

**Society of American Archivists
Council Meeting
November 5-7, 2017
Chicago, Illinois**

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 Tanya Zanish-Belcher called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. on Sunday, November 5. Present were Vice President/President-Elect Meredith Evans; Treasurer Cheryl Stadel-Bevans; Executive Committee Member Kris Kiesling; Council members Steven Booth, Courtney Chartier, Amy Cooper Cary, Brenda Gunn, Bergis Jules, Erin Lawrimore, Bertram Lyons (via telephone), and Audra Eagle Yun; and SAA Executive Director Nancy Beaumont, Publications Director Teresa Brinati, Finance/Administration Director Peter Carlson, Information Systems Administrator Matt Black, and Governance Program Coordinator Felicia Owens.

I. COUNCIL BUSINESS

A. Adoption of the [Agenda](#)

Zanish-Belcher introduced the agenda with changes proposed by the Executive Committee. The Council agreed to remove II.C. Approve Archival Continuing Education (ACE) Guidelines from the Consent Agenda and address it as an Action Item (IV.F.1.) and to add an Action Item to approve revisions to the SAA Foundation Bylaws (IV.F.2.).

The Council further agreed to re-order several agenda items to enhance the efficiency of the meeting. (Agenda items are presented in these minutes based on the original sequencing to minimize confusion.) Kiesling moved adoption of the agenda as revised, Gunn seconded, and the agenda was adopted unanimously (**MOTION 1**).

B. Status of Council Action List

Council members briefly reviewed and provided updates on the status of actions listed in this internal working document.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

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

Move Consent Items: Cooper Cary
Second Consent Items: Stadel-Bevans
Vote: PASSED (unanimous)

A. Ratify Council Interim Actions

THAT the following interim actions taken by the Council in October 2017 be ratified:

- Approved the minutes of the [October 6, 2017](#), Council conference call. (October 27, 2017)
- Approved a statement on [U.S. Intention to Withdraw from UNESCO](#). (November 4, 2017)

B. Ratify Executive Committee Interim Actions

THAT the following interim actions taken by the Executive Committee in October 2017 be ratified:

- Approved a statement, drafted by the SAA Committee on Public Policy, regarding “[Use of Non-government Email Accounts for the Conduct of Public Business](#),” which points back to the CoSA/NAGARA/SAA Joint Statement on Conducting Public Business in Non-government Email Accounts (2015). (October 6, 2017)
- Signed on to [a letter to Secretary of the Treasury Steven Mnuchin](#), initiated by Americans for Tax Fairness, Institute for Taxation and Economic Policy, and Public Citizen, regarding removal from the federal government website of the Treasury report on the impacts of corporate tax cuts. (Approved by SAA President Tanya Zanish-Belcher, October 11, 2017)
- Signed on to [a letter to Acting Privacy Chief Officer Jonathan Cantor](#), written by the Center for Democracy and Technology (CDT), expressing “concerns with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) System of Records Notice...stating that DHS will now store social media information in ‘Alien Files’ (A-Files), which include the official record of an individual’s visa and immigration history.” (Approved by SAA President Tanya Zanish-Belcher, October 20, 2017)
- Submitted a comment, drafted by the SAA Committee on Public Policy, in response to a request from the Open Government Partnership for comments on the U.S. federal government’s Third Open Government National Action Plan (NAP3). (Appendix A) (October 30, 2017)
- Submitted a comment, drafted by the SAA Intellectual Property Working Group, on the U.S. Copyright Office’s proposal to create a new group registration option for unpublished works. (Appendix B) (Approved by SAA President Tanya Zanish-Belcher, October 30, 2017)

III. STRATEGIC PLANNING

A. “Mega Issue” Discussion: Barriers to Participation in SAA

Reference: [Membership Committee Survey on Barriers to Participation in SAA](#)

To open the strategic planning session, the Council met in small groups to review the results of the Membership Committee survey and discuss barriers to participation in SAA.

B. Strategic Planning Session

References:

- [Current Strategic Plan](#)
- [Current Strategic Plan Actions and Timelines](#)
- [Member Comments on Current Goals and Objectives](#)

Following small group discussions, the Council came together to discuss revisions to the current SAA strategic plan. Overall, minor revisions were made to clarify language and enhance the goals and strategies.

Working from the current [Strategic Plan 2014-2018](#), the group made minor revisions to the Vision, Mission, Core Organizational Values, Goals, and Strategies. See the current draft [SAA Strategic Plan 2018-2020](#). Council members and staff will be discussing Key Performance Indicators and activities directed to achieving the goals starting in January.

The following revisions were made by the Council (*underline = addition, strikethrough = deletion*):

Society of American Archivists Strategic Plan 2018-2020

VISION: The Society of American Archivists ~~enables~~ empowers archivists to achieve professional excellence and to foster innovation to ensure the identification, preservation, understanding, and use of records of enduring value.

MISSION: ~~SAA promotes the value and diversity of archives and archivists. We are the preeminent source of professional resources and the principal communication hub for American archivists. SAA is a vital community that promotes the value and diversity of archives and archivists and serves as the preeminent resource for the profession.~~

CORE ORGANIZATIONAL VALUES:

The Society of American Archivists is committed to:

- Advancing the public standing of archivists.
- Ensuring the diversity of its membership and leaders, the profession, and the archival record.
- Fostering an open and inclusive culture of creativity, collaboration, and experimentation across the association.
- ~~Providing an open, inclusive, and collaborative environment.~~
- Providing excellent member service.
- ~~Social responsibility and the public good.~~

- Ensuring transparency, accountability, integrity, and professionalism, and social responsibility in conducting its activities.

The following Goals and Strategies represent areas of focus for the next three to five years. The Goals articulate the outcomes that SAA would like to achieve and answer the question, “What will constitute future success?” The Goals are not necessarily identified in priority order, but are numbered to enable easy reference.

GOAL 1: ADVOCATING FOR ARCHIVES AND ARCHIVISTS

Society values the vital role of archivists and archives.

SAA will:

- 1.1. Provide leadership in promoting the value of archives and archivists to institutions, communities, and society.
- 1.2. Educate and influence decision makers about the importance of archives and archivists.
- 1.3. Provide leadership in ensuring the completeness, diversity, and accessibility of the historical record.
- 1.4. Strengthen the ability of those who manage and use archival material to articulate the value of archives.

GOAL 2: ENHANCING PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Archivists have access to the professional community and resources they need to be successful and effective in their careers.

SAA will:

- 2.1. Mentor and support the career development of members to assist them in achieving their goals.
- ~~2.1.~~ 2.2. Provide content, via education and publications, that reflects the latest thinking and best practices in the field.
- ~~2.2.~~ 2.3. Deliver information and education via methods that are accessible, affordable, and keep pace with technological change.
- ~~2.3. Support the career development of members to assist them in achieving their goals.~~
- 2.4. Foster communities for professional interaction.

GOAL 3: ADVANCING THE FIELD

Professional knowledge expands to keep pace with an increasingly diverse archival record.

SAA will:

- 3.1. Identify the need for new standards, guidelines, and best practices and lead or participate in their development.
- 3.2. Foster and disseminate research in and about the field.
- 3.3. Participate actively in relevant partnerships and collaborations to enhance professional knowledge.
- 3.4. Support the development of executive leadership skills and encourage the participation in leadership opportunities by archivists at all stages of their careers.

GOAL 4: MEETING MEMBERS’ NEEDS

~~SAA is an agile association that delivers outstanding service, and fosters a culture of inclusiveness and participation, and is proactive and responsive to member needs.~~

SAA will:

- 4.1. Facilitate effective communication with and among members.
- 4.2. Create opportunities for members to participate fully in the association.
- 4.3. ~~Continue to enrich the association and the profession with~~ Foster an inclusive association and profession through greater diversity ~~in~~ of membership and expanded leadership opportunities.
- 4.4. Ensure that leaders are accessible and their work is transparent.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. Revision of SAA Public Policy Agenda

The Committee on Public Policy determined it was time to issue a new public policy agenda to guide SAA’s efforts to influence public policies that have an impact on the archival mission. A clean version of the revised Public Policy Agenda is presented below; see the agenda item (linked above) to view the previous version and note changes. The Council approved of the changes and made an additional revision (underlined below). COPP will work with staff to embed links to issue briefs and position statements accordingly, as has been custom.

MOTION 3

THAT the following SAA Public Policy Agenda be adopted, as revised (*underline = addition, strikethrough = deletion*):

**Society of American Archivists
Public Policy Agenda**

Archival sources protect the rights of individuals and organizations, ensure the accountability of governments and institutions, and provide access to historical information and cultural heritage. The

Society of American Archivists (SAA) will work with the archives profession to advocate for public policies and resources that ensure that such records are identified, preserved, and made accessible. SAA defines public policy as any government policy—federal, state, or local—that directly affects archivists or the archival record, including legislation, executive orders, judicial decisions, funding priorities, and other regulatory measures.

In alignment with our [Core Values Statement and Code of Ethics](#), SAA is committed to supporting policies that will ensure the protection of privacy and individual rights; ensure the transparency and accountability of government at all levels; guarantee the administrative continuity necessary for good governance; make accessible evidence of the diverse and complex elements of the human experience; and preserve historical documentation for future generations.

SAA firmly believes that the critical nature of information in a democracy places the burden to prove the need for confidentiality, or the legitimacy of excluding information from the public domain, on those asserting such claims. Unless there are legal or other compelling reasons to the contrary, SAA will consistently value the general good obtained through open access to information over the limited good achieved by information closure or proprietary use. SAA also is committed to actively resisting policies that undermine existing records authority and privacy laws or that endanger the integrity of the historical record held in both public and private institutions.

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). Therefore, SAA reserves the right to speak out on human rights or social justice issues that affect archivists or researchers.

SAA will prioritize the following policy areas:

- Public policy issues that affect archivists and their ability to do their work;
- Advancing the diversity of the archival record;
- Protecting privacy and individual rights of archival subjects and users;
- Promoting the public's right to access information held or created by public and publicly funded bodies;
- Strengthening of federal, state, and local records authority over information created by public and publicly funded bodies;
- Supporting impartial and non-partisan federal, state, and municipal records authorities;
- Ensuring adequate funding for government archives at the federal, state, and municipal level;
- Ensuring adequate funding for federal and state programs that support archives and archival projects, including, but not limited to, the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC), the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), and the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS);

- Supporting a robust public domain, which forms the backbone of creative and research activities by ensuring access to unambiguously free cultural content; and
- Advocating for copyright rules that preserve the incentives for creators to make and publish new works without unduly constraining the work archivists do in pursuit of our mission.

[Requests for SAA's commitment to a specific policy issue](#) will be more vigorously pursued if that issue fits within these priorities. However, many worthy advocacy issues lie outside the scope of this policy agenda. Individual members or groups may request that SAA address these issues using the same procedures as for public policy issues; SAA will consider them on a case-by-case basis.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

[How to Suggest SAA Take Action on an Issue](#)

[SAA's Criteria for Advocacy Statements](#)

For more information and perspectives, see the Committee on Public Policy's [microsite](#).

Several other SAA groups track issues of importance to archivists and the archival community. See, for example, the microsites of SAA's [Committee on Ethics and Professional Conduct](#), [Intellectual Property Working Group](#), and [Issues and Advocacy Section](#). SAA also works cooperatively with the Council of State Archivists, the National Association of Government Archives and Records Administrators, and the Regional Archival Associations Consortium on the [CoSA/NAGARA/SAA/RAAC Joint Working Group on Issues and Awareness](#).

Support Statement: The revised Public Policy Agenda provides members and other prospective audiences with an understanding of SAA's priorities related to public policies that affect archivists, archives, the archives profession, and the communities we serve.

Impact on Strategic Priorities: Addresses Goal 1: Advocating for Archives and Archivists, Strategy 1.1. Provide leadership in promoting the value of archives and archivists to institutions, communities, and society; 1.2. Educate and influence decision makers about the importance of archives and archivists; 1.3. Provide leadership in ensuring the completeness, diversity, and accessibility of the historical record; and 1.4. Strengthen the ability of those who manage and use archival material to articulate the value of archives.

Fiscal Impact: Approval of the Public Policy Agenda does not commit SAA to expend funds on any particular advocacy effort at this time.

Move: Jules

Second: Gunn

Vote: PASSED (unanimous)

B. Revised Procedures for Suggesting SAA Advocacy Action

In the two years since the Council adopted the [Criteria for Advocacy Statements](#) and the [Procedures for Suggesting SAA Advocacy Action](#), the Committee on Public Policy has experienced a mix of understanding and expectations from COPP, the Council, and SAA members as to how these procedures operate, that at times resulted in confusion and frustration. COPP edited the procedures to address these issues with a view toward applying them to all types of advocacy actions. The Council approved the changes and discussed additional resources that could help clarify the process.

MOTION 4

THAT the following revised Procedures for Suggesting SAA Advocacy Action be adopted (*strikethrough = deletion, underline = addition*):

Procedures for Suggesting SAA Advocacy Action

~~FOR SAA MEMBERS:~~ HOW TO SUGGEST THAT SAA TAKE ACTION ON AN ~~ADVOCACY~~ ISSUE

If you encounter an ~~public policy~~ issue on which you think SAA should comment (or advocate for in another way), here's how to bring that issue forward.

- Review the SAA Public Policy Agenda to determine if your issue is included among the priorities outlined there. Use this review to note the types of issues that SAA addresses and also to ensure that your issue is not already being addressed. ~~Gather as much information as you can on the issue.~~
- Also review the [Criteria for Advocacy Statements](#), [SAA Strategic Plan](#), and the [Core Values Statement and Code of Ethics](#) to determine how your issue aligns with these guiding documents.
- Gather as much information as you can on the issue.
- Prepare a brief (1 or 2 page) written Overview of the issue that includes:
- Using the approved Overview template, prepare a brief (1- to 3-page) written overview of the issue that includes:

Statement of Facts: What is the issue? Have SAA or allied professions taken action on this or a similar issue in the past? If so, what was that action?

Discussion: Why is this issue important to archives and/or archivists? Does the issue fit within the priorities outlined in SAA's Strategic Plan, Public Policy Agenda, or Code of Ethics? ~~Advocacy Agenda?~~ If so, where? If not, why should it be considered as a high priority outside of the Agenda? What are the pros and cons or implications of SAA taking a position or action (or not taking a position or action) on this issue?

Recommendation(s): What do you recommend that SAA do? Should SAA act alone in this, or should it seek support from one or more other organizations?

- As you prepare your Overview, consider the following: If you were in a leadership position within the organization, what information would you need to make a good decision on behalf of SAA?

If you are an individual member:

- Consider whether there is an SAA component group (committee, board, working group, or section) that would have a specific interest or expertise in the issue that you are raising. ~~(e.g., the Intellectual Property Working Group on copyright issues or the Privacy and Confidentiality Section on privacy issues).~~ Collaboration with one or more ~~an~~ existing group(s) is encouraged because it could both avoid the potential for duplication of effort and assist you in gaining support for addressing your issue.
- ~~If so, e~~ Contact the chair of that group(s) to determine if the group's leadership team is interested in collaborating with you to put the issue forward and draft or review an Overview.
- ~~Contact the chair of the Committee on Public Policy to discuss whether COPP would support putting the issue forward.~~
- ~~You should always feel free to contact the staff office directly for assistance in determining who to contact.~~
- Submit your Overview as an attachment in an email to the SAA President (president@archivists.org).
- ***On very urgent matters:*** ~~Contact the staff office~~ SAA Executive Director Nancy Beaumont (nbeaumont@archivists.org or 866-722-7858) so that she we can help you take the issue directly to the SAA President, Executive Committee, or Council. The President may choose to seek advice from the Committee on Public Policy or other groups.

If you represent a component group (committee, board, section, or roundtable):

- ~~Discuss the issue with your steering committee. If the steering committee agrees to proceed on behalf of your group, ask its members to draft/review/approve an Overview of the issue.~~
- ~~Consider whether there are other component groups that would have a specific interest or expertise in the issue that you are raising. Collaboration with one or more groups is encouraged as a means of gaining support for your issue. If so, contact the chair of that group to determine if the group is interested in collaborating with your group to put the issue forward.~~
- ~~Contact the chair of the Committee on Public Policy to discuss whether COPP would support putting the issue forward.~~
- ~~With or without collaboration from other groups, proceed with your request for action by contacting your Council liaison. If your liaison is not available, reach out to the SAA staff for help in moving your request forward. Contact information for Council liaisons is included on each component group's roster.~~
- ***On very urgent matters:*** ~~Contact the staff office so that we can help you take the issue directly to the SAA President, Executive Committee, or Council. The President may choose to seek advice from the Committee on Public Policy or other groups.~~

After you've raised your issue or concern:

- ~~The Council liaison or staff member will pass it along to the President, the Executive Committee, or the Council.~~
- The President, Executive Committee, or Council may ask for additional information, assessment, and/or recommendations from a component group ~~(such as the Committee on Public Policy)~~, related professional associations, and/or experts on the specific topic or issue.
- The leadership (either the Executive Committee or the full Council) will determine whether SAA should respond as an organization.
- *If the decision is made to issue a statement and/or take action:* The Executive Committee or Council may designate a person or group to develop a statement of SAA's position. (This is where your

Overview can be extremely helpful when time is of the essence.) The Executive Committee will then review and approve the statement for public dissemination or determine that the statement should be reviewed and approved by the full Council before dissemination. The President (or the Executive Director on behalf of the President), ~~Council liaison, or staff member~~ will inform you or your group of the decision.

- *If the decision is made not to develop a statement and/or take action:* The President (or the Executive Director on behalf of the President), ~~Council liaison, or staff member~~ will inform you or your group of the decision.

Whether or not SAA takes action on your issue or concern:

~~Your group has an opportunity to inform or educate your members—and the broader SAA membership—on the issue. See, for example, the Oral History Section’s activities to educate archivists about the issues surrounding the controversial Belfast Project/Boston College Subpoena Case.~~

SAA members and groups have opportunities to inform or educate the broader SAA membership on the issue. See, for example:

- The Oral History Section’s activities to educate archivists about the issues involved in the controversial Belfast Project/Boston College Subpoena Case.
- The Issues and Advocacy Section’s Research Teams, Archivists on the Issues blog posts, and Advocacy Toolkit.
- The Committee on Public Awareness’s [ArchivesAWARE!](#) blog.
- SAA offers [advocacy resources and toolkits](#) to help you advocate for your issue within your own organization or local community.

Support Statement: The revised procedures support SAA’s Public Policy Agenda by providing members and other prospective audiences with a streamlined process regarding how SAA as an organization responds to the advocacy interests of the profession.

Impact on Strategic Priorities: Addresses Goal 1: Advocating for Archives and Archivists, Strategy 1.1. Provide leadership in promoting the value of archives and archivists to institutions, communities, and society, and Strategy 1.2. Educate and influence decision makers about the importance of archives and archivists.

Fiscal Impact: Approval of these procedures does not commit SAA to expend funds on any particular advocacy effort at this time.

Move: Gunn

Second: Yun

Vote: PASSED (unanimous)

C. Issue Brief: Classification and Controlled Unclassified Information

The SAA Committee on Public Policy prepared the following issue brief to address the need for the federal government to continue its efforts at reducing the overall quantity of classified or restricted information to ensure timely access to records and overall governmental accountability

and transparency. The Council made additional revisions to clarify language, noted below with underline and strikethrough.

MOTION 5

THAT the following issue brief on “Federal Classified Information and Controlled Unclassified Information” be approved, as revised (*strikethrough = deletion, underline = addition*).

Issue Brief: ~~Federal Classification~~ Classified Information and Controlled Unclassified Information

SAA Position

SAA supports efforts to improve classification and avoid over-classification according to the following recommendations:

- Classification should be simplified into two classification categories, the current “Top Secret” and a second level that would follow standards for a lower level of protection.
- Classification should take a risk-management approach, i.e., that the level of protection assigned should align with the level of harm due to an unauthorized release by linking clearly identifiable risk to an accurate assessment of harm in classification guidance.
- In both policy and practice, a “safe harbor” protection should be provided to classifiers who rigorously take this approach in order to prevent bias toward classification and protect those who make good-faith decisions not to classify information.
- The protections needed for intelligence sources and methods should be precisely defined and distinguished.
- Information with short-lived sensitivity should be identified and set aside for automatic declassification without further review. This could include creating a category of “self-cancelling” classification in which information based on an operation, date, or event is declassified automatically when that operation, date, or event passes. Any exceptions would require a written notice of a specific need for the information to remain classified.
- The system used to rate civilian and military personnel performance should include the designation and management of classified information as a critical element or item to be evaluated when rating individuals whose duties significantly involve the creation or handling of classified information
- Agencies continue to improve classification training—especially concerning derivative classification—and the processes used to monitor such training and provide oversight.
- Any system designed to handle unclassified information that must be safeguarded (i.e., Controlled Unclassified Information) or have its dissemination controlled due to law, regulations, and policy (e.g., “protected health information” under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act [HIPAA]) must avoid disclosure restrictions that override discovery, whistleblower protections, and other lawful disclosures; must not discourage legitimate information sharing both inside and outside the government; and must not hinder access via the Freedom of Information Act. In short, the system should not become another layer of “classification.”
- Congress should appropriate more funding directed to classification training and the development of technologies to assist and improve the classification process.

In accordance with this position, SAA will:

- Advocate for pertinent legislation and the development of appropriate agency regulations that support these goals.
- Advocate for additional funding from Congress to improve classification, especially for training and technology to assist and improve the classification process.
- Work with other organizations concerned about ~~classification~~ the over-protection of information.

The Issues

The classification system currently in use was created more than seventy years ago. The methods used to identify, mark, handle, and store have remained fairly constant and the system's purpose—to categorize and protect sensitive information—has changed little. But basing classification decisions on a loosely defined level of presumed “damage” to national security, with little input from other classifying agencies or knowledge of prior declassification decisions, led to a system that almost always favored protection over declassification and eventual public access. Inadequate guidance and training exacerbated the problem. In addition, the advent of electronic records resulted in a hodgepodge of changes to policies and procedures based on the older, paper-based system, which led to more system complexity that worsened over-classification. Available technology has not been used to meet current needs nor to handle the increasing volume of digital records.

Classification comes at a cost. In the latest figures available (2015), the cost of classification management—the resources used to identify, control, transfer, transmit, retrieve, inventory, archive, or destroy classified information—was \$367.44 million.[1] The total cost for security classification (which in addition to the costs already noted includes the costs for personnel, physical security, protection and maintenance for classified information systems, training, and other related costs) was \$16.17 billion.[2] And costs have been rising steadily since 1997, when the total cost for security classification was \$3.37 billion.[3] Streamlining the classification process, reducing over-classification, and increasing the use of technology could help bring down these costs.

Related to the question of classification is the administration of controlled unclassified information (CUI). This is “information that laws, regulations, or Government-wide policies require to have safeguarding or dissemination controls, excluding classified information.” Prior to 2010 more than 100 different markings existed to denote CUI as a result of *ad hoc*, agency-specific efforts to administer this type of information. This led to a patchwork system that was confusing and inefficient; that inadequately safeguarded information that needed protection; and that unnecessarily impeded information sharing. Executive Order 13556 (November 4, 2010) established a program to standardize the way CUI was handled in the federal government. The Information Security Oversight Office (ISOO) of the National Archives and Records Administration, tasked with developing policy and overseeing the CUI program, published CUI regulations (32 CFR Part 2002) in the *Federal Register* on September 14, 2016. It is reassuring that the patchwork of agency-developed systems of categorizing sensitive but unclassified materials has been replaced with a standardized system overseen by the federal agency with the necessary expertise in records management. The government—particularly ISOO—is to be commended for this effort to establish an orderly and standardized system to handle CUI.

Core values of archivists as defined by the Society of American Archivists and the profession include accountability and access and use. “In a republic ... accountability and transparency constitute an essential hallmark of democracy. Public leaders must be held accountable both to the judgment of history and future generations as well as to citizens in the ongoing governance of society. Access to the records of public officials and agencies provides a means of holding them accountable both to public citizens and to the judgment of future generations.”[4] Use is one of the tenets of archival ethics as well: “Recognizing that use is the fundamental reason for keeping archives, archivists actively promote open and equitable

access to the records in their care within the context of their institutions' missions and their intended user groups.”[5]

Reforming the classification process, reducing over-classification, and ensuring the CUI system does not become yet another system of “classification” will lead to a more open and transparent government as demanded by both our core values and code of ethics.

[1] “2015 Report to the President,” Information Security Oversight Office, July 15, 2016, p.31-32.
<https://www.archives.gov/files/isoo/reports/2015-annual-report.pdf>

[2] Ibid, p.32.

[3] Ibid, p.34.

[4] <http://www2.archivists.org/statements/saa-core-values-statement-and-code-of-ethics>.

[5] Ibid.

Additional Resources

Code of Federal Regulations Title 32, Part 2002, <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-1998-title32-vol6/pdf/CFR-1998-title32-vol6-part2002.pdf>.

Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI), National Archives and Records Administration:
<https://www.archives.gov/cui>.

Open the Government coalition: <http://www.openthegovernment.org/>.

Public Interest Declassification Board, “Transforming the Security Classification System” report (2012),
<http://www.archives.gov/declassification/pidb/recommendations/transforming-classification.pdf>.

Revised Guidance regarding Controlled Unclassified Information and the Freedom of Information Act, July 3, 2014, <https://www.archives.gov/files/cui/registry/policy-guidance/registry-documents/2014-doj-oip-cui-joint-issuance-on-foia.pdf>.

All sites accessed September 22, 2017.

Support Statement: This issue brief supports SAA’s Public Policy Agenda by providing members and other prospective audiences with SAA’s considered opinion on the topic of accountability, transparency, and access to federal records.

Impact on Strategic Priorities: Addresses Goal 1: Advocating for Archives and Archivists, Strategy 1.1. Provide leadership in promoting the value of archives and archivists to institutions, communities, and society, 1.2. Educate and influence decision makers about the importance of archives and archivists, and 1.3. Provide leadership in ensuring the completeness, diversity, and accessibility of the historical record.

Fiscal Impact: Approval of the issue brief does not commit SAA to expend funds on any particular advocacy effort at this time.

Move: Jules

Second: Cooper Cary

Vote: PASSED (unanimous)

D. Issue Brief: Police-Worn Mobile Camera Footage as Public Record

The SAA Committee on Public Policy prepared this issue brief focused on mobile camera footage as a public record and the attendant records management and archival challenges these pose. The SAA Council considered the initial draft at its May 2017 meeting and returned it to COPP for further deliberation. The following revised issue brief attempts to address these comments.

MOTION 6

THAT the following issue brief on Police Mobile Camera Footage as a Public Record be approved, as revised. (*Underline=addition, strikethrough=deletion*)

Issue Brief: Police Mobile Camera Footage as a Public Record

SAA Position

Footage from police mobile cameras, including body-worn cameras, dash-cams, and unmanned aerial vehicles, is a public record with informational and evidentiary value. Footage produced by police-operated cameras should be handled according to local, state, or federal records retention policies; managed in systems that ensure their authenticity; and made available to the public according to government records transparency and privacy laws. Records retention policies for law enforcement agencies should explicitly address camera footage in alignment with these principles.

This issue has taken on particular salience in recent years as a growing number of law enforcement agencies implement mobile camera programs. This trend is due in part to calls from Black Lives Matter, the Movement For Black Lives, and other community organizations to increase transparency of law enforcement agencies and ensure accountability when police use excessive force. The Society of American Archivists has a vested interest in developing and advocating for comprehensive policies to govern these records in the interest of serving the public good and affirming the importance of Black Lives.

In accordance with this position, SAA will:

- ~~Appoint a working group or task force to explore this issue in depth and compile recommendations for future action.~~
- Support efforts to define police mobile camera footage as a public record under existing public records laws according to local, state, and federal statutes.
- Advocate for standardized practices of recording, processing, storing, and making accessible police mobile camera footage.
- Support comprehensive policies that ensure compliance with government records laws by private contractors that sell or maintain police mobile cameras and their attendant evidence management software.
- Advocate for retention and access policies that, while ensuring government transparency and accountability, protect the personal privacy rights of individuals being filmed, particularly those who are incidental to the investigation or recorded incident.
- Encourage SAA members engaged with law enforcement agencies, community organizations, and companies that manufacture and sell body cameras and evidence management systems to ensure that

archival and records management best practices are considered when developing policies and procedures related to police mobile cameras.

The Issues

Police mobile camera video—recorded in the course of operations and preserved as evidence—falls under the professionally accepted definition of public records, i.e., any documentary materials, regardless of physical form or characteristics, made or received by a government entity in the conduct of public business and preserved (or appropriate for preservation) as evidence of the entity's organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, operations, or other activities, or because of the information contained therein. However, state laws diverge widely on the treatment of body camera recordings as public or open records.[1] As of April 2017, eighteen states and the District of Columbia have adopted regulations for handling police mobile camera data in accordance with public record laws. Although some of these states explicitly treat police mobile camera footage as a public record (subject to selected exemptions for confidentiality), other states consider such footage to be exempt from open records requests. This lack of consistent regulatory coverage highlights the need for clear guidance from archivists and records managers.

A 2016 joint report by the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Massachusetts and the University of California, Berkeley School of Law, notes that body-worn cameras increasingly are used by law enforcement officers to record their encounters with civilians.[2] A 2015 survey by the Associations of Major Cities Chiefs and Major County Sheriffs found that 95% of surveyed law enforcement agencies had already implemented body-worn cameras or were planning such programs.[3] This trend is attributed in large part to the Black Lives Matter movement, which has significantly raised public awareness of police conduct toward Black Americans and other marginalized groups. Mobile-camera footage provides important, albeit at times imperfect, documentation of situations that are often high-stress, emotionally charged encounters. By their very nature, such cameras provide evidence of a situation from a single, fixed point of view, one that does not always perfectly replicate what the recording officer actually sees.

The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) has advocated for the use of body-worn camera recordings to document and prosecute police misconduct, provide authoritative evidence in the examination of violent encounters between police and civilians, and diminish the need for juries and judges to rely on fallible eyewitness testimony.[4] The ACLU also has recommended that jurors be allowed to consider whether a police department properly preserved body-worn camera footage. In May 2015, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights published *the Civil Rights Principles on Body Worn Cameras*.^[5] These principles were endorsed and signed by 35 civil rights and social justice organizations, including the ACLU, Center for Media Justice, Data and Society Research Institute, Electronic Frontier Foundation, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and Public Knowledge. According to these principles, law enforcement agencies should, for example: develop camera policies with public input; specify clear operational policies for recording, retention, and access; and make footage available to promote accountability with appropriate privacy safeguards in place. Within this context, records managers and archivists should play an active role in collaborating with policymakers, government agencies, and other stakeholders in meeting the complex records management challenges posed by mobile police video.

The ways in which these videos are understood and treated as records are of paramount concern to archivists, particularly with respect to preservation and access practices that may affect the evidentiary value and authenticity of mobile-camera footage. This issue resides at the nexus of SAA's core values and principles, including the organization's commitment to ensuring transparency and accountability of government at all levels; ensuring the protection of citizens' rights and personal privacy; making

accessible evidence of the diverse and complex elements of the human experience; and preserving historical documentation for future generations. Archivists' professional expertise and investment can help ensure the integrity of these records and assist in fostering transparency.

Regulations and statutes governing mobile-camera footage have failed to keep pace with the growth of programs that produce them. However, *ad hoc* policies and practices have emerged from the need to process, store, and access massive amounts of data in accordance with evidence management standards and protocols. Because this work requires significant investment in infrastructure, many law enforcement agencies have contracted with private companies to purchase mobile cameras and manage footage through proprietary evidence management software. Regulations and statutes should clearly define mobile-camera footage to be a public record within the context of state-specific public records law. Such statutes or regulations should dictate how these records are captured, stored, maintained, accessed, and destroyed. Additionally, such statutes or regulations should clearly outline the limitations for use by contractors of police body-camera footage and attendant data.

While acknowledging the evidentiary value of police-operated camera footage, SAA recognizes the tension between the public's right to know and personal privacy concerns. Police-operated cameras capture deeply personal information and large amounts of footage that are incidental to any potential investigation. Law enforcement agencies should avoid the indiscriminate retention of personally identifiable information, including biometric data captured by mobile cameras. Data retention policies must balance the competing needs for citizen privacy and government transparency within practical, technical, and financial limitations.

In accordance with statutory privacy protections, manual review and redaction may be necessary before police mobile-camera footage can be released. Because this process is both expensive and time-consuming, it may contribute to significant backlogs in fulfilling public requests for footage. Law enforcement agencies should develop efficient policies and procedures for promptly reviewing and releasing or destroying footage in accordance with existing public records regulations.

- [1] <http://www.ncsl.org/research/civil-and-criminal-justice/body-worn-cameras-interactive-graphic.aspx>
- [2] http://aclum.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/ACLU_BodyCameras_11.21_final.pdf
- [3] <https://assets.bwbx.io/documents/users/iqjWHBFdfxIU/rvnT.EAJQwK4/v0>
- [4] http://aclum.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/ACLU_BodyCameras_11.21_final.pdf
- [5] <http://www.civilrights.org/press/2015/body-camera-principles.html>

Additional Resources

American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Massachusetts, "No Tape, No Testimony: How Courts Can Ensure the Responsible Use of Body Cameras," November 29, 2016.
http://aclum.org/wpcontent/uploads/2016/11/ACLU_BodyCameras_11.21_final.pdf

Bakst, Brian, and Ryan Foley. "For Police Body Cameras, Big Costs Loom in Storing Footage." Washington Times February 6, 2015. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/feb/6/forpolice-body-cameras-big-costs-loom-in-storing-/>

Brennan Center for Justice, "Police Body Cameras: Retention and Release," August 3, 2016.
<https://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/police-body-camera-policies-retention-and-release>

Community Oriented Policing Services and Police Executive Research Forum, "Implementing a Body-Worn Camera Program: Recommendations and Lessons Learned," 2014. <https://ric-zaiinc.com/Publications/cops-p296-pub.pdf>

Electronic Frontier Foundation, "Surveillance Drones." <https://www.eff.org/issues/surveillancedrones>

Funk, McKenzie, "Should We See Everything a Cop Sees?" The New York Times Magazine, October 18, 2016. http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/23/magazine/police-bodycameras.html?_r=1

Laperruque, Jake, "Should Police Bodycams Come With Facial Recognition Software?" Slate. November 22, 2016.

http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/future_tense/2016/11/should_police_bodycams_come_With_facial_recognition_software.html

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, "Civil Rights, Privacy, and Media Groups Release Principles for Law Enforcement Body Worn Cameras," May 15, 2015.

<http://www.civilrights.org/press/2015/body-cameraprinciples.html>

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, "Police Body Worn Cameras: A Policy Scorecard," August 2016.

<https://www.bwescorecard.org/>

National Conference of State Legislatures, "Body-Worn Camera Data and Open Records Laws," April 1, 2017.

<http://www.ncsl.org/research/civil-and-criminal-justice/body-worn-cameras-interactive-graphic.aspx>

National Public Radio, "State Laws Restrict Release of Police Body Cam Footage," All Things Considered, July 13, 2016.

<http://www.npr.org/2016/07/13/485895793/state-laws-restrict-release-of-police-body-cam-footage>

Richards, Sam, "Drones: law enforcement's secret eye in the sky," August 24, 2016.

<https://thinkprogress.org/drones-law-enforcements-secret-eye-in-the-sky-9eda68fb8bc#.x6jdcadv>

Sledge, Matt and Hunter Stuart, "Cop Cams Will Change Policing. But Maybe Not the Way You Think," Huffington Post, March 25, 2015. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/03/25/policebody-cameras_n_6933474.html

The Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press. "Access to Policy Body-Worn Camera Video." 2017.

<http://rcfp.org/bodycams>

UCLA Department of Information Studies National Forum, "On the Record, All the Time," August 17-19, 2016. <https://is.gseis.ucla.edu/bodycams/>

U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Administration, "Body Worn Camera Toolkit." <https://www.bja.gov/bwc/>

Urban Institute, "Police Body-Worn Camera Legislation Tracker." <http://apps.urban.org/features/body-camera-update/>

WIRED, "Peter Gabriel: Tech can make video evidence a cornerstone of justice," 2014 December 30.

<https://www.wired.com/2014/12/peter-gabriel-witness-on-video-evidence/>

All sites were accessed on June 24, 2017.

Support Statement: This issue brief supports SAA's Public Policy Agenda by providing members and other prospective audiences with SAA's considered opinion on the topic of managing police mobile camera video as a public record, as well as transparency and accountability of government agencies.

Impact on Strategic Priorities: Addresses Goal 1: Advocating for Archives and Archivists, Strategy 1.1. Provide leadership in promoting the value of archives and archivists to institutions, communities, and society, 1.2. Educate and influence decision makers about the importance of archives and archivists, and 1.3. Provide leadership in ensuring the completeness, diversity, and accessibility of the historical record.

Fiscal Impact: Approval of the issue brief does not commit SAA to expend funds on any particular advocacy effort at this time.

Move: Kiesling

Second: Jules

Vote: PASSED (unanimous)

E. Task Force to Revise Best Practices on Accessibility

Zanish-Belcher brought forward this recommendation, as several SAA members as well as the SAA Diversity Committee have discussed and been interested in revising these Best Practices to expand and represent current practice beyond physical disabilities. The SAA Committee on Education is developing two courses to correspond with each of these best practices, so this would seem to be an opportune time to undertake the work of revising the Best Practices document. The Council agreed and approved the creation of the task force, as detailed below.

MOTION 7

THAT a Working Group to Revise the Best Practices on Accessibility be charged per the following description, with a final report due not later than November 2018.

SAA Working Group to Revise Best Practices on Accessibility

I. Purpose

The Working Group to Revise Best Practices for Working with Archives Employees and Archives Researchers with Physical Disabilities is responsible for reviewing both of the current Best Practices documents and exploring expansion of the Best Practices to include neuro-disability, temporary physical disabilities, and any other topics that should be considered within the scope of the document.

II. Selection, Size, and Length of Term

The Working Group is charged for a 12-month period that begins in November 2017 and continues through the Council's November 2018 meeting. The Working Group will comprise six SAA members, one of whom will serve as chair. The Working Group members will be appointed by the current President and a Council member will be appointed as a liaison/*ex-officio* member.

III. Reporting Procedures

Update reports will be provided to the SAA Council at its May and August 2018 meetings, with a final report due in November 2018.

IV. Duties and Responsibilities

To fulfill its purpose as described above, the Working Group is specifically charged to:

- Share draft Best Practices with selected individuals for comment and review;
- Share draft Best Practices with appropriate Sections, such as Archives Management and Records Management; and
- Seek member comment on a draft and revise accordingly prior to submitting a final draft to the Council.

V. Meetings

The Working Group will carry out its charge primarily via electronic mail, conference calls, online meetings, and face-to-face meetings held in conjunction with the SAA Annual Meeting.

Support Statement: As articulated in the SAA Statement on Diversity and Inclusion, the Society of American Archivists is a professional association that benefits from the participation of people from all backgrounds, and strives to ensure that its membership, the holdings that archivists acquire and manage, and the users whom archivists serve reflect the evolving diversity of society. SAA identifies inclusion as our commitment to ongoing and cumulative efforts (e.g., policies, principles, practices, and activities) that engage an increasingly diverse community in a welcoming, equitable, and responsive manner. Reaffirming and revising these Best Practices focusing on accessibility will demonstrate our continued commitment to a diverse and welcoming profession and provide appropriate guidelines for archival institutions and their employees.

Impact on Strategic Priorities: The work of the proposed Working Group will meet the following components of SAA's Strategic Plan: Goal 1: Advocating for Archives and Archivists, and Goal 4: Meeting Members' Needs.

Fiscal Impact: None.

Move: Stadel-Bevans

Second: Cooper Cary

Vote: PASSED (unanimous)

F. Other Action Items from Council Members

1. Approve Archival Continuing Education (ACE) Guidelines

The SAA Committee on Education put forward revisions to the Archival Continuing Education (ACE) Guidelines in response to recent revisions to the Guidelines for a Graduate Program in Archival Studies (GPAS) and member comments. The Standards Committee reviewed and brought forward the revisions for the Council's final approval. Council members discussed various fine points and were able to connect with CoE Chair Lauren Goodley to make further

revisions. See the Appendix of these minutes for the final version of the 2017 ACE Guidelines, with the Council's revisions indicated.

MOTION 8

THAT the 2017 version of the Guidelines for Archival Continuing Education (ACE) be approved, as revised. (See Appendix of these minutes for the final approved version.)

Support Statement: Council approval of these revisions would continue the work already well-underway to update the Committee on Education's guidelines. These revisions were done in accordance with the Standards Committee's procedures for revising SAA-developed standards and reflect an earnest effort on behalf of the Committee on Education to make the ACE Guidelines more relevant to changing circumstance, both internally within SAA and externally in the field, as well as be more responsive to members by incorporating many of their comments.

Impact on Strategic Priorities: Approval of the revisions would have direct, positive impact on the SAA Strategic Goals 2 Enhancing Professional Growth and Goal 4 Meeting Members' Needs. The ACE Guidelines updates promise to enhance both the content of the educational offerings and make the usability of the standard be members.

Fiscal Impact: None.

Move: Yun

Second: Gunn

Vote: PASSED (unanimous)

2. SAAF Bylaws Revisions

At their November meeting, the SAA Foundation Board discussed aligning with SAA practice the schedule for seating of Board members and election of officers and proposed several revisions in the Bylaws. The Foundation Board approved the proposed revisions and forwarded to the Council for ratification.

MOTION 9

THAT the Council ratify the proposed revisions of the Society of American Archivists Foundation Bylaws, Sections 5.3.2, Election and Tenure; 5.9, Annual Meeting; 6.1, Officers/Number; 6.2, Election and Term of Office; and 6.3, as approved by the SAA Foundation Board. (See revisions in the SAA Foundation Board [November 2017 meeting minutes](#).)

Support Statement: The proposed revisions bring the Bylaws into alignment with current Board function and practice and help to ensure smoother and more transparent transition of members and overall continuity of the Board.

Fiscal Impact: None.

Move: Kiesling
Second: Stadel-Bevans
Vote: PASSED (unanimous)

G. Executive Session: Beaumont Evaluation / Proposed Process and Timeline

In Executive Session, the Council discussed the process and timeline for Executive Director Nancy Beaumont's annual performance review.

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Archives and Archivists Discussion List

The Archives and Archivists Discussion List was created at a time when there were few options for connecting thousands of archivists. Today, there are many options for broad communication, including social media, blogs, and SAA Section discussion lists, which are open to both members and nonmember participants. At its best, the A&A List has been an example of SAA's ideals for community and collaboration among archivists to serve the profession. At its worst, however, the list has undermined SAA's values of inclusion, diversity, and community among archivists.

The Council had a lengthy discussion to consider the staff recommendation to decommission the Archives and Archivists Discussion List. Given the list's fraught history, many similar Council discussions over the years, and recent situations that have required staff intervention, Council members voted unanimously to decommission the list, effective December 31, and charged the staff to explore new options for providing an online forum for profession-wide discussion.

A [press release](#) was issued to notify members and A&A list subscribers of the Council's decision.

MOTION 10

THAT the Archives and Archivists (A&A) List be decommissioned, effective December 31, 2017;

**THAT the A&A List archives (2006-2017) be maintained by SAA to ensure access by all;
and**

THAT the SAA staff explore options for providing an online forum for profession-wide discussion that can be monitored effectively and moderated to ensure that it fosters a professional exchange of ideas.

Support Statement: At its best, the A&A List has been an example of SAA's ideals for community and collaboration among archivists to serve the profession. However, at its worst, the

list has undermined our values of inclusion, diversity, and community among archivists. We believe we can do better and that the time has come to invest SAA's resources in new models.

Relation to Strategic Priorities: An appropriate communication tool that links SAA members and others with an interest in the profession potentially would serve all of SAA's strategic priorities.

Fiscal Impact: Some savings after December 31 of small honorarium paid to list moderator. Some savings in staff time spent in resolving ongoing violation of list terms of participation. Exploration of Higher Logic capabilities and options for implementation is likely to take a significant amount of staff time in conjunction with the AMS implementation.

Move: Lawrimore

Second: Stadel-Bevans

Vote: PASSED (unanimous)

B. Preliminary Ideas for SAA Toolkit on Diversity and Inclusion

Chartier reported that the SAA Council Working Group on Diversity and Inclusion has begun to develop a social justice toolkit, to live on the SAA website and be a home for dynamic resources related to any social justice issues and archives, to encourage intensive grassroots work by archivists. The Council discussed various aspects of the project to help determine the working group's next steps.

C. Proposal for Tragedy Response Initiative

In response to the June 2016 Pulse nightclub shooting in Orlando, a member of the Diverse Sexuality and Gender Section asked the co-chairs to investigate creation of a Tragedy Response Initiative to provide professional policies and best practice guidelines for archivists responding to tragedies in their communities that also affect their professional responsibilities. The section leaders reached out to other SAA leaders to collaborate, and ultimately determined that the initiative would be most successful and sustainable if the Council created a task force to consider key aspects in moving forward. The Council agreed that this is an important initiative and approved a charge for a task force to convene by January 2018 and provide a final report and recommendations no later than January 2020.

MOTION 11

THAT a Tragedy Response Initiative Task Force be charged per the following description, with a final report due not later than January 2020.

SAA Tragedy Response Initiative Task Force

I. Purpose

The Tragedy Response Initiative Task Force is responsible for 1) creating and/or compiling material for ready accessibility by archivists who are facing a sudden tragedy and 2) exploring the feasibility of

creating a standing body within SAA that would update documentation as needed and serve as a volunteer tragedy response team.

II. Selection, Size, and Length of Term

The Task Force is charged for a two-year period that begins in January 2018, with a final report and recommendations for the Council no later than January 2020.

The Task Force will comprise eight SAA members, one of whom will serve as chair. Task Force members will be appointed by the vice president/president-elect.

III. Reporting Procedures

The Task Force chair will prepare a written status report for each of the Council's spring and fall meetings, and will prepare for Council consideration at its fall/winter 2020 meeting a final written report with recommendations. Should the Task Force recommend that a standing group be created, it should include in its final report a draft charge/description for that group.

IV. Duties and Responsibilities

To fulfill its purpose as described above, the Task Force is specifically charged to:

- Research current best practices and resources for archival tragedy response, including interviewing similar, successful programs (i.e., Disaster Planning and Recovery Subcommittee, AID National Heritage Responders).
- Collaborate with allied organizations to ensure that policies and practices reflect varied needs and strategies for cooperation among various archival institutions.
- Create and/or compile material for the SAA website documenting professional policies and best practices for collecting strategies, management, preservation, and provision of access to memorial collections, including templated forms that are easily adapted.
- Determine whether sufficient need exists to justify the effort and costs associated with establishing a standing body to serve as a Tragedy Response Volunteer Team.
- Determine how such a standing body might be structured, staffed, and governed, with administratively and financially sustainable models for national-, regional-, and state-based structures.
- Determine how such a standing body might be financed and supported.
- Propose how such a standing body might interact with other SAA groups and with external groups.

V. Meetings

The Task Force will carry out its charge primarily via electronic mail, conference calls, online meetings, and face-to-face meetings held in conjunction with the SAA Annual Meeting. Should the Task Force determine that an additional face-to-face meeting would be beneficial, it must apply to the Council (through the Executive Office) for funding.

Support Statement:

The formation of a SAA Tragedy Response Initiative Task Force will benefit SAA membership and allied colleagues who have professional obligations to document and preserve collections related to tragic events in their communities and workplaces by, 1. providing guidance regarding policies, procedures, and best practices for acquisition, deaccessioning, preservation, and access of memorial collections created as a result of a tragic event(s); and 2. the creation of a volunteer response team to physically help collect material at the archivists' request.

Impact on Strategic Priorities: The work of the proposed task force would assist in achieving the following outcomes for SAA’s strategic goals and strategies: 1.1 and 1.4, 2.1 and 2.2, 3.1 and 3.3, and 4.2 and 4.3.

Fiscal Impact: Members of the task force may be affected financially by individual work associated with the task force as well as attendance necessary for teleconference and in-person (at Annual Meetings) meetings. It is anticipated that work conducted as part of the task force will not exceed 5-8 hours per week.

Move: Gunn

Second: Chartier

Vote: PASSED (Yes: Booth, Chartier, Cooper Cary, Evans, Gunn, Jules, Kiesling, Lawrimore, Stadel-Bevans, Yun. Absent: Lyons.)

D. Current Standards Revision Practices

Lyons and Kiesling updated the Council on their inquiry into the continuous revision process and practices for the standards technical subcommittees. They are still in discussion with various groups about their processes and the distinctions between major and minor revisions. Lyons and Kiesling will continue to explore coordinating continuous revision with the technical subcommittees and the SAA Publications and Education departments, and they will provide a report for the January Council conference call.

E. Component Funding Requests

Reference: [0717-2 Revised Component Funding Request Form](#)

Following up from a discussion at the July 29, 2017, Council meeting, Stadel-Bevans brought forward the proposed revisions to the Component Group Funding Request Form. The Council agreed that these revisions would help clarify the process for component group leaders and help ensure that the Finance Committee and Council receive all necessary information for reviewing the requests.

The Council also discussed a pilot test of providing funding (\$500) to each section to support programming or activities for the section’s annual meeting. Chartier, Lawrimore, Stadel-Bevans, and Yun volunteered to develop criteria and timelines for this pilot for discussion during the Council’s January conference call.

MOTION 12

THAT the following revisions to the SAA Component Group Funding Request Form be adopted. (*Underline=addition, strikethrough=deletion*)

**Society of American Archivists
Component Group Funding Request
Fiscal Year 2018**

(July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018)
Deadline: March 1, 2017

[Appointed Group Name]: Funding to Support [Project/Program]
Prepared by: [TK, TK, and TK]
Submitted: [Date]

The [component group] requests that funding be included in SAA's FY 2018 budget to support [project/program name].

BACKGROUND [Should not exceed 3 paragraphs.]

Describe origin of project or program for which you are seeking funding from SAA.

- Is the request in response to a charge from Council?
- How does it address a priority from the SAA Strategic Plan?
- How does it further the purpose of SAA?
- What makes this project relevant to your Section or to the profession at this time?
- Please indicate the time period during which the activity is expected to take place if funded, and continuing programs or projects that will imply future funding needs.

- ~~[Ex: Is it in response to a charge from the Council or another group?]~~
- ~~[Ex: Is it being proposed in response to SAA's Strategic Plan?]~~

DISCUSSION [Should not exceed 2 pages.]

Describe the project or program more fully, providing a balanced discussion of the benefits to the profession or SAA resulting from the project or program. Be sure to indicate clearly the outcomes or products you expect from the activity.

- How is this project significant to the component group(s)? How is this project significant to SAA overall? Who is the audience for this project?
- Does the project foster collaboration between SAA component groups? Does it foster collaboration with groups outside of SAA?
- What is special about this project? How is it innovative?
- What or who will this project fund? Is it to bring in a consultant or outside speaker? Is it in support of a task force? [Please note that Council is reluctant to fund requests for registration or other expenses for archivists who are located in North America.]
- What are the expected outcomes? How will the outcomes benefit SAA? How do the outcomes support work that is fundamental to the archives profession?

Budget

Within the Discussion section, provide an estimated budget for the project or program, including as much detail as possible. Provide background for your analysis and any alternatives that were considered. Are there other ways to accomplish this project that would reduce the budget?

FUNDING REQUEST

The [component group] requests that funding in the amount of [\$TK] be included in SAA's FY 2018 budget to support [project/program name].

Support Statement: The support statement provides a very brief rationale for or summary of the recommendation. The naïve reader should be able to glean much of the intent of the request by reading the support statement, without having to read the background and discussion.

Relation to SAA Strategic Plan: Describe how the proposed project or program addresses one or more of SAA's strategic goals. Or indicate that it does not.

Fiscal Impact: Restate the total dollar amount being requested. If staff or volunteer time will be required, please address that impact here as well.

- [Ex: "The total direct expenses for hiring a consultant to assist with development of X will be approximately \$2,000."]
- [Ex: "The estimated staff time associated with this project/program is 1 staff member @ 20 hours plus 1 staff member @ 40 hours."]

Support Statement: These revisions will clarify the process for component group leaders and ensure the Council and the Finance Committee receive important and necessary information to appropriately review each request.

Strategic Plan: These revisions support Goal 4: Meeting Members' Needs.

Fiscal Impact: None.

Move: Stadel-Bevans

Second: Gunn

Vote: PASSED (unanimous)

F. Award Honoring Mark Greene

A group of Mark Greene's long-time colleagues had been discussing how SAA might recognize his lasting impact on the archives profession and on SAA. They ultimately determined that an award—particularly one that focuses on recognizing and supporting young leaders who are making their way in the profession—might be the best way to honor him. The mission and purpose of SAA's existing Emerging Leader Award would seem to align with Greene's own commitment and approach to mentoring. For this reason his colleagues recommend that the Emerging Leader Award be renamed to commemorate Mark A. Greene. The group also suggested that the Council reconsider the award's requirement for "formal archival education," as this may be preempted by the requirements for experience. The Council agreed that this would be a great way to honor Mark Greene and that the "formal archival education requirement" did not serve the intentions and purpose of the award.

MOTION 13

THAT the SAA Emerging Leader Award be re-named the Mark A. Greene Emerging Leader Award in honor of Mark A. Greene, and that the award description be revised as follows (*underline = addition, strikethrough = deletion*):

Society of American Archivists
Mark A. Greene Emerging Leader Award

Purpose and Criteria for Selection: Created in 2011, this award celebrates and encourages early-career archivists who have completed archival work of broad merit, demonstrated significant promise of leadership, and/or performed commendable service to the archives profession. The award was renamed in honor of SAA Fellow and Past President Mark A. Greene in 2017 in honor of his long-standing commitment to mentoring young leaders.

Nominees will have more than two years and less than ten years of professional archives experience. Nominees must be SAA members and must meet as many of the following criteria as possible:

- Work of merit that has made a substantive contribution to an area (or areas) of the archives profession beyond the nominee's local institution and that holds promise for future contributions.
- Demonstrated leadership through collaborative work or exemplary service to local, regional, and/or national archival and cultural associations.
- ~~Formal archival education through a graduate degree program in history, library science, information science, or a related field; through participation in an archival or preservation institute; and/or through certification by the Academy of Certified Archivists.~~
- Involvement in successful outreach and advocacy efforts on behalf of the nominee's institution and the archives profession.

Support Statement: A group of Mark's long-time colleagues determined that an award – particularly one that focuses on recognizing and supporting young leaders who are making their way in the profession – might be the best way to honor his lasting impact on the archives profession and on SAA. The mission and purpose of SAA's existing Emerging Leader Award would seem to align with Mark's own commitment and approach to mentoring.

Fiscal Impact: None.

Move: Kiesling

Second: Cooper Cary

Vote: PASSED (unanimous)

G. Future Dues Increases

Carlson and Stadel-Bevans noted that the Finance Committee has just begun the process of considering whether a dues increase is warranted in the next cycle, as the group is required to do every three years. The committee will be running models for various options and will report to the Council soon with findings and a recommendation.

H. Briefing on Annual Meeting Site Selection Process

Beaumont provided an update on site selection for future annual meetings, as she is working to secure contracts in cities that the Council previously has discussed for the 2021 – 2023 meetings. SAA has been diligent in considering the Annual Meeting Task Force’s recommendations, exploring convention centers, paying particular attention to issues of cost to attendees and social responsibility, and continuing to ensure that the meeting is rotated among regions of the country. She noted that she hopes to secure a location in California in the next few years so that those who will not be able to attend the 2019 Annual Meeting in Austin, Texas, will be able to more easily attend in the near future.

I. Preliminary Schedule for 2018 Joint Annual Meeting

Beaumont will soon be sharing an updated version of the preliminary schedule for the 2018 Joint Annual Meeting, and asked that the Council review and consider how to manage the many events to minimize conflicts.

J. Other Discussion Items from Council Members

1. Report from SAA Foundation Board Meeting

Zanish-Belcher shared highlights from the November SAA Foundation Board meeting, including the Board’s election of officers and members of their subcommittees, the creation of an SAAF Nominating Committee, and a motion to increase the maximum NDRFA grant to \$5,000, among other actions taken and discussions had. See the SAA Foundation Board [November 2017 meeting minutes](#) for a complete review of the meeting.

VI. 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>.

The following reports were reviewed in advance by Council members but were not discussed at the meeting:

- A. [Executive Committee](#)
- B. [President](#)
- C. [Vice President / President-Elect](#)
- E.1. [Staff: Executive Director](#)
- E.2. [Staff: Membership](#)
- E.3. [Staff: Education](#)
- E.4. [Staff: Publications](#)
- E.5. [Staff: Annual Meeting](#)
- E.6. [Staff: Technology](#)

- F. [The American Archivist Editor](#)
- G. [Publications Editor](#)
- H. [Final Report: 2017 Program Committee](#)
- J. [Annual Report: Committee on Education](#)
- K. [Annual Report: Committee on Public Awareness](#)
- L. [Annual Report: Committee on Public Policy](#)
- M. [Annual Report: Membership Committee](#)
- N. [Annual Report: CALM](#)
- O. [Annual Report: Dictionary Working Group](#)
- Q. [Task Force on Research/Data and Evaluation Update](#)

D. Treasurer

1. [FY 17 Fiscal-Year-End Financials](#)
2. [FY 18 Year-to-Date Financials](#)

Stadel-Bevans reported that the Executive Committee had approved on November 5 the allocation of the FY2017 net gain of \$39,285 to the Technology Fund. It is customary for the Executive Committee to determine allocation of any net gain. For the past several years, any net gain has gone to the Technology Fund in recognition of the ongoing need to fund a new association management system as well as other technology priorities.

I. [Annual Report: Awards Committee](#)

Brinati reported that the staff has just implemented a new awards management software solution called Smarter Select. Nominators will be able to submit applications online and award subcommittee members will be able to review and rank applications within Smarter Select. The new system will save considerable staff and volunteer time.

P. [2016-2017 Section Annual Reports](#)

Council members reviewed each section report and noted where follow-up was needed. Council liaisons will be following up promptly on questions posed in the reports.

R. [Metadata Environmental Scan](#)

In answering the questions posed in the report by Mark Matienzo, the Council determined that his report at the 2017 Research Forum was sufficient for the desired outcomes of the project and moved to conclude the project, with thanks to Matienzo.

MOTION 14

THAT the Metadata and Digital Object Practice Environmental Scan, commissioned in August 2016, be considered concluded; and

THAT Mark Matienzo be thanked for his contributions, particularly his presentation at the 2017 Research Forum in Portland, Oregon.

Move: Kiesling

Second: Chartier

Vote: PASSED (unanimous)

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

Yun mentioned that the Society of California Archivists is discussing how it might incorporate an SAA presence in the state in 2019, for those who will not have support to attend the SAA Annual Meeting in Austin, Texas. Yun and Beaumont will coordinate with SCA to discuss options.

I. COUNCIL BUSINESS (continued)

A. Review of November 2017 Action List

Council members reviewed the draft list of action items stemming from the meeting.

B. Review of November 2017 Talking Points

Council members reviewed the draft list of action items stemming from the meeting.

C. Adjournment

Stadel-Bevans moved adjournment, Kiesling seconded, and the Council meeting was adjourned by unanimous consent at 11:51 a.m. on Tuesday, November 7.

Note: Further revisions made by the Council are indicated below (underline = addition, strikethrough = deletion).

Guidelines for Archival Continuing Education (ACE)

Adopted by the Council of the Society of American Archivists, November 2017.

Introduction

Archival continuing education (ACE) provides professional archival knowledge beyond the formal credit/hour structure of education institutions. ACE connects with individual archivists in all phases of their careers by delivering basic, intermediate, and advanced courses in the areas of archival knowledge listed below.¹

These guidelines encourage lifelong learning opportunities within the archival community and specifically apply to providers or sponsors of archival continuing education. Others will find them useful, including practicing archivists, allied professionals, employers, archival educators, accrediting agencies, and those who fund, oversee, support, work with, or use archives or who participate in archival continuing education.

Continuing education is typically focused on applied practice but should be grounded in archival principles, theories, histories, and values. All programs should engage the latest developments, technologies, and best practices in the knowledge areas.

Areas of Archival Knowledge

Archival continuing education programs should address the areas of archival knowledge delineated by the Society of American Archivists Guidelines for Graduate Programs in Archival Studies (GPAS) and the Academy of Certified Archivists (ACA)²:

1. **Nature of Records and Archives:** The theory and history of archives and the archival profession; social and cultural history; records-keeping models; relationships to allied professions; familiarity with professional standards and best practices; and use of appropriate research methodologies and technological solutions.
2. **Selection, Appraisal, and Acquisition:** The theory, policies, and procedures that archivists use to identify, evaluate, acquire, accession, and authenticate archival materials, in all forms.
3. **Arrangement and Description:** The intellectual and physical organization or verification of archival materials in all forms, and the development of descriptive tools

¹ ACE "courses" is a generic term that includes workshops, seminars, clinics, institutes, short courses, e-learning, recorded programs, and webinars. See Appendix List of Effective Delivery Formats.

² The Areas of Archival Knowledge list is taken directly from GPAS and informed by the ACA General Knowledge Statements.

and systems that provide both control of and access to collections.

4. **Preservation:** The strategy, practice, and administration of physical and intellectual protection of materials in all forms, in order to ensure their continued accessibility. This includes environmental controls, material stabilization, storage and housing, handling and security, reformatting, and migration.
5. **Reference and Access:** ~~The policies and procedures designed to serve the information needs of various user groups.~~ The practices and policies guiding the contextualization, evaluation, and/or use of archival resources to serve the information needs of various user groups.
6. **Outreach, Instruction, and Advocacy:** The theories and practices that archivists ~~use~~ implement to identify needs and to develop programs ~~to support~~ that promote the value and/or use of archives by individuals and communities. These activities ~~promote~~ understanding of archival materials and methods, facilitate comprehension of archival materials and archival work, increased use and primary source literacy, expanded resources, improved and new community relationships, visibility, and support.
7. **Management and Administration:** The principles and practices archivists use to facilitate all aspects of archival work through careful planning and administration of the repository, unit, or program, its institutional resources, and its policy making practices.
8. **Ethical and Legal Responsibilities:** The laws, regulations, institutional policies, and professional standards that apply to the archival community and its users, including intellectual property, sensitivities, and privacy concerns.

Specialized Courses

Courses that address specialized topics such as formats, allied functions, or repository type are also appropriate. These can be specialized courses or part of courses addressing the above areas of archival knowledge. Such topics may include:

1. **Digital Materials:** Methods to manage born-digital records and digital surrogates, including means to address the specific nature, issues, and preservation challenges of digital archives.
2. **Collaboration with Allied Professionals:** Methods to work with creators and managers of information, including records managers, rare book librarians, cultural heritage workers, conservators, information technologists, museum professionals, oral historians, public historians, educators, and social and community organization professionals.
3. **Innovative Areas:** Archival practice is informed by and informs a range of influences, including interdisciplinary approaches to research; new and emerging theories, practices, and technologies; and subject specialization.

Delivery Options, Courses, Evaluation

Different instructional format and venue options exist. Matching the needs of participants and topics being taught with the optimum format and venue is important. Courses may include, but are not limited to, workshops, seminars, institutes, in-house training programs, and professional

association meetings, as well as emerging distance and online educational delivery mechanisms. Providing low cost, widely available continuing education should be the primary goal.

Course information and materials must be appropriate to the intended subject, duration, delivery mechanism, and audience.³ Course developers will create learning materials based on identified needs and will incorporate and assess learning outcomes using recognized assessment methods and formal evaluation instruments. Instructors should be qualified in their fields.⁴

Providers must consider accessibility when developing and offering courses and make efforts to meet the needs of persons with disabilities. Providers must have a policy for handling ADA-related requests. Any materials promoting and advertising CE courses should contain information about how participants may request reasonable accommodations to address their special needs. Instructors and students should evaluate specific continuing education courses. Developers and providers of individual courses and multi-class programs should evaluate the total range of courses offered over time to avoid needless duplication or competition.⁵

Appended to these guidelines are materials intended to serve as a general “toolkit” to aid continuing education providers and users in developing and preparing to attend continuing education offerings:

Appendix 1: Evolution of the ACE Guidelines

Appendix 2: Recommended Instructor Qualifications

Appendix 3: List of Effective Delivery Formats

Appendix 4: Guidelines for Evaluating Continuing Education Programs

- Sample Evaluation Form for Individual Program and Instructor
- Sample Reviewer Evaluation Form

Appendix 5: Curriculum Development (Objectives, Work Application, Measurable Outcomes)

³ See Appendix 5: Guidelines for an Ideal Course and Curriculum Development

⁴ See Appendix 3: Recommended Instructor Qualifications

⁵ See Appendix 4: Guidelines for Evaluating Continuing Education Programs and sample evaluation forms.

Appendix 1: Evolution of the ACE Guidelines

A field as complex and rapidly changing as the archival profession requires effective continuing education and training. In 1997, SAA adopted “Guidelines for the Development of Post-Appointment and Continuing Education and Training Programs” (PACE) which had as its basis the Guidelines for a Graduate Program in Archival Studies (GPAS) guidelines. The ACE Guidelines resulted from a scheduled review and revision of [PACE in 2005 – 2006](#). The ACE Guidelines adopted by the SAA Council in 2006 incorporate information from SAA’s 2002 GPAS guidelines and the Academy of Certified Archivists’ 2003 Role Delineation Statement Revision.

In 2017, the Committee on Education revised the ACE Guidelines to be in better accordance with a 2016 revision of the Guidelines for a Graduate Program in Archival Studies. During the 2017 ACE revision, an appendix referencing the 2004-2005 A*CENSUS was removed due to concerns about the census being outdated.

Appendix 2: Recommended Guidelines for Evaluating Instructor Qualifications

Instructors should be experts in their field.

This expertise may be indicated by an appropriate combination of elements such as:

- Experience in archival practice in the given subject matter.
- Publications.
- A record of presentations at conferences.
- Work in related professional associations.
- Formal academic credentials.
- Other demonstrable indications of advanced knowledge.

Instructors should demonstrate an ability or a strong potential to teach effectively. This ~~should~~ could be confirmed by a successful teaching record (based on student, peer, or reviewer evaluations), completion of instructor training geared toward adult education, or review by Committee on Education members or the Education Director.

Another measure of instructor qualification is completion of instructor training geared toward adult education. When evaluating this qualification in an instructor, the provider should consider the wide range of venues and structures that are appropriate for such education. Adult education teaching skills include the ability to conceptualize and deliver course content in person or via distance education and to research and write a formal manual.

Appendix 3: Effective Delivery Formats

There are a variety of face-to-face and online delivery formats within continuing education. The below provides some examples of these formats and their advantages and limitations.

Face-to-Face Delivery Formats⁶

Course (W): A relatively short-term, intensive, problem-focused learning experience that actively involves participants in the identification and analysis of problems and in the development and evaluation of solutions.

Seminar (S): A session or series of sessions in which a group of experienced people meet with one or more knowledgeable resource persons to discuss a given content area.

Institute (I): A short-term, often residential program that fosters intensive learning on a well-defined topic. New material is presented to add to the knowledge which the participants already have on the subject.

Clinic (C): A short-term program that emphasizes diagnosis and treatment of problems that participants bring to the session. Experts available at the clinic, rather than participants themselves, have primary responsibility for diagnosing problems and prescribing treatment.

Short course (SC): An abbreviated, more focused version of the class typically found in colleges and universities. Designed to update or deepen the knowledge of those in a particular field, the expert dominates the sessions because it focuses on communication and on acquisition of information within a short time.

Advantages of Each Format

- Many people can attend (W/S/SC)
- Very transportable (W/S/I/SC)
- Immediate application of results of problem-solving efforts (W/C)
- People interact in novel ways (W/I)
- Isolation from distractions of day-to-day concerns (W/S/I/SC)
- Problem-solving skills refined (W/C)
- Little need to reorganize facilities and equipment once they are in place (W/S/I)

Limitations of Each Format

- Fatigue and information overload are always possible (W/S)
- Mid-stream corrective action difficult when learner problems occur (W)
- Teacher burnout (W/SC)
- Little flexibility if timing is not maintained (W/SC)
- Individual feedback to learners rarely possible (W/S)
- Learners are not always effective participants (W/I/C/SC)
- Costs for travel (W/I/C/SC)

Criteria for Selecting a Format

- Learning objectives emphasize problem solving (W)
- Solving problems that are relatively complex and generalized and that require intensive analysis (W)
- Resources necessary to engage in problem solving are available where they can be effectively incorporated into workshop activities (W)
- Skilled leadership is available (W/S/I/C/SC)
- Participants come with, or can be provided with, the group process skills that they need to engage in effective problem solving (W)
- Important to remove participants from their “natural” environment to bring about the desired changes in capabilities (W/I/C/SC)

Online Learning Formats

Online or distance learning is training that takes place virtually with registrants and instructors separated by geographic regions. Registrants may receive materials and participate in learning activities for an online course via their computer or email and may be asked to complete a series of activities in a particular order, pass assessments, or submit an assignment to an instructor for review.

Distance learning may be delivered using many techniques and technologies. These include the following:

- **Online Learning or “eLearning”** is delivered via computers using internet technology and software programs that allow registrants to interact with the course materials, each other, and the instructor via discussion boards learning management systems, video conferencing platforms, etc., both synchronously and asynchronously. This is a fast-moving field with new products and techniques coming online in rapid succession.
- **On-Demand or Pre-Recorded programming** uses a series of pre-recorded programs designed to convey information. Delivery via webcast, video, podcast or other digital recordings is most common. Recordings may be hosted in Learning Management Systems, clouds or on websites. In some cases the recorded programming includes an assessment. Live broadcasts (webcasts, podcasts) may offer the opportunity for webcam sharing, screen sharing, live chat, Q&A and polling.

Advantages of the Distance Learning Format

- Allows registrants to take courses where and when they choose
- Alleviates cost, time, and work constraints related to travelling to in-person courses
- Increases choices for more registrants
- Offers an alternative format for those with different learning styles, or those who may find it preferable to watch and re-watch recorded content on their own time
- Doesn't require a “brick-and-mortar” classroom and logistical coordination association with the rental or reservation of a physical space and materials.
- Engagement features such as Discussion Boards can increase interaction amongst course registrants

Limitations of the Distance Learning Format

- Certain learning styles may just prefer the classroom lecture format and interaction an in-person course offers
- Some learners may find the content more challenging due to lack of interaction with others

Criteria for Selecting the Distance Learning Format

- Requires an instructor be comfortable developing and presenting content in an online format.
- Activities and self-assessment exercises may be interspersed throughout, building to the end goal
- Most effective when concepts, ideas, and theories are delivered in a clear and concise manner, and steps are in place to ensure learning retention.

Appendix 4: Guidelines for Evaluating Continuing Education Programs

Feedback from participants, peers, reviewers, and instructors is essential to assess the quality and relevance of individual courses and programs of continuing education courses.

Use the course evaluation forms that follow or construct your own to assist the instructor in refining/tweaking the content and presentation. Lengthy evaluation forms typically defeat the purpose as participants are eager to leave – one sheet of paper with questions on both sides appears to yield the greatest results. Include succinct questions and request answers based on a scale of one to five as well as open ended questions encouraging comprehensive responses. Allowing participants to complete evaluations at home and/or online after the program concludes results in a significant decrease in evaluations submitted.

Ask participants about the complete education experience including:

- Objectives
- Learning outcomes
- Content
- Break-out sessions
- Relevance of training
- Skill of Presenter
- Advertised description
- Handouts and materials
- Pre-reading assignments if appropriate
- What was missing
- Catering if appropriate
- Information provided about location, transportation, parking,
- Comfort and appropriateness of facility
- Other education needs

Evaluations allow instructors and education providers to pin point areas for improvement in course content, presentation, and materials. Both entities should study the numbers, comments, and suggestions/complaints to resolve issues. Pay particular attention to negative comments, even if there are few. Assess their legitimacy and attempt to address the concerns they raise even while keeping positive comments in mind.

Course Title: **NAME**

Date: **DATE**

Location: **LOCATION**

I. Assess the workshop from the standpoint of what you gained from the experience:

How well did the workshop meet the following stated objectives?

	Not at all			On target	
Understand the basic elements of an electronic records program, including file formats, authenticity, and management strategies;	1	2	3	4	5
Know strategies for working with records creators ranging from university employees to donors of personal papers; and	1	2	3	4	5
Have a basic understanding of the open source tools available for ingest and management of electronic records.	1	2	3	4	5
New knowledge/skills acquired	Very little 1	2	3	Substantial 4	5
Likelihood of applying concepts to your work	Not likely 1	2	3	Very likely 4	5
Expectations met per advertising	Not at all 1	2	3	On target 4	5

II. Rate the methods and materials relative to their value in accomplishing the workshop:

	NA	Poor			Outstanding
Clarity of participant handouts	0	1	2	3	4 5
Content of participant handouts	0	1	2	3	4 5
Pre course readings	0	1	2	3	4 5
Exercises/group discussions	0	1	2	3	4 5
Clarity of audio-visual aids	0	1	2	3	4 5
Content of audio-visual aids	0	1	2	3	4 5

III. What aspect of the workshop methods/materials was most valuable to you? Why?

IV. What aspect of the workshop methods/materials would you change? Why?

Continued on reverse side

V. How would you rate the individual instructor(s)?

Instructor: NAME

	Poor			Outstanding	
Knowledge of topic	1	2	3	4	5
Preparation	1	2	3	4	5
Ability to handle questions	1	2	3	4	5
Presentation skills	1	2	3	4	5

Additional Comments for Tim:

Instructor: NAME (if applicable)

	Poor			Outstanding	
Knowledge of topic	1	2	3	4	5
Preparation	1	2	3	4	5
Ability to handle questions	1	2	3	4	5
Presentation skills	1	2	3	4	5

Additional Comments for Seth:

VI. May we use your evaluation and name for testimonials? ___Yes ___No

Name (optional): _____

VII. What other workshop topics do you need for your continuing education and where would you like to see them held?

VIII. How did find out about this workshop? Please circle all that apply:

Archival Outlook In the Loop Email Blast Listserv Announcement
Twitter Facebook SAA Website Postcard Other (Please Specify) _____

Thank you in advance for completing this evaluation. The Committee on Education of the Society of American Archivists appreciates your assistance to help it maintain the highest standard of archival continuing education. Please complete this form and return it to the instructor at the conclusion of the course, or return it via mail or fax to:
**Society of American Archivists; 17 North State Street, Suite #1425; Chicago, IL 60602;
Voice 312/606.0722—Fax 312/606.0728**

Appendix 5: Guidelines for an Ideal Course and Curriculum Development

As an archival continuing education provider, you have decided on the topic for your course or program based on research and feedback from various sources that point to the need for a presentation on this topic.

In the case of an individual instructor proposing a course, a good first step is to contact the provider and ensure that the course idea is a good fit for the provider, in terms of content, delivery format, audience, and development timeline.

Consider listing the following for the single course or multi-course curriculum:

- Goals. What do you intend to accomplish? Create an overview. Each goal/purpose should be stated relative to the rationale behind the content.
- Learning objectives. Use verbs that convey measurable behavioral objectives (e.g., registrants will be able to define [knowledge], classify [comprehension], calculate [application], appraise [analysis], assemble [synthesis], or determine [evaluation]). Each learning objective may be broken into subcategories that detail what will be discussed and what activities will take place.
- Outcomes. These should clearly identify how learning can be applied in the workplace.
- Intended audience (introductory, intermediate, advanced, seasoned, etc.).
- Secondary audience who would benefit from attending, if appropriate.
- Required or recommended prerequisite knowledge, skills, or behaviors.
- Schedule/outline.
- Which techniques – lecture, discussion, simulation, or case study – do you intend to use for each component?
- Describe the exercises and case studies that you plan to incorporate. For case studies, it is best to use cases based on personal experience wherever possible. Personal experience is much more compelling in an instructional situation than are generic examples, and instructors are strongly encouraged to bring their own case studies to the classroom.
- Pre-course readings you may want to assign.
- Audiovisual requirements to present what you have in mind.
- Delivery format and reason for this choice.