

# Membership Committee Conference Call

---

Monday, October 4, 2010

## MEETING MINUTES

### In attendance:

Adriana Cuervo (Chair)  
Rachel Vagts (Vice Chair)  
Salvador Barragan  
J. Gordon Daines  
Bert Lyons  
Teresa Mora  
Brian Doyle (Staff)  
Terry Baxter (Ex Officio)

### Absent:

Renna Tuten  
Larissa Woo

#### 1. Approval of the agenda

Approved

#### 2. First impressions/reactions to the August 2010 Discussion Item?

<http://www.archivists.org/council/Council0810/0810-1-III-A-InstMember.pdf>

Daines: We need to decide what we want institutional membership to be before we answer the specific question regarding Fellowship.

Cuervo: Why are we not extending all of benefits of membership to institutional members?

Vagts: Institutions join societies for different reasons than individual members. Institutions support those associations to support the mission while individuals join for personal benefit.  
Mora agreed.

Cuervo: Yes, but how are institutions speaking? Do institutions actively pursue the same kinds of involvement as individuals?

Mora: I don't think they do. Their involvement is one of supporting the mission.

Daines: What do institutions themselves expect from their membership? Is it entirely altruistic or is there a quid pro quo?

Mora: Agree. However, the things that we are talking about right now (e.g., Fellowship) speak to *individual* benefits.

Baxter: Another question is, why call them “members?” Why not call them “donors?” Is this primary about money? For instance, some institutions may desire representation on committees and in other appointed bodies.

Daines: Question for the Fellows: Can institutions, per se, become Fellows?

Mora: It’s perfectly acceptable for institutions to have representation on committees—but holding office and being recognized as a Fellow are individual honors.

### **3. Potential responses to discrepancy identified by the Committee to Select SAA Fellows:**

Does the committee agree that there is a discrepancy and that it is problematic? If so, the committee could find that:

- a. Eligibility to hold office is not appropriate for institutional member primary contacts; Recommend to rescind the eligibility to hold office (constitutional amendment).
- b. Eligibility to hold office is appropriate for institutional member primary contacts: Recommend to confer eligibility to be elected as an SAA Fellow (constitutional amendment).
- c. Otherwise, if the committee disagrees that the apparent discrepancy is problematic, it could recommend that no change be made.

Any recommendation(s) will need to provide an accompanying rationale/support statement.

The committee agrees that there is a discrepancy.

Daines: What are the offices?

Doyle: Elected officials are VP/President Elect; Treasurer; Council members, members of the Nominating Committee.

Daines and Mora: Eligibility for elected offices not appropriate for institutional members.

Vagts: Therefore, the proposed recommendation from the committee should be THAT eligibility to hold office is not appropriate for institutional member primary contacts and recommend to rescind the eligibility to hold office. In addition, the committee should explicate those roles that are appropriate for institutional members—representation on committees, hosting events, etc.

Lyons: What Rachel outlined makes sense. This is membership and there’s no need to make this too complicated.

Baxter: I would offer a contradictory opinion: Fellowship is an award and not a benefit of membership per se. However, what’s the difference between serving as a committee chair and serving as an elected official?

Daines: But what if an institution primary contact leaves the institution? To what entity is the appointment being made—the individual or the institution?

Baxter: The same problems apply to committee appointments as to elected office. Would understand limited benefits from the beginning but why draw the distinction in the middle?

Mora: I can see circumstance when a VP might want appoint a particular institutional representative regardless of who that person might be.

The committee members took a straw poll on Recommendation A finding that eligibility to hold office is not appropriate for institutional member primary contacts and recommend to rescind the eligibility to hold elected office.

Cuervo: **nay**

Vagts: aye

Barragan: aye

Daines: aye

Lyons: aye

Mora: aye:

Baxter: **nay** (prefers C)

Agreed that this straw poll constitutes the preliminary sense of the committee.

4. The committee should solicit **input from critical stakeholders**—minimally, the members of the Committee to Select SAA Fellows—to ensure that it is aware of differing perspectives among SAA’s leaders. The committee should determine:
  - d. Whose input needs to be solicited? (Anyone outside of the Committee to Select SAA Fellows?)

Cuervo: **Committee on the Selection of SAA Fellows**

Daines: Also include **Fellows Steering Committee**: Query about broader issues regarding definition of institutional membership. Why are institutional members dropping? (Vagts: Anecdotally, she has heard that some institutions are dropping all institutional memberships due to budget limitations.)

Doyle: **Individuals who are Fellows and Primary Contacts?** (Yes.)

- e. How should input be solicited and by whom?

Vagts: Draft standard query and have Brian distribute.

Rachel can work on this during the week of the 11<sup>th</sup>. Cuervo and Daines to assist.

- f. By what date does the committee require input in order to proceed with its deliberations?  
(Doyle recommends end of October or early November at the latest.)

**5. Any additional questions, suggestions, or concerns?**

**6. Assignments / Action Items**

- a. Draft of query to go out to committee week of October 11.
- b. Committee to finalize and Doyle to distribute by October 15 with RSVP by October 31.
- c. Doyle suggests that committee be prepared to hold conversations or teleconferences by telephone if necessary. Staff can provide technical support.