Standards Committee

Agenda for 2024 February 8, 10:05-11 MDT

You can join this meeting from your computer, tablet, or smartphone.
https://smith.zoom.us/j/91995537451

Attending: Dan, Jodi, Lara, Lydia, Becca, Regine, Stephanie, Karin, Sue, Heather, Maristella

Regrets: Wendy, Bethany, Sharry, Alexis, Anna
Guests: None
Chairing meeting: Lara
Minutes: Jodi

Continuing Business

Procedures

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

Planned next steps:
- Work asynchronously before the February meeting in this document
  - Modifying language of conference proposal form
    - How are we handling the question of involvement of a diverse group, or considerations of diverse persons?
    - Editing the bullet points/examples to cover both/and
    - Acknowledging that the broad language will not apply universally to all groups
    - What do we consider the minimum? It's quite open, but the expectation is that there's some indication that there's been reflection/consideration
    - The first paragraph creates a strong expectation, but the how is somewhat softer
    - It's so common to have a question or expectation like this; it's not a burden.
    - Edited down statement that we've been editing.
  - International aspect: How do we make this language work for our international-facing standards?
    - Decided against this

- Aim: Use the discussion today to inform a working definition of diversity. Result as follows:

<mark>One of SAA's core values is ensuring the diversity of its membership and leaders, the profession, and the archival record. We expect SAA-endorsed standards to reflect this commitment to a diverse and inclusive profession. Please describe how the standard/revision addresses individual, institutional, or geographic diversity, or supports the development, inclusion, and stewardship of a diverse profession or cultural record.</mark>
<mark>Please indicate how the standard/revision has incorporated diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility principles. Aspects that you could consider addressing include, but are not limited to:</mark>
- <mark>Consideration for/consultation with/involvement of multiple types of institutions (e.g., academic, corporate, government, religious etc.).</mark>
- <mark>Consideration for/consultation with institutions in multiple geographic regions.</mark>
- <mark>Consideration for/involvement of persons at multiple career points (e.g., mid-career, student, retired, paraprofessional, temporary, etc.), researchers, and persons in allied fields.</mark>
- <mark>Consideration for/consultation with people with disabilities, multiple gender identities, multiple sexual orientations, multiple racial/ethnic identities or nationalities, multiple religious backgrounds, and diverse economic status.</mark>
- <mark>Positionality statements reflecting on the unique identities of the committee members in relation to the standard.</mark>

Next steps:
- One more asynchronous review!
- Take that definition 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

ACE Standard on Continuing Archival Education

- Group has submitted a revision request: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1WnUWuXgWBI1LPIHOiwQBtklABXbm8zMtWQVoonRAo4Y/edit?usp=sharing
- Document snafu: Committee members please review the document and respond by February 16 with comments
- Do we understand why they are proposing a revision?

Updates

Co-chairs (Jodi and Lara)

RiC/EGAD: Recap Council discussion (Lydia)
- Council was very impressed with the statements and agreed with posting the statement.
- DACS statement on RiC: individual commented on last sentence [transparency and seeking consensus in alignment] and asking how we plan to do that. Regine: Not specifically planned at this time, but survey instruments and/or community discussions are two possibilities.

Re-up of ARM BIBFRAME group: Outcomes of Council meeting (Lydia)
- Approved without any problem

Council (Lydia)

Other items from the Council meeting:
- Looking at SP dashboard, we are not addressing several things that are assignment to us. Lydia will follow up with Lara and Jodi about seeing to those things. Standards needs to take the lead on supporting post-custodialism, radical empathy, addressing bias in description.
- If we need Council to suggest a working group or to direct resources to this, ask Lydia for guidance.

Technical Subcommittees (liaisons)

TS-DACS (Dan)
- None (next meeting is Tuesday)
- Put out a [call for a virtual community meeting](#) in April to support alignment work **with the Principles**; signups are open now (22 registrations received so far).

TS-EAS (Lara)
- Next TS-EAS meeting, Feb 28-29.
- First set of consultations with aggregators; valuable comments received. Meeting again later this month.

TS-AFG (Heather)
- Followed up with both groups, no response.

TS-GRD (Heather)
- Followed up with both groups, no response.

Other Groups (liaisons)

Accessibility and Disability (Jodi)
- Draft revised standard is currently being shared among the community with an anonymous form for gathering feedback

Acquisitions and Appraisal (Wendy)
- [unable to attend]

College and University Archives (Sue)
- Nothing to report

ALA CC:DA/MAC (Becca)
- MARC Advisory Committee met January 24th and 25th. Four proposals with minimal impact on archival cataloging were discussed and passed. A discussion paper (2024-DP02) suggesting the addition of a subfield to the 245 field (title) to record a statement about the origin of a transcribed title yielded concerns that there are plenty of other areas in the MARC record where problematic historic language exists. Perhaps another approach should be considered for educating library users about where library catalogs get their metadata. Expecting another discussion paper at ALA annual to address the main concerns. Discussion paper (2024-DP04) about adding linked data fields to fields 506 (Restrictions on Access Note) and 540 (Terms Governing Use and Reproduction Note) was favorably received and will return to the committee as a formal proposal.
- ALA Core Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access met on February 2nd and 5th. Several reports from liaisons. Current task forces include CC:DA Task Force on Personal Names in Official RDA and CC:DA Procedures Task Force. Next meetings will be in person in San Diego in June. I will post my notes about things of interest to archives.

Education Committee (Becca)
- Nothing to report this month

Intellectual Property WG (Anna)
- [unable to attend]

Action Items

- DEI considerations:
  - Send out the statement for one more review by group by [date–how about Feb 12?]
  - Then the co-chairs will take on to the Diversity committee for conversation and to discuss how the groups will work together
- Standard request for revision

- ○ Lara will send out document for members to review and comment on by **February 16**.
  - ○ After comments are received, we will respond to the group and copy Standards
- ● Lara and Jodi will consult with Lydia on SP items