Conference Call Agenda + Notes

March 24, 2017
10-11 AM Pacific /11 AM-Noon Mountain /Noon-1 PM Central /1-2 PM Eastern.
Call-in Instructions:

1. Dial (855) 925-3266.
2. When prompted enter meeting ID (21069), then #
3. When prompted speak your name, then enter #

Link to notes from previous meeting

Members Present:
Sam, Bill, Julie, Heather, Sarah, Morgan, Robin

Absent:
Gordon, Leah, Anne, Lisa

Notetaker: Julie Grob

Getting Started:

- Welcome
- Roll Call
- Call for additions to the agenda
- Announcements

Discussion of Small Group Work:

- Introduction Group (working in main document)
    - Feedback on the edits and cleaned up version?
    - Subgroup made changes based on ALA feedback, tightened up and improved the introduction.
    - Wait to make changes on the last paragraph, where appendix and guidelines have been flagged.
- Core Ideas / Learning Objectives Group (working on separated document)
    - Discuss lingering questions/comments
    - Other feedback?
    - The only real difference between the Concepts section and the Learning Objectives is the format - Concepts are narrative, Objectives are bullet points. There is also a lot of overlap, with few true concepts (archival silences being the main exception).
    - There is value to having two separate sections to appeal to two different audiences - narrative appealing to faculty, while objectives are appealing to librarians/instructors. Suggestion to taking out the bullet points in the Practical Concepts section to improve the flow.
    - Length of document is a concern. There is no way to superimpose the conceptual categories over the learning objectives. Would it be worth

comparing the Core Ideas and the Learning Objectives for gaps or things that could be better explained?
    - How successful is the Core Idea section as a stand-alone narrative at a higher level than the Learning Objectives? Does it need to be edited? Is there more detail than required? Can we keep it higher level and shorter so they stand on their own better?
    - Would a different structure work better for the Learning Objectives, such as a short overview sentence followed by finer points? Or could the formatting be handled online through dropdowns?
    - Concern about rethinking the document too much at this point. Introduction stands on its own well. Would be a worthwhile idea to take the Core Ideas and Learning Objectives and see if we could bring them together in a way that is more straightforward for readers. Would allow people to skim over parts that they understand.
    - Other perspective that the Learning Objectives section is pretty good at this point.
    - In Core Ideas, the Practical Concepts section was the one that sounded the most like Learning Objectives, but there was general overlap with the Learning Objectives section throughout. The Practical Concepts section stands out as not sounding as higher order - do we need them or do we want to integrate them elsewhere in the document?
    - Heather, Sarah, and Robin will form a small sub-group to quickly review/revise the Core Ideas section. Fun people.
    - Addressed several outstanding questions in the Learning Objectives.
    - Bill will draft a new Learning Objective on generally analyzing primary sources as the new IV.A.

- Case Studies Group (working on 2 documents, a Call for Case Studies on Teaching with Primary Sources and a Submission Form - both based on the SAA CEPC documents for Case Studies in Archival Ethics. A 3rd document, a Peer Review Assessment Form containing a rubric for evaluating SAA case studies is generic and doesn't likely need to be tailored to primary source teaching case studies, but everyone should take a look at it and see what you think. We propose to use this to evaluate any example case studies the JTF members might wish to do in advance of turning this over to RAO)
    - Reporting out - discussions and ideas
    - How/if to tie into this document (still have a placeholder Appendix 2)
    - Planning to talk to co-chairs of RAO to see if they are interested in being the home for these case studies after our group goes away.
    - Members of SAA Committee on Ethics and Professional Conduct wrote two case studies as examples before they went public with a call. So we might produce two or three case studies between now and July as a way to get the process going. If some folks from RAO want to be involved in those case studies and helping us assess, that would be great. But after our task force ends, RAO would provide the infrastructure for keeping it going.

    - We would get rid of Appendix 2 and replace it with these case studies. Heather will go into draft and remove references to Appendix 2.
    - There is also a document in the folder which is a generic SAA case studies rubric.
    - Would like feedback on the Elements of a Case Study section in the Call for Case Studies document. Requesting feedback by Friday, April 7th.

Remaining Work to do/In progress:
- Tighten-up pithy text for Background appendix (Appendix 4)
- Review/clean-up glossary (HS had volunteered, but has not yet done this)
- Adjust Appendix numbers as necessary - HS

Next Steps:
- March 31, 2017: Push to have all of our work on a final draft completed
- April 2017: one-month feedback period for final draft feedback from a broad swath of potential stakeholders.
    - digress.it
    - webinars (HS reached out to Christian Dupont about their webinar)?
    - individual JTF members reach out to their local constituents (faculty, etc)
- May 2017: final edits to create final draft for submission to RBMS/ACRL and SAA.
- June 9, 2017: final version of guidelines ready to submit to RBMS/ACRL and SAA.
    - For SAA: Bill to work with Standards Ctte cochairs to prep standards approval documentation in advance of their late July meeting in Portland.
    - HS to work with RBMS Exec and ACRL Standards groups on process and documentation