

# Standards Committee

Agenda for 2024 March 14 and 28 (time change affected the first meeting)

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

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

Attending: Lara, Alexis, Karin, Regine, Heather, Maristella, Wendy, Mary

Regrets: Anna, Dan, Sue, Lydia

Guests: None

Chairing meeting: Jodi

Minutes: Lara

## Continuing Business

### Procedures

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

[Marked up version](#)

[Summary of issues in markup](#)

- In our February meeting, we completed a draft section on DEIA for the standards creation and revision procedures.
- On March 8, Lara shared this draft via email with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the SAA Diversity Committee and asked for feedback on this particular section of the procedures and also engagement on what role, if any, the Diversity Committee might want to play in reviewing new and revised SAA standards for compliance with DEIA requirements.
- Diversity Committee Chair and Vice-Chair are bringing this for discussion at the April Diversity Committee meeting.

With that in process, let's talk about items numbered 4 and 5 in the [Summary of issues in markup](#):

#### 4. Accessibility considerations

1. Currently nothing about the role of the accessibility and disability section. Should there be? Even if it simply helps us be informed about evolving notions of accessibility?
  - a. Reach out to the committee?
  - b. Annual check-in with disability section.
  - c. Ask them what they want their role to be?
  - d. Jodi will follow up with the section.
2. Throughout: Comments that accessibility should be more prominent throughout the process. Suggestions for how to structure that exactly?
  - a. Screen reader compatibility of written standards (easy navigability, etc)

- b. Does SAA have its own rules around accessibility? CMS guidelines.
  - c. What do our institutions require?
  - d. Github and GitBook accessibility?
  - e. Accessible PDFs
  - f. Colors and contrast issue
  - g. Provide list of accessibility checkers and ask that groups document that they have used one or more of those.
  - h. <https://accessibility.umich.edu/training>
  - i. <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/web-accessibility-directive-standards-and-harmonisation>
  - j. Closed captioning for SAA meetings and events and videos
5. Comment and consultations
- 3. III.A: requirement for an open meeting and to record comments?
    - a. Karin: difference between an open meeting and consultation? Don't try to regulate the process too much. Leave some room for flexibility.
    - b. At minimum, we need some kind of open meeting that is broadly accessible with recorded comments and summary of comments. Also include group's response to feedback.
    - c. Subcommittees want more specific guidance on what it means. Provide examples to groups.
  - 4. Proposed added example of consulting recent reports or publications related to the standard
    - a. Add this as an example of consultation actions.
      - i. Example: EAD revision team has looked at NAFAN reports and engaged with them.

## ACE Standard on Continuing Archival Education

- The following is a summary of comments on the [revision request submission](#) that were exchanged in email:
  - Dan: I'm a little unclear on our [procedures](#). Are they supposed to follow the instructions in Section I and following or is that superseded by Section V? If it isn't superseded, they haven't answered some of the required questions and their timetable is impossible in light of Section II.C.I. (Announcement of standards project). It doesn't make logical sense to me that II.C.I would be required when we already have a group that is responsible for maintaining the standard, but logic and procedures are sadly not always aligned.
  - Jodi's response: Putting in the relevant text for reference, I see the following under V.D.2, Standards Committee and SAA Council review plan:
    - V.D.4. Recommendation to the SAA Council
    - The maintaining technical subcommittee will submit a package to the Standards Committee containing its recommendation to reaffirm, revise, or rescind the standard along with documentation about the review

process (**as in III.**). If the technical subcommittee recommends revision, the technical subcommittee will also submit a completed proposal form (**as in I.A.2.**).

- V.D.5. The Standards Committee will review the package to ensure that the review plan was adequate. Assuming that no procedural questions remain unresolved, it will forward the package to the Council with the recommendation to reaffirm, revise, or rescind.
  - III refers to the Standards Development Process, which begins with III.A, consultation with other SAA subgroups and external organizations.
  - I.A refers to filling out the Proposal for Standards Development form.
  - So, it's possible that what may be lacking in the submission is the consultation process, which is related to stating the need for a revision. And yes, I agree: their timeline is not actually possible.
- Rebecca: These are my same concerns with the proposal. It seems prudent to pursue a review due to the number of years that have passed since it was approved by Council, but there doesn't seem to be a period built in to their process for gathering community feedback. I would recommend we ask for a revised timeline that outlines a better consultation process as well as a more realistic schedule.
- Summary and response: The group needs to revise their request and integrate the following:
    - State why a revision is needed
    - Revise the timeline that outlines a more thorough consultation process and a more realistic schedule
    - Jodi sent this request to the group

## Minor Change Requests

TS-DACS sent the following minor change requests:

<https://github.com/saa-ts-dacs/dacs/pull/89>

<https://github.com/saa-ts-dacs/dacs/pull/90>

<https://github.com/saa-ts-dacs/dacs/pull/28>

<https://github.com/saa-ts-dacs/dacs/pull/83>

Business conducted by email: Committee members asked to review and approve by April 3, 2024.

# Updates

## ***Co-chairs (Jodi and Lara)***

RiC/EGAD: Response so far and next steps

- Meeting between chairs/Lydia and SAA leadership: report out
- Crafting a response to individual who has raised concerns; this is in process.
- Asked Leadership to help us find ways of building a healthier relationship with ICA.
- Jacque observed that SAA is a dues paying member of ICA and this affects relationship.
- SAA Leadership will be pursuing that conversation with counterparts in ICA
- Statement will not be changed (already approved by Council)
- SAA leadership follow up needs to be prompt; keep an eye on that

## ***Council (Lydia)***

No updates.

## ***Technical Subcommittees (liaisons)***

TS-DACS (Dan)

- Focus has been on the [virtual community meeting](#) April 15-17 to support alignment work with the Principles (signups now up to about 40) and reviewing and addressing outstanding pull requests and selected issues (several proposals will be sent out for consideration at next Standards meeting).

TS-EAS (Lara)

- During the February meeting of TS-EAS, it was reported that SAA Council have approved:
  - Standards Committee recommendations for RiC
  - TS EAS updated Standards Alignment statement
  - TS DACS statements regarding RiC
  - Initiation of review of the Arts and Rare Materials BIBFRAME extension
  - Update of TS DACS standing rules
- It was also reported to TS-EAS that the Standards Committee is working on DEIA issues.
- EAD 4 revision ongoing. Draft schema and project management in GitHub.
- See March 5 [Descriptive Notes blog post](#) on EAD revision by Kerstin Arnold, Cory Nimer, and Mary Samouelian
- Major revision of EAC-CPF anticipated after release of EAD 4 and finalization of EAC-F also to be synced with release of EAD 4.
- EAD team will do an outreach event focused on Asia with aid from their Chinese member and volunteering Japanese archivists.
- Annual meeting preparations
  - Bring your own breakfast event with TS-EAS

- 2-day EAD meeting (12th and 13th of August)
- First set of consultations with aggregators; valuable comments received. Meeting again later this month.

#### TS-AFG (Heather)

- Co-chair situation still an issue that Standards leadership is working on.

#### TS-GRD (Heather)

- Meeting on March 21st and Heather attended
  - The group divided up the standard for review and discussed revisions
- One of the co-chairs has been difficult to contact, so subcommittee is being led exclusively by a single co-chair. Co-chair did attend and participate in March 21st meeting.
- Looking into directly addressing other formats like Born-Digital, right now the standard is “format-neutral”
- Questions about whether SAA standards portal can support dropdown menus and more dynamic features

#### Other Groups (liaisons)

##### Accessibility and Disability (Jodi)

- No update

##### Acquisitions and Appraisal (Wendy)

- Looking for feedback on [Accessioning Best Practices draft](#)

##### College and University Archives (Sue)

- No update

##### ALA CC:DA/MAC (Becca)

- Nothing to report.

##### Education Committee (Becca)

- Nothing to report.

##### Intellectual Property WG (Anna)

- No update

#### Action Items

- Lara and Jodi will send out three DACS minor revisions to group and move forward with them
  - Sent 3/29/24; respond by 4/3/24
- Committee members should look at accessibility tools and what we might draw on specifically for the April meeting. **Please come prepared with tangible suggestions.**

- SAA's CMS manual
- <https://accessibility.umich.edu/training>
- <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/web-accessibility-directive-standards-and-harmonisation>
- Jodi following up with accessibility/disability section on consultation
- Response to Kerstin will be finalized this week/next.
- Join the fun with the DACS meetings in April! To receive an invitation and Zoom link, please register no later than March 31 by [filling out this form](#).
- Committee members should look at accessioning BPs draft:
  - This is just a reminder that the feedback period for the Archival Accessioning Best Practices Circulation draft is open until **April 15th**. Please see the original announcement below for links.
  - The [National Best Practices for Archival Accessioning Working Group](#) (NBPAAWG) was established in 2021 to develop a body of best practices for archival accessioning. This group of archivists is supported by the Standards Committee of the Society of American Archivists and is funded by the Institute of Museum and Library Services' National Leadership Grants for Libraries program.
  - We are happy to share that our first draft of these best practices guidelines are ready for external review and feedback. We welcome input from anyone who works on the acquisition, accessioning, or processing of archival materials from small to large institutions.
  - Please feel free to share the survey widely. Our aim was to make these guidelines inclusive of a range of experiences.
  - Survey link: <https://forms.gle/6PiouyoSsCvXaL9MA>
  - Archival Accessioning Best Practices Circulation Draft: <http://tinyurl.com/accessioningbp>