

SAA Metadata and Digital Practice Review

Mark A. Matienzo, Stanford University Libraries / @anarchivist
SAA Research Forum, 25 July 2017

Project background



- Wide variety of component groups and appointed positions on committees, etc. that relate to metadata and digital practice
- Some known gaps or overlaps across these groups, and further possibilities for collaboration
- Timeline: Nov 2016-Nov 2017

— — —

Intended results

— — —

Provide suggestions and observations to SAA Council, including:

- areas in metadata and digital practice that are not currently addressed, possibly duplicative, or opportunities for coordination or collaboration
- possible adjustments in scope of existing groups or the establishment of new or consolidated groups to address suggestions
- activities and opportunities for SAA and broader profession to address suggestions

Deliverable: Summary report to SAA Council with supporting documentation to assist SAA in responding more flexibly and sustainably to evolving needs and emerging opportunities

Target SAA groups and roles

— — —

Sections

- Collection Management Tools Section
- Description Section
- Electronic Records Section
- Encoded Archival Standards Section
- Metadata and Digital Object Section
- Web Archiving Section

Appointed Groups/Roles

- Standards Committee & subcommittees:
 - TS-DACS
 - TS-EAS
- Intellectual Property Working Group
- Representatives
 - ALA CC:DA/MARC Advisory Committee
 - ARMA International Standards Development Committee
 - ICA-EGAD
 - NISO

Approach

- Research on and outreach to SAA groups to collect information, suggestions, and provide feedback
- **Investigate allied professional associations and domains, and comparable initiatives within them**
- **Identifying examples from any source that enable a community to monitor, investigate, inform, advise, & provide feedback as SAA's groups do**

Review of allied organizations and initiatives



- Existing component groups
- Component group structures
- Relevant working models
- Independent initiatives

Groups/organizations reviewed

- ARMA
- International Council on Archives
- Museum organizations (American Alliance of Museums, etc.)
- American Library Association
- Association of Moving Image Archivists
- Digital Library Federation
- Samvera (Hydra) community

ARMA

— — —

- No obvious component group structure
- Strong network of regional chapters
- Engagement is active and focuses on specific areas of knowledge

International Council on Archives

— — —

- Highly structured organization
- Component groups include professional sections, regional branches, and expert groups
- Professional Programme as a potential collaborative model

Museum organizations

- American Alliance of Museums
 - “Professional communities” based on overlap in job responsibilities and topics
 - Little overlap in terms of conceptualization used for this project
- Museum Computer Network
 - Special Interest Group structure
 - Minimal overhead to create: identify chairs and mission of “durable value”

American Library Association

- Model for component groups is both more formal but also seems to have fewer barriers
- Section structure focuses on professional functions; interest groups are more topically-focused
- Deeper investigation into LITA and ALCTS as sections and the interest groups associated with them is probably worthwhile

Association of Moving Image Archivists

- Two types of committees and associated ad-hoc, time-bound groups:
 - Committee of the board / Task force
 - Committee of the membership / Working group
- Relevant committees: Cataloging & Metadata; Open Source
- More extensive infrastructure to support
 - Project management tools
 - Small budget for special projects

Digital Library Federation

- Established history for providing infrastructure for groups intended to support cross-institutional work
- Clear overlap in scope of domain for this project
- Minimal barriers to establish new groups
- Strong set of resources for group facilitators (DLF Organizers' Toolkit)

Samvera (a.k.a. Hydra) community

- Situated within the context of an open source software project
- Structure allows for discussion-focused interest groups and deliverable-focused, time-bound working groups
- Existing Archivists Interest Group provides good insight into challenges

Evolution of independent initiative

- Born-Digital Access Research Team (2014-2015)
- Findings helped to develop #hackbdaccess (Born-Digital Access Hackfest) at 2015 SAA annual meeting
- Hackfest suggested need for a “born-digital access bootcamp”; developed and subsequently offered at 2017 NEA annual meeting
- Led to creation of DLF Born-Digital Access Group
- Also heavily relied on SAA Electronic Records Section to assist with communications

Early observations



- Lack of explicit space for technology within SAA
- Emerging external groups and support options

Questions

- What other organizations or initiatives should we investigate?
- When do we consider effort or scope to be duplicative, and why is that an issue?
- What are the perceived or actual barriers that prevent SAA, its membership, or groups from addressing gaps?

— — —

Thank you!

Mark A. Matienzo, Stanford University Libraries / @anarchivist

Please contact me at mark@matienzo.org if you are interested in providing feedback during the outreach phase