

**Society of American Archivists  
Council Meeting  
November 2-3, 2018  
Chicago, Illinois**

**Annual Report: Standards Committee**

**(Prepared by 2017-2018 Co-chairs Caitlin Christian-Lamb and John Bence)**

**Membership**

Caitlin Christian-Lamb (2014-2018; Co-Chair, 2016-2018)  
John Bence (2014-2018; Co-Chair, 2017-2019)  
Keith Chevalier (2017-2020)  
Kira Dietz (2017-2020)  
Christiana Dobryzinski (2015-2018)  
Elizabeth Dunham (2017-2020)  
Rebecca Wiederhold (2016-2018)  
Lindsay Wittwer (2016-2019)  
Renaë Rapp (Intern)  
Bertram Lyons, Council Liaison (2016-2019)

*Ex Officio:*

Carrie Hintz (Immediate past Co-Chair)  
Maureen Callahan (TS-DACS Co-Chair)  
Adrien Hilton (TS-DACS Co-Chair)  
Karin Bredenberg (TS-EAS Co-Chair)  
Katherine Wisser (TS-EAS Co-Chair)  
Dara Baker (TS-GRD Chair)  
Michele Pacifico (TS-AFG Co-Chair/Rep to NISO)  
Daniel Pitti (Rep to ICA-EGAD)  
Stephan Weatherly (Rep to ALA/Description & Access and MARC)  
Sharry Watson (Rep from CAA CCAD)  
Tom Wilsted (TS-AFG Co-Chair)  
Vacant (Rep to ARMA)

*Incoming members/ex officios:*

Rebecca Wiederhold (Co-Chair, 2019-2022)  
Jennifer Coggins (2018-2021)  
Erin Sonnenberg (2018-2021)  
Noah Lasley (Rep to NISO)

## COMPLETED PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES

### Governance

See appendices H and I for Standards Committee meeting minutes for 2017-2018.

### Technical Subcommittees and Task Forces

TS-GRD started the year with new membership and has been reviewing possible directions for enhancements to the *Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning*. See appendix E for full report.

Following the development in 2016-2017 of the DACS principles through in-person meetings and community feedback, TS-DACS will release a final draft of the principles for further comment before the Annual Meeting. The comment period will last until the end of August. TS-DACS completed an overhaul of *Appendix B: Companion Standards* to replace superseded standards and to correct outdated links. See appendix D for full report.

TS-EAS organized itself in 2016 into five teams to reflect the expanded scope of the combined technical subcommittee. A number of accomplishments were reported, including full adoption of GitHub for coordinating development work and sharing documentation. EAD 3.1.1 was released in June. See appendix F for full report.

In January 2018, the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy (JTF-PSL) sent their final submission packet for Standards Committee review. The final report pointed out that ongoing maintenance and development of the standard does not account for the temporary nature of the joint task force. Answering the question of how SAA and RBMS will work together in the future was put off until a later date, in favor of allowing the *Guidelines* to move forward. An agenda item was drafted and submitted to the Council for an online vote in June and the standard was approved. See appendix B for final report.

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force for the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (JTF-HCM) released their final draft for comment in May 2018. As of July, no comments were received. The JTF-HCM plans to request approval from ACRL/RBMS first before pursuing SAA approval, given the complex nature of ALA governance; this conforms to how previous joint task forces' sought approval. Final submission to SAA Standards is expected in the fall of 2018 or early 2019. See appendix A for full report.

The question of ongoing maintenance and development of jointly developed standards remains and is a priority for 2018-2019.

### External representatives

See appendix J for report from the Representative to the ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access and the Library of Congress MARC Advisory Committee. The external representative to ARMA seat remains vacant. Michele Pacifico is ending her term as SAA

representative to NISO and will be replaced by Noah Lasley.

### Liaisons

The committee continues to use liaisons to SAA component groups for such purposes as calls for comments on draft standards and bringing questions to co-chairs' attention.

### Endorsements and comments

Standards Committee participated in the following standards reviews this year:

In October, Standards received the Committee on Education's submission packet for the *Archival Continuing Education Guidelines* revision. Standards held an online vote between October 18 and October 22, the result of which was approval of the *Guidelines*. An agenda item was submitted to Council ahead of their November meeting, at which the *Guidelines* were approved (Item II.C., Council meeting minutes, November 5-7, 2017).

Standards was approached by John Bewley and Elizabeth Surles, members of a working group of the Music Library Association. The working group has developed a supplement to DACS for noted music materials. Endorsement was sought as a precursor to publication of the supplement, but further review was needed given the external nature of the proposed standard. TS-DACS will be conducting a peer review of the supplement after the 2018 Joint Annual Meeting. Following a successful review by TS-DACS, Standards will again review the supplement for formal endorsement. Standards has touched based with SAA Publications on this topic as well. See appendix G for submission packet.

### Standards Development and Revision

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

- Met in-person at the University of Michigan, November 13-14, 2017.
- Held open meetings at ALA Midwinter, February 11, 2018, and at RBMS, June 24, 2018.
- Final draft made available for comment on May 24, 2018.
- See Appendix A for full report.

#### ***SAA/ACRL-RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy***

- Submission packet sent to Standards in January 2018, approved in February 2018.
- Council voted online to approve the standards in June 2018.
- See Appendix B for full report.

#### ***Archival and Special Collections Facilities: Guidelines for Archivists, Librarians, Architects, and Engineers (Revision)***

- Several chapters, the bibliography, and appendix are completed following extensive comment and review.
- Other chapters will be complete by the end of summer, early fall.
- Delays in the revision process have occurred for numerous reasons.

- See appendix C for complete report.

### ***Archival Continuing Education Guidelines***

- ACE Guidelines were submitted for final approval to Standards in October 2017 and were approved via email that same month.
- Council approved the Standard in November 2017 (Item II.C., Council meeting minutes, November 5-7, 2017).

### ***Describing Archives: A Content Standard***

- Overhauled *Appendix B: Companion Standards* to increase accuracy and usability.
- Further revised the *DACS* principles following 2017 annual meeting.
- *DACS* principles will be posted for comment through the end of August 2018.
- See appendix D for complete report.

Two standards have been overdue for a review for over a year, based on their stated next review dates: *Best Practices for Internships as a Component of Graduate Archival Education* and *Best Practices for Volunteers in Archives*. Maintenance of these standards was going to be a topic of discussion at the 2018 Joint Annual Meeting, but SAA President Zanish-Belcher made a call in July 2018 for comments that will begin the process of reviewing the content of these standards.

Additionally, the Council created the Task Force to Revise Best Practices on Accessibility in May 2018 to revise two standards: *Best Practices for Working with Archives Employees with Physical Disabilities* and *Best Practices for Working with Archives Researchers with Physical Disabilities* (Item IV.E., Council meeting minutes, November 5-7, 2017). See Item VI.P, Council meeting minutes, November 2-3, 2018.

## **ONGOING PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES**

### ***Continuous Revision Procedures***

TS-DACS and TS-EAS have adopted a model of continuous revision in the maintenance of their respective standards. Over the next year, Standards hopes to develop continuous revision procedures that clarify what changes require Standards and Council approval, which changes do not warrant approval, how changes are made public, and how to work with other SAA groups like Publications and Education to ensure SAA offerings are up-to-date.

### ***SAA-ACRL/RBMS Ongoing Maintenance Procedures***

Upon completion of two of the three joint task forces, it became clear that ongoing maintenance and development of jointly-created standards was not discussed or defined in the initial charge of those groups. This created an immediate issue when JTF chairs and Standards discussed possible review schedules that wouldn't differ from RBMS'. However, a broader issue of how SAA and RBMS plan to work together to make sure these standards stay up-to-date in a coordinated way has been made apparent.

## INITIATIVES ASSOCIATED WITH THE 2013-2018 STRATEGIC PLAN

### ***Goal 1: Advocating for Archivists and Archives***

A significant argument for the creation of two of the SAA-ACRL/RBMS joint task forces was to standardize the methods and measures archives and archivists use in assessment. Once standardized, archives and archivists can communicate externally about their activities and impact at an aggregate, discipline-wide level (1.4)

### ***Goal 2: Enhancing Professional Growth***

All standards are added to the SAA Standards Portal, which allows members to easily access SAA standards and endorsements (2.2). DACS and EAD3 have moved to a continuous revision model, allowing for those standards to keep pace with technological change (2.2)

### ***Goal 3: Advancing the Field***

The current partnership between SAA and RBMS on joint task forces demonstrates leadership within the field in the development of new standards in the areas of reference and outreach, collection management, and education (3.1, 3.3).

### ***Goal 4: Meeting Members' Needs***

The Standards Committee's portfolio of concurrent initiatives creates opportunities for member participation in a number of ways: from commenting on draft standards and best practices to taking a more active role on technical subcommittee and task forces (4.2)

## QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS FOR COUNCIL ATTENTION

The external representative to ARMA International remains vacant pending additional research regarding a 2008 Memorandum of Agreement between SAA and ARMA International (item D.3, Council meeting minutes, August 12–13, 2013). In 2016-2017, our Council liaison reported that SAA staff would investigate this matter. The committee simply wishes to remind the Council of this in case it is considered a priority.

The Standards Portal remains an area of possible work that so far has been difficult to scope. Two volunteers had done an analysis of SAA-endorsed external standards in 2016-2017 and surfaced the need for better definitions of terms like *standard*, *best practices*, and *guidelines*, as well as the need for comprehensive review to ensure endorsements are up-to-date. Both individuals declined to take the project further, citing the level of effort, amount of time, and complexity of the project. Standards may tackle this issue in the coming year, but a call from Council for volunteers may be needed to garner support for such an effort.

**Society of American Archivists  
Standards Committee  
July 02, 2018**

**SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of  
Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures  
for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries  
(Prepared by: Emily R. Novak Gustainis, SAA Co-chair)**

**Annual Report to Standards Committee**

**BACKGROUND**

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (hereafter "JTF-HCM") is responsible for the development of guidelines (hereafter "Guidelines") that will provide metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries. The Guidelines will consider and address both the wide range of types and formats of material typically held--including analog, digital, and audiovisual materials--and the different ways in which collection material is managed and described. The Guidelines might also accommodate a two-tiered approach involving basic/minimum metrics and advanced/optimum metrics and/or include recommendations for institutions that wish to engage in collections assessment.

Officers

- Martha O'Hara Conway, Co-Chair, ACRL/RBMS, University of Michigan
- Emily R. Novak Gustainis, Co-Chair, SAA, Harvard University

Membership

- Elizabeth Haven-Hawley (ACRL/RBMS), University of Florida
- Rachel D'Agostino (ACRL/RBMS), Library Company of Philadelphia
- Lara Friedman-Shedlov (ACRL/RBMS), University of Minnesota
- Lisa Miller (SAA rep), Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University

**SUMMARY OF MEETING ACTIVITIES**

The Joint Task Force met 42 times between July 25, 2017 and July 02, 2018. This includes:

- 37 standing/working meetings via conference call between August 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018
- 2 in-person working meetings (SAA Annual Meeting, July 25, 2017; University

of Michigan, November 13-14, 2017)

- 3 open meetings (SAA Annual Meeting, July 25, 2017; ALA Midwinter, February 11, 2018; RBMS Annual Conference, June 24, 2018)

Due to the nature of the meeting discussions, formal minutes were not generated during this reporting period; activities were generally recorded in the form (or as part) of working documents.

## **ONGOING ACTIVITIES**

The Joint Task Force is currently:

1. Collecting responses to its 2018 revised draft *Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries*, which was released on May 24, 2018. As of July 2, 2018, no comments have been received.
2. Awaiting RBMS approval of the revised *Guidelines* as the first step in submitting the *Guidelines* to the Standards Committee for review.
3. Initiating work on the review package to submit to the Standards Committee for the revised *Guidelines* for a post-RBMS approval, post-2018 SAA Annual Meeting submission.

## **COMPLETED ACTIVITIES**

During the reporting period, Task Force members:

- Conducted an exhaustive review of the community feedback received in response to the circulation of the 2017 draft *Level 1 Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries*.
- Substantially revised the 2017 draft *Guidelines*, collapsing the concept of reporting levels in favor of an easier to implement “Recommended” and “Optional Counts” approach. To do so, the Task Force updated its approach to the three counts/measures (Intellectual Units Held, Physical Space Occupied, Digital Space Occupied).
- Jointly authored the components of the revised draft *Guidelines*:
  - A *Background* section briefly describing the context within which the guidelines were called for and developed
  - An *Audience and Purpose* section to remind readers that the guidelines are intended to be used by repositories of all types and sizes and to account for all varieties of collection material typically held
  - An *Overarching Approach* section that outlines the four fundamental considerations of the guidelines (Type, Discoverability, How Managed, Origination)

- *Intellectual Units Held, Physical Space Occupied, and Digital Space Occupied* sections that provide a rationale and guidance for conducting each of these counts
  - A *Counts and Measures* section that offers basic considerations and general instructions for conducting the recommended and optional counts and measures for Intellectual Units Held, Physical Space Occupied, and Digital Space Occupied
  - *Appendix A: Categories/Types of Collection Material*, which provides a definition and a scope statement for each of the ten categories of collection material identified in the guidelines
  - *Appendix B: Tables for Recording Counts and Measures*, which consists of three tables for recording the recommended and optional counts and measures.
  - *Appendix C: Glossary*, which identifies and provides a definition for the key terms that are employed in the guidelines
- Completed and posted the 2018 revised draft *Guidelines* to its SAA microsite.
  - Distributed a call for comments/feedback on the 2018 revised draft *Guidelines* to twenty- eight professional organizations and listservs, with the invitation to comment open from May 24 through July 31, 2018.
  - Held one poster session at the 2018 RBMS Annual Conference (June 21, 2018,;Martha O’Hara Conway, presenter)

### **UPCOMING ACTIVITIES**

The term of service for the Task Force and its charge ends on August 31, 2018. Emily Novak Gustainis will continue to consult with her ACRL/RBMS Co-Chair, Martha O’Hara Conway, regarding the RBMS approval process, community feedback on the *Guidelines*, and the submission to the Standards Committee. Novak Gustainis will also continue to liaise with John Bence, Co-Chair of the Standards Committee regarding the *Guidelines* and prepare the documentation necessary to submit the revised *Guidelines* to Standards for review after their approval by RBMS.

### **Report Appendix**

PDF of the poster for the 2018 RBMS Poster Session (presented by Martha O’Hara Conway)

# Counting In A Common Language

## Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

Martha O'Hara Conway \* University of Michigan

### THREE COUNTS/MEASURES

- Intellectual Units Held
- Physical Space Occupied
- Digital Space Occupied

### FOUR CONSIDERATIONS

- Category/Type of Collection Material (**Type**)
- Described Online or Not Yet Described Online (**Discoverability**)
- How Described and Managed (**How Managed**)
- Born Digital or Digitized (**Origination**)

### TEN CATEGORIES/TYPES OF COLLECTION MATERIAL

- Archival and Manuscript Material
- Published Language Material
- Cartographic Material
- Computer Programs
- Graphic/Visual Material
- Moving Image Material
- Notated Movement
- Notated Music
- Objects/Artifacts
- Sound Recordings

Annual Report 2017-2018



### INTELLECTUAL UNITS HELD

#### **Recommended Counts**

- Count online descriptions of collection material.
- Categorize by (1) type of collection material and (2) how managed.

#### **Optional Counts**

- Count not-yet-online descriptions of collection material.
- Categorize by type of collection material.

### PHYSICAL SPACE OCCUPIED

#### **Recommended Measures**

- Measure physical space occupied by all collection material.
- Categorize, whenever possible, by type of collection material.

#### **Optional Measures**

- Distinguish, whenever possible, physical space occupied by collection material that is discoverable from physical space occupied by collection material that is not yet discoverable.

### DIGITAL SPACE OCCUPIED

#### **Recommended Counts**

- Categorize all files to be counted as Born Digital, Digitized, or Mixed/Unknown Origin.
- Categorize all files to be counted as Discoverable, Not Yet Discoverable, or Mixed/Unknown Discoverability.

#### **Optional Counts**

- Categorize all files to be counted, whenever possible, by type of collection material.

[https://www2.archivists.org/sites/al/HCMGuidelines2018\\_Draft2\\_2.pdf](https://www2.archivists.org/sites/al/HCMGuidelines2018_Draft2_2.pdf)

**Society of American Archivists  
Standards Committee**

**Final Report: SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the  
Development of Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy  
(JTF-PSL)**

(Prepared by Bill Landis, SAA co-chair of the JTF-PSL)

**SUMMARY**

The Joint Task Force on the Development of Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy (JTF-PSL) was jointly charged by Society of American Archivists (SAA) Council and the Executive Committee of the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL/RBMS) in late 2014/early 2015<sup>1</sup> with the following tasks:

- “Develop a definition of primary source literacy and a set of guidelines—standards, performance indicators, and outcomes directed at college and university students. These Guidelines will address primary sources wherever they might be available (e.g., in physical collections, in published volumes, in licensed databases) and will be applicable to a wide range of institutional types that offer instructional services.”
- “Consult broadly in developing Guidelines with professional organizations of those who teach and use primary sources, in addition to archives and library organizations.”
- “Ensure that the language and scope of the Guidelines are appropriate for those teaching and learning with primary sources.”
- “Publicize and conduct public hearings, public comment periods, or both to ensure that members of the archives and library professions have adequate opportunities to become aware of and contribute to the development of the Guidelines.”
- “Follow procedures outlined in SAA’s *Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard* and ACRL’s *Procedures for Preparation of New Standards and Guidelines* to ensure that the SAA Council, ACRL Standards, and RBMS Executive Committee can approve and adopt the Guidelines in a timely manner.”

The JTF-PSL conducted its work as charged between September 2015 and July 2017. This is the final report of the JTF-PSL to the SAA Standards Committee. The report is accompanied by the final version of the *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy*, along with the supporting documentation to assist the Standards Committee to review the *Guidelines for Primary Source*

---

<sup>1</sup> The full ACRL/RBMS charge is located at <http://www.ala.org/acrl/rbms/acr-rbmtfpsi?year=2017>, and the full SAA charge at <https://www2.archivists.org/governance/handbook/section8/groups/SAA-ACRL-RBMS-Joint-Task-Force-on-Primary-Source-Literacy>.

*Literacy* and develop a recommendation to the SAA Council regarding the document's potential adoption as an official standard of the Society of American Archivists, per the *Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard*.

## TASK FORCE WORK

Members of the Joint Task Force began work following the 2015 SAA annual meeting. The bulk of our work was accomplished through scheduled bi-weekly conference calls, which were held only as needed. Throughout the time working on our charge we have posted meeting and conference call minutes, work documents, and drafts of the *Guidelines* on our SAA-hosted microsite at

<https://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-primary-source-literacy>.

We spent six months conducting and discussing background research in an effort to ensure as broad a disciplinary perspective as possible on the topic of primary source literacy, and also seeking to identify possible successful models for our final product. This effort focused on exploring places of potential intersection with the ACRL *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*<sup>2</sup> and that document's January 2016 ACRL-approved replacement *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*<sup>3,4</sup>. We also explored the websites of a number of discipline-specific professional organizations with possible interests in teaching primary source-based research, looking for articulations of guidelines, best practices, or standards of any type.<sup>5</sup> Finally we conducted a review of professional literature that touches on primary source literacy<sup>6</sup>, and also assembled a communication plan and draft timeline for our work<sup>7</sup>.

During the course of our two-years of work on the *Guidelines* we worked as transparently as possible, regularly posting updates to our SAA-hosted microsite (and the companion ALA Connect site hosted by RBMS), and seeking feedback in both virtual and in-person venues. We posted our first draft of the *Guidelines* in June 2016 and focused our efforts to gather feedback on this initial work from the library and archives communities. We solicited feedback using an online digress.it version of the draft, hosted by the RBMS Web Team, which allowed commenters to log in and supply comments directly at relevant places within the document. We also provided a [primarysourceliteracy@gmail.com](mailto:primarysourceliteracy@gmail.com) email address for commenters who felt more comfortable providing feedback in that way. We hosted well-attended open forums on our work leading to the first draft of the *Guidelines*, and once available on the first draft itself, at the SAA 2015 annual meeting (Cleveland, OH, 20 August),

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>

<sup>4</sup> The report on this activity is available at <https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/JTF-PSLSubgroupReportACRLFrameworkDecember2015.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> The report on this activity is available at <https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/JTF-PSLSubgroupReportOtherGuidelinesDecember2015.pdf>.

<sup>6</sup> The report on this activity is available at <https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/JTF-PSLSubgroupReportLiteratureReviewDecember2015.pdf>.

<sup>7</sup> The report on this activity is available at <https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/JTF-PSLSubgroupReportCommunicationsDecember2015.pdf>.

the ALA 2016 midwinter meeting (Boston, MA, 10 January), the 2016 ALA annual meeting (Orlando, FL, 26 June), and the 2016 SAA annual meeting (Atlanta, GA, 4 August).

Following a summer of gathering feedback on the first draft, we worked in subgroups to analyze feedback and determine best approaches to incorporating it into a second draft. We posted the second draft of the *Guidelines* in April 2017. We again used an online digress.it version and the [primarysourceliteracy@gmail.com](mailto:primarysourceliteracy@gmail.com) address as the primary mechanisms for soliciting feedback.

We broadened our outreach efforts to seek feedback on the second draft by sending emails to a host of organizations representing constituencies that have interests in primary source literacy.<sup>8</sup> As with the first draft, we used the following meetings to solicit in-person input on our work leading to second draft and on the draft itself: the 2017 ALA midwinter meeting (Atlanta, GA, 22 January), and the ALA annual meeting (Chicago, IL, 24 June). We will hold our final open forum on the *Guidelines* at the 2017 SAA annual meeting (Portland, OR, 26 July), which coincides with the expiration of our charge.

Serendipitously, the Information Literacy Section of the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) hosted a satellite pre-conference at DePaul University in Chicago in August 2016. We were approached by organizers and encouraged to submit a panel proposal. Four JTF-PSL members (Samantha Crisp, Gordon Daines, Sarah Horowitz, and Heather Smedberg) presented a well-attended (approximately 90 participants) and well-received panel discussion of our work to that point, and then led 30-minute small group discussions, followed by a 30-minute “reporting out” discussion. This was immensely helpful, coming towards the end of our open comment period on the first draft of the *Guidelines*, to all members of the JTF-PSL as we began our work to analyze and make sense of the feedback we received.

## **RELATIONSHIP WITH THE ACRL INFORMATION LITERACY FRAMEWORK**

The JTF-PSL’s work overlapped with a period of significant changes to the broader information literacy landscape. Throughout its work, RBMS appointees to the JTF-PSL have consulted with the ACRL Information Literacy Standards Committee on our ongoing work, and our determination not to closely mirror the structure and language of the ACRL *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*, which was adopted in January 2016. Much of the work within ACRL since the *Framework*’s adoption has focused on relationships between the *Framework* and various discipline-specific guidelines and standards for information literacy. Primary source literacy, while cognizant of varying applications within specific academic disciplines, transcends those disciplinary boundaries in important ways. We attempted to remain discipline neutral in our work on the *Guidelines for Primary*

---

<sup>8</sup> Emails were sent to the following organizations soliciting feedback on the second draft of the *Guidelines*: relevant H-Net listservs, National History Day organizers in each of the 50 states and Puerto Rico, the SAA leaders listserv and the RAO Section distribution list, the RBMS listserv, Regional Archival Associations Consortium co-chairs, Reference and User Services Association of ACRL, Modern Language Association, American Historical Association, Organization of American Historians, American Association for State and Local History, National Council on Public History, National Council for History Education, American Association of Museums, National Council for Social Studies, National Council of Teachers of English, and American Studies Association.

*Source Literacy*, while still remaining thoughtful about their relation to the broader *Framework* in which many may attempt to situate them when thinking about how best to utilize these *Guidelines*.

Finally, one of the primary areas on which we received a significant amount of feedback was the absence of examples in the drafts of the *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy*. Omitting examples of application and assessment was a conscious decision of the members of the JTF-PSL for a number of reasons:

- JTF-PSL members represent a small number of types of institutions in which instruction, outreach, and assessment of research using primary sources may be important. We did not feel that we collectively had the institutional expertise to create broadly useful and applicable examples and possibly tacitly setting some kind of “standards” or best practices beyond the learning objectives included in the *Guidelines*.
- There is as yet no infrastructure designated within either SAA or RBMS (the RBMS Executive Committee, at its meetings in late June 2016 has approved the *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy* and taken the initial steps of approving a new Instruction and Outreach Committee, which will presumably be charged with maintaining and updating the *Guidelines* for that organization) for active maintenance of the *Guidelines*. Members of the JTF-PSL were concerned with including examples in this document at a point where our group would be disbanded and there was no organizational home for ensuring representational and useful examples for communities seeking to use the *Guidelines*.

We felt that SAA’s infrastructure for case studies ePublications series<sup>9</sup> are a promising model for allowing members of the archives, library, and other interested communities to provide successful and challenging examples of the application and use of the *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy* and assessment based on instruction using them. This option seemed to be one that could be successful regardless of the organization decisions to be made within SAA and RBMS about the maintenance over time of the *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy*.

Members of the JTF-PSL prepared draft documentation on what a possible ePublications series of *Case Studies on Teaching with Primary Sources* might entail, following existing models, and received enthusiastic support for pursuing this option from Chris Prom, SAA Publications Editor, and Teresa Brinati, SAA Director of Publications. Believing that the Reference, Access, and Outreach (RAO) Section of SAA would be an ideal institutional home for such an ePublications series, we then opened discussions with Su Kim Chung and Alison Stankrauff, chair and vice-chair respectively, to see if there was interest from within the section’s leadership, which there was. The case studies ePublication, a single-blind peer reviewed series, presents interesting and complementary opportunities for the instruction and outreach community with RAO’s Teaching with/about Primary Sources Committee<sup>10</sup> and its work. Bill

---

<sup>9</sup> See for example *Campus Case Studies* (<https://www2.archivists.org/publications/epubs/Campus-Case-Studies>) and *Case Studies in Archival Ethics* (<https://www2.archivists.org/groups/committee-on-ethics-and-professional-conduct/case-studies-in-archival-ethics>).

<sup>10</sup> See <https://www2.archivists.org/groups/reference-access-and-outreach-section/teaching-withabout-primary-sources-committee>.

Landis, SAA's co-chair of the JTF-PSL, has agreed to serve as initial editor for the new SAA ePublications series *Case Studies on Teaching with Primary Sources*, and will work with Chris Prom and Teresa Brinati and the RAO Section leadership following the 2017 annual meeting to launch this effort.

## **FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS**

Bill Landis will be in touch with the Standards Committee co-chairs to determine what additional supporting documentation<sup>11</sup> is needed to enable the Standards Committee to conduct its review of the *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy* to prepare its report and recommendation to Council.

---

<sup>11</sup> Per Section IIIB of *Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard*:  
<https://www2.archivists.org/governance/handbook/section7/groups/Standards/Procedures-Review-Approval-SAA-Developed-Standard>.

**Society of American Archivists  
Standards Committee  
July 2, 2018**

**Annual Report: Technical Subcommittee on  
Archival Facility Guidelines (TS-AFG)  
(Prepared by Co-chairs Michele Pacifico and Thomas Wilsted)**

Below is the annual report for the TS-AFG, 2017-2018:

As of 2016 the extension for the continuing work of the TS-AFG had expired and the revised US- Canadian standard was still in draft. Michele Pacifico attended the Standards Committee meeting at the annual meeting on August 2, 2016. After discussion at the Standards Committee meeting it was agreed that the TS-AFG would request SAA Council to extend the TS-AFG to August 2018 and to recruit new members, as some of the original subcommittee members had retired.

On October 11, 2016, the Standards Committee submitted a formal request to the SAA Council to extend the TS-AFG to August 2018 and it was approved.

On May 3, 2017, a new TS-AFG was established with both former and new members. Michele Pacifico and Tom Wilsted agreed to continue as co-chairs. The new membership is listed below. Keith P. Chevalier was assigned to be the subcommittee's liaison from the Standards Committee. He is copied on our minutes and progress.

Last Name	First Name	Role	Term	Company
<a href="#">Pacifico</a>	Michele	Co-Chair	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Pacifico Archival Consulting
<a href="#">Wilsted</a>	Thomas	Co-Chair	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Wilsted Consulting
<a href="#">Fritz</a>	Angela	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	University of Notre Dame
<a href="#">Graham</a>	Fiona	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	
<a href="#">Linden</a>	Jeremy	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Image Permanence Institute, Rochester Institute of Technology
<a href="#">Owings</a>	David	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	

<a href="#">Teixeira</a>	Scott	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Hartman-Cox Architects
<a href="#">Trinkaus-Randall</a>	Gregor	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners
<a href="#">Christian-Lamb</a>	Caitlin	Ex Officio (Standards Committee Co-chair)	8/6/2016 - 8/18/2018	Davidson College
<a href="#">Hintz</a>	Carrie	Ex Officio	8/22/2015 - 7/29/2017	Emory University
<a href="#">Lyons</a>	Bertram	Council Liaison	8/6/2016 - 8/15/2019	AVPreserve
<a href="#">Chevalier</a>	Keith	Standards Committee Liaison		St. Anselm College

The TS-AFG hosted an Open Forum at the 2017 Annual meeting. Michele Pacifico showed a PowerPoint presentation on the subcommittee's work to date and on the challenges of revising the standard to reflect new science and sustainability issues. Jeremy Linden presented on the Image Permanence Institute's developing research on collections preservation environments. It drew approximately 30 SAA members and much discussion.

On September 26, 2017, the renewed TS-AFG had a conference call to discuss strategy and begin the work of completing a new draft of the standard. The minutes of the meeting are attached to this report.

On June 4, 2018, Michele Pacifico updated Chris Prom, Teresa Brinati, and the Standards Committee on the progress of the standard. Since the SAA book store is out of copies of the 2009 standard, and we are not close to publication, the SAA will order a small print run for the next year.

The TS-AFG will again host an Open Forum at the 2018 Annual meeting on Thursday, August 16 from 12:00 to 1:15. We hope to continue the dialogue about changing standards and update the membership on our progress and solicit feedback. The open forum announcement reads:

*Join us for an open forum to update colleagues on the rapidly developing joint US/Canadian archival facility standard. Members of the Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facility Guidelines (TS-AFG) will discuss the challenges in developing the revised standard for archival facilities and review the proposed changes to the 2009 standard, the open issues, and the new research.*

The TS-AFG is still working on completing a draft of the Guidelines. Three chapters, the Appendix, and Bibliography are complete having been through numerous edits and subcommittee review. They are ready for peer review. Other chapters will be completed in the next month. A few are going slowly. In addition to developing the new information, we are reformatting the publication for consistency of language and easier reading. The

committee reviewed their progress by email in June and all are working toward completing their chapters.

There have been a number of delays with with member illness and work issues. Its further complicated because for some areas there is scarce new research to guide us. Pacifico has been working to communicate with NARA, Library Archives Canada, the Image Permanence Institute, preservation and museum specialists, and others to get their interpretations of the new research and regulations. We are also working to make sure that SAA's guidelines do not contradict any other national or international standard for archives.

We don't have an ETA for publishing the next edition but we are working toward getting a complete draft by August to send out for peer review. Pacifico has been compiling a list of interested reviewers that includes experts outside the SAA.

The terms of the TS-AFG are set to expire on August 18, 2018. Pacifico will work with the Standards Committee at the annual meeting to determine the appropriate next steps for the standard and the subcommittee.

The subcommittee currently has no funding for the revised publication. We used the remaining funds leftover from our 2007 Spacesaver grant to fund the subcommittee's 2013 meeting. To date our attempts at additional grants have not been successful.

**Society of American Archivists  
 Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines  
 Conference Call Minutes  
 September 26, 2018**

Introductions – Members of the Subcommittee.  
 All subcommittee members attended the conference call.

<b>Last Name</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Term</b>	<b>Company</b>
Pacifico	Michele	Co-Chair	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Pacifico Archival Consulting
Wilsted	Thomas	Co-Chair	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Wilsted Consulting
Fritz	Angela	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	University of Notre Dame
Graham	Fiona	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Canadian Council of Archives (CCA) representative
Linden	Jeremy	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Linden Preservation Services, Inc.
Owings	David	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Columbus State University
Teixeira	Scott	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Hartman-Cox Architects
Trinkaus-Randall	Gregor	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners
Bence	John	Ex Officio (Standards Committee Co- chair)	7/29/2017 - 8/7/2019	Emory University
Christian-Lamb	Caitlin	Ex Officio (Standards Committee Co- chair)	8/6/2016 - 8/18/2018	University of Maryland
Lyons	Bertram	Council Liaison	8/6/2016 - 8/15/2019	AVPreserve

Background on the revisions of the TS-AFG since 2015. Michele summarized the status of the subcommittee to date. Michele sent out an earlier email summarizing some of the issues that would be discussed in the call. Below is a copy of the email from Michele dated September 12, 2017:

*Hello everyone. It is time to have our first conference call and get moving on completing the newest edition of the Archival Facility Guidelines. I hope that all new members have reviewed the 2009 edition and will come to the meeting with some ideas on how to bring it up to date and include new information on standards, digitization, sustainability, etc. I will be sending out a Doodle poll to check on everyone's availability and then will work with SAA to set up the call once we decide on a date.*

*I gave a briefing on the status of the Facilities Guideline at an open forum at the AA meeting in Portland and have attached the PowerPoint. We had about 40 SAA members in attendance. Jeremy Linden also presented on new research from IPI and I've attached his PowerPoint too.*

*One of our first topics of discussion will be if and how we change the format of the standard. We have received various comments from readers about including more bullets and charts. The easiest course of action is to keep the same overall format but provide more of those bullets and charts. Also, the Standards committee very much wants a numbered document (which we have in the first edition), so that revisions can be done on a shorter schedule. But the future edition is open for discussion and any new ideas are welcome.*

*Additionally, there have been suggestions to make the published version it a "binder ready" on letter sized paper with 3-hole punches so that that can new updates can be done more regularly. There was discussion at the Standards Committee meeting about the changing nature of SAA publications, paper vs. online versions, and whether members could pay a reduced rate (or get free) for an online version and then how to price paper copies. Nothing has been decided about but I will continue to work with SAA on this as we get closer to publication. A list of the most pertinent comments for changes and additions can be found on the PP.*

*A change will be how the Guidelines are authored. The Standards Committee no longer wants to see individual authors in standards. All Standards are a collaborative effort and are authored by the entire subcommittee. The 2009 version's chapters each had an author. For the new members, in the past edition, each chapter was drafted by one committee member, reviewed in-depth by a second committee member, and then reviewed by the entire subcommittee. So in reality it was reviewed and edited by the entire committee. Also, since many of the original materials will be included in this edition, we will probably acknowledge past authors in this edition too. All to be discussed as we move forward....*

*Status: Fiona prepared a new draft on Archival Environments that went through some editing by Tom and myself. I've also got new updates for Materials and Finishes, Fire Protection and for Shelving. Former subcommittee member Diane Vogt O'Connor prepared a new lighting chapter, but it is already out of date and contained some material that is out of our scope as a standard. We will need to prepare a new draft on Lighting and take a close look at all the*

chapters.

A second background email was sent by Michele on September 24, 2017

*I've attached a copy of Fiona's draft for Section 3: Archival Environments with some of Tom and my early edits. The draft charts are separate attachments for chapter 3. It is a critical chapter and still needs to incorporate information on current sustainability issues, new research on air filtration, etc. But it is an example of a slightly altered format that we will discuss.*

*In addition, as we begin to revise the guidelines, we also have to reconsider the language that we use for the revised standard. For example, this is a comment that I sent to Fiona in 2015 regarding her draft charts:*

*Hi Fiona: I hope all is well. I wanted to report back to you on some interesting comments/observations that I got from the Museum conference and my presentation on audio-visual storage at the Minnesota Historical Society. Your draft tables were incredibly helpful in illustrating the variety of standards and guidelines that exist.*

*Most importantly, people felt the terms "cool" and "cold" for the storage of special media were confusing and needed more precise definitions. In other words "cold" could mean "cool" in some settings and "cold" can mean freezing temperatures for some institutions. People preferred using the actual temperatures or although seemed ok with the following ranges as long as they were defined:*

- Cool Storage: range from 50 to 65 degrees F*
- Cold Storage: range from 35 to 45 degrees F*
- Freezing: 32 degrees F and below*

*I will send a copy of the British standard for reference in a second email. While some have suggested that we consider a similar format, I have also received many compliments on the SAA Guidelines and the added discussion and background that we provided in the last edition.*

- a. Review of options: Michele reviewed past discussions about how the format might change. General consensus at this point is to keep the same chapter and numbering format, but to include more charts and bullets.
- b. Standards Committee guidance: Standards Committee prefers that all new standards be numbered to help with references and timely updates.
- c. New research: The subcommittee had a general discussion on the goals of the revised standard. Jeremy pointed out the standards for archival facilities are moving away from prescriptive environmental conditions. Gregor noted that archivists often are overly concerned about the storage temperature and don't understand the interconnectedness with the relative humidity. Overall, sustainability and changing environmental guidelines should be addressed in the SAA revised guidelines.

- d. Comments from past Open Forums: Michele sent a summary list of the past comments from the Open Forums. See above.
- e. Relationship and comparison to other standards: Subcommittee had a general discussion about ISO, British Standards and ASHRAE. Jeremy provided an overview of other standards. Tom emphasized that SAA members are looking for guidance on what to tell architects in planning their renovations or new facilities. Jeremy suggested we review ISO technical report 19815, as it attempts to address the guidance needed by architects. The subcommittee would like to be able to review the ISO standards without purchase. Fiona noted that we should try to avoid contradicting other standards. Michele will investigate obtaining copies of ISO 11789, Tech report 19815, 18911, and others relating to archival facilities.

NOTE post meeting: Tom had some correspondence regarding ISO publications in 2014 and was told that ISO is very strict about free access to their standards. We might have to make an appeal and may only be able to access documents through a secure portal.

- f. US/Canadian standard. Michele will discuss with Nancy Beaumont, Teresa Brinati, and the Standards Committee on approaching the CCA about the joint standard.

General discussion regarding format and revisions of 2009 Guidelines.

- a. What should SAA be offering? As part of the update, the guidelines should include a discussion of new research and sustainability.
- b. David joined the call late, but sent in the following comments before the call:
  - Archival and Special Collections Facilities***
    - 1. *Introduction*
      - a. *Pull out content on outreach and advocacy into dedicated chapter, one example maybe to include is leveraging local supports when admins/project managers do not solicit/value input from archival experts in the field*  
*--Can do a walkthrough of meetings for people who have never participated in new construction or renovation*
      - b. *Differing approaches in conversations with administrators, architects, and maybe constituents and donors. What to architects want to know, minutia vs. big picture of archival operations and how facilities are used*
      - c. *How can you spend the money? Grants funding, federal, state, donor provided?*
    - 2. *Section 6: Lighting*
      - a. *Most of the subsections seem redundant and could probably be cut in favor of just having the chart. Some sections with specific details may want to be kept.*
    - 3. *Section 7: Materials and Finishes*
      - a. *Floors – what about vinyl, laminate, linoleum, and other options?*

#### 4. Section 9: Functional Spaces

- a. *I would be interested in seeing more on reading room table lamps, pros, cons, do researchers like them, does having light closer to the document accelerate deterioration, etc...*

Discussion by chapter on status, needed additional research and rewriting needed, and assignment of responsibility: Overall each chapter should take into account advancements in archival and building research. Sustainability should be addressed in each chapter where appropriate. In addition, there will be a new chapter that will discuss sustainability for archival facilities.

- a. Building Site: needs updates; check new thinking on underground storage.
- b. Building Construction: needs updates; more detail on LEED and other measurements for sustainability.
- c. Archival Environments: needs to incorporate new research on temperature, RH, and air filtration.
- d. Fire Protection: needs updates to include hybrid systems; mobile shelving, other.
- e. Security: need updates to include cyber security. What is relevant to design and construction of archival facilities? Do we need to address SCIF?
- f. Lighting: needs to be updated and shortened – keep it simple – LED, UV, automated sensors, Foot-candles, sustainability.
- g. Materials and Finishes: needs to be updated and perhaps reformatted with more charts.
- h. Storage Equipment: minor updates needed; include ASRS.
- i. Functional Spaces: needs updates to reflect new functional spaces – examples are digital labs, digital forensics, reformatting labs, and integrative teaching spaces.
- j. Bibliography: needs to be updated to include publications post 2009. Michele will provide draft of the ICA’s Expert Group on Archive Buildings and Environments Bibliography for publications since 2003.

Chapter Assignments: The first name is responsible for drafting the first revision; the second name is the first reviewer who is to assist in the rewriting and reformatting. After the first two readers complete their work, each chapter will be sent to the other members of the subcommittee for review and comment. All draft documents should be dated and in Word for review and redlining. At this point in the development of the revisions, the writers will concentrate on the content and suggested formatting; later in the process the separate chapters will be edited for uniformity.

- a. Introduction: Tom Wilsted/Michele Pacifico
- b. New Research/Sustainability: Jeremy Linden/Tom Wilsted
- c. Building Site: Scott Teixeira/Michele Pacifico
- d. Building Construction: Scott Teixeira/Michele Pacifico
- e. Archival Environments: Fiona Graham/Jeremy Linden
- f. Fire Protection: Michele Pacifico/Gregor Trinkaus-Randall
- g. Security: Gregor Trinkaus-Randall/David Owings
- h. Lighting: Michele Pacifico/Fiona Graham
- i. Materials and Finishes: Michele Pacifico/Tom Wilsted

- j. Storage Equipment: Michele Pacifico/Tom Wilsted
- k. Functional Spaces: Angela Fritz/David Owings
- l. Bibliography: Tom Wilsted/Michele Pacifico
- m. Prohibited Materials: Michele Pacifico

Next Steps:

- a. Each subcommittee member will send out any background materials that they hold to the respective chapter team.
- b. Michele will send out the original word versions to those who need them.
- c. Michele will send out to primary writers any updates that were done since 2015.
- d. Deadline for draft chapters to be sent to whole subcommittee for review is January 5, 2018.
- e. Michele will send out new draft of Prohibited Materials for review in the next week.

News since Conference call meeting: We have a new liaison from the Standards Committee. He will be copied on our minutes and progress.

Keith P. Chevalier  
Archivist & Head of Special Collections  
Saint Anselm College  
100 Saint Anselm Drive #1746  
Manchester, NH 03102  
603.656.6197

**Society of American Archivists  
Standards Committee  
July 2018**

**Annual Report: Technical Subcommittee on  
*Describing Archives: A Content Standard (TS-DACS)*  
(Prepared by Co-chairs Maureen Calahan and Adrien Hilton)**

The Technical Subcommittee on Describing Archives: A Content Standard (TS-DACS) has had an active and productive year in fulfillment of its charge to oversee the timely and ongoing intellectual and technical maintenance and development of Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DACS). This report covers the period August 2017-July 2018.

At the annual meeting in Portland in August 2017 TS-DACS convened to review the community feedback to the [Principles minimum viable product \(MVP\)](#) as well as the [analysis conducted](#). The meeting focused on discussing solutions to problems brought out in the analysis of comments. We developed next steps that included making edits to specific principles, creating a preface to place the changes in context, performing more education about the principles, and making it more clear what rules may change in the future.

Based on the solutions developed at the annual meeting, the co-chairs developed the [DACS principles, preface, and letter to community](#) document. Members of TS-DACS and archival description experts who have participated in the revision process contributed to the document. We plan to release this document for community feedback two weeks before the 2018 annual meeting and accept comments until two weeks after SAA. This will provide a lengthy comment period while seeking out opportunities to connect with the community during the annual meeting.

In addition, TS-DACS submitted a proposal for the annual meeting that was accepted. The session “‘What Were They Thinking?’ How the Proposed New DACS Principles Take on the Need for Transparency” will be another opportunity for the community to engage with the principles and gain a better understanding on how the principles can be put into action.

TS-DACS, in coordination with the Student and New Archives Professional Roundtable, hosted a [tweet-up](#) to promote the freely available DACS-related content on SAA’s education portal. The content was developed by TS-DACS with help from community volunteers during our reconceptualization and revision of SAA’s DACS workshop.

TS-DACS developed a workshop proposal dedicated to Part II of DACS. This will be submitted to SAA Education by the annual meeting.

TS-DACS approved a major overhaul and new version of [Appendix B: Companion Standards](#). The revision takes into account recent developments in the field and improves usability.

One revision to DACS, through the use of Github and our community comment mechanisms, is nearing completion. It consists of the addition of a rights statement to DACS. The committee is working on our final recommendation as well as coordinating revisions with the submitters.

The feedback on the rights statement prompted the creation of a project to institute versioning for DACS to improve communications and transparency and allow citation of specific versions.

Members of TS-DACS provided comments on the draft *Archival Description of Music Materials*.

TS-DACS created role descriptions for members of the committee and continued to make improvements in how we manage and share the group's work and documentation.

**Society of American Archivists  
Standards Committee  
July 3, 2018**

**Annual Report: Technical Subcommittee on  
Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning  
2017-2018**

**(Prepared by Chair Dara A. Baker)**

**MEMBERS**

Chair: Dara A. Baker, Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library  
Members: Danielle Emmerling, West Virginia University Libraries  
Elizabeth Russell, Providence Archives  
Dainan Skeem, Brigham Young University

The newly selected members of the TS-GRD spent our first year focused on review and research. The handover from the previous TS-GRD headed by Laura Uglean Jackson included documentation related to the most recent revision and founding of the TS-GRD and first Guidelines, but minimal direction for the new TS-GRD.

The Committee held an initial welcome and planning meeting at SAA in Portland, Oregon with all four members in attendance. Two conference calls were held on October 31, 2017 and March 19, 2018.

Committee members reported back on research including a literature review for the past 10 years of the terms “deaccession” and “reappraisal” in American, Canadian, and international library, archives and cultural heritage journals. Lack of access to international journals by two members of the team meant that work had to be divided up based on access. Our second conference call focused on the Subcommittee’s desire to know how widespread use of the Guidelines may be within the profession with planning for an SAA-wide survey on use of the Guidelines for the 2018-2019 (Year 2) of the TS-GRD.

In January 2018, former TS-GRD Chair Laura Uglean Jackson put out a call for submissions for a new book being published on the topic: *Deaccessioning in Special Collections and Archives*, edited by Laura Uglean Jackson and published by Rowman & Littlefield. No further information has been forthcoming, but the TS-GRD is interested in the contents and will be reviewing it if, and when, it is published.

For year two, we are seeking information from the Standards Committee and the SAA Leadership about their goals and intentions for the Guidelines to better structure the Subcommittee’s approach. The Committee believes that some revisions focused on digital

records and born-digital collections should be included before our five year term is complete. Areas identified include reappraisal of digital records with a focus on timelines and systems agnostic recommendations, and a review and additions on deaccessioning of analog material when digital surrogates or duplicates have been created. The TS members agree that understanding the community's knowledge and implementation of the Guidelines is important to future work on these critical concepts for the profession.

The TS-GRD will be seeking information on mechanisms by which the Standards Committee and SAA would like us to propose areas where we think revisions or updates are needed and further guidance on how SAA envisions TS-GRD's role in the next 4 years.

**Society of American Archivists  
Standards Committee  
July 2, 2018**

**Annual Report: Technical Subcommittee on  
Encoded Archival Standards (TS-EAS)  
(Prepared by Co-chairs Katherine Wisser and Karin Bredenberg)**

**MEMBERS, 2017-2018**

Katherine Wisser (co-chair), Karin Bredenberg (co-chair), Anila Angjeli, Erica Boudreau, Lina Bountouri, Florence Clavaud, Mark Custer, Wim van Dongen, Alexander Duryee, Regine Heberlein, Noah Huffman, Silke Jagodzinski, Joost van Koutrik, Corey Nimer, Aaron Rubenstein, Claire Sibille-de Grimouard, William Stocking, Adrian Turner

Glenn Gardner and Gerhard Mueller serve as ex officio members and maintain the web presences for EAD and EAC-CPF at the Library of Congress and the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin respectively.

Two new members will be joining the subcommittee for the 2018-2019 year: Kerstin Arnold for the British National Archives and Ailie Smith from the University of Melbourne

*Subcommittee overview*

2017-2018 was the second year of TS-EAS. The subcommittee is charged with the development and maintenance of the encoding standards in support of archival descriptive practices. In order to tackle this far-reaching charge, the subcommittee used the annual meeting in 2016 to devise a strategy and develop priorities. This resulted in the creation of a series of teams. The first year of this strategy (2016-2017) gave us a better view of how this work should progress, so the 2017-2018 year was more productive. There are five active teams and volunteers from the committee lead those teams:

- EAD Team (Huffman)
- EAC-CPF Team (Jagodzinski)
- EAC-F Team (van Koutrik)
- Schema Team (Custer)
- Documentation Team (Nimer)

The team looking at the collaboration with other standards is on hold for now. Additionally, an ad hoc exploratory effort to reach out to the community using EAG and seek a recommendation as to whether or not that should be brought into the TS-EAS purview was taken on by van Dongen.

Boudreau continues to serve as secretary and assists the co-chairs with subcommittee documentation and meetings.

Individual teams meet as necessary to complete the initiatives of the team. The committee as a whole has quarterly meetings. Over the 2017-2018 period, the committee as a whole meet in July at the annual meeting in Portland, and met virtually in October, February and May. These meetings support the team structure and ensure that all members of the committee are aware of the various efforts underway.

### *Accomplishments*

Below are listed the accomplishments reported by teams:

- Adoption of GitHub repositories for team work and standards maintenance is completed. Documentation on how to use the GitHub repositories for the archival community have been created.
- EAD 3.1.1 released
- Tag Library conventions established to handle rolling revisions of standards. This includes mechanisms for recognizing changes within the context of individual element and attribute definitions as well as summary documentation for revisions.
- Reworked the implementation survey for EAD3, which will be distributed in July 2018- September 2018
- Established a strategy for the revision of EAC-CPF which entails a two-phase process. The first phase will be focused on immediate fixes, bugs and non-controversial change requests. A second phase will involve a deeper content revision of the standard and alignment with EAD3. Open EAC-CPF issues on the GitHub repository have been tagged phase 1 or phase 2, and phase 1 issues have been resolved.
- On-going research for the justification of EAC-F, based on use cases, literature, and external expert perspectives
- Website revisions completed at the Library of Congress and Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin (by Glenn Gardner and Gerhard Müller respectively)

### *Annual Meeting objectives*

Based on the experience from the 2017 annual meeting, TS-EAS has requested more time to be allocated for the face-to-face meeting. This will allow for basic team reporting and updates from project, strategic planning for the 2018-2019 year, and a large block of time to address identified problems that impact the standards under the subcommittee charge. Issues that will be covered at the meeting:

- Revision of EAC-CPF
- The potential of a shared schema between EAD and EAC-CPF
- The impact of RiC in terms of the encoding standards
- Review and additions to the new TS-EAS Handbook
- Data types for attributes

**Society of American Archivists  
Standards Committee  
June 11, 2018**

**Request to Endorse External Standard:  
Music Library Association's Working Group for  
Archival Description of Music Materials  
(Submitted by Elizabeth Surles)**

**Contact Person**

Name: Elizabeth Surles  
Position Title: Archivist  
Institution: Institute of Jazz Studies, Dana Library  
Address 1: Rutgers University-Newark  
Address 2: 185 University Ave. City: Newark  
State/Province: New Jersey  
Zip/Postal Code: 07102  
Daytime Phone: 973-353-5180  
Email: [elizabeth.surles@rutgers.edu](mailto:elizabeth.surles@rutgers.edu)

- **Title of Standard:** Archival Description of Notated Music, A Supplement to Describing Archives: A Content Standard
- **Type of Standard:** Best Practices
- **Topic(s):** Arrangement and Description
- **Maintaining Organization(s):** Music Library Association (MLA). Archival Description of Notated Music was written by members of the MLA Working Group for Archival Description of Music Materials. The Working Group was initiated by MLA's Archives and Special Collections Committee, and charged officially by the MLA Board of Directors in June 2016.
- **Link(s):** The supplement has not yet been published and is currently unavailable online, but the MLA Archives and Special Collections Committee website is here: <https://www.musiclibraryassoc.org/members/group.aspx?id=120372>. The supplement will be published as an online open access publication. The working group is currently determining publication details with SAA's Publications Board and staff and MLA's open access editor.
- **Description of Standard:** Archival Description of Notated Music supplements DACS and provides best practice guidelines for archival description of notated music; discusses how appraisal and arrangement of notated music impact description; and includes a glossary, supplementary readings, and example finding aids in an appendix.

- **Effect/Impact of Standard:** The supplement is practical for a range of professionals, from archivists with little musical knowledge to music librarians with little knowledge of archives. In short, anyone with descriptive responsibility for archival collections with notated music will benefit from implementing the recommendations in the supplement.
- **Use of Standard:** The supplement has not yet been published, but even after releasing the draft for comment, the Working Group has already received one request to use the draft as a reading for a graduate level course on description.
- **Review/Revision Procedures:** The supplement has been through a lengthy review, comment, and revision process. The first draft was released for public comment between February and April 2018 and has since been revised accordingly by members of the working group, based on the nearly 150 comments received. Once the supplement is finalized, the MLA Archives and Special Collections Committee will be responsible for future updates and will review the supplement upon publication of new editions of DACS, excluding minor revisions in GitHub, or every five years as necessary. Should revision be needed, the Committee will be responsible for charging a working group to update the supplement.
- **Related Standards:** DACS
- **File attachment:**

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www2.archivists.org/node/15790/submission/23941>

Standards Co-Chair, John Bence, emailed submitter on June 11 to inquire about current status of the DACS supplement within MLA. Elizabeth Surles' response of June 12 follows:

To answer your question, I did not address MLA's endorsement in the online form, but I'm happy to provide more details. The Working Group has been in close communication with the MLA Board during the course of its work and has its full support. We've received the MLA Board's endorsement via their initial charge to the Working Group, through their participation in our comment and revision process, by approving our formal request to pursue endorsement and publication partnership with SAA, and perhaps most importantly, by approving a publications budget so that we can meet SAA's editing, style, and formatting requirements for electronic publications. We're working with Kathleen DeLaurenti, MLA's Open Access Editor, to coordinate with SAA's Publications Board and staff on publication, dissemination, open access, and digital preservation and access.

Throughout the Working Group's process, we have reported regularly to the MLA Board and the MLA Archives and Special Collections Committee on our progress. The draft supplement has been personally vetted by all the Committee members as well.

All that being said, we have not yet asked the MLA Board formally to endorse the supplement for a couple reasons. First, MLA doesn't have the same kind of standards endorsement structure as SAA, but it would not be a problem to request this kind of formal approval in addition to the many ways the organization has already lent its

support as I've explained above. Also, the Working Group has been focused on determining the parameters of a partnership with SAA so that we could make a formal request to the MLA Board to approve the specific partnership both in terms of SAA's endorsement and the joint publication terms. We've got a financial commitment from MLA, and our intention is to report back to the Board the results of our partnership negotiations and ask for their final approval, but we don't yet have all the SAA details pinned down to report on. Hope this makes sense, but if we need a formal MLA Board vote, please let me know and we can get on it right away.

**Society of American Archivists  
Standards Committee  
Conference Call Minutes  
February 14, 2018**

**Attendees:**

John Bence  
Karin Bredenberg  
Kira Dietz  
Michele Pacifico  
Becca Wiederhold  
Lindsay Wittwer

**Report-outs:**

- TS-AFG (Pacifico)
  - Numerous chapters of the facilities guidelines are in first or second drafts. A few chapters are almost ready to be sent out for peer review.
  - Industry research is lacking in many of the guidelines' domains and SAA may be leading the charge in addressing gaps in present knowledge with this project
  - Plans for SAA's Fundamentals Series III includes a revision of the module on preservation. Michele is in touch with Publications to ensure coordination between SAA-endorsed standard and future SAA publications.
  - Current plans are to send individual chapters out for peer review as they are completed, rather than wait for all of them to be finalized before sending out for review.
- TS-EAS (Wittwer)
  - EAD3 out for comments
  - Revisions of EAC-CPF have begun
  - Need for definitive answer to lingering questions about continuous renewal
- TS-DACS
  - DACS Principles draft went out in the summer, waiting on new draft for dissemination.
  - Annual meeting proposal accepted, but low commitment from TS members, might need to expand scope of panel.
- NISO (Pacifico)
  - SAA appointed Michele Ganz as liaison to Ad Hoc Group to review possible solutions for the maintenance of ISO 5127 as a database standard
  - Pacifico will share information with Standards, SAA Leaders, and relevant Sections about possible submitting comments on the ISO

technical report "[Records management in the cloud: Issues and concerns](#)"

***Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy:***

- Submission packet from the SAA/RBMS Joint Task Force was reviewed prior to the call
- One area of debate was the lack of a maintenance and review plan. However, the JTF-PSL's report to Standards included a summary discussion of the issues leading to a lack of clarity in this area. For one, the nature of the JTF means there is no official SAA group responsible for the standard, though RAO was proposed. Additionally, coordination with RBMS for maintenance of the standard seems to be an important part of the plan going forward.
- Another discussion was around the JTF's lack of examples provided within the text of the draft guidelines. This was addressed in the JTF-PSL's report to standards, which pointed out that while public comments clearly requested examples be included, the JTF was hesitant to include any for fear of limiting possible application of the standard. Instead, the JTF has independently pursued an ePub series on the topic to be published in coordination with the Publications Board. It was determined that this was satisfactory.
- Standards approved the guidelines with the caveat that the maintenance and review be addressed. John Bence will reach out to Council for guidance on possible involvement by RBMS in maintenance of all JTF-developed standard and work with JTF co-chairs to create a maintenance and review plan.

**Standards Portal:**

- Initial attempts to reboot efforts to revisit the portal were unsuccessful since January. Individuals previously involved in exploring the issue could not commit discretionary time to this project.
- Definitions, acceptance criteria for what constitutes a guideline/standard/best practice, relationship to external standards, maintenance of the portal, etc. came up as areas for exploration.
- Co-Chairs will explore ways forward, including a possible appeal to Council for resources to put toward it.
- Concurrent efforts by the Acquisition and Appraisal Section to create a policy "portal" might dovetail with these needs

**Society of American Archivists  
Standards Committee  
Conference Call Minutes  
June 18, 2018**

**Attendees:**

John Bence

Karin Bredenberg

Keith Chevalier

Caitlin Christian-Lamb

Becca Wiederhold

Lindsay Wittwer

**Agenda**

- MLA DACS supplement discussion and vote
- Continuous revision – next steps
- Orphaned standards – next steps
- Annual meeting planning
  
- **MLA DACS Supplement**
  - Discussion covered SAA procedures for external endorsement presume a standard is a) already published "in the wild" and b) is being used by SAA members, thus warranting endorsement. The MLA DACS supplement is neither of those things.
  - MLA working group have been in touch with TS-DACS, SAA Publications - both groups have expressed interest in moving forward.
  - No formal process at MLA for developing standards, so there's no formal approval by MLA Board. May reach out to request a memo of approval.
  - Karin points out old version of EAD is being used in the examples.
  - The Committee was in favor of endorsing the standard, as long as further conversations are had with SAA stakeholders.
  
- **Continuous revision**
  - John Bence had a call with Standards' Council liaison Bert Lyons about next steps. His suggestions was to get a group of stakeholders together at the annual meeting.
  - Committee discussed having a draft of something for stakeholders to respond to ahead of annual meeting.
  - John and Caitlin will draft a high-level procedure doc. TS-DACS and TS-EAS liaisons Kira and Lindsay will provide feedback, revisions, and then share with TS members for comment and further revisions. Hopefully, something more

complete will then be available for annual meeting.

- **Orphaned standards**

- *Best Practices for Internships as a Component of Graduate Archival Education* and *Best Practices for Volunteers in Archives* are currently out-of-date based on their maintenance plans
- These Council-driven projects were created by ad hoc task forces that never assigned responsibility of maintenance to a section or committee. Rather than ask Council to recreate new ad hoc task forces, John and Caitlin will explore giving the Committee on Education responsibility for these standards. COE recently updated the *Guidelines for Archival Continuing Education*, which is related to the best practices for internships. Seeing connectivity between volunteer and internship best practices.

- **Annual meeting planning**

- Everyone agreed that perhaps we won't print hard copies of reports for distribution at the meeting. Perhaps only a few.

- **Report outs**

- Kira: DACS Principles will be posted for comment right before SAA and comment period will last through August
- Lindsay: New release of EAD available.

**Society of American Archivists**  
**Representative to the ALA Committee on**  
**Cataloging: Description and Access and the**  
**Library of Congress MARC Advisory Committee**  
**2017-2018 Annual Report**  
**(Prepared by Weatherly Stephan)**

This year I attended the Midwinter (February 10-12, 2018) and Annual (June 23-25, 2018) meetings of the Library of Congress MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) and the ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA). These meetings continue ongoing work on the RDA standard and MARC format to accommodate the cataloging needs of specialist communities.

Summarized below are proposals and discussions that may be of interest to practitioners of archival description; many proposals reviewed by the committees do not directly impact archival description.

#### **MARC Advisory Committee**

Several proposals and discussion papers this year focused on recording accessibility information about resources, with an eye toward improving machine actionability. Of note for archival description is [2018-DP 10](#), which proposes adding a new subfield to the 856 field with a numeric designator indicating the accessibility of online resources. Since the 856 field is one of two fields commonly used to record the location of finding aids in MARC records, this new subfield would be very pertinent to catalogers of archival materials. The committee recommended that the discussion paper be combined with [2018-DP 11](#) (revisions allowing for the recording of open access and license information in bibliographic and holdings records) before being resubmitted as a proposal, which would likely happen at the 2019 Midwinter meeting.

Fast Track Proposals—approved outright by the Library of Congress without requiring review and comment by the committee—as well as discussion papers converted to proposals at MAC meetings are now numbered and listed alongside the year’s proposals at: <http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/list-p.html>

A complete list of Discussion Papers and Proposals reviewed by the committee are available on the MAC website: [http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/an2018\\_age.html](http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/an2018_age.html)

The next meetings of MAC will take place on January 26 and 27, 2019 at ALA Midwinter in Seattle.

#### **Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access**

Unlike previous years, CC:DA voting members and liaisons were not presented with RDA proposal papers for review and comment. Instead, many changes to RDA typically proposed

through this process were incorporated into the [3R Project](#).

The Midwinter and Annual meetings of CC:DA were primarily focused on updates from the RDA Joint Steering Committee and the ALA Publishing Office on RDA revisions and the new RDA Toolkit. Major points are as follows:

- The next major release of the RDA Toolkit is scheduled for September 2018. The Toolkit is being redesigned as an example-rich and dynamic site, with integrated functionality for bookmarking, creating notes, creating anchor links to any text, and subscribing to updates. Policy statements will also be integrated into entity pages.
- The new site for the RDA Toolkit (<https://beta.rdatoolkit.org/RDA.Web/>) will remain in beta throughout the year with constant revisions expected. The original RDA Toolkit will still be available online for up to one year but will be frozen and not updated.
- The Joint Steering Committee will be looking to overhaul the process for revision proposals to RDA to no longer take up to a year for approval.
- After discussions with specialist communities on the compatibility of RDA with non-traditional materials at the 2017 ALA Annual Meeting, the North American RDA Committee is forming working groups to examine gaps in RDA and propose revisions. The Committee is interested in forming an archives working group in the coming year, and will likely reach out to the new SAA representative for suggestions on working group membership.

CC:DA voting members and liaisons discussed convening new task forces to broaden the work of the committee beyond reviewing RDA revisions and to creating strategy and support documentation for metadata creation and management writ large. Two potential task forces—to examine vocabulary management in the linked data context, and best practices for application profiles—will likely be appointed in the coming year.

Over the course of this year, a working group has examined the feasibility of supporting remote attendance at CC:DA meetings as well as hosting additional virtual meetings outside of the ALA conference schedule. The working group is still reviewing hosting platforms, as single licenses for most platforms would limit the number of attendees and the frequency of meetings. Committee leadership recognizes that requiring in person attendance for meetings hinders contributions from specialist communities (such as archives and special collections) and does not encourage a diversity of viewpoints in its discussions, due to the cost of travelling to ALA meetings.

The next meetings of CC:DA will take place on January 26 and 29, 2019 at ALA Midwinter in Seattle.