SAA/ACRL RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy (JTF-PSL) Documentation of the JTF-PSL Consultation Process, August 2015-July 2017, to Accompany the SAA Standards Committee Submission Packet

Table of Contents

1. Primary communication channels used

Throughout its work, the JTF-PSL used the following primary communication channels to ensure that interested members of the Society of American Archivists (SAA) and the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS) of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) were apprised of opportunities to attend in-person meetings of the JTF-PSL or to provide input and feedback on drafts of the guidelines as they were developed.
- SAA Leadership listserv: saaleaders@forums.archivists.org
- RBMS-L listserv: rbms@lists.ala.org
- SAA Reference, Access, and Outreach Section listserv: rao@forums.archivists.org – note that RAO collaborated with RBMS on developing the proposal to form the JTF-PSL and the group's charge, which was adopted by the SAA Council in November 2014.

Additional communication channels used to ensure broad knowledge of and input and feedback regarding two drafts of the guidelines will be provided later in this documentation.

In addition to these email communication channels, the JTF-PSL, throughout its work, maintained two publicly accessible websites where we posted meeting minutes, calls for feedback, in-person meeting announcements, reports of subgroup research, and other relevant documents for those interested in our ongoing work.
- An SAA-hosted Drupal microsite: https://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-primary-source-literacy
- An ACRL-hosted site (on ALA Connect): http://www.ala.org/acrl/rbms/acr-rbmtfpsl

2. Task Force meetings and open forums held at SAA and ALA meetings, including number of guests in attendance

20 August 2015: SAA Annual Meeting, Cleveland, OH.
- Prior to the official September 2015 start date of its charge, several members of the JTF-PSL participated in the SAA/ACRL-RBMS Joint Task Forces Public Forum during the Thursday open forums over lunchtime. JTF-PSL members sought thoughts from 50 attendees on what they hoped guidelines for primary source literacy might encompass and how they anticipated using them.

10 January 2016: ALA Midwinter Meeting, Boston, MA.
- Task force members and 11 guests held an open meeting to discuss a draft definition of primary source literacy, the outline of an anticipated first draft of the guidelines, and the JTF-PSL's communication plan.

26 June 2016: ALA Annual Meeting, Orlando, FL.
- Task force members and 6 guests held an open meeting to discuss the first draft of guidelines for primary source literacy and online feedback opportunities.

4 August 2016: SAA Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA.
- During an open lunchtime forum, task force members and 16 guests discussed the first draft of guidelines for primary source literacy and online feedback opportunities.
- During the JTF-PSL's scheduled meeting time, task force members and 21 guests, who could not attend the open forum earlier in the day, discussed the first draft of guidelines for primary source literacy and online feedback opportunities.

22 January 2017: ALA Midwinter Meeting, Atlanta, GA.
- Task force members and 21 guests held an open meeting to discuss the second draft of guidelines for primary source literacy, online feedback opportunities, and the JTF-PSL's work plan for completing a final draft of the guidelines.

24 June 2017: ALA Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL.
- Task force members and 10 guests held an open meeting to discuss the final draft of guidelines for primary source literacy and next steps in the process of adopting it as a standard by RBMS, ACRL, and SAA, and its dissemination.

26 July 2017: SAA Annual Meeting, Portland, OR.
- During an open lunchtime forum, task force members and approximately 25 guests discussed the final draft of guidelines for primary source literacy and next steps in the process of adopting it as a standard by SAA, RBMS, and ACRL, and it dissemination.

3. Presentations and publications by Task Force members

Daines, J. Gordon and Cory L. Nimer. "In Search of Primary Source Literacy: Opportunities and Challenges." *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage* 16, No. 1 (2015): 19-34. https://doi.org/10.5860/rbm.16.1.433.

Anne Bahde, speaker, "Educational Standards: Update on the RBMS/SAA Joint Task Force on Primary Source Literacy Standards," Orbis Cascade Alliance Teaching with Primary Sources Symposium, Seattle, Washington, March 2016.

Morgan Swan, speaker, "Standards and Best Practices for Metrics: Reports from the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Forces," New England Archivists Annual Meeting, Portland, Maine, April 2016.

Gordon Daines, speaker, "Primary Source Literacy and Outreach," Conference of Intermountain Archivists Annual Meeting, Ogden, Utah, May 2016.

Sarah Horowitz, Heather Smedberg, Gordon Daines, and Samantha Crisp, presenters, "Information and Artifactual Literacies: Engaging Minds in Libraries and Museums," International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) Information Literacy Preconference, Chicago, Illinois, August 2016.

Horowitz, Sarah M. "Putting the Draft Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy Into Practice." *Archive Journal*, July 2017. http://www.archivejournal.net/notes/putting-the-draft-guidelines-on-primary-source-literacy-into-practice/.

4. Initial research and reports

Members of the JTF-PSL worked from September-December 2015 conducting literature reviews, exploring websites of other related organizations seeking similar guidelines or documents that addressed aspects of primary source literacy, analyzing the ACRL *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* for intersections with our work, and developing a communication plan for use in seeking feedback on drafts of our guidelines as these were completed. We conducted discussions of this ongoing work via bi-weekly conference calls during this period, regularly posted minutes from those conference calls on our SAA-hosted microsite and ACRL-hosed ALA Connect site, and produced and made publicly available four reports that informed our work on a first draft of guidelines:
- Literature Review Subgroup Report: https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/JTF-PSLSubgroupReportLiteratureReviewDecember2015.pdf
- ACRL Framework Subgroup Report: https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/JTF-PSLSubgroupReportACRLFrameworkDecember2015.pdf
- Other Guidelines Subgroup Report: https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/JTF-PSLSubgroupReportOtherGuidelinesDecember2015.pdf
- Communications Subgroup Report: https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/JTF-PSLSubgroupReportCommunicationsDecember2015.pdf

5. SAA announcement of and call for feedback on first draft of *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy*, July 2016

Announcement on the JTF-PSL SAA microsite:

https://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-primary-source-literacy/draft-of-guidelines-for-primary-sour

Email sent to the RAO and SAA-Leaders listservs:

> The SAA/ACRL-RBMS (Assoc. of College and Research Libraries-Rare Books and Manuscripts Section) Joint Task Force on the Development of Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy is pleased to invite you to engage with and comment on our Draft Guidelines. Visit the http://rbms.info/digress/primarysourceliteracy/draft-guidelines/ to annotate and comment directly on the document. You'll also find a PDF copy of the draft guidelines on our SAA microsite: http://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-primary-source-literacy/draft-of-guidelines-for-primary-sour#.V5Jcj_mANBc (also, if interested, you'll find meeting minutes and other documents reflecting our joint task force's work during the first year of our two year charge).
>
> The Task Force encourages broad participation during this summer feedback period and will leave the document posted for comment through August. We hosted feedback sessions at the recent RBMS and ALA annual meetings and will host further discussions at the IFLA Information Literacy Preconference in Chicago. We will also be peppering various professional listervs with calls for comments. Please feel free to forward this call to colleagues you know to be interested and engaged in teaching with primary sources in any capacity.
>
> In addition, there will be an in-person opportunity for discussion and feedback at the upcoming SAA annual meeting, when we'll be holding a Brown Bag Forum on Thursday, August 4th, from 12:15-1:30 PM in Room 213 of the Hilton Atlanta (the conference hotel). We hope to see you there! For more information see: https://archives2016.sched.org/event/6oM5/open-forums-saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-primary-source-literacy
>
> If you have questions or comments you can always reach members of the Joint Task Force at: primarysourceliteracy@gmail.com
>
> We look forward to hearing your feedback, and thank you in advance for contributing!
>
> Bill Landis (for SAA) and Heather Smedberg (for ACRL-RBMS), Co-Chairs, SAA/ACRL-RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy

6. SAA announcement of and call for feedback on second draft of *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy*

Announcement on the JTF-PSL SAA microsite:

https://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-primary-source-literacy/guidelines-for-primary-source-litera

Email sent to the RAO and SAA-Leaders listservs. Also specifically targeted to the listservs of SAA's Diversity Committee; Cultural Heritage Working Group; and Committee on Libraries, Archives, and Museums (CALM):

> The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy invites your feedback on the revised second draft of the Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy. The draft document will be open for in-line comments (requires a quick registration) at http://rbms.info/digress/primarysourceliteracy/draft-guidelines-2/ through Friday, May 19, 2017. Comments can also be emailed to the task force at primarysourceliteracy@gmail.com if preferred.
>
> We look forward to hearing your feedback, and thank you in advance for contributing your comments by May 19!
>
> -- Members of the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy

While the task force itself was comprised of experts on teaching with primary sources, in soliciting feedback on the second draft of *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy* we specifically sought out input from the following individuals who have written and presented on literacies engaged with primary sources:

· Peter Carini, College Archivist, Rauner Special Collections Library, Dartmouth College

· Meg Maiman, Head of Teaching and Learning, Indiana University Bloomington

· Suzy Taraba, Director of Special Collections and Archives, Wesleyan University

· Elizabeth Yakel, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Professor of Information, School of Information, University of Michigan

7. Contact tracking used to insure broad distribution of email messages seeking feedback on second draft of *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy*, April 2017

The following is a sample of an email used in communicating to external organizations, in this case the History Day coordinator for each state plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico:

> Dear [name],
>
> I am co-chair of a joint task force on primary source literacy charged by the Society of American Archivists and the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries. We have recently completed work on a second draft of *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy* and are seeking input broadly from allied professionals who teach or engage in primary source research in humanities disciplines. We are especially interested in feedback from teachers and others engaged in History Day activities and mentoring. This second draft of the document will be open for in-line comments (requires a quick registration) at http://rbms.info/digress/primarysourceliteracy/draft-guidelines-2/ through **Friday, May 19, 2017.** Comments can also be emailed to the task force at primarysourceliteracy@gmail.com if preferred.
>
> I would greatly appreciate your assistance in distributing this information to your [state] History Day colleagues as you think it appropriate.

As part of our communication strategy relating to feedback on drafts, we decided to focus the call for feedback on the first, fairly rough, draft of *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy* primarily on the archives and library communities within SAA, ACRL, and RBMS. With the more complete and contextualized second draft of the *Guidelines* we sought feedback broadly, as documented in the tables below.

Listservs and other organizational mechanisms:

Name + contact info	JTF member who will make contact	Date contact made
Heather will hammer the H-Net Listservs! - H-announce (from where it will be picked up by other sub-list administrators as appropriate). Also posted discussion to H-Teach, focused on teaching in university setting. - both pending approval 4/28/17	Heather	4/28/17
Get a comprehensive list of National History Day organizers (local and state levels) https://www.nhd.org/affiliate Individually contact state coordinator(s) for: AL, AK, AZ, AR, CA, CO, CT, DE, DC, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, ME, MD, MA, MI,	Bill	4/27-28/17

MN, MI, MO, MT, NE, NV, NH, NJ, NM, NY, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, PA, PR, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VT, VA, WA, WV, WI, WY		
SAA leaders listserv - ask to forward to individual groups -Confirm that it is sent to SAA RAO and CALM and Archives/Archivists of Color. -specifically ask for feedback from Diversity Committee and Cultural Heritage Working Group	Lisa	4/27/17
RBMS Listserv	Heather	4/25/17
RBMS Diversity Committee	Heather	4/25/17
Regional archives organizations (RAAC) - co-chairs Kristen Chinery (kristen.chinery@wayne.edu) and Jennifer McGillan (jmcgillan@library.msstate.edu)	Bill	4/27/17
ALA - RUSA	Heather	4/28/2017
MLA (via staff/exec) https://www.mla.org/About-Us/Contact used help@mla.org	Bill	4/27/17
History orgs: AHA, OAH, AASLH, smaller groups like Western History Assoc, Environmental History Assoc, etc. (ended up feeling like trying to include the smaller history organizations was too difficult, since many don't have a paid staff to email). **AHA**, possibly via Teaching Division: https://www.historians.org/about-aha-and-membership/governance/divisions/teaching used info@historians.org **OAH** http://www.oah.org/about/contact/ used oah@oah.org **AASLH** http://about.aaslh.org/contact/ used info@aaslh.org **NCPH** http://ncph.org/about/staff/ used ncph@iupui.edu **NCHE** http://www.nche.net/staff used nche@nche.net	Bill	4/27/17
AAM Committee on Education (museum educators) edcom@aam-us.org	Robin	5/1/2017
National Council for the Social Studies ncss@ncss.org	Robin	5/1/2017

National Council of Teachers of English NCTE https://secure.ncte.org/forms/contactus	Robin	5/1/2017
American Studies Association (many Ethnic studies scholars are members)	Heather	4/28/2017
Conference of Intermountain Archivists	Gordon	4/28/2017
Utah Library Association	Gordon	4/28/2017

Individuals:

Name + contact info	JTF member who will make contact	Date contact made
yul-librarians@mailman.yale.edu (closed distribution list to reach all professional staff in the Yale University Library)	Bill	4/27/17
Dr. David Mazella, UH English Dept. mazella@central.uh.edu	Julie	4/25/17
Jack Stoneman; jack_stoneman@byu.edu; College of Humanities, Department of Asian & Near Eastern Languages	Gordon	4/28/2017
Brian Cannon; brian_cannon@byu.edu; Director, Charles Redd Center For Western Studies	Gordon	4/28/2017
Jay Buckley; jay_buckley@byu.edu; Department of History	Gordon	4/28/2017
Eric Dursteler; eric_dursteler@byu.edu; Chair, Department of History	Gordon	4/28/2017
Elliot Wise; elliot_wise@byu.edu; Department of Comparative Arts and Letters	Gordon	4/28/2017
Lee Library Staff; library-l-bounces@lib.byu.edu; private distribution list	Gordon	4/28/2017
Jay Satterfield - Dartmouth	Heather	4/27/2017
GW Library special collections and research and user services staff	Leah	4/28/2017

8. Summaries of feedback received at key points

June 2016: Feedback from meetings at which the first draft of Guidelines was discussed during the ALA Annual meeting in Orlando, Florida

- Requests for examples of how to create assessment rubrics and learning objectives
- "Created at the time under study" is problematic -- might exclude a memoir -- either needs to be clarified or simply removed
- Definition: this will be a "destination definition" and be cited a lot, so it needs to be brief, but it can have apparatus around it
  - Witness, inspiration
  - What is a source?
  - The documenting function of evidence is important
  - Serve as "signs" of evenTie in ACRL framework language -- this is part of a conversation
    - Especially important given that ACRL rescinded the competency standards this meeting
    - Crosswalk our document to ACRL framework in an appendix?
- The issue of competencies for primary source instructors was raised -- this is outside our scope, but we can link to core competencies document
- Change order of key concepts to theoretical>>ethical>>analytical>>practical
  - Learning outcomes go the other way
- Ethical concepts should include the ethics of collecting, issue of silences
- What does it mean to let a document speak for itself? To be raw? How does one approach it? (also for ethical section)
- Need more practical information about where and when task force appointed, so it's clear how we are entering the conversation
- Need to balance adding more information to the intro with actually getting people to the meat of the document
  - What can we put in appendices?
  - Structure and headlines will be very important
- What about basic versus advanced skills
  - An appendix with progressions and breakdowns was suggested
  - TF wants to be sure this isn't seen as linear
- In "conceptualize" add something on identify or understand different formats
- Libraries and archives are implicit in the document, and could be explicit -- a good opportunity to justify ourselves
- Appendix linking to other definitions of primary sources
- The more practical the document, the more quickly it becomes outdated
- Guidelines for who to do what? How do we expect the document to be used?
  - Needs foregrounding
  - Pull from first paragraph and the concepts to outcomes section

July 2016: Input from public call for feedback on first draft of Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy

The JTF-PSL summarized feedback from the online digress.it document, along with feedback received via emails, in a Google Drive spreadsheet available here in PDF format: https://drive.google.com/open?id=1Mizm-Zvsk8v0-IrdFB9PJdhfpv8I1ikp

August 2016: *Feedback from general and breakout discussions at IFLA Information Literacy Preconference (90 registered participants)*

<u>Feedback from general group discussion</u>
Find: Learning Outcomes
- Move beyond something that is standards based and seems binary Discover > Find. Explore, Select, Explain
- Persistence
- Valuing disciplinary expertise

Ethical Concepts – needs to be clarified, between legal and other ethical concerns

Interpret/Analyze and Evaluate Learning Outcomes – these are not learning outcomes, exactly. Look at use of this terminology. Following, how can these be measured, achieved. Too much jargon, examples would be helpful. Include section of how it's intended to be used, and by whom.

Theoretical Concepts – a lot of overlap with analytical concepts. 2 themes, knowing how to analyze the document itself, and how it's created, and how the materials are collected. Use of term mediated was a big discussions, it was not clear that this concept extends beyond archives. Check out bias here. Concepts are sandwiched between sentences, get lost – bullet list helpful

Use Incorporate learning outcomes – more examples would be useful – honed in on in general, assessing will be difficult, because we don't see the final projects – advice on assessment, absences in section B, repeatable Section D – open up more beyond examples given, rethink word mores. Section E – include something about intentionalilty of audience students are writing for

Practical Concepts:

Might be a place to streamline language, acknowledge differences between different collecting and mediating organizations, museums, archives, libraries

Conceptualize – conflating conceptualize with analysis section, use words like discover, serendipity, primary sources as gateways to discovery. In general, who's the audience for this document, scope, the pitch is important, and clear articulation of audience, others will feel inspired to use and adapt.

Ethical Concepts: want to see things fleshed out more, more examples. Concerned about things related to authority and power that appear under next section, also relevant here. Security, handling, custodianship.

Interpret Analyze and Evaluate: consider born digital materials -= too focused on physical. Discussed term empathy, could be rephrased as historical empathy rather than personal connections. More specific and flesh out absences, investigate > use. Silence does not always equal a total absence

Question about decision to provide list of outcomes, rather than larger metacognitive approach ala Framework.

Practical Concepts: how preserved and digitized seems too focused on workflows, not that helpful. This section really seems to be about FINDING, some overlap with analytical

Use/incorporate: agree section B, add "lack thereof". Section A opening sentence ambiguous compared to specificity of rest of section.

General Comment: would like section from concepts to outcomes that links those two areas, beneficial to have it earlier in the document – move up. Question about the difference in language between key concepts and learning outcomes headings.

Be more explicit about ultimate audience – who are the learners were talking about, that will have impact on language we use throughout, e.g. "discipline" means dewey range, college academic dept. Issue with term literacy. Keep this document as short as humanly possible – examples in appendix?

This isn't really cross compatible or cross interpretable outside of libraries – museums will be put off by some of this

Analytical concepts – separate into multiple thematic concepts to allow reading room between complicated concepts

Conceptual – last bullet could use explaining,

One thing that might be worth considering is the cost of maintaining these collections, and the concepts of giving, fundraising, development.

<u>Feedback from breakout group discussions</u>

Ten breakout groups were given a worksheet on which to record their discussions of specific parts of the first draft of the ***Guidelines***, and asked to highlight two main points to bring back to the larger group in a wrap-up discussion. Break out group worksheets are provided in PDF format here:
https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B19xnBnkTJmUTXJJRmRHODBad0U/view?usp=sharing

August 2016: *Feedback from meetings at SAA annual meeting in Atlanta, Georgia*

<u>Open forum session (16 attendees + TF members):</u>
- Welcomes the document - gives weight and leverage to what we do. Audience is key, and in particular in relation to language, use more of ACRL Framework language (knowledge practices, etc);
- Historical society comment, national history day - 8-12 graders, can see using this in teacher workshops and orientations to how to do research with primary sources - the learning outcomes groupings are the things their learners are learning for the first time. Would use these to set learning objectives for a session, to develop classroom activities
- Archives at university - getting resistance from higher level that teaching primary sources is even anything that archivists should be doing - faculty role.
- Subject librarian in history working with special collections a lot - useful as a document for communicating with faculty - helps them getting beyond the language of finding bibliographic, special collections can use as language in meetings with faculty, here's what we'd like to be able to do with you.

- In addition to learning outcomes, would be great if there was a pointer to pedagogical techniques, set up scenarios.
- Comment on word literacy: accrediting agency spells out information literacy in accreditation documents.
- Prefers guidelines to framework because it gets at real questions I am asked.
- Actual faculty member, next generation is much more engaged, impressed by attempt to be multidisciplinary. In doing so, will have to be vague, also suggestion making a distinction in writing this to an audience of academic, and on the track to academia
- Get on conference program for disciplinary groups who have focus on pedagogy. Targeting *History Teacher.*
- Language applicable when reaching out to disciplines beyond history. Focus on skills, and applicability of skills in the classroom regardless of what students are majoring in.
- Broadness, vagueness is spot on. There are people they can see and apply this document to what they are teaching - sick of seeing case studies, I want to see use cases of the document after it's done. Each one of these sub points can turn into a use case example. Consider going a bit broader that could apply in museum, does it hit everything applicable
- Language about absences - loves this aspect of it - but archivists and librarians and their role (not neutral) is not articulated here.
- Critical Thinking is THE key concept - do a better job of putting critical thinking front and center in this document.
- Likes the flexibility for different disciplines, things it's strong for that
- OAH space for pedagogy discussion, imagine discussions are happening on assessment, that can be an angle for getting into conversations about this.
- Might have luck approaching smaller regional associations to get on disciplinary (e.g., AHA Tuning Project) programs for preparing future faculty at local universities
- K-12 teachers - national council of social studies, music teacher education, etc. – good to have feedback at that level
- Would like to see something added - students have a lot of trouble with the materiality, and difference between digital copy, and the connections between the original and digital representations, careful on the language...some discussion about how detailed we get on this, and other aspects of the document.
- Got caught up on archival literacy portion, representational language of finding aids and that this is a power relationships, in Find section: finding aids are challenging, diverse and require a whole skill to interpret.
- Systems thinking - could be a useful lens to view this through, doesn't seem much a part of this document, but could be useful in a lot of ways to think through this more.
- Part IV, Use and Incorporate B-E - awfully ambitious. Go beyond the primary sources...the things here are critical thinking and critical thinking does not = primary sources, these things happen in all kinds of sources. Is this too ambitious? Discussion about this, and in the end came back to this indeed being part and parcel and important.
- One of the strengths, going from specific to the broad and more general - we can all use our experience to read into it from there, appreciates this, thanks us.
- Levels, rubric...again mentioned.

JTF-PSL meeting-time session (21 attendees + TF members):
- Audience wanted the committee to make sure that we have a plan to share the guidelines with affiliated professions so that they can give us feedback
- Need to be clear that primary source literacy is not archival literacy
- It is important to create guidelines that are reusable by different communities for different purposes; users need to be able to pick and choose the parts of the guidelines that are most valuable to them

- Document is potentially useful to LIS instructors for teaching primary source literacy; the learning outcomes piece is well written and could be lifted to a syllabus
- Suggestion made to share document with archival educators
- Document provides a way to articulate primary source literacy to undergraduate students and will be useful to archivists doing instruction
- Do donors have a place in the guidelines? Are they a potential audience? Archivists could potentially use this document to talk about what materials will be used for
- Potential audience: archivists reaching out to K-12 teachers
- Need to clearly articulate the difference between "originals" and "digital surrogates"; we should provide guidance on how "born-digital" can be explained as primary sources to users; primary sources can come in a variety of formats and media
- Appendix with examples of document analysis?
- Importance of going beyond the "show-n-tell" environment (see p. 2 of the guidelines)
- Guidelines should talk about assessment; provide recommendations or point out to other recommendations?
- Liked mention of absences in the guidelines
- Does provenance and chain of ownership and their relationship to understanding documents need to be in the guidelines?
- It is a huge plus that the document has been kept short
- Bibliography should not be aimed only at archivists and librarians
- Guidelines need to be targeted to an audience more than college and university students

June 2017: *Plan for Addressing 2ⁿᵈ Draft Feedback*

Comments on the second draft of *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy* were primarily editorial and not substantive, and were almost all embedded as comments in the digress.it version online. Only two emails containing comments were received. The JTF-PSL co-chairs organized the comments into a work plan document for consideration and final decision-making by the members of the Task Force, and tracking as agreed-upon changes were made to the final draft of the *Guidelines*. That document is available here in PDF format:
https://drive.google.com/open?id=16wpRiGpT5WXrH8F2U--MoLN-he5vO6fW.