

Society of American Archivists (SAA)

**FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE:
PLANNING A 21ST-CENTURY APPROACH TO
CORE ARCHIVAL KNOWLEDGE**

SUMMARY

The Society of American Archivists (SAA) has, since the late 1970s, supported a robust, successful, and influential publishing program. Graduate education programs, governmental and regional training institutes, archival practitioners, and allied professionals have all benefitted from SAA's practical manuals and more theoretical monographs. Historically, publications have also supported other association programs and educational endeavors. This program is at a key transitional moment. As we now begin to plan the next Archival Fundamentals series, we recognize that technological changes, user demands, and electronic publishing are threatening our program's sustainability and challenging our traditional business model. The archival, library, museum, and public history disciplines have converged in recent years, generating new user communities. Theoretical and methodological shifts have shortened publication shelf lives and created demands for more rapid and timely dissemination of knowledge. Clearly, the publications program requires significant modification, and the potential solutions have important implications for related professional associations, academic publishers, and organizations engaged in scholarly communication.

We therefore are applying for a two-year \$65,574 planning grant from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) in order to address

the problem. We propose to convene a ten-member Working Group that will conduct an environmental scan, electronically survey both our membership and professionals in related disciplines, conduct a series in-depth interviews with key stakeholders, devise a program to revamp our archival fundamentals series, and produce a long-term business plan that will ensure the publication program's vitality and sustainability. Our new model will prove adaptable to other associations that face nearly identical issues.

BACKGROUND

The Society of American Archivists is the largest and oldest archival professional association in North America. Its core mission involves serving the education and information needs of more than 5,500 members, and its publications program constitutes a cornerstone in achieving this purpose. Beginning in the early 1970s, SAA published the five-volume set known as the Basic Manual Series, organized around core archival functions.¹ The subsequent growth of the archives profession and related graduate programs in the 1980s led to the seven-volume Archival Fundamentals Series that both replaced and offered a more ambitious agenda than the Basic Manual Series, including a discussion of theoretical principles and techniques that represented the best practices in the field.

The Archival Fundamentals Series had a transformative effect on both the SAA publications program and the profession. Publications sales began to have a substantial impact on SAA's budget, and every volume in the Archival Fundamentals Series became

¹ The initial Basic Manual Series included works on arrangement and description, appraisal and accessioning, reference and access, surveys, and security. This evolved into the Basic Manual Series II in 1982, which expanded the scope by including volumes on automation, exhibits, public programs, cartographic records and architectural drawings, and reprography. It should be noted that the preparation and publication of the Basic Manual Series, Basic Manual Series II, and the subsequent Archival Fundamentals Series were awarded generous support from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission

a leading seller in a variety of marketplaces.² The series established SAA as a book publishing force within the archives profession and provided “seed money” for the production of dozens of other books with smaller distribution footprints that made equally important contributions to the professional discourse. In the late 1990s, SAA updated the popular series through the seven-volume Archival Fundamentals Series II, which proved to be as successful as its predecessor.³ A variety of technological, theoretical, and institutional factors that converged in the first decade of the 21st century made it clear, however, that the Archival Fundamentals Series II books would have a shorter shelf life than previous series.⁴ These factors make this a critical moment for SAA as a publisher, and have stimulated our request that NHPRC fund this planning grant in order to allow us to rethink the core of our publications program, construct a sustainable business model and blueprint for our future, and better meet the needs of our increasingly diverse professional and technologically sophisticated community.

PROJECT’S PURPOSE

There are three compelling reasons why a critical need exists now to develop a new core literature and a new publishing model. The following observations indicate the need for SAA to reach beyond its membership and structure to rethink its approach to providing core archival knowledge. These observations flow naturally from SAA’s Strategic Priority Outcomes and Activities 2010–2013, which emphasizes technology,

² The success and proliferation of the SAA publications has led to a contribution of between 18% and 26% of the association’s annual revenue over the past two decades.

³ The seven volumes were *Managing Archival and Manuscript Repositories* (Michael Kurtz, 2004); *A Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology* (Richard Pearce-Moses, 2005); *Arranging and Describing Archives and Manuscripts* (Kathleen Roe, 2005); *Providing Reference Services for Archives and Manuscripts* (Mary Jo Pugh, 2005); *Selecting and Appraising Archives and Manuscripts* (Frank Boles, 2005); *Understanding Archives and Manuscripts* (James M. O’Toole and Richard J. Cox, 2006); and *Preserving Archives and Manuscripts* (Mary Lynn Ritzenthaler, 2010).

⁴ While some publications in the Archival Fundamentals Series II represent the initial steps in SAA’s growing electronic publications program, others involved less radical re-conceptualizations of archival theory, practice, and Web 2.0 applications.

diversity, and advocacy/public awareness as critical issues for the association and the archives profession.⁵ A revitalized core literature and an improved method of delivery will enhance archival education and practice.

1. Publishing Environment

Our definition of a successor to the Archival Fundamentals Series II must move forward in a rapidly changing publishing environment that poses significant challenges for professional associations. Archival educators now structure their courses around readily available online resources rather than assigning our series of introductory publications, and their students are accustomed to accessing course material on the Web. Graduate educators increasingly are creating their own online course packs in such content management systems as Blackboard, Sakai, and wikis, and instructors are less inclined to rely solely on professional association manuals. The audience for our publications program has diversified to include a broader range of knowledge and skills. A “one-size-fits-all” approach to core knowledge no longer works. Archivists, like other professionals operating in a web-based informational culture, increasingly rely on rapidly accessible, easily updatable, and cafeteria-style resources tailored to their particular interests. SAA’s publishing program must become more nimble and innovative in order to meet the needs of educators, students, and practitioners. A more thorough understanding of user needs will enable SAA to tailor publication content and delivery to contemporary expectations.

User demands and new publishing models also raise sustainability issues. During the past several years, SAA has struggled to find an appropriate balance between its

⁵ See <http://www2.archivists.org/governance/strategic-priorities>.

electronic and print publications program. In 2005, *A Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology* became the first SAA publication to be simultaneously published in two formats: a structured database-driven resource available for free on the SAA website, and a print edition available for purchase. SAA's website now features such other electronic publications as *Campus Case Studies* (2008 and ongoing), *The Interactive Archivist: Case Studies in Utilizing Web 2.0 to Improve the Archival Experience* (2009), *Thesaurus for Use in College and University Archives* (2009), and an assortment of downloadable files of out-of-print classic archives books. All of this content is freely available. The hybrid print and electronic approach to the publications program has increased our ability to serve as an effective vehicle for scholarly communication, but it has also introduced the challenges of quality-control and sustainability. The aforementioned *Glossary* best illustrates the quality-control issue. No mechanism was developed for adding content, updating entries, or correcting errors. Although the original glossary compiler has been maintaining a list of entries to add, we lack a process for responding to his efforts. As we move toward an online publishing environment, we must create workable procedures for updating not only the *Glossary* but also our entire body of core literature.

Sustainability raises even more complex and wide-ranging challenges. Robert B. Townsend, Assistant Director of Publications and Research at the American Historical Association, has observed that e-publishing has allowed his association to reach a much broader audience, but that the cost of reaching that audience has significantly diminished the association's revenue stream.⁶ Donald Waters, Program Officer for Scholarly Communications and Information Technology at the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, has

⁶ Robert Townsend, "Mission, Media, and Risk: The American Historical Association Online," *Perspectives in History* 46:9 (December 2008).

urged publishers and professional associations to move toward an “open access” model, but he also has admitted that infrastructure issues prevent these institutions from adopting his recommendations.⁷ SAA must develop a business plan for core literature that considers a variety of strategies and models, which include cross-institutional collaboration, publishing cooperatives, and cost-containment. We cannot merely continue our traditional monograph publication program (which owed its creation to the cultural and business climate of the 1970s) and expect to survive in a far different social and technological world. A robust planning process, which is beyond SAA’s institutional capacity to undertake and implement, will help us develop a sustainable business model consistent with the new publishing paradigm. Because the scholarly communications paradigm shift affects all professional associations, our work will produce a business plan that other associations and content producers will be able to adapt.

2. Content

The Archival Fundamentals Series II sought to be more open-ended and to draw on a richer and deeper theoretical context than its predecessors. Its production in the early 2000s, however, proved inauspicious for several reasons, making it imperative that SAA move quickly to launch a successor series.

First, though the World Wide Web dates to the mid-1990s, and observers certainly noted its transformative impact on archival practice by the time of the

⁷ Donald J. Waters, “Building on Success, Forging New Ground: The Question of Sustainability,” *First Monday* 9:5 (3 May 2004). A lively literature has developed in recent years around the sustainability issue and the implications of e-publications for scholarly associations and university presses. For some representative treatments, see: Laura Brown, Rebecca Griffiths, and Matthew Rascoff, “University Publishing in a Digital Age,” (July 2007) available at: (<http://www.ithaka.org>); Paul N. Courant, “Scholarship and Academic Libraries (and their Kin) in a World of Google,” *First Monday* 11:8 (August 2006); Raym Crow, “Publishing Cooperatives: An Alternative for Non-Profit Publishers,” *First Monday* 11:9 (September 2006); Joseph J. Esposito, “The Wisdom of Oz: The Role of the University Press in Scholarly Communications,” *The Journal of Electronic Publishing* 10:1 (Winter 2007); Peter Givler, “University Press Publishing in the United States,” *Scholarly Publishing: Books, Journals, Publishers, and Libraries in the Twentieth Century* edited by Richard E. Abel and Lyman W. Newman (Indianapolis: Wiley, 2002); and John B. Thompson, “Survival Strategies for Academic Publishing,” *Chronicle of Higher Education* 51:41 (June 2005).

appearance of Archival Fundamentals Series II, most volumes only touched lightly on such issues as electronic records management and digital technology.⁸ Second, and even more critical, the volumes appeared on the cusp of new technological and theoretical transformations, such as social networking, that have revolutionized the profession. O'Reilly Media's "Web 2.0 Summit" in 2004, for example, gave popular currency to the term "Web 2.0" just as the first Archival Fundamentals Series II book on management appeared in print. Since that date, tagging, social bookmarking, blogging, image-sharing, social networking, micro-blogging, and similar practices have contributed to a new vision for archival reference and research environments, prompting all sorts of intriguing professional experiments. These important trends are understandably absent from Archival Fundamentals Series II. Similarly, Mark Greene and Dennis Meissner published their article, "More Product, Less Process: Revamping Traditional Archival Processing" shortly after the appearance of Kathleen Roe's *Arranging and Describing Archives and Manuscripts*.⁹ Their article generated passionate discussion at professional conferences and revolutionized accepted best practices for arrangement and description. Greene/Meissner procedures now routinely appear in funding proposals and guidelines; yet, our core professional literature does not reference this work. It is essential that SAA develop a mechanism for incorporating new trends more rapidly into our publications program.

Finally, discussions concerning "the archive" in a variety of social sciences and humanities disciplines have generated new ways of thinking about archival practice.

⁸ A 2005 *Archival Issues* review of *Arranging and Describing Archives and Manuscripts*, for example, noted that the book "completely avoids the problem and challenges of electronic records." Frank Boles's *Selecting and Appraising Archives and Manuscripts* devotes only three pages to a sustained discussion of electronic records, which tellingly appears in a chapter that discusses such "other media" as audio, film, and visual image. Michael Kurtz's *Managing Archival and Manuscript Repositories* contains a mere handful of references to electronic mail (which he primarily discusses as a communications tool of managers) with only one brief index entry for "web technology."

⁹ *The American Archivist* 68 (2005): 208–63.

Historians, literary critics, digital humanists, poststructuralists, cultural studies scholars, and performing arts theorists have all contributed to these academic debates, yet their insights remain absent from the archival literature. The archival educator Terry Eastwood hinted at this issue when he wrote of the need for a publication concerning “archival knowledge” and criticized the Archival Fundamentals Series II for virtually ignoring international insights and failing to address “the activities of making, organizing, using, keeping, and disposing of records.”¹⁰ The emergence of theory-based journals such as *Archival Science* (2001); the growing discussions about convergence among libraries, museums, and archives; and the appearance of books such as *Archives, Documentation, and Institutions of Social Memory*¹¹ illustrate these new trends. As these publications also demonstrate, archival literature must draw upon and contribute to a growing and sophisticated multidisciplinary base.

3. Audiences

Our audience has also undergone an important transformation. The data from the “Archival Census & Education Needs Survey in the United States” (A*CENSUS), a comprehensive nationwide survey of the archives profession in May 2004, provides important insights that inform this proposal.¹² Perhaps the most relevant conclusion is the extent to which graduate archival education has transformed the field. Structured MA, and especially MLIS, programs have rapidly multiplied in the past two decades, replacing workshops and institutes as the primary point of entry into the profession. Further, “students” comprise the largest single membership category within SAA, which has 32

¹⁰ “Fundamentally Speaking: The Third Version, A Review of the Archival Fundamentals Series II,” *The American Archivist* 71 (2008): 228–245.

¹¹ Francis X. Blouin and William Rosenberg, eds., *Archives, Documentation, and Institutions of Social Memory* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2007).

¹² “Special Section on A*CENSUS (Archival Census & Education Needs Survey in the United States,” *The American Archivist* 69 (2006): 291–553.

affiliated student chapters. Multi-course graduate education programs require a different approach than the Archival Fundamentals Series II offers. In 2009, SAA surveyed archival educators and found that few professors assign the series to their students; rather, educators select from the rich periodical literature, seek out more theoretically sophisticated resources, and prefer affordable single-volume professional overviews. Our “traditional” approach to publishing no longer resonates with the most important and expanding cohorts in our audience: graduate archival educators and graduate students.

A*CENSUS also informs us that the archives profession includes a growing number of practitioners with limited experience: more than 43 percent of the respondents had worked as an archivist for fewer than 10 years, which indicates that the need for core knowledge and foundational texts remains vital for working archivists. Training programs, such as the Modern Archives Institute, the Western Archives Institute, the Georgia Archives Institute, and the Association of Catholic Diocesan Archivists Biennial Conference, continue to educate government employees, tribal archivists, and religious archivists. These programs seek sound literature that provides core archival knowledge. SAA has an obligation to serve all these audiences.

Finally, the convergence of disciplines in recent years means that we must develop and market our core literature offerings beyond SAA members. Digital technology has fostered greater visibility for archival and manuscript collections in local libraries. Special collections have assumed more significance within academic libraries as they have sought to highlight their original materials in an era of full-text databases and shared resources. Public historians have incorporated archival materials into Web exhibits and created such digital archives as the September 11 and Hurricane Katrina

sites. Archives have partnered especially with social studies educators to tie their on-line collections more closely to state and national standards and to create document-based curriculum materials around their resources. SAA must provide ready access to its core publications for the librarians, public historians, educators, and others who incorporate archival materials into their daily work. Furthermore, we must reach out to our colleagues who manage historical resources in a variety of settings; and more effectively solicit input from members of allied organizations.¹³

To reach this broader audience, we need to experiment with more effective delivery mechanisms. SAA has historically marketed products primarily to its own membership and to professionals who self-identify as archivists. We need to develop both better resources and a more effective means of reaching librarians, records managers, cultural resource managers, public historians, historical society personnel, and museum curators. The business plan that results from this project will delineate a process for creating and enhancing our core literature, and develop a strategy for marketing our products to diverse audiences across professional boundaries in order to disseminate knowledge more effectively and ensure the sustainability of SAA's publishing program.

LONG-TERM GOALS AND MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

We propose to address these needs through a dynamic 24-month planning process. We will convene a Working Group comprised of 10 individuals who represent diverse segments of the profession, have complementary skills including survey development and data analysis, and have proven their commitment to the profession

¹³ Letters of support from the following organizations may be found in the supplementary materials: Academy of Certified Archivists, Association of Canadian Archivists, American History Association, Council of State Archivists, and National Council on Public History.

through innovative research and writing, collaborative style, and hard work. This group will:

- 1) Attend two national archival meetings (e.g., Society of American Archivists and Association of Canadian Archivists), seven regional/local archival meetings (e.g., Midwest Archives Conference, Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference, New England Archivists, Archivists Round Table of Metropolitan New York, Society of Southwest Archivists, Society of California Archivists, and Northwest Archivists), and three allied professional meetings (e.g., American Association of State and Local History, National Council on Public History, Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries) to solicit input from attendees.
- 2) Conduct an online survey available to approximately 6,000 archivists, librarians and public historians, and making sure to obtain a statistically valid response rate.¹⁴
- 3) Contact 60 key professionals in the archives, public history, information, and scholarly publishing disciplines for in-depth phone interviews (one-hour long; questions to be sent ahead of time for consideration).
- 4) Create a wiki to facilitate sharing of data for public review and comment.
- 5) Use the data and feedback to build a business plan and produce a report for project implementation with a framework/roadmap for the new series.
- 6) Disseminate the report to the archives community, library community, public history community, and allied professional associations with publishing programs by posting announcements on H-Net listservs and linking to SAA site.

¹⁴ Michael D. Kaplowitz, Timothy D. Hadlock, and Ralph Levine, 'A Comparison of Web and Mail Survey Response Rates,' *Public Opinion Quarterly* 68:1 (2004): 94–101," for example," provides a succinct discussion of web-based surveys that has been useful in guiding our thinking.

PLAN OF WORK

Initiated by the SAA Publications Board but reaching well beyond its membership, “Fundamental Change” planning will be carried out by a diverse Working Group of archivists with the assistance of SAA’s permanent staff. The Working Group will conduct research, reach out to a broad cross-section of the archives profession for input, make contact with allied professional organizations to ascertain their needs, and analyze and synthesize the data collected. The final report will translate this work into a clear direction and prospectus for 1) developing a new approach to core archival knowledge; 2) outline a business plan for integrating the new approach into SAA’s publications program; and 3) create a blueprint for managing the technological aspects of this new publishing model. Following this study and synthesis, SAA will be strongly positioned for the next step, to implement a pilot project.

The working process will be collaborative and take full advantage of both traditional group interaction and online technologies. Three strategically timed, face-to-face meetings will provide the intensive interaction needed to plan and shape such a complex project. A series of virtual meetings will bring members of the Working Group and subgroups together to work on targeted tasks. Independent work will be shared via online resources. Virtual and online tools will include conference calls, video conferencing, Google Docs, Google Wave, a project wiki, and other collaborative tools identified as appropriate to particular tasks. Data will be gathered via an online survey to members of archival and allied professions; targeted in-depth telephone interviews; and

outreach at meetings of national, regional, and allied professional groups. A public wiki will open the process to comment as findings are compiled and conclusions are reached. SAA is strongly committed to transparency and to having its new publication venture reflect that core value.

Preplanning (completed)

The SAA Publications Board discussed a new approach to core archival knowledge at its March and August 2009 meetings, agreeing on a vision and beginning to sketch out the shape of the series. An intensive look at e-publishing, held at a joint meeting of the Publications Board and the *American Archivist* Editorial Board in March 2008, informed these discussions as well. A subcommittee of the Publications Board met in February 2010 to flesh out the vision, define a planning process, and prepare this proposal.

Working Group Selection (completed)

Members of the Working Group were selected based on their diverse skill sets, career paths, and institutional settings. The seven members of the Working Group and three *ex-officio* participants bring varied skill sets to the project, in particular data collection and analysis, archival education, diversity, and digital technologies, as well as geographical, generational, and institutional diversity. In addition, all have demonstrated experience with writing and publishing for the archival profession—and a strong interest in developing a new publishing paradigm.

Magia Ghetu Krause (doctoral student, School of Information, University of Michigan) and Christopher Prom (Assistant University Archivist, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign) bring strong survey development and data analysis experience to the

team. Robin Chandler (Director, Digital Library Program, University of California, San Diego), Timothy Pyatt (University Archivist, Duke University), and Deborah Wythe (Head of Digital Collections and Services, Brooklyn Museum) provide digital and electronic records technologies expertise. Peter Wosh (Director of the Archives and Public History Program, New York University), Thomas Frusciano (University Archivist, Rutgers University), along with and Christopher Prom are active archival educators. Teresa Mora (Supervisory Archivist, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley) and Joan Krizack (University Archivist and Head of Special Collections, Northeastern University) are strong advocates for diversity in the field. Teresa Brinati (SAA's Director of Publishing) brings more than 20 years of experience in the publishing industry. Several members of the Working Group have prior experience managing federal grants from NHPRC, NEH, and IMLS.

Both Deborah Wythe, who will chair the Working Group, and Joan Krizack have been members of the SAA Publications Board since 2003. The three *ex-officio* members of the Working Group will participate actively in the project as well as acting as liaisons with the relevant SAA groups: Peter Wosh, as SAA's Editor of Print and Electronic Publications, represents the SAA Publications Board; Thomas Frusciano is our Council liaison; and Teresa Brinati will eventually be responsible for implementing the outcomes of the project. In addition, SAA staff will provide logistical and technical support as well as participate in the research and analysis activities. An initial, informal meeting of the Working Group will be scheduled at the Joint Annual Meeting of SAA, CoSA, and NAGARA in August 2010 in Washington, D.C. For more information about key personnel, please see their resumes in the supplementary materials submitted.

Calendar of Activities

January 2011: SAA staff will provide Working Group members with information compiled to date, including a set of reviews from the professional literature of the Archival Fundamentals Series, minutes of pre-planning meetings, and a copy of the grant proposal and work plan. Communication Plan: Publish announcement about receipt of NHPRC grant on SAA homepage, SAA Facebook page, and to archival and allied profession listservs; and in *In the Loop* (e-newsletter) and *Archival Outlook* (bimonthly newsletter).

February 2011: Working Group meeting (two days). The purpose of this face-to-face meeting is twofold: first, to bring the group together as a team, building relationships and allowing the new members of the Working Group to develop a strong investment in the project¹⁵ and second, to accomplish substantive work on the first phase of the project, a survey of the profession and allied groups. Agenda: Review pre-planning activities; discuss project goals and workflow. Plan survey of the profession: outline areas of interest and brainstorm possible questions; detail desired outcomes; identify audiences; discuss survey formats and potential outreach channels; define statistical elements such as sample size, response rate, and confidence level. Create work plan and make assignments; select relevant collaborative tools for this phase. Plan project outreach visits to regional archives and allied profession meetings.

¹⁵ While virtual meetings are becoming more prevalent in the business and academic world, primarily to save time and money, there is also still strong evidence that face-to-face meetings serve important team-building and valuable interactive purposes. A study by *Forbes/Insights* noted that “face-to-face meetings are still crucial for building stronger, more meaningful and profitable business relationships. . . For example, respondents said face-to-face meetings are best for persuasion (91%), leadership (87%), engagement (86%), accountability (79%), and decision-making (82%). When web-, video- and teleconferences were preferred, it was generally for the dissemination of data or when time was of greater concern.”
http://www.forbes.com/forbesinsights/Business_Meetings_FaceToFace/index.html (downloaded 5/15/2010)

February–April 2011: Independent Work: Draft survey questions in assigned areas. Develop survey testing procedures and assemble list of colleagues willing to test. Compile contact list for target audiences. Write survey and open forum announcements. Create survey in online format. Online Collaboration: Share, evaluate, and refine questions. Virtual Meetings: Email exchanges; schedule calls as needed for members working on assigned topics. Conference call to review final draft of survey and make assignments for testing process. Communication Plan: Submit content about open forum at 2011 SAA Annual Meeting for inclusion in preliminary program to be posted on SAA website and onsite program. Prepare article for July/August *Archival Outlook* promoting attendance at open forum. Post a save-the-date announcement about open forum on SAA Facebook page. Outreach: Working Group members attend their customary regional archival association and allied professional association meetings and schedule open forums and discussion groups as appropriate.

May 2011: Finalize and test survey. Independent Work: Release survey to test population; collect and post data. Virtual Collaboration: Post data, evaluate, assess, and revise survey as needed. Email exchanges; schedule calls as needed for members working on assigned topics. Communication Plan: Post announcement of forthcoming survey to targeted listservs and newsletters.

June–July 2011: Implement online survey. Independent Work: Send out announcements and follow-up reminders; collect and organize data; track incoming surveys and address any problems. Online Collaboration: Review and analyze data, draw preliminary conclusions. Communication Plan: Post announcement about survey and

open forum on SAA homepage, SAA Facebook page, Twitter, and various listservs and publish in SAA's *In the Loop* email newsletter.

July–September 2011: Outreach: Hold open forum at SAA annual meeting: discuss activities and findings to date, invite comment and input. Brief, informal gathering of Working Group in conjunction with open forum. Independent Work: Collect and organize survey data and comments from SAA forum and regional meetings. Online Collaboration: Analyze data, draw preliminary conclusions. Write survey report. Communication Plan: Report in person to SAA Council and Publications Board at 2011 SAA Annual Meeting (August 22–27 in Chicago).

Fall 2011: Outreach: Working Group members attend their customary regional archival association and allied professional association meetings and schedule open forums and discussion groups as appropriate.

October 2011: Working Group meeting (two days). The purpose of this face-to-face meeting is to provide an intensive working session to detail the second phase of the project—a series of in-depth, carefully-scripted interviews with 60 individuals representing key constituencies in archival and allied professions. Agenda: Review survey report and analysis and comments received to date; highlight key topics and questions that need to be addressed in more detail; review constituencies represented and identify gaps. Plan in-depth telephone interviews to both gather further information and to develop a “buzz” about the project across the profession: assess information needs; brainstorm questions; identify constituencies; discuss data compilation methods. Create work plan and make assignments; select relevant collaborative tools for this phase. Plan project outreach visits to Fall regional and allied profession meetings.

November–December 2011: Independent Work: Write brief description of this phase of the project; draft script for telephone interviews; create list of individuals to be interviewed; implement data submission and compilation tools. Online Collaboration: share, review, revise, and finalize script. Make interview assignments. Communication Plan: Send email to 60 key individuals inviting them to participate in a telephone interview and schedule interviews.

January–February 2012: Independent Work: Conduct telephone interviews (approximately 1 hour in length; 6 per Working Group member); transcribe, compile, and submit data. Online Collaboration: Ongoing review of data; revise and adjust script if needed; revise contact list as necessary. Virtual Meeting (late January): Once several interviews have been completed, schedule conference call to discuss and evaluate interview process to date and adjust if needed. Communication Plan: Send thank you note to each interviewee and include a \$50 gift certificate for the SAA Bookstore as a token of appreciation for his/her time.

March–April 2012: Independent Work: compile and organize data from telephone interviews. Independent Research: compile and circulate resources on the future of publishing, particularly in associations; identify existing and potential business models; identify technology models. Online Collaboration: Review and analyze data; generate executive summary and report; share research results. Communication Plan: Submit content about open forum at 2012 SAA Annual Meeting for inclusion in preliminary program to be posted on SAA website and onsite program.

Spring 2012: Working Group members attend their customary regional archives and allied profession meetings and seek input from across the archives profession.

May 2012: Working Group meeting (2 days). The purpose of this face-to-face meeting is to collaborate intensively in planning the final stages of the project and the project products. Agenda: Review survey and interview reports, identify any gaps in knowledge and understanding, propose remedies. Articulate conclusions. What have we learned? What do people need and want? What is the shape of the new Fundamentals series? Outline prospectus for a 21st-century Fundamentals: content, organization, format(s), dissemination. Discuss SAA resources—what is possible? Identify possible business models and outline business plan. Identify viable technology solutions. Plan outreach wiki for community comment on preliminary conclusions. Create work plan and make assignments; select relevant collaborative tools for this phase.

June 2012: Online Collaboration: Draft preliminary conclusions; quantify open questions. Create outreach wiki.

July–August 2012: Independent Work: Implement outreach wiki and mount reports and conclusions to date. Invite comment (including reaching out to SAA sections and roundtables). Collect and analyze comments. Outreach: Hold second open forum reaching members of SAA and Council of State Archivists at the joint annual meeting in San Diego. Communication Plan: Post announcement about the wiki and open forum on SAA homepage, SAA Facebook page, Twitter, and various listservs (including sections and roundtables) and publish in issues of *In the Loop*. Include outreach to COSA members and other allied professions. Report in person to SAA Council and Publications Board at 2012 SAA Annual Meeting (August 5–12 in San Diego).

August–October 2012: Online Collaboration: Draft prospectus, business plan, and technology plan. Virtual Meeting: Conference call to discuss possible scenarios for a

pilot project: content, extent, format. Online Collaboration: Draft outline for pilot project.

Independent Work: Research funding sources for pilot project implementation.

November–December 2012: Online Collaboration: Revise and finalize prospectus for new approach to core archival knowledge. Revise and finalize business model and technology plan. Produce prospectus, business and technology plan; evaluate process and outcomes, based on responses to wiki and progress reports, and satisfied objectives. Write final report for NHPRC, SAA Council, and Publications Board. Draft plan for pilot implementation project.