Committee between May 9 and August 7, 2015, be ratified.

- Finalized contract with SAA Executive Director Nancy Beaumont for a three-year period, May 1, 2015 – April 30, 2018. (May 2015)
- Approved SAA letter from President Kathleen Roe (drafted by the Intellectual Property Working Group) on "Comments on Orphan Works and Mass Digitization." (June 2015)

- Approved SAA letter from President Kathleen Roe (drafted by the Intellectual Property Working Group) on "Copyright Protection for Certain Visual Works." (June 2015)

- Approved a draft statement on "Qualities of a Successful Candidate for Librarian of Congress" for circulation to other groups for feedback and possible sign-on. (June 2015)

- Approved "Information for New Council Members" and draft orientation schedule. (July 2015)

- Extended charge of the Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines for a period of 12 months so that the group can complete its work. (July 2015)

- Approved signing on to "The London Manifesto," which has been published by the Library and Archives Copyright Alliance as a way to advocate for uniform copyright exceptions across all EU states. (August 2015)

- Approved an SAA letter to Facebook (drafted by the Web Archiving Roundtable) requesting functionality that would allow a page owner to download the contents of his/her page(s) for archives preservation purposes. (August 2015) (See Appendix C.)

C. Approve Electronic Records Section Bylaws Revision

THAT the bylaws of the SAA Electronic Records Section, as revised, be approved (strikethrough = deletion, underline = addition).

Bylaws of the SAA Electronic Records Section

1) Annual Meeting.

The Annual Meeting of the Electronic Records Section will be held during the Annual Meeting of the Society of American Archivists.

2) Officers.

a) **Chair** - The Leader of the section will be the Chair, who will serve for a term of one year beginning at the end of the Section's ~~A~~annual meeting. The Chair will lead all Section meetings and will serve as the official representative of the section. ~~The Chair may appoint section members to serve as Newsletter Editor, Section Secretary, Webmaster or Press Relations Representative, and these members shall be full members of the Steering Committee during the Chair's term of service. Upon completion of the term as Chair, the outgoing chair will become a member of the Steering committee for a term of three years.~~

b) **Vice Chair/Chair Elect** - The Vice Chair will be elected by the section members via an electronic vote supervised by the Society of American Archivists staff. ~~present and voting at the annual meeting of the section.~~ The Vice chair must be a member of the section. The Vice chair will serve a term of one year as Vice Chair and will assume the position of chair at the conclusion of the term of the incumbent Chair. The Vice Chair will assist the Chair in leading the section and will represent the section in the absence of the Chair.

c) **Immediate Past Chair** – Upon completion of the term as Chair, the Chair assumes the role of Immediate Past Chair, continuing to serve on the Steering Committee for another one-year term. The primary responsibility of the Immediate Past Chair is to oversee the election process for new section leadership for the following year.

3) Steering Committee.

In addition to the Chair, Vice Chair and Immediate Past Chair, the Steering Committee consists of six (6) members elected from the section membership. The Steering Committee leads and organizes section activities, as well as appoints section members to serve in appointed positions. ~~There will be a section steering committee composed of six members. The section steering committee will assist the Chair and the Vice Chair in leading and organizing section activities. Members of the committee will serve for a term of three years, except the initial membership of the committee which will be elected according to the provisions of section III below. Each year, at the Annual Section Meeting, one new member of the steering committee will be elected by a majority of Section Members present and voting. Upon completion of the term as Chair, the outgoing chair will become a member of the Steering Committee for a full term of three years.~~

a) **Membership.** The maximum number of steering committee members shall be nine, including the Chair, Vice Chair, and Immediate Past Chair.
b) **Eligibility.** Steering Committee members must be members of the Society of American Archivists and Electronic Records Section.
c) **Elections.** One-third of the six elected members of the Steering Committee shall be elected each July by electronic vote supervised by the Society of American Archivists staff. The persons receiving the two highest vote totals shall be elected to a term as described in part d) of this Article.
d) **Terms.** Steering Committee members shall serve terms of three (3) years, beginning at the annual meeting following the ballot on which the member was elected. Steering Committee members shall be limited to two (2) consecutive terms unless no one is available to stand for election.

~~e) **Terms of initial membership of the steering committee.**~~
~~At the initial organization of the Section governance structure during the Section 1995 Annual Meeting, members of the steering committee will be elected for the following terms:~~

- ~~2 members will be elec~~
- ~~ted for a term of one year, terms expiring at the 1996 Annual Meeting.~~
- ~~2 members will be elected for a term of two years, terms expiring at the 1997 Annual Meeting.~~
- ~~2 members will be elected for a term of three years, terms expiring at the 1998 Annual Meeting.~~

~~The successful candidates will be selected by a majority of all Section members present and voting.~~
~~f) **Initial election of Section Chair.**~~
~~At the initial organization of the Section governance structure the office of Chair will be filled by an election at the 1995 Section Annual Meeting. The successful candidate will be selected by a majority of all Section members present and voting.~~

4) Appointed Positions.

The Steering Committee shall appoint section members to serve in the positions of Communications Liaison and Secretary, and may appoint liaisons to other SAA component groups and other roles as necessary.

a) **Communications Liaison**. The Communications Liaison facilitates communications between the Steering Committee and the Section membership and other audiences, including but not limited to

the SAA microsite, electronic mailing lists, blogs, social media, and other forms of online communication not yet in use by the Section. This role is open to all eligible Electronic Records Section members. The appointee will serve a renewable one-year term.

b) **Secretary.** The secretary is responsible for taking notes at the annual meeting and regular meetings of the Steering Committee, and for posting minutes of these meetings to the Electronic Records Section microsite. The secretary is selected from the membership of the Steering Committee.

5) Modification of this governance structure.

This section governance structure may be modified by an electronic vote administered by the Society of American Archivists. ~~vote of all members present and voting at the Section Annual Meeting.~~

Support Statement: These bylaws meet the minimum requirements of the Council and are in alignment with SAA's governance documents. By approving the section bylaws, the Council places them in the official record.

Impact on Strategic Priorities: To the extent that section bylaws enhance transparency and understanding of how component groups function, this action is related to Goal 4.1. Facilitate effective communication with and among members, Goal 4.2. Create opportunities for members to participate fully in the association, and Goal 4.3. Continue to enrich the association and the profession with greater diversity in membership and expanded leadership opportunities.

Fiscal Impact: None.

D. Approve Issues and Advocacy Roundtable Bylaws Revision

This agenda item was removed from the Consent Agenda and placed on the Action Agenda as item III.E.2.

E. Approve Web Archiving Roundtable Bylaws Revision

THAT the bylaws of the Web Archiving Roundtable, as revised, be approved (strikethrough = deletion, underline = addition).

Bylaws of the SAA Web Archiving Roundtable

I. Name
The name of this roundtable shall be Web Archiving Roundtable.

II. Mission
To heighten advocacy and awareness of the issues archivists encounter related to the selection, appraisal, harvesting, management, preservation, and provision of access to web content.

III. Goals and Objectives

A. Provide SAA a voice for issues related to web archiving.
B. Enhance web archiving through the creation of best practices and community-based standards.

C. Give direction and leadership to SAA in regards to web archiving.
D. Cultivate the need for archives and special collections to create new job lines or repurpose existing ones to include a web archiving component.
E. Educate the membership of SAA by increasing their understanding and ability to implement web archiving practices within their own institutions.
F. Serve as a liaison to other organizations, nationally and internationally, engaged in web archiving, such as the Archive-It Partner Meeting and the International Internet Preservation Consortium.

IV. Membership
The Web Archiving Roundtable is open to any persons interested in the archival efforts to collect the web. Membership in the roundtable shall be determined according to the guidelines established in Section X: Roundtables of the SAA Governance Manual. Nonmembers of SAA may also participate in the Web Archiving Roundtable but will not have voting privileges or be eligible for elected/appointed leadership positions.

V. Meetings
The Web Archiving Roundtable will meet formally as a body at least once a year during the annual Society of American Archivists' Meeting. Other meetings or meetups may be held during the year at the discretion of the Steering Committee at-large with approval from the Chair or Vice Chair.

VI. Governance
The Web Archiving Roundtable Steering Committee is composed of ~~five to~~ six members from the roundtable leadership: Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, Web Liaison, Education Coordinator, ~~one member from the~~ and the Social Media Manager~~s~~. When applicable, a ~~sixth~~ seventh member of the Steering Committee will be appointed from the Best Practices/Toolbox Committee. The Chair, in consultation with the Vice Chair and the Past Chair, is responsible for appointing members from the ~~Social Media Managers and~~ Best Practices/Toolbox Committee to serve on the Steering Committee if needed. The Chair will serve as the head of the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee directs and coordinates all roundtable activities, including the establishment of annual projects and meetings.

Elected positions of leadership are as follows:

Chair: ~~(1 individual)~~
- Provides leadership for
  - Elections
  - Reporting
  - Governance
  - Meetings
- Serves as liaison to SAA and other bodies.
- Coordinates session proposals for annual meeting.
- Serves as the head of the Steering Committee.
- Fulfills all responsibilities specified in Section X: Roundtables of the SAA Governance Manual.

Vice Chair: ~~(1 individual)~~
- Gives support to fulfill the duties and responsibilities of the Chair as assigned.
- Operates as acting Chair in the absence of the Chair.
- Serves as member of the Steering Committee.
- Fulfills all responsibilities specified in Section X: Roundtables of the SAA Governance Manual.

Secretary:
- In consultation with Chair and Vice Chair establishes all Steering Committee meetings.

● Calls for and distributes agenda items for Steering Committee meetings.
● Records meeting minutes and distributes them to the Steering Committee.
● Serves as member of the Steering Committee.

Web Liaison: ~~(1 individual)~~
● Maintains and updates roundtable website, for both SAA and external sites.
● Serves as member of the Steering Committee.

Education Coordinator: ~~(1 individual)~~
● Serves as the roundtable's liaison to SAA Education Committee.
● Arranges informal online meet-ups for members.
● Prepares educational experiences, such as guest speakers, etc.
● Serves as member of the Steering Committee.

Social Media Manager~~s~~: ~~(1-2 individual[s])~~
● Coordinates and updates social media feeds utilized by the roundtable.
● Serves as member of the Steering Committee.

Appointed positions of leadership are as follows:

Past Chair:
● Coordinates and calls all meetings for the Best Practices/Toolbox Committee.
● Works as liaison to the Steering Committee on behalf of Best Practices/Toolbox
● Serves on the Steering Committee at the discretion of the current Chair.
● In consultation with the current Chair, sets the yearly agenda for the Best Practices/Toolbox Committee

Best Practices/Toolbox Committee: (3-6 individuals)
● Creates/updates standards and promotes strategies to enhance the quality of web
● Shares links and resources with members, providing up-to-date information regarding Committee.

The Chair will serve for a term of one year to begin immediately following the annual Society of American Archivists' Meeting. The Vice Chair will serve for two years, in the first year as Chair elect and in the second year as Chair. The Past Chair serves for one year immediately following the annual Society of American Archivists' Meeting of which they chaired. All other positions appointed or elected shall be required to commit to a term of no more than one year.

VII. Elections and appointments
Membership in the Web Archiving Roundtable is required in order to participate in elections through candidacy or in casting a ballot.

The Chair shall issue a call for nominations, including self-nominations, for the positions of Vice Chair, Secretary, Web Liaison, Education Coordinator, and Social Media Manager~~(s)~~ every June to all Web Archiving Roundtable members via the roundtable's established forms of communication. A slate of candidates shall be established by the officers and announced to roundtable members no later than June 15.

Adopted by the Web Archiving Roundtable membership on 08/14/13; approved by the SAA Council on 9/30/13. Revision adopted by the Roundtable membership in July 2015 and approved by the SAA Council on August 17, 2015.

Support Statement: These bylaws meet the minimum requirements of the Council and are in alignment with SAA's governance documents. By approving the roundtable bylaws, the Council places them in the official record.

Impact on Strategic Priorities: To the extent that creation and adoption of roundtable bylaws enhances transparency and understanding of how component groups function, this action is related to Goal 4.1. Facilitate effective communication with and among members, Goal 4.2. Create opportunities for members to participate fully in the association, and Goal 4.3. Continue to enrich the association and the profession with greater diversity in membership and expanded leadership opportunities.

Fiscal Impact: None.

III. ACTION ITEMS

A. Committee on Education: Arrangement and Description Curriculum

At its May 2015 meeting, the SAA Council reviewed a recommendation from the Committee on Education (CoE) that SAA offer a curriculum and certificate program in Arrangement and Description (A&D) modeled on SAA's highly successful Digital Archives Specialist (DAS) Curriculum and Certificate program. The Council approved the curriculum component of the recommendation and asked for further analysis of the recommendation that the program include a certificate component. The Committee provided further analysis and rationale.

MOTION 3

THAT the SAA Committee on Education proceed with implementation of an Arrangement and Description program that includes a certificate component.

Support Statement: Professional organizations like SAA should not only provide high-quality continuing education to their members and others, but package this education in a way that is attractive to current and potential employers. Like the highly successful DAS certificate program, the A&D track/certificate program would provide a credential to archivists wishing to expand their descriptive skills and advance professionally. The certificate would be a benchmark for achievement in archival description, a part of the field that requires continuous updates of skills and knowledge of standards.

Relation to Strategic Goals: The proposal addresses Goal 2.1. "Provide content, via education and publications, that reflects the latest thinking and best practices in the filed" and responds directly to Activity 2.1.1., "Refine SAA's entire education program based on the DAS model: Develop training plans for archivists, integrate courses across archival realms of knowledge, and continuously improve offerings and training materials based on attendee and instructor feedback."

Fiscal Impact: The Council-adopted budget for FY16 presupposes a certificate component to the new Arrangement and Description program. The staff believes that revenues will be affected significantly without the incentive of a certificate.

Move: Huth
Second: Vagts
Vote: PASSED (unanimous) (Absent: Roth)

B. Standards Committee: Combine TS-EAD, TS-EAC-CPF, and SDT into Single Technical Subcommittee on Encoded Archival Standards

The Standards Committee proposed combining the Technical Subcommittee on Encoded Archival Description (TS-EAD), the Technical Subcommittee on Encoded Archival Context-Corporate Bodies, Persons, and Families (TS-EAC-CPF), and the Schema Development Team (SDT) into one Technical Subcommittee on Encoded Archival Standards as a means of increasing efficiency and ensuring the necessary level of coherence and integration across encoded archival metadata standards. In presenting its recommendation, the Committee posed several questions for the Council's consideration in determining options for size, composition, and length of terms for membership of this restructured committee. The Council discussed options and agreed on the following charge/description for the restructured technical subcommittee.

MOTION 4

THAT the Technical Subcommittee on Encoded Archival Description (TS-EAD), the Technical Subcommittee on Encoded Archival Context-Corporate Bodies, Persons, and Families (TS-EAC), and the Schema Development Team (SDT) be combined into a single technical subcommittee, the Technical Subcommittee on Encoded Archival Standards (TS-EAS), with the following charge:

Technical Subcommittee on Encoded Archival Standards (TS-EAS)

I. Purpose

The Technical Subcommittee on Encoded Archival Standards (TS-EAS) is responsible for the ongoing maintenance of EAD and EAC-CPF, including all schemas and related code, as well as the development of future companion standards, including Encoded Archival Context - Functions. Its membership will be sufficient to encompass the necessary domain expertise for each standard and schema development, and will include broad representation from SAA and the international archives community.

II. Committee Selection, Size, and Length of Term

All members of the technical subcommittee shall demonstrate significant knowledge of and experience with archival schemas generally, and with EAD and EAC-CPF specifically. The subcommittee shall be composed of between 15 and 20 members (including two co-chairs) appointed by the SAA Vice President/President-Elect for staggered three-year terms so that a minimum of three individuals are appointed by the Vice President each year. SAA members will make up a majority of the subcommittee membership. The chairs and members of TS-EAS may be reappointed; no member shall serve for more than nine years.

The Technical Subcommittee on Encoded Archival Standards co-chairs will be appointed by the SAA Vice President / President-Elect, and serve as the primary contacts among TS-EAS and SAA, the Standards Committee, and other related organizations. One co-chair will be a member of SAA and the other will be a member of the international archives community.

Ex officio members of TS-EAS shall include the following if they are not regular members of the subcommittee:

- Co-chairs of the Standards Committee
- Chair or co-chairs of the EAD Roundtable
- Representative from ICA Experts Group on Archival Description or Committee on Best Practices and Standards

III. Reporting Procedures

The co-chairs of TS-EAS shall report at least annually to the chairs of the SAA Standards Committee. They will coordinate meeting logistics at the SAA Annual Meeting and elsewhere, establish TS-EAS priorities and agendas, coordinate dissemination of news from TS-EAS, work with related SAA section and roundtable leaders, and oversee and support the work of various TS-EAS standard leads. If extramural funding is obtained by SAA, the co-chairs shall provide all necessary narrative reports to the SAA office in order that the reporting requirements of SAA and the funding source are met.

IV. Duties and Responsibilities

Within TS-EAS, a member will be designated by the co-chairs as the lead for each standard being maintained or developed. Each standard lead will be responsible, with the support of the co-chairs, for soliciting and compiling comments, logging bugs, leading discussion of proposed changes, articulating and justifying changes to the community, and coordinating as necessary with other standard leads. There will also be a lead for schema design who will be responsible, with the support of the co-chairs, for coordinating work on schemas and related code and maintaining appropriate GitHub repositories. The TS-EAS co-chairs will also designate a committee member to serve as a secretary, responsible for taking and distributing meeting minutes. Additional *ad hoc* subgroups within TS-EAS may be formed on a project basis (e.g., a tag library editorial team).

VI. Meetings

TS-EAS shall carry out its charge primarily via electronic mail, regular mail, and conference calls. It shall meet at the SAA Annual Meeting and as necessary with funding from SAA or from extramural sources (with prior approval by the SAA Council).

Support Statement: Combining TS-EAD, TS-EAC, and SDT is a step toward greater integration and more efficient maintenance of the encoding standards that SAA maintains. In addition, it will reduce administrative overhead for the Standards Committee, the SAA Council, and the SAA staff.

Impact on Strategic Priorities: The proposed restructuring will make work related to Goal 3.1 ("Identify the need for new standards, guidelines, and best practices and lead or participate in their development") more agile and efficient and thus will also serve Goal 4.1. ("Facilitate effective communication with and among members").

Fiscal Impact: The restructuring is likely to save volunteer and staff time.

Move: Duffy
Second: Huth
Vote: PASSED (unanimous) (Absent: Roth)

C. Archives and Archivists Discussion List Terms of Participation

Since 2013 the SAA Council had responded to controversies regarding the Archives and Archivists (A&A) List and had modified the Terms of Participation to address concerns. The previous revision had included some imprecise language that made it difficult for the A&A List moderator to manage the list. In May 2015 the Council charged List liaisons Geof Huth and Lisa Mangiafico to prepare a revision of the Terms, circulate the revision for member comment, collect and assess the comments received, and propose a new set of terms for Council consideration.

MOTION 5

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

Revised Archives and Archivists List Terms of Participation

NB: The base text of this document is the text of the July 2015 revision to the terms of participation. Text proposed for removal is struck through, and text proposed for insert is underlined.

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 audiences~~ include~~ 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 ~~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 (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 ~~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.

Move: Zanish-Belcher
Second: Smith
Vote: PASSED (Yes: Duffy, Hackbart-Dean, Huth, Light, Mangiafico, Meissner, Smith, Vagts, Zanish-Belcher. Abstain: Pyatt. Absent: Roth.)

D. Elect SAA Foundation Class B Members

This agenda item was moved to the Council's August 22 meeting so that it would follow the Foundation Board meeting on Wednesday, August 19.

E. Other Action Items from Council Members

E.1. Qualities of a Successful Candidate for Librarian of Congress

The Joint Working Group on Issues and Awareness (a working group of the Council of State Archivists, the National Association of Government Archives and Records Administrators, and SAA) proposed that the three organizations collaborate on a document outlining the qualities of a successful candidate for Librarian of Congress, similar to what the three organizations had issued when the position of Archivist of the United States was vacant. The Council considered and approved the working group's draft statement.

MOTION 6

THAT "A New Librarian of Congress: Qualities of a Successful Candidate," as developed by the Joint Working Group on Issues and Advocacy, be adopted with the minor revision shown below (underline = addition).

A New Librarian of Congress: Qualities of a Successful Candidate

A nominee for the office of Librarian of Congress will be selected based upon the legal obligations and responsibilities under federal law. In addition to these requirements, the Society of American Archivists, the Council of State Archivists, and the National Association of Government Archives and Records Administrators believe that the following personal and professional qualities are important in order for a nominee to be successful in this essential position of public trust.

Vision

- Ability to present a compelling vision for the mission and work of the Library of Congress (LoC) and, more broadly, for the library, information, and archives professions in the United States.
- Ability to envision LoC's stewardship role in preserving America's intellectual, historical and <u>diverse</u> cultural heritage.
- Ability to envision a leading role for LoC in digital asset management, digital preservation, copyright and fair use, and congressional research.

Values

- Commitment to protecting the public's right to privacy, as defined by law and custom.
- Commitment to providing access to open government and support for transparency.
- Commitment to protecting LoC's professional integrity and political non-partisanship.
- Commitment to the Library's leadership role in setting, maintaining, and promulgating national and international standards.
- Commitment to providing leadership in the advancement of digital preservation and information technology.
- Commitment to the ongoing mission of National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program.
- Commitment to recruiting a diverse and representative workforce for the LoC.

- Commitment to collaborate with other federal offices, with state and local governments, and with other library and archival programs, including those in other countries, to identify and address shared responsibilities and concerns.

Expertise

- Experience and excellence in leadership, program advocacy, and management of a complex information-based organization.
- Ability to communicate effectively, listen, and partner with a wide range of stakeholders, including librarians, archivists, historians, journalists, political scientists, researchers, and the general public.
- Ability to understand critical issues, including the challenges of implementing new information technologies, and the competing demands of access, security, and privacy in using primary source materials.
- Ability to provide leadership and advocacy on behalf of LoC's roles to the public, government officials, and LoC staff, and on behalf of the library, archives, cultural and historical communities.

Moved: Duffy
Second: Meissner
Vote: PASSED (unanimous) (Absent: Roth)

E.2. Approve Issues and Advocacy Roundtable Bylaws Revision

This item was removed from the Consent Agenda by Pyatt, who wished to discuss the fact that the bylaws include mention of roundtable endorsements of Annual Meeting session proposals, a practice that the Council had put on hold. Beaumont noted that many section and roundtable bylaws include this language. Council members agreed that the issue of component group endorsements should be discussed by the Council and brought to closure soon, possibly in conjunction with current discussions of restructuring member affinity groups.

MOTION 7

THAT the bylaws of the Issues and Advocacy Roundtable, as revised, be approved (strikethrough = deletion, underline = addition).

Bylaws of the SAA Issues and Advocacy Roundtable

I. Mission

Provides a forum for discussion on critical issues that the archival profession faces that are not the primary focus of another SAA group.

II. Governance

A. Steering Committee

The Steering Committee is composed of between six and eight members willing to serve, including the

officers (a Chair and a Vice-Chair).

The Steering Committee directs and coordinates the activities of the Roundtable and approves appointments made by the Chair and the Vice-Chair if vacancies occur. Committee members establish projects to work on through the year, help to plan the annual business meeting, and endorse SAA program sessions presented to the Roundtable. A member of the Steering Committee shall serve as secretary at the annual Roundtable meeting and take minutes.

B. Officers

The Chair and the Vice-Chair serve as joint officers of the Roundtable. Only individual members of SAA and the Issues and Advocacy Roundtable may hold these positions.

The Chair and the Vice-Chair direct and report the activities of the Roundtable, organize and conduct the annual meeting of the Roundtable, chair the Steering Committee, act as liaisons for the Roundtable to other bodies, appoint Roundtable committees as needed, and handle administrative matters, including, but not limited to, annual reports to the SAA.

C. Committees and Taskforces

Committees and special taskforces may be appointed by the Chair and the Vice-Chair upon recommendation of the Steering Committee or by action of the membership at its annual meeting.

D. Website Editor

A Website Editor shall be appointed by the Steering Committee as needed and will serve as a member of the Steering Committee. The website editor should not serve concurrently as either Chair or Vice-Chair of the Roundtable.

The Website Editor is responsible for maintaining and updating the I&AR website as needed and for negotiating all website matters with the SAA office as appropriate.

E. Endorsing Proposals for the Annual Meeting

Endorsements may be given to sessions submitted to the SAA's Program Committee and the I&AR by the appropriate proposal deadline dates. Rules and guidelines for endorsement from the SAA shall be followed. Priority will be given to proposals submitted by I&AR members or those sessions dealing directly with the I&AR mission. The Steering Committee members will review the proposals and respond with either a yes or no vote for endorsement. The proposals receiving the most affirmative votes will be endorsed. In the event of any ties the Steering Committee will reconsider. If the tie is not broken, the decision will be made by the Chair and the Vice-Chair. The Chair will forward the endorsement of the I&AR to the SAA by the appropriate endorsement deadline.

Members of the Steering Committee who are participating in the proposals are not eligible to vote on the endorsement.

F. Elections and Terms

As of this time there is no official Nominating Committee for the I&A Roundtable; if needed in the future this committee can be added through an amendment to the Bylaws.

Instead, the Chair and the Vice-Chair solicit candidates for the next year's Steering Committee and/or Chair/Vice-Chair positions as needed, using the Roundtable's listserv and/or website, and receive the names of volunteers or persons recommended. They then prepare an appropriate slate of candidates and their statements for general Roundtable membership to vote on.
Roundtable Chair, Vice-Chair, and Steering Committee members are elected via electronic vote by the general membership of the Roundtable. ~~four to two weeks prior to the week of the Annual General Meeting of SAA.~~ Elections are conducted online with the assistance of the SAA staff and in accordance with the guidelines for Section elections as specified in Section IX. of the SAA Governance Manual. Availability of the online ballot and the deadline for voting is announced by the Chair to all roundtable members via the roundtable's official email discussion list and website.

As officers, the Chair and the Vice-Chair serve terms that total two years each. Upon completion of his/her term as Vice-Chair, that officer succeeds to the office of Chair for the next term. Their terms are to be staggered such that no year will bring in two brand new Chairs (i.e. 2010-2012 and 2011-2013), so that an experienced Chair or Vice-Chair will share leadership at all times.

Each officer is expected to attend the Annual Meeting.

Steering Committee positions are ~~one year~~ two-year terms and will be staggered such that no year will bring in an entirely new Steering Committee (e.g., two members will serve 2016-2018 and two members will serve 2017-2019). ~~and must be voted on each year.~~ Steering committee members may hold their position for two consecutive terms of two years (four years total), and then may not be re-elected for a minimum of two years. Steering committee members who wish to run for Vice-Chair must do so at the end of their first term or must wait for two years following the end of their second term to run. Each Steering Committee member is expected to attend the annual meeting or be involved virtually as needed.

The Steering Committee will ensure that there is at least one nominee for Chair, one nominee for Vice-Chair, and four nominees for Steering Committee. All candidates for election must be individual members of SAA and the Roundtable and must provide a statement for their election. ~~it is recommended that Steering Committee members be present at the Annual Meeting but it is not required.~~ The Committee will publicize the candidates on the Roundtable website and via the I&AR ~~and Archivists~~ listserv ~~at least one month preceding the Annual Meeting~~. The Committee will prepare a ballot and conduct an election as specified above. ~~four to two weeks prior to the week of the annual Roundtable meeting, electronically~~. Only members of the Roundtable may vote; members may vote only once. Candidates with the highest number of votes shall be elected. New leadership assumes office at the conclusion of the annual meeting of the Roundtable.

The Steering Committee shall appoint any other vacancies to fulfill unexpired terms of elected positions, after which a normal election shall occur.

III. Meetings

I&AR will meet at least once during the Society of American Archivists' annual meeting and at other times as deemed appropriate by the Steering Committee.

Meetings of Issues and Advocacy Roundtable members – and those interested in the concerns of the Roundtable – are encouraged at regional archives meetings.

IV. Communication

I&AR will submit information to the SAA's publication, *Archival Outlook*, the Issues and Advocacy Listserv and the Archives Listserv. The Roundtable will also disseminate information about its work through its website.

V. Roundtable Leadership and Council

As appropriate, I&AR leadership may meet with SAA Council Representatives to discuss matters of mutual concern.

VI. Enactment and Amendments

These bylaws were first approved and enacted by a majority vote of the membership in December 2010. These bylaws shall be reviewed at least every three years by the Steering Committee.

Proposed amendments to the Bylaws must be published on the website at least one month preceding the annual meeting. Amendments must be approved by a two-thirds majority of the Steering Committee and must be ratified by a two-thirds majority of the total votes cast by members of the Roundtable. A copy of the Bylaws shall be available to any member through the Roundtable's website and upon request to the Steering Committee.

Adopted by the Issues and Advocacy Roundtable membership on 08/30/13; approved by the SAA Council on 9/30/13. Revision adopted by the Roundtable membership in July 2015 and approved by the SAA Council on August 17, 2015.

Support Statement: These bylaws meet the minimum requirements of the Council and are in alignment with SAA's governance documents. By approving the roundtable bylaws, the Council places them in the official record.

Impact on Strategic Priorities: To the extent that creation and adoption of roundtable bylaws enhances transparency and understanding of how component groups function, this action is related to Goal 4.1. Facilitate effective communication with and among members, Goal 4.2. Create opportunities for members to participate fully in the association, and Goal 4.3. Continue to enrich the association and the profession with greater diversity in membership and expanded leadership opportunities.

Fiscal Impact: None.

Move: Duffy
Second: Huth
Vote: PASSED (unanimous) (Absent: Roth)

F. Executive Session (as needed)

The Council did not meet in executive session.

The Council adjourned for the evening and reconvened at 8:35 am on Tuesday, August 18.

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Dues Increase Proposal

The Council discussed the briefing paper that had been prepared as background for the Council-proposed dues increase that would be addressed at the Annual Business Meeting on August 22 and put to an online all-member referendum in the fall. (See Appendix D.)

B. Member Comment on Council Working Group on Member Affinity Groups Proposal

The Council discussed the call for member comment on the Council Working Group on Member Affinity Groups proposal that had been issued on August 13.[1] The working group's proposal had been refined since the Council's May 2015 discussion.

C. SAA "Statement on Statements"

Roe noted that SAA had been asked several times during the previous year – and many times in the past – to take a position and/or issue a statement on a social or social justice issue that was not related directly to SAA's mission or strategic plan. The Executive Committee agreed that it would be helpful to have a Council-adopted statement that could guide SAA in the future when responding to member requests for advocacy. The Council reviewed a draft document that had been prepared by the Executive Committee.

MOTION 8

THAT SAA's Criteria for Advocacy Statements be adopted.

SAA's Criteria for Advocacy Statements

The Society of American Archivists, through its Council or Executive Committee, periodically is asked to take a position, make a statement, or take action on an issue that arises within the larger context of American society. Very recent examples include [the heinous murders of members of the Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, South Carolina, in June 2015 or the U.S. Supreme Court's decisions in support of gay marriage and certain provisions of the Affordable Care Act].

Some SAA members believe that SAA should speak for all archivists on these types of broader social issues. SAA has been compared with the American Library Association and other organizations that choose to issue statements on social issues, whether or not related directly to the missions of those organizations.

Although some – or even most – of SAA's leaders, members, and staff may hold similar views on social issues and matters of social justice, the organization as a whole does not have the resources or knowledge of a consensus to comment or act on every social issue that emerges. To choose to comment or act on one issue to the exclusion of others would raise concerns about how SAA reaches a decision about when to become involved and when and how the broader membership is consulted (or even polled) about their individual positions on a given social issue.

[1] http://www2.archivists.org/news/2015/council-seeks-comment-on-proposed-changes-in-member-affinity-groups

SAA will take a position, make a statement, or take other action only on issues that are related directly to archives and archival functions. SAA recognizes that social issues and archival concerns may overlap (e.g., in matters of personal privacy, access to public information, or misuse of records for political purposes). In these cases, the SAA Council or Executive Committee will consider the prudence and potential impact of becoming involved in the issue.

Members may recommend that SAA take action on an issue by following Procedures for Suggesting SAA Advocacy Action.

As an organization that values social responsibility, the public good, and the completeness of the public record and that understands the importance of advocacy, SAA encourages its members to engage with social issues to the extent that they, as individuals, are able.

Move: Huth
Second: Pyatt
Vote: PASSED (unanimous) (Absent: Roth)

D. Annual Meeting Activities/Assignments

The Council reviewed various Annual Meeting activities and assignments, including the Leadership Orientation and Forum; the Regional Archival Associations Consortium meeting; the New Member/First Timer Orientation; component group meetings; the two plenaries; forums on Diversity, Ethics Case Studies, Standards, and other topics; the Council Exemplary Service Awards; exhibit hall assignments; and the Annual Membership Meeting.

E. Other Discussion Items from Council Members

No additional discussion items were brought forward.

V. REPORTS

Reports are discussed by the Council only as needed and generally are not summarized in the minutes (with the exception of the Executive Committee report, which details interim actions of the Executive Committee). They do, however, provide a wealth of information about the work of appointed and component groups and the staff. To view the reports–and all other background materials–see http://www2.archivists.org/governance/reports.

A. Executive Committee

The Council reviewed, but did not discuss, this report.

B. President

The Council reviewed, but did not discuss, this report.

C. Vice President / President-Elect

The Council reviewed, but did not discuss, this report.

D. Treasurer

The Council reviewed and briefly discussed this report.

E.1. Staff: Executive Director

The Council reviewed, but did not discuss, this report.

E.2. Staff: Membership

The Council reviewed, but did not discuss, this report.

E.3. Staff: Education

The Council reviewed, but did not discuss, this report.

E.4. Staff: Publications

The Council reviewed, but did not discuss, this report.

E.5. Staff: Annual Meeting

The Council reviewed, but did not discuss, this report.

E.6. Staff: Technology

The Council reviewed, but did not discuss, this report.

E.7. Staff: Update on Progress Toward Council-Adopted Recommendations of Communications Task Force

The Council reviewed, but did not discuss, this report.

F. *American Archivist* Editor

The Council reviewed, but did not discuss, this report.

G. Publications Editor

The Council reviewed, but did not discuss, this report.

H. Committee on Education

The Council reviewed, but did not discuss, this report.

I. 2014-2015 Nominating Committee

The Council reviewed, but did not discuss, this report.

J. Archival Educators Roundtable Annual Report (Late)

The Council reviewed, but did not discuss, this report.

K. Representative to ICA Section on Professional Associations

The Council reviewed, but did not discuss, this report.

L. Other Reports from Council Members / What Are You Hearing from Members?

No other reports were received from Council members.

M. Representative to WIPO/SCCR

The Council reviewed a confidential report from William Maher regarding this recent attendance at the WIPO/SCCR meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, including strategies for collaborating with other organizations to further SAA's advocacy agenda.

I. COUNCIL BUSINESS (Continued)

A. Review of August 17-18, 2015, Action List

Council members did not review the draft list of action items stemming from the meeting.

B. Review of August 17-18, 2015, Talking Points

Council members did not formally review the decisions made at the meeting.

C. Meeting Debriefing

Council members did not conduct a review of the meeting.

D. Adjournment

Huth moved adjournment, Duffy seconded, and the Council meeting was adjourned by unanimous consent of those in attendance at 11:40 a.m. on Tuesday, August 18, 2015.

Adopted unanimously by the SAA Council on September 22, 2015.

APPENDIX A
Interim Action Item

Society of American Archivists
Council Interim Action
July 9, 2015

Standards Committee:
Revision Proposal for Encoded Archival Description
(Prepared by Co-chairs Dan Santamaria and Meg Tuomala)

The Standards Committee certifies that the Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Description (TS-EAD) has complied with Council-adopted procedures relating to standards development and revision, and recommends the adoption of the revisions to the EAD standard as submitted by TS-EAD.

This proposal is the culmination of a process that began in 2010, when the Standards Committee charged a new Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Description (TS-EAD) to oversee the maintenance of the standard. Recognizing that EAD needed an update, its charge instructed TS-EAD to complete a revision of the standard within five years. This was a complicated process that included substantial community feedback as summarized below. The revision to EAD is known as EAD3 and would replace EAD 2002 as the current, official version of the standard.

In addition to substantive changes to the EAD schema and DTD TS-EAD is proposing to change the maintenance of EAD3 to an ongoing maintenance model (as is currently employed by TS-DACS) and recommends consolidating the technical subcommittees charged with maintaining archival data structure standards (TS-EAD, TS-EAC-CPF, and the Schema Development Team) into a single group (the Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Standards). The consolidation of subcommittees requires further discussion and will be dealt with in a separate agenda item. The Standards Committee also supports this change.

BACKGROUND

Extensive background is available in the Appendix, EAD3 Submission Information, which was compiled by the TS-EAD chairs. The full submission packet compiled by TS-EAD also contains extensive documentation of the revision process. A briefer summary is included here (text in italics is directly quoted from the TS-EAD submission to Standards):

In the years between the release of EAD 2002 and 2010, when the revision process that led to EAD3 began, the technological landscape surrounding archival description evolved enormously. Collection management systems, such as the Archivists' Toolkit, Archon, and ICA-AtoM, offered the robust advantages of modeling descriptive information in relational databases, but exposed

the difficulty of adapting the EAD document model in data-centric applications. Linked Open Data emerged as a viable methodology for creating a semantically meaningful Web, for which EAD was poorly prepared. New and closely related metadata transmission standards were developed, most notably Encoded Archival Context – Corporate bodies, Persons, and Families (EAC-CPF), opening new frontiers in archival metadata. Finally, over a decade of working with EAD gave archivists a general sense that it was too complex, too forgiving, and too flexible for its own good.

In 2010, the SAA Standards Committee charged a new Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Description (TS-EAD) to oversee the maintenance of the standard. Recognizing that EAD needed an update, its charge instructed TS-EAD to complete a revision of the standard within five years.

Early in the revision process TS-EAD published four points of emphasis to guide us as we weighed the benefits of changes to EAD.

1. *Achieving greater conceptual and semantic consistency in the use of EAD.*
2. *Exploring mechanisms whereby EAD-encoded information might more seamlessly and effectively connect with, exchange, or incorporate data maintained according to other protocols.*
3. *Improving the functionality of EAD for representing descriptive information created in international and particularly in multilingual environments.*
4. *Being mindful that a new version will affect current users.*

All of the changes made in EAD3 can be seen in the context of these four points. Throughout the revision process, the most difficult decisions concerned proposals that highlighted tensions between them, especially between making EAD more consistent and aligned to other standards and mitigating impact on current users.

DISCUSSION

The Standards Committee considers the consultation process for this revision thorough and appropriate for such a major project. The revision process involved an initial call for comments, and opportunities for feedback on alpha, beta, and gamma versions of EAD3. A timeline and overview of these comment periods is available in the Appendix, under the heading "Documentation of the Consultation Process." In addition to the public comment periods, TS-EAD conducted all technical development work and logged comments in a publicly accessible repository on GitHub, regularly presented at the SAA Annual Meeting and elsewhere, including internationally, and sent updates to appropriate email lists as work progressed.

A summary of significant changes is available in the Appendix as well as in the emails, presentation, and supporting documentation provided by TS-EAD in their submission packet. Decision-making during such a large-scale project is complicated and in select cases consensus was difficult to achieve. TS-EAD describes their decision-making process as follows:

TS-EAD's decision-making process focused on detailed analysis and consensus building within the committee. As we received proposals from the community or fellow committee members, individuals or small groups did additional work to better understand the request, clarify the specific impact on the schema, and make recommendations to the committee. Many issues were revisited multiple times as we collectively came to understand better our goals and their impact. Although healthy differences of opinion persisted throughout the revision process, ultimately only one issue had to be decided by an executive decision by the co-chairs. In the alpha schema element and attribute names were converted to camel case, as is the convention in EAC-CPF. This met our goals of conceptual consistency and interoperability with EAC-CPF, but we received strong feedback from the community arguing against the change. Entrenched and opposing opinions – all with strong justifications from our points of emphasis – remained within TS-EAD; ultimately the co-chairs decided to honor precedent and sensitivity to the impact on users and opted to remove camel case.

Another case of disagreement was the inclusion of the <relations> element within EAD3, which is detailed in the Appendix. Related substantial feedback came in comments from TS-EAC, also summarized in the Appendix, and detailed in the file EAD3Gamma-commentsFromAngjeliWisser.pdf in the TS-EAD submission packet. In summary,

TS-EAD acknowledged their feedback, but made no subsequent changes to EAD3. The areas of concern identified by TS-EAC all reflected different interpretations of the points of emphasis that guided the revision. Within TS-EAD there was a stronger consensus around mitigating impact to existing users than would have allowed some of the changes preferred by TS-EAC. There were also fundamental differences of opinion between the two groups about what mechanisms best support the exchange of data.

The Standards Committee notes that the proposed maintenance, described below, is designed to help better coordinate and plan development of descriptive standards through combining TS-EAD, TS-EAC, and SDT into a single technical subcommittee.

Maintenance Plan

In its proposed maintenance plan TS-EAD also proposes to move maintenance of EAD to an ongoing maintenance and review model. The Standards Committee supports this change as it should allow additional flexibility in maintaining the standard and help make future revisions less overwhelming than the eight-year gap between the release of EAD2002 and the start of the revision process for EAD3 (and the resulting gap of 13 years between finalization of the two versions).

The Standards Committee also supports the restructuring of the technical subcommittees to combine TS-EAD, TS-EAC-CPF, and the Schema Development team (SDT). TS-EAD, TS-EAC, and the SDT are closely interrelated, both formally (the co-chairs of each subcommittee are ex officio members of the others and all SDT members are ex officio members of the subcommittees) and through other professional and informal networks. The exact composition of this committee requires further discussion and will be presented in a separate agenda item.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the revision to Encoded Archival Description as submitted by the Standards Committee on behalf of the Technical Subcommittee on EAD (Appendix) be adopted and that EAD3 replace EAD 2002 as the current, official version of the standard.

Support Statement: The revision resulting in EAD3 was a major undertaking and represents a significant step forward from EAD2002 and in achieving TS-EAD's goals of achieving greater conceptual and semantic consistency in the use of EAD, exploring mechanisms whereby EAD-encoded information might more seamlessly and effectively connect with, exchange, or incorporate data maintained according to other protocols, improving the functionality of EAD for representing descriptive information created in international and particularly in multilingual environments, and being mindful that a new version will affect current users.

Impact on Strategic Priorities: This addresses SAA's strategic goals of providing content that reflects the latest thinking and best practices in the field (2.1), delivering information via methods that keep pace with technological change (2.2), and participation in standards development (3.1).

Fiscal Impact: Staff time associated with updating related publications including the EAD tag library, likely to be offset by tag library sales.

Appendix

June 29, 2015

Standards Committee
Society of American Archivists

Dear SAA Standards Committee,

It is our great pleasure to submit EAD3 to the SAA Standards Committee on behalf of the Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Description (TS-EAD). The process of revising EAD was tremendously challenging yet rewarding, and we feel that EAD3 represents a significant enhancement to the most important metadata standard in our field as well as a solid foundation for further development.

Please review the following pieces of supporting documentation:

- Introductory Narrative
- Bibliography
- Documentation of the Consultation Process
- Maintenance and Review Plan
- EAD3 Version 1 (pre-release)
    - See https://github.com/SAA-SDT/EAD-Revision/releases/tag/v1.0.1-beta or EAD-Revision-1.0.1-beta.zip.
- EAD3 Tag Library
    - See EAD3 Tag Library.docx
      [Note this is still undergoing final revisions at the date of submission, primarily to check and supplement examples.]
- Example EAD3 instance
    - See beinecke.hayward_ead3.xml

We are ready and happy to provide clarification or additional documentation.

Thank you for the opportunity to invest our time, effort, and expertise into a standard we care deeply about. Revising EAD was a significant undertaking, and the support and patience of the Standards Committee was a necessary pre-condition for a successful outcome.

Sincerely,

Mike Rush
Bill Stockting
TS-EAD Co-Chairs

Introductory Narrative

Encoded Archival Description (EAD) is the international metadata transmission standard for hierarchical descriptions of archival records. Developed by the EAD Working Group of the Society of American Archivists and first published in 1998, EAD is an XML markup language used by archivists around the globe. A second version with greater international alignment, EAD 2002, was released as a DTD in 2002 and in 2007 as Relax NG and W3C schemas. The development of EAD made it possible to create electronic finding aids within a specifically-archival data structure compliant with *International Standard Archival Description (General)* (ISAD(G)). This innovation was a crucial impetus behind the swift migration of archival description to the internet, the acceptance of national archival descriptive content standards like *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (DACS), and the emergence of a professional consensus that archival description existed to be shared widely and shared well.

This new version of Encoded Archival Description – EAD3 – exists thanks to the efforts and support of many people, but it exists because of the many archivists and repositories around the world that saw the utility of EAD, used it in diverse and inspiring ways, and continue to recognize many ways in which it might work better.

In the years between the release of EAD 2002 and 2010, when the revision process that lead to EAD3 began, the technological landscape surrounding archival description evolved enormously. Collection management systems, such as the Archivists' Toolkit, Archon, and ICA-AtoM, offered the robust advantages of modelling descriptive information in relational databases, but exposed the difficulty of adapting the EAD document model in data-centric applications. Linked Open Data emerged as a viable methodology for creating a semantically meaningful Web, for which EAD was poorly prepared. New and closely-related metadata transmission standards were developed, most notably Encoded Archival Context – Corporate bodies, Persons, and Families (EAC-CPF), opening new frontiers in archival metadata. Finally, over a decade of working with EAD gave archivists a general sense that it was too complex, too forgiving, and too flexible for its own good.

In 2010, following an update to its by-laws concerning standards maintenance, the SAA Standards Committee charged a new Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Description (TS-EAD) to oversee the maintenance of the standard. Recognizing that EAD needed an update, its charge instructed TS-EAD to complete a revision of the standard within five years.

TS-EAD completed the revision of EAD with the help of the SAA Schema Development Team and with many contributions, large and small, from the international EAD community. EAD3 is the result of four public comment periods, countless feedback, three working meetings, numerous conference calls, regular presentations to the EAD Roundtable, and lots of careful analysis, spirited discussion, and hard-won compromise. Notable milestones in the revision process include the initial comment period, which shaped our early agenda; a three-day TS-EAD working meeting at Yale University's Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, which established a clear direction; and the alpha, beta, and gamma schema releases, which gave the EAD community concrete examples to test and critique.

Early in the revision process TS-EAD published four points of emphasis to guide us as we weighed the benefits of changes to EAD.

5. Achieving greater conceptual and semantic consistency in the use of EAD.
6. Exploring mechanisms whereby EAD-encoded information might more seamlessly and effectively connect with, exchange, or incorporate data maintained according to other protocols.

7. Improving the functionality of EAD for representing descriptive information created in international and particularly in multilingual environments.
8. Being mindful that a new version will affect current users.

All of the changes made in EAD3 can be seen in the context of these four points. Throughout the revision process, the most difficult decisions concerned proposals that highlighted tensions between them, especially between making EAD more consistent and aligned to other standards and mitigating impact on current users.

TS-EAD's decision making process focused on detailed analysis and consensus building within the committee. As we received proposals from the community or fellow committee members, individuals or small groups did additional work to better understand the request, clarify the specific impact on the schema, and make recommendations to the committee. Many issues were revisited multiple times as we collectively came to understand better our goals and their impact. Although healthy differences of opinion persisted throughout the revision process, ultimately only one issue had to be decided by an executive decision by the co-chairs. In the alpha schema element and attribute names were converted to camel case, as is the convention in EAC-CPF. This met our goals of conceptual consistency and interoperability with EAC-CPF, but we received strong feedback from the community arguing against the change. Entrenched and opposing opinions – all with strong justifications from our points of emphasis – remained within TS-EAD; ultimately the co-chairs decided to honor precedent and sensitivity to the impact on users and opted to remove camel case.

Of the changes made in EAD3, the most extensive departure from EAD 2002 is the replacement of <eadheader> with <control>. Borrowed from EAC-CPF with some enhancements, <control> offers a better model for representing information about finding aids, including its identifiers, status, languages, conventions, maintenance history, and sources. One notable change to <control> as modelled in EAC-CPF is the inclusion of <filedesc> from <eadheader>. As an aggregation of descriptions of all the material in an archival collection, finding aids have bibliographic attributes, such as a title or a publication statement captured in <filedesc> that are not necessary when documenting authority records.

The elements available within <did> (Descriptive Identification) were extensively updated in order to better support the exchange of key descriptive data between EAD3 and other systems. Some <did> elements were modified to remove mixed content and other ambiguities, including <origination>, <repository>, and <langmaterial>. The existing <unitdate> and <physdesc> elements were felt to be too lax to constrain and still provide a forward migration path, so new <unitdatestructured> and <physdescstructured> elements were added. These "structured" elements provide nuanced data models for capturing temporal and physical description, while the original elements remain in modified form as unstructured alternatives and to allow for forward migration from EAD 2002. Whereas these new elements provided additional structure, the <daogrp> element, which allowed the creation of extended links to digital archival objects, was simplified to <daoset>, which binds two or more simple <dao> elements.

The access point elements available within <controlaccess>, e.g. <persname>, <subject>, <genreform>, etc., were modified in several ways. Each may now contain one or more <part> elements so that multi-part terms may be accurately represented in EAD, allowing for example the capture of an individual's surname, forename, and life dates, etc. They also now share a common set of attributes to improve interoperability with external vocabularies: @identifier, for the code or URI associated with a term, @source, for identifying the originating vocabulary, and @rules, for recording how terms are formulated. The <geogname> element now has an optional child <geographiccoordinates> for encoding a set of geographic coordinates.

Support for multilingual description was addressed by adding @lang and @script attributes to all non-empty elements in EAD3, making it possible to explicitly state what language or script is used therein. Additionally, some elements were modified to allow them to repeat where previously they did not, thus enabling the inclusion of the same data in multiple languages.

Early in the revision process there were multiple requests to simplify EAD, and one suggested measure was reducing the number of elements. However, TS-EAD decided that consistency and semantic clarity was a better measure of simplicity, not the number of elements in the schema. The <note> element is a useful case study. In EAD 2002 <note> was available in 8 distinct contexts, each representing a subtly different usage; in EAD3 the <note> element has been replaced with context-specific elements, including <didnote>, <controlnote>, and <footnote>.

Many other changes can be categorized as supporting the drive for greater conceptual and sematic consistency in EAD. Major descriptive elements that previously could be contained in other descriptive elements were removed in those contexts. For example, <arrangement> is no longer a permitted child of <scopecontent>, <unitdate> is no longer a permitted child of <unittitle>, and <dao> is now only available within <did>. Block and formatting elements like <list>, <blockquote>, <quote>, were modified or created to more closely resemble their HTML counterparts. The <chronlist> element was updated to incorporate <geogname> to convey the locations where events occur, more closely aligning it with its namesake in EAC-CPF. Mixed content models were streamlined to three progressively-inclusive sets of elements allowed to intermix with text. Attribute names were disambiguated throughout the schema: @role on access point elements was changed to @relator to distinguish it from @role on linking elements, @type was renamed through the schema to @localtype where no values are supplied by the schema, and to @*elementname*type (e.g. @listtype and @unitdatetype) where specified values are supplied. Linking elements – of which there were many in EAD 2002 – were consolidated to a handful and limited to simple links, eliminating overly-complicated extended links. The XLink model for linking attributes was preserved, but the XLink namespace, which had been added to the schema versions of EAD 2002, was removed due to the onerous and needless complexity that namespaces introduce when processing XML. Elements that existed solely to support formatting and presentation or were otherwise deemed out of scope for archival description were deprecated, including <frontmatter>, <descgrp>, <runner>, <imprint>, and <bibseries>.

The feature of EAD3 that caused the most heated discussion within TS-EAD was the inclusion of the <relations> element. Introduced in EAC-CPF and added to EAD3 with some modifications, <relations> is available at any level of description and contains one or more <relation> elements. A <relation> describes – in a Linked Open Data-friendly way – the relationship between the records being described and a corporate body, person or family; an archival or bibliographic resource; a function; or other external entity. That relationship can be an actionable link and may be qualified by supplying relevant dates or geographic names. XML describing the external entity may be cached for local processing within the <objectxmlwrap> element.

TS-EAD could not reach a consensus regarding the inclusion of <relations>. Some members felt strongly that including <relations> was essential in order to support rich Linked Open Data applications, align with EAC-CPF, and acknowledge draft guidelines on relationships in archival description published by the ICA Committee on Best Practices and Standards. Others felt that it duplicated functionality present in <controlaccess>, added unnecessary complexity, and that incorporating robust support for Linked Open Data was premature. We ultimately negotiated a compromise: <relations> would be included in EAD3 as an “experimental” element. As an experimental element, it is not guaranteed that <relations> will persist in the next version of EAD. However, TS-EAD encourages its use so that the EAD community will learn more about how the <relations> model works within archival description. Put simply, a consensus will require more data and experience, and including <relations> provisionally makes that possible.

The revision of EAD 1.0 to EAD 2002 established a precedent that obsolete elements would first be deprecated – suppressed within a DTD but available if necessary – before being removed from subsequent versions. All elements deprecated in EAD 2002 were removed from EAD3. TS-EAD endeavored to honor the commitment to deprecate obsolete elements, however the extent of the changes in EAD3 made comprehensive deprecation impossible. Elements to be removed entirely from the standard remain available in the undeprecated versions of EAD3. These include <frontmatter>, <descgrp>, <imprint>, <bibseries>, and <runner>, as well as the @tpattern attribute. Elements that were replaced by other elements offering commensurate functionality, or whose availability within the standard changed are in most cases not supported in undeprecated EAD3. Two exceptions to that rule are the full EAD 2002 version of <physdesc> and <unitdate> within <unittitle>, both of which are available in undeprecated EAD3.

EAD3 replaces EAD 2002 as the current, official version of EAD. EAD 2002 was available as a DTD, Relax NG schema, and W3C schema. Additionally, the DTD could be edited to enable the inclusion of deprecated elements. EAD3 continues to be available in DTD, Relax NG, and W3C versions. For repositories who choose to continue to use deprecated elements, an undreprecated version of EAD3 is available in DTD, Relax NG, and W3C varieties. Due to differences between DTDs and schemas, the <objectxmlwrap> element is not available in the DTD versions of EAD3. A Schematron schema is also available to provide further validation functionality for EAD instances, imposing data constraints that either cannot be expressed in DTD, Relax NG, and W3C, or were intentionally removed from the schemas by TS-EAD due to challenges of maintaining code lists outside of our control or to allow alternative data sources or patterns.

EAD3 was possible because of the generous support of the Society of American Archivists, the Gladys Krieble Delmas Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Nationaal Archief of the Netherlands, the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, the Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities at the University of Virginia, and OCLC Research. Each member of TS-EAD* made invaluable contributions to EAD3, but two merit special mention: Terry Catapano, Schema Development Team chair, for leading the technical development of EAD3, and Kelcy Shepherd, for leading the revision of the tag library.

Mike Rush
TS-EAD Co-Chair

*TS-EAD members during the revision process included Mike Rush, co-chair, Yale University; Bill Stockting, co-chair, British Library (UK); Kerstin Arnold, Bundesarchiv (Germany); Michael Fox, Minnesota Historical Society; Kris Kiesling, University of Minnesota; Angelika Menne-Haritz, Bundesarchiv (Germany); Kelcy Shepherd, University of Massachusetts and Amherst College; Claire Sibille, Direction Générale des Patrimonies (France); Henny van Schie, Nationaal Archief / Bibliotheek (Netherlands); and Brad Westbrook, University of California, San Diego, and ArchivesSpace. Notable ex-officio contributors included Jodi Allison-Bunnell, Orbis Cascade Alliance (EAD Roundtable); Anila Angjeli, Bibliotheque Nationale de France (TS-EAC); Hillel Arnold, Rockefeller Archives Center (EAD Roundtable); Mark Custer, Yale University (EAD Roundtable); Merrilee Proffitt, OCLC Research; Ruth Kitchin Tillman, Cadence Group (EAD Roundtable); and Katherine Wisser, Simmons College (TS-EAC). Schema Development Team members included Terry Catapano, chair, Columbia University; Karin Bredenberg, National Archives of Sweden; Florence Clavaud, Ecole Nationale des Chartes (France); Michele Combs, Syracuse University; Mark Matienzo, Yale University and DPLA; Daniel Pitti, University of Virginia; and Salvatore Vassallo, University of Pavia (Italy).

Bibliography

EAD3 Discussion

- For a comprehensive explanation of all of the changes in EAD3, please see the SAA webinar "EAD3: What's new?" at http://saa.peachnewmedia.com/store/seminar/seminar.php?seminar=28538. The slides from the presentation are included in the submission package, see EAD3 - What's new_rev.pptx.
- For a nice summary of the changes in EAD3 and their impact on the Archives Portal Europe, see Kerstin Arnold, "EAD3 and the consequences of the new version," APEx (Februray 18, 2014): http://www.apex-project.eu/index.php/en/articles/149-ead3-and-the-consequences-of-the-new-version.

Related Standards

- Encoded Archival Context – Corporate bodies, Persons, and Families (EAC-CPF). http://eac.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/.
- ICA Committee on Best Practices and Standards. *ISAD(G): General International Standard Archival Description - Second edition*. (2000) http://www.ica.org/10207/standards/isadg-general-international-standard-archival-description-second-edition.html
- ICA Committee on Best Practices and Standards. *Relationship in archival descriptive systems*. (2012) http://www.ica.org/13149/standards/cbps-relationship-in-archival-descriptive-systems.html
- *Describing Archives: A Content Standard – Second Edition*. Society of American Archivists: Chicago, 2013 (revised March 2015). http://files.archivists.org/pubs/DACS2E-2013_v0315.pdf.

Documentation of the Consultation Process

TS-EAD made every effort to make the EAD revision process open and inclusive. Toward that end, we had four public comment periods, conducted all technical development work and logged comments in a publicly accessible repository on GitHub, regularly presented at the SAA Annual Meeting and elsewhere, including internationally, and sent updates to appropriate email lists as our worked progressed.

Comment Periods

TS-EAD accepted comments on the revision of EAD during the following comment periods:

- Call for proposed changes to EAD 2002: October 2010 – February 2011
    - To start the revision process TS-EAD invited proposals for changes to EAD 2002 from the EAD community and beyond.
    - Circulation: The initial call for comments was sent to the following email lists: EAD list, EAD Roundtable, Archives and Archivists, Library and Information Technology Association (LITA), Arcan-l, Canadian Committee on Cataloging and the Canadian Committee on MARC, aus-archivists, Marc 21 Formats, Code4Lib, Semantic Web and Archives, Archivists' Toolkit (atug-l), Archivists' Toolkit Forums, Archon Forums, Archivliste (German and German-speaking archivists), AFNOR, Séminaire de formateurs EAD – EAC, DIGLIB (IFLA), XML4Lib, Metadata librarians, METS, MODS, archives-nra (United Kingdom), scot-arch (United Kingdom), Het Archiefforum (NL), EAD_NL Archives, JISC-Repositories discussion list

    - Method: Accepted via email or submission through a form on the SAA Web site
    - Result: See EAD_Revision_Comments.xls for the comprehensive list of proposed changes.
    - Response: Presented a summary of the results at the 2011 EAD Roundtable Meeting / EAD Revision Forum. See saa11EADForum_Suggestions.ppt.
    - Response: Systematically reviewed and addressed compiled comments during March 2012 working meeting. See TS-EADmeetingminutes_2012-03.pdf for meeting minutes.
- Alpha comment period: March – May 2013
    - TS-EAD released an alpha version of the new EAD schema on February 28, 2013 and invited comments on the early draft.
    - Circulation: Sent to the EAD, EAD Roundtable, and Archives and Archivists email lists
    - Method: Accepted via GitHub issue tracker (https://github.com/SAA-SDT/EAD-Revision/issues) or SAA Web site form.
    - Result: All issues were logged into GitHub.
    - Response: TS-EAD systematically addressed all issues via conference calls or online discussion. All decisions were logged in GitHub.
- Beta comment period: August – September 2013
    - TS-EAD released a beta version of the new EAD schema on August 2, 2013 and invited comments on the second draft.
    - Circulation: Sent to the EAD, EAD Roundtable, and Archives and Archivists email lists
    - Method: Accepted via GitHub issue tracker (https://github.com/SAA-SDT/EAD-Revision/issues) or SAA Web site form.
    - Result: All issues were logged into GitHub.
    - Response: TS-EAD systematically addressed all issues via conference calls or online discussion. All decisions were logged in GitHub.
- Gamma comment period: February 2014
    - TS-EAD released a gamma version of the new EAD schema on February 5, 2014 and invited comments on the third draft.
    - Circulation: Sent to the EAD, EAD Roundtable, and Archives and Archivists email lists
    - Method: Accepted via GitHub issue tracker (https://github.com/SAA-SDT/EAD-Revision/issues) or SAA Web site form.
    - Result: All issues were logged into GitHub.
    - Response: TS-EAD systematically addressed all issues via conference calls or online discussion. All decisions were logged in GitHub.

Following the gamma schema release, TS-EAC co-chairs Anila Angjeli and Katherine Wisser submitted comments regarding EAD3 from the perspective of the group responsible for maintaining EAC-CPF. See EAD3Gamma-commentsFromAngjeliWisser.pdf for their full comments. They conclude that "EAD3 represents a step forward as compared to EAD 2002," but note several areas of concern, primarily in relation to where inconsistencies remain between EAD3 and EAC-CPF. TS-EAD acknowledged their feedback, but made no subsequent changes to EAD3. The areas of concern identified by TS-EAC all reflected different interpretations of the points of emphasis that guided the revision. Within TS-EAD there was a stronger consensus around mitigating impact to existing users than would have allowed some of the changes preferred by TS-EAC. There were also fundamental differences of opinion between the two groups about what mechanisms best support the exchange of data.

GitHub

Immediately following the Schema Development Team meeting in October 2012, all development work on the new EAD schema, along with all comments and issues, moved to a GitHub repository. Using GitHub to manage the EAD revision work had several advantages. It provided a central space for us to receive, log, discuss, and assign issues that ranged from bug reports to foundational philosophical questions. With its version and change tracking functionality it facilitated collaboration on the design of the schema. It also enabled us to package and preserve discrete releases. Most importantly, all of the issues, discussion, releases, and schema development was publicly accessible. Interested members of the EAD community contributed comments and, in a few instances, corrections to the new schema itself.

- EAD Revision issues: https://github.com/SAA-SDT/EAD-Revision/issues
    - Example issue with extensive discussion: https://github.com/SAA-SDT/EAD-Revision/issues/450
- EAD Revision code: https://github.com/SAA-SDT/EAD-Revision
- EAD Revision releases: https://github.com/SAA-SDT/EAD-Revision/releases

Presentations

Members of TS-EAD regularly presented to the EAD Roundtable at the SAA Annual Meeting during the revision process. The 2011 EAD Roundtable Meeting served as an extended EAD Revision Forum, where initial revision proposals, technical considerations, and possible outcomes were discussed. TS-EAD co-chair Mike Rush also taught an SAA webinar on the changes from EAD 2002 to EAD3.

- 2011 EAD Roundtable Meeting and EAD Revision Forum
    - saa11EADForum_Process.pptx
    - saa11EADForum_Suggestions.ppt
    - saa11EADForum_Outcomes.pptx
    - saa11EADForum_Technical Considerations.ppt
- 2012 EAD Roundtable Meeting
    - eadRevisionProgress_2012-08-08.pptx
- 2013 EAD Roundtable Meeting
    - eadRevisionProgress_2013-08-16.pptx
- 2014 EAD Roundtable Meeting
    - eadRevisionProgress_2014-08-13.pptx
- SAA Webinar, “EAD3: What’s new?”
    - EAD3 - What's new_rev.pptx

Communication with the EAD Community

TS-EAD communicated with the EAD community via email lists throughout the revision process. Examples emails include the following:

- “Announcing new EAD groups and revision,” March 31, 2010
    - email_2010-03-31.pdf
- “Revision of Encoded Archival Description (EAD) – Call for Comments,” October 4, 2010
    - email_2010-10-04.pdf
- “EAD Revision - Alpha Release,” February 28, 2013
    - email_2013-02-28.pdf
- “EAD Beta Schema Released - Comments Welcome,” August 2, 2013
    - email_2013-08-02.pdf

- EAD Revision Highlights #1-6
    - email_2013-08-20.pdf
    - email_2013-08-28.pdf
    - email_2013-09-02.pdf
    - email_2013-09-09.pdf
    - email_2013-09-16.pdf
    - email_2013-09-23.pdf
- "EAD3 Gamma Release," February 5, 2014
    - email_2014-02-05.pd

Maintenance and Review Plan

The ongoing maintenance and review of Encoded Archival Description should be structured to achieve the following goals: ongoing involvement and cultivation of domain experts within the archival field; broad representation, particularly but not exclusively from the international archival community; transparency in the ongoing maintenance process; integration with the process of maintaining related standards in the archival domain and beyond; and a regularly scheduled review process.

Toward those ends, we propose the following:

- Consolidate TS-EAD, TS-EAC, and the Schema Development Team into a single subcommittee

The ongoing maintenance of EAD, EAC-CPF, and EAC-F should be undertaken in an integrated and coordinated way. Combining the technical subcommittees will help achieve this goal through greater efficiency, decreased duplication of effort, easier communication, and a consolidation of expertise and documentation.

The challenge of consolidating to a single technical subcommittee for encoded archival standards will be determining the correct size, composition, and terms of membership. The committee will need to be sufficiently large to incorporate diverse and international representation and sufficient domain expertise with both the application and the design of the standards. The chairs of TS-EAD, TS-EAC, and the SDT drafted a proposal to form a Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Standards (TS-EAS) in 2014. See TSEASproposoal_draft.docx for further information.

- Closely monitor the work of ICA's Experts Group on Archival Description (EGAD)

Charged with developing a formal conceptual model for archival description and a supporting ontology, ICA's EGAD is actively engaged in an area that will have a significant impact on all standards for archival description. The ongoing development of EAD will necessarily be heavily influenced by their work, so it should be followed closely. The conceptual model and ontology are scheduled for release in 2016. See http://www.ica.org/13799/the-experts-group-on-archival-description/about-the-egad.html for more information about EGAD.

- Maintain all code in GitHub

All of the development work for EAD3 was done in a GitHub repository. GitHub's change tracking and other features made it possible for the Schema Development Team to collaborate successfully on the new schema and related code. Most importantly all work in GitHub is public. Continuing this practice will promote transparency in the maintenance of EAD.

- Log all bug reports, comments, and feature requests in GitHub

All suggestions received during the first comment period of the EAD revision were received via email and logged into a spreadsheet, which became the bulk of the agenda for the TS-EAD working meeting in 2012. Following the Alpha release, however, rather than logging comments in spreadsheet, we began to log all comments, whether from the community or the committee, into GitHub's issue tracker. This gave us a successful mechanism for threaded conversations, referencing issues when committing code, tracking open and closed issues, and, most importantly, addressing all community input in a single, open, transparent forum. Continuing this practice will promote transparency and will result in a comprehensive record of the maintenance of EAD.

- Release incremental improvements to EAD3 on and as-needed basis

The version control functionality in GitHub will make it feasible for incremental changes to EAD3 to be made as necessary. We recommend fixing bugs and making minor, backwards-compatible changes as they are reported and reviewed appropriately. However, requests for new functionality or other significant changes should be logged as issues and saved until a critical mass accrues and a more thorough revision can be undertaken.

- Review EAD3 and make a recommendation regarding a significant revision no later than 2020

As per the Standards Committee by-laws, EAD3 should be comprehensively reviewed no later than 2020, 5 years after the completion of this revision. A recommendation should be made to the Standards Committee by the occasion of the SAA Annual Meeting whether SAA should reaffirm, revise, or rescind EAD3.

APPENDIX B
Interim Action Item

Society of American Archivists
Council Interim Action
July 16, 2015

2015 Council Exemplary Service Awards
(Prepared by Executive Director Nancy Beaumont)

BACKGROUND

The Council Exemplary Service Award was created in 1980, at the request of the Committee on the Selection of SAA Fellows, to recognize a special contribution to the archives profession (and especially to SAA) that is not eligible for one of the other awards given by the Society. It is given on an occasional basis at the discretion of the Council or upon recommendation to the Council by the Awards Committee. The Council also occasionally chooses to honor a member, group, or other entity with a Council resolution.

DISCUSSION

At its November 2014 and May 2015 meetings the Council discussed potential recipients of the 2015 Council Exemplary Service Award and favored awards to the Committee on Advocacy and Public Policy, the Digital Archives Specialist Subcommittee of the Committee on Education, and Past President Mark Greene. Tanya Zanish-Belcher agreed to draft the CAPP recommendation and Dennis Meissner agreed to draft the Greene recommendation. The DAS recommendation was drafted by Education Director Solveig De Sutter.

Three recommendations are provided for Council consideration.

RECOMMENDATION 1

THAT SAA's Committee on Advocacy and Public Policy be given the Council Exemplary Service Award in 2015.

Council Exemplary Service Award
Honoring the
SAA Committee on Advocacy and Public Policy (CAPP)

Frank Boles (chair), Barbara Teague (vice chair), Jeremy Brett, James Cross, Debra Davendonis-Todd, Amy Lazarus, Nancy Lenoil, and Dennis Roman Riley

WHEREAS CAPP was established in 2013 to enhance SAA's capacity to address public policy issues and concerns affecting archivists, archives, the archival profession,
and its stakeholders; and

WHEREAS CAPP in two short years has created a public policy agenda and an effective process for SAA members to request an advocacy action; and

WHEREAS CAPP has consistently and in a deliberative manner made detailed professional recommendations to the Council on public policy priorities on which SAA should focus its attention and resources; and

WHEREAS CAPP members have examined a host of complex issues, resolving their own individual opinions and putting forth recommendations for the Council to consider on behalf of the organization in its entirety; and

WHEREAS CAPP has prepared important issue briefs that address the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), Archivists and Section 108 of the Copyright Act, Orphan Works, Presidential Records Act of 1978, Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), and State Freedom of Information Laws; and

WHEREAS CAPP members have enthusiastically demonstrated that no issue is too dense or too dry for their spirited consideration;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the Society of American Archivists recognizes and thanks the Committee on Advocacy and Public Policy for outstanding service to SAA and the archives profession.

Support Statement: The Committee on Advocacy and Public Policy is a most worthy recipient of the 2015 Council Exemplary Service Award.

Fiscal Impact: None.

RECOMMENDATION 2

THAT the Digital Archives Specialist Subcommittee of SAA's Committee on Education be given the Council Exemplary Service Award in 2015.

Council Exemplary Service Award
Honoring the
Digital Archives Specialist (DAS) Subcommittee

Liz Bishoff, Mahnaz Ghaznavi (Chair 2014–), Cynthia Ghering,
Lori Lindberg (Chair, 2011–2014), Veronica Martzahl,
Glen McAninch, Thomas Rosko, and Sibyl Schaefer

WHEREAS the DAS Subcommittee was established in 2011 by the Committee on Education to ensure that the curriculum for SAA's Digital Archives Specialist Certificate Program reflects best practice and remains cutting edge; and

WHEREAS the DAS Subcommittee, in the span of three-and-a-half years, has shepherded the development of thirty unique courses, including webinars; and

WHEREAS the DAS Subcommittee has overseen the creation of a one-hundred-question comprehensive examination; and

WHEREAS more than one thousand individuals have taken Digital Archives Specialist courses, with approximately six hundred actively pursuing the Digital Archives Specialist Certificate; and

WHEREAS to date 183 individuals from around the country have fulfilled all the course requirements, passed the comprehensive exam, and earned a Digital Archives Specialist Certificate; and

WHEREAS the DAS Subcommittee has enthusiastically dedicated countless hours to achieve a highly successful program that is a leader in the field;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the Society of American Archivists recognizes and thanks the DAS Subcommittee for outstanding service to SAA and the archives profession.

Support Statement: The DAS Subcommittee of the Committee on Education is a most worthy recipient of the 2015 Council Exemplary Service Award.

Fiscal Impact: None.

RECOMMENDATION 3

THAT Mark Allen Greene be given the Council Exemplary Service Award in 2015.

Council Exemplary Service Award
Honoring
Mark Allen Greene

WHEREAS Mark A. Greene has, for the past thirty years, provided significant and continuous leadership to the Society of American Archivists across its sections, roundtables, committees, and governing bodies, culminating in service as its President in 2007-2008; and

WHEREAS Mark A. Greene has, over the course of his career, made numerous impressive contributions to the literary canon of archival science, focusing especially on archival appraisal but including archival meaning and value, archival ethics, archives management, and arrangement and description; and

WHEREAS Mark A. Greene has worked continuously and enthusiastically to mentor, educate, and train a large number of emerging archivists so that they, too, could achieve success in the archival endeavor; and

WHEREAS Mark A. Greene has consistently and relentlessly demonstrated a vision for the archives profession that has frequently caused him to challenge accepted theory and practice and to champion new approaches and directions, often for the betterment of the profession; and

WHEREAS Mark A. Greene has, in a too-brief career that has been burdened by physical challenges, nevertheless invested himself in this profession to a heroic degree that is admired by so many of his colleagues;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the Society of American Archivists recognizes, applauds, and heartily thanks Mark A. Greene for his outstanding service to SAA and to the archives profession.

Support Statement: Mark Allen Greene is a most worthy recipient of the 2015 Council Exemplary Service Award.

Fiscal Impact: None.

APPENDIX C

August 5, 2015

Via email to press@fb.com

Mark Zuckerberg and Members of the Facebook Board of Directors:

The Society of American Archivists (SAA) is North America's oldest and largest national archival professional organization. Our profession is dedicated to documenting the activities of institutions, communities, and individuals in order to provide authentic and reliable primary sources to researchers. This letter concerns the ability to download archives for pages created on Facebook.

Facebook is an incredibly important platform for documenting the lives and activities of more than a billion people around the world.[i] We commend you for enabling users to download their "archive" periodically from Facebook. This archive includes a user's messages, chats, likes, searches, photos, videos, and more.[ii] It is conveniently packaged as a zip file, which contains commonly understood file formats that can be viewed with a web browser. This data is of great use to archivists because it allows donors to easily collect their Facebook activity when they are donating their materials to an archive. The data presents a unique snapshot of the individual's activities on Facebook. Visitors using the donated materials in an archive can view this content in the context of other materials. Most importantly it is authoritative because it comes directly from Facebook and the donors themselves.

As you know Facebook users often create pages for their businesses, organizations, places, community groups, and more. Per your guidelines,[iii] Facebook pages are administered by an authorized representative of the entity in question. When an entity such as a business or community group is donating materials to an archive, it would be extremely useful if donors were able to download the contents of their pages so that the contents could be included with the donated materials. Unfortunately this function is not currently supported. In addition, Facebook's terms of service prevent this content from being collected without Facebook's permission (see section II.C in Facebook's Pages Terms).

SAA's members strongly encourage you to add functionality that allows a page owner to download the contents of his/her page(s). This would allow archival institutions to accept donations of this material so that it can be made part of a collection and be made available to researchers who are examining other materials from the donor.

We believe that Facebook is a platform that offers an unprecedented ability for users to make their voices heard, to organize, and to effect change in their lives. As archivists we are dedicated to selecting, preserving, providing access to, and ensuring responsible custody of primary resource materials related to our diverse communities. We believe that the content in Facebook pages that has been managed by particular organizations, communities, and individuals will prove to be an indispensable part of that record.

Sincerely,

Kathleen D. Roe
President, 2014 – 2015

cc: Trevor Alvord, Chair, SAA Web Archiving Roundtable
Kate Stratton, Vice Chair, SAA Web Archiving Roundtable
Bethany Cron, Chair, SAA Records Management Roundtable
Brad Houston, Immediate Past Chair, SAA Records Management Roundtable
Robert Spindler, Chair, SAA Congressional Papers Roundtable
Nancy Beaumont, SAA Executive Director

[i] http://newsroom.fb.com/company-info/
[ii] https://www.facebook.com/help/405183566203254
[iii] https://www.facebook.com/page_guidelines.php

APPENDIX D

Society of American Archivists

Briefing Paper: Council-Proposed Motion to Implement a Member Dues Increase, Effective July 1, 2016

For discussion at the August 22, 2015, SAA Annual Business Meeting at the Cleveland Convention Center, Cleveland, Ohio. Distributed to all SAA members on August 13, 2015, via www.archivists.org.

MOTION:

THAT an increase in SAA member dues be implemented over a three-year period, beginning July 1, 2016, according to the following schedule:

Membership Category	2015 Dues Current	Proposed Dues (FY2017)	Proposed Dues (FY2018)	Proposed Dues (FY2019)
Retired	$70	$73	$75	$77
Bridge	$50	$52	$53	$55
Student	$50	$52	$53	$55
ID1 (<$20k/yr)	$80	$83	$85	$88
ID2 ($20-$29k/yr)	$105	$109	$112	$115
ID3 ($30-$39k/yr)	$130	$135	$139	$143
ID4 ($40-$49k/yr)	$160	$166	$171	$176
ID5 ($50-$59k/yr)	$200	$208	$214	$220
ID6 ($60-$74k/yr)	$225	$234	$241	$248
ID7 (≥$75k/yr)	$250	$260	$267	$275
Regular	$300	$312	$321	$330
Sustaining	$550	$572	$589	$605
Associate Domestic	$100	$104	$107	$110
Associate International	$125	$130	$134	$138

PROPOSED BY: The SAA Council

SUPPORT STATEMENT: SAA has set itself on a growth-oriented path with an ambitious five-year Strategic Plan, healthy but leveling membership numbers, a high-demand education program, a publications program that is working toward a successful e-publishing business model, and nascent advocacy and public awareness efforts. This growth strategy is most likely to be sustained only if SAA maintains an appropriate balance of revenues from both member dues and non-dues sources (i.e., product and service sales). The table lays out the proposed dues schedule, which would be implemented over a three-year period and reflect an increase of approximately 3% per year. The Council believes that the proposal reflects a fair distribution of the dues burden among the various categories of membership.

BACKGROUND

The SAA Finance Committee is charged to "…annually review SAA dues and dues revenue to assure SAA's long-term financial stability." The Committee considered the appropriateness, scope, timing, and financial details of a dues revision at each of its in-person meetings in 2012, 2013, and 2014 and via several conference calls during which the group discussed the financial resources needed to ensure SAA's future stability.

The Committee recommended to the Council in November 2014 that a three-year stepped dues adjustment be implemented, effective July 1, 2016. At that time the Council affirmed the need to move forward with a dues increase proposal, pending some revisions of the dues schedule.[iii] At its May 2015 meeting, the Council discussed the proposed dues schedule and voted unanimously to bring the proposal forward to an all-member referendum in 2015.[iii]

Member Referenda: In August 2011 members approved at the Annual Business Meeting a Council recommendation that SAA's Bylaws be revised to state that member dues changes (as well as amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws) will be determined by member referendum. Following discussion of the proposed dues change at the August 22, 2015, Annual Business Meeting, the motion (in its current form or revised as a result of the Business Meeting discussion) will be presented to the full membership in an online referendum to be initiated between October 21 (i.e., 60 days after the Business Meeting) and November 20 (i.e., 90 days after the meeting).

DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS

In Support of the Proposal:

The SAA Council, which bears fiduciary responsibility for the organization, believes that implementation of a modest dues increase in July 2016 is critical to SAA's ongoing financial stability. The proposed schedule addresses cost-of-business increases since the last dues change ending in FY 2014 and accommodates forecasted changes in non-dues revenue streams (including publications and annual meetings). Implementing the increase over a three-year period enables members and SAA to budget accordingly and allows SAA to develop programs and implement technology enhancements with some measure of predictable income. A planned increase also minimizes the risk of financial crisis and reactionary budgeting.

As a result, in part, of the resources derived from the 2011-2014 dues increase, SAA has been able to 1) invest in development of a robust professional education program; 2) experiment with e-publishing and annual meeting models in response to member feedback; 3) launch new advocacy and public awareness initiatives; 4) take steps to make the SAA website more functional, accessible, and content-rich; and 5) create a reserve that will enable purchase of a more nimble and functional association management software system. Technology is expensive, and we must maintain a steady (predictable) investment in it or risk spending money on temporary, patchwork responses to members' needs.

To sustain its overall growth, SAA must have a baseline measure of predictable income (i.e., dues) so that the organization is not overly reliant on the increasing success of such revenue-producing products and services as publications, workshops, and annual meetings and so that it can continue to invest in its infrastructure and technology to support the programs that address member needs and interests.

- Members are turning to SAA for continuing education in record numbers as career opportunities widen. SAA must continue to enhance and upgrade its education offerings and methods of delivery. Capacity is stretched thin currently; the human talent is in place and technology/infrastructure solutions to expand capacity are within our grasp.

- Based on member feedback, SAA is experimenting with new locations and models for the Annual Meeting. Although we all agree this is the right thing to do, experimentation may have a negative impact on this critically important source of non-dues revenue. Notwithstanding the potential impact of experimenting with new models, the costs of travel, room rental, audiovisual, and food and beverage will continue to increase.

- The early 2000s marked years of progressive growth in publication revenue that halted with the 2008 recession. Since then, publication sales have declined steadily despite SAA's move to electronic publications. This "loss leader" program awaits a successful e-publishing business model. In the meantime healthy revenues from member dues will allow SAA to maintain high-quality professional publications and implement new platforms that are the foundation of this new business model.

- To remain the preeminent professional organization representing the interests of archives and archivists, SAA must ensure the sustainability of its investments in advocacy and public awareness efforts through outreach and coalition building. With modest funding our early efforts have been modest in view of our ambitious goals. Bolder initiatives and the possibilities that come from experimental risk will require more robust and continuous funding.

- Although SAA's membership remains healthy at 6,200+, growth has leveled off. The FY16 budget projects no growth in member dues income.

SAA member feedback has shown the importance of developing and maintaining best-in-class information technology, e-publishing and subscription services, and professional education programs and initiating advocacy and public awareness efforts. During the past three years the

organization has been able to address each of these areas. But continuing advancement is expensive and must be sustained over time to be effective. A modest dues increase, phased in over time, allows for SAA to plan and implement complex systems and programming enhancements with confidence that baseline revenues are suitable to the task. Without such confidence, we run the risk of staggered implementation and/or reactionary budgeting when non-dues revenues prove to be insufficient.

FISCAL IMPACT: Assuming no decline in membership, the proposed three-year increase would yield an additional $42,280 in dues revenue by the end of FY 2017, an additional $68,535 by the end of FY 2018, and an additional $97,445 by the end of FY 2019. This proposal not only provides support for the Society's routine operations but also will generate a modest yearly contribution to reserves (in the range of 3% to 6%) to support continued advances in technology and communication and future member services. It is not possible to estimate at this time how many members may drop their memberships as a result of a dues increase.

In Opposition to the Proposal:

The most compelling argument in opposition to the proposal is that some members will find the dues increase to be 1) beyond their means and/or 2) not supported by the value that they derive from membership in SAA.

CONTACTS FOR MORE INFORMATION:

SAA Treasurer Mark Duffy (2012-2015) and/or Cheryl Stadel-Bevans (2015-2018): treasurer@archivists.org.

SAA Executive Director Nancy Beaumont: nbeaumont@archivists.org.

SAA Director of Finance/Administration Peter Carlson: pcarlson@archivists.org