

American Archivist Editorial Board
Conference Call – March 23, 2010
Noon–1 p.m.

MINUTES

Present: Mari Jo Pugh, Jeannette Bastian, Bruce Bruemmer, Amy Cooper Cary, Su Kim Chung Paul Conway, Bill Landis, Michelle Light, and Teresa Brinati.

Unable to participate: Danna Bell-Russel, Brien Brothman, Cal Lee, Chris Prom,

I. Issue on SAA's 75th Anniversary

A. Solicitation of Proposals

Why are we doing this? Because Council invited the Editorial Board to do this. The Editorial Board can define the amount of content – from an entire issue to just a section in the issue. The hope is to get a solid response to the call for proposals (deadline is May 1). The papers that result from accepted proposals will go in vol. 74, no. 2.

We are not commissioning papers, but do we need to encourage proposals? Yes! There is a proposal in the works on education from two archival educators. Outreach and advocacy were mentioned as possible topics. Larry Hackman is currently editing a publication on this topic, *Many Happy Returns*, which is projected to be available 2010/2011. With regard to advocacy and outreach, don't necessarily want naval gazing, but where are we compared to other associations/professions? How is SAA doing it?

ACTION: Brinati to send TOC of Hackman book to Editorial Board.

Documentation? Terry Cook is editing a publication on this topic, *Documenting Society and Institutions: Essays in Honor of Helen Willa Samuels*, which is also projected to be available 2010/2011. TOC already desitributed.

Reminder: Proposals due May 1 for issue on SAA's 75th anniversary.

ACTION: Brinati to continue to disseminate call for proposals via various lists.

Another possible topic: Descriptive standards. SAA has excelled at this. Perhaps explore archival standards as a significant contribution by SAA to the profession? Descriptive standards are more fully developed than other standards, specifically technical standards, within SAA. Bill sent an email to Steve Hensen, Jackie Dooley, Kris Keisling, and Michael Fox inviting them to consider submitting proposal on Descriptive

Standards. What about Elizabeth Dow as an author given her work in EAD, if the above are not available?

Goal of proposals/articles: Critical look at SAA as a professional organization and what it needs to do to be a leader in the standards arena. SAA's role can't just be serendipitous. Proposals/articles should offer critical commentary and not necessarily be solely celebratory.

Another possible topic: How does a professional organization support the profession? What has SAA done or not done? Has the momentum been kept up or morphed in some way? Consider Tim Ericson as a possible author for an overview of the association's growth across time. He has served SAA in a variety of capacities: volunteer, elected leadership, paid staff – as education officer and interim executive director. It should be a think piece about how a professional association supports the profession and members. What about Nick Burckel as a possible author?

ACTIONS:

- Landis to pursue proposal on Descriptive Standards.
- Bruemmer to talk with Ericson and see if he is interested in doing the association/profession growth overview and, if so, is there anyone else he would like to work with.
- Pugh to talk with Brothman about a big “think piece.”
- Pugh to ask Lee to invite Margaret Hedstrom to do a piece on the evolution of digital preservation activities over the past several decades and the place of archives within that evolution. In an email Lee noted that “2011 will be the 20-year anniversary of her ‘Understanding Electronic Incunabula: A Framework for Research on Electronic Records.’ We're arguably now past the age of ‘incunabula’ when it comes to born-digital materials, so this could be a good occasion to revisit some of those themes and provide a vision of where things are going

B. Evaluation process for proposals

Pugh to receive proposals by May 1 and will send each of them to 2 Editorial Board members, who will need turnaround their reviews by May 31.

FYI, later in the process, finished papers will be blind reviewed by peer reviewers. The Editorial Board would not review the papers, only the proposals.

II. Survey - Final Review

A. Questions

ACTION: Pugh to make final changes to questions based on input from Editorial Board.

Here's a summary of requests.

Delete Q. 5

ACTION: Pugh and Brinati to develop a question about would not receiving a paper copy of the *American Archivist* and only an e-copy affect your membership in SAA? [Note: Q. 30: Preference for electronic or print access? This it to determine a benchmark for where we are at. The baseline info will be important to have. Combine with above action.]

Other Qs: Give a series of time choices about when people read the journal. Combine and make congruent with Redesign Survey.

When do you read back issues of the journal? Specificity is preferred.

What is the universe of the people looking at American Archivist? Where are we situated? If that's the case, then name specific journals. But that may be a challenge because there are so many. However, there is an "other" space in the survey for responders to fill in. Access is not a problem, but reading is for most folks. If access is a problem, then add an option "don't have access."

B. Survey launch

Proposed launch is March 30 with survey closing April 15. Announcements will be made via In the Loop and various lists.

III. Occasional Series

Landis to speak with Nancy McGovern tomorrow with regard to Research Forum content.

Brinati and Pugh to speak with MetaPress about placing the Occasional Series with *American Archivist Online* and whether this is feasible.