

Standards Committee

Agenda for 2024 January 11, 10:05-11 MDT

You can join this meeting from your computer, tablet, or smartphone.

<https://smith.zoom.us/j/91995537451>

Attending: Dan, Regine, Karin, Stephanie, Mary, Rebecca, Maristella, Anna, Alexis, Heather, Wendy, Sue

Regrets:

Guests: none

Chairing meeting: Jodi

Minutes: Lara

Liaisons to other groups: Bethany, Karin, Stephanie, Sharry, Rebecca, Lydia, Sue, Stephanie Daniel, Regine, Maristella, Alexis, Wendy, Jodi, Heather, Anna, Lara

Continuing Business

Procedures

We deferred this item to January in favor of using meeting time for the RiC statements and making our plans.

Revision of [Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard](#)

[Marked up version](#)

[Summary of issues in markup](#)

We will continue our discussion of *only* the items in section 3, DEI considerations

Outcomes we would like to get to:

- What would be the *ideal* role of the Diversity committee?
- What would be an *acceptable* role for the Diversity committee?
- What elements of diversity and accessibility should come from the Standards committee?

How will we define diversity? Our homework was to go looking for examples in their own institutional and standards universe, and put them in [this document](#).

Notes:

- Each standard should be addressed individually because each standard will have a different relationship to DEI issues

- Standards should provide examples to groups.
- Maybe a new section in each standards proposal that addresses DEI issues
- TS-EAS needs an introduction to DEI in the U.S. context...so this group can address this.
- Is there are clear definition of DEI??? Statements tend to be broad.
- Elements of diversity: different kinds of users (on a professional level); varying institutional resources, institution type; level of technical support; culturally literate description; be more explicit and transparent in drafting standards; SAA has a [statement on DEI](#); accessibility of standard; whether standard addresses diversity in various ways.
- Within the texts of standards themselves, what might change?
- Does it make sense to look at questions on session proposal forms and then adapt them to standards application package.
- Lean on existing SAA DEI statement and use session proposal forms.
- Standards has to be explicit in its own instructions...
- Minor updates—do not require DEI work
- Different aspects of standards *content* and standards *creation*.
- International considerations: language, non-Roman scripts, accessibility to various communities around the world
- Include in our own statement a commitment to ongoing self-reflection.
- Three aspects to consider:
 - Content
 - Ethics of description
 - Who owns description
 - Creation
 - Composition of the steering group
 - Extent of outreach to / participation from stakeholder community
 - Accessibility
 - Modes of publication
 - Availability in translations
 - Technology barriers
 - Screen reader readiness etc.
- DEIA section from SAA session proposal:
 - One of SAA's core values is ensuring the diversity of its membership and leaders, the profession, and the archival record. We expect program sessions to reflect this commitment to a diverse and inclusive program and profession. Please indicate—in a summative way—how your proposal reflects individual, institutional, or geographic diversity, or supports the development, inclusion, and stewardship of a diverse profession or cultural record. This could include positionality statements reflecting on the unique identities of the panelists in relation to the session topic, a recognition of dominant positionality inherent in your identity or organization, or the ways in which power and privilege manifest in the session and how you will use or respond to it.

- Please indicate how your proposed session provides a diverse, equitable, and inclusive roster of presenters:
 - The panel includes presenters representing multiple types of institutions (e.g., academic, corporate, government, religious etc.).
 - The panel includes presenters representing multiple geographic regions (e.g., Northeast, Midwest, South, etc.)
 - The panel includes presenters representing multiple career points (e.g., mid-career, student, retired, paraprofessional, temporary, etc.)
 - The panel includes presenters representing people with disabilities.
 - The panel includes presenters representing multiple gender identities.
 - The panel includes presenters representing multiple sexual orientations.
 - The panel includes presenters representing multiple racial/ethnic identities or nationalities.
 - The panel includes presenters representing multiple religious backgrounds.

Planned next steps:

- Work asynchronously before the February meeting
- Defining diversity: Use the discussion today to inform a working definition of diversity
- Take that scope to the Diversity Committee after the February meeting
- Ask them what they would like their role to be, including but not limited to:
 - They review all standards submissions
 - They appoint an ex officio member to Standards

Updates

Co-chairs (Jodi and Lara)

RiC: [Proposal](#) sent to Council Jan 8

Re-up of ARM BIBFRAME group: [Proposal](#) sent to Council Jan 8

Council (Lydia)

Technical Subcommittees (liaisons)

TS-DACS (Dan)

- Met Tuesday, mostly focused on discussing potential revisions to the conditions governing access note and the processing note.

TS-EAS (Lara)

- Will soon publish minor revision
- Comments on EAD update from aggregators. Eight aggregators will be part of this.

- EAD webinar focused on Asia upcoming in May

TS-AFG (Heather)

- No updates

TS-GRD (Heather)

Other Groups (liaisons)

Accessibility and Disability (Jodi)

- Nothing to report

Acquisitions and Appraisal (Wendy)

Very determined to get the standard done; Wendy met with them and had a good conversation about how to do that

College and University Archives (Sue)

- Nothing to report

ALA CC:DA/MAC (Becca)

- CC:DA will be meeting Feb. 2nd 1-4 CST and 5th 11-2 CST
- MARC Advisory Committee will be meeting Jan. 24th 10:30-1:30 Eastern and Thu. Jan. 25 10:30-1:30 ET. None of the proposals for immediate change to MARC appear to have significant potential impact to archival description, but three of the discussion papers have clearer connection to archival description:
 - Adding a subfield to the 245 title field with text explaining the source of a transcribed formal title, when the title contains harmful language.
 - Adding MARC subfield \$0 for authority record control number and \$1 Real World Object URI to the 506 (Restrictions on access note) and 540 (Terms governing use and reproduction note)
 - Adding MARC relator terms in subfields \$e and \$4 to MARC fields 647 (named events) and 648 (chronological terms). I'm not sure how widely these fields are used in the archives community

Education Committee (Becca)

- Group has submitted [a revision request for the Archival Continuing Education \(ACE\) Guidelines](#)
- We will look at this during the February meeting; need to make the packet accessible

Intellectual Property WG (Anna)

- Team contacted Anna about process and seem to be moving forward and planning for submission.

Action Items

1. Getting ACE revision request to a form we can all review before Feb Meeting (Jodi/Lara)
2. Work asynchronously before the February meeting [in this document](#) (all)
 - We will use that work to inform discussion at that meeting
 - Take that scope to the Diversity Committee after the February meeting
 - Consider international element: This was our assignment to think on how we do this, and possibly draw on other examples from international groups, There's a section in the document above to share your thoughts.
3. Jodi and Lara will consider and make recommendations for new Standards members (note from Karin: remove the filter on the sheet)