

Society of American Archivists Standards Committee Annual Report, 2016– 2017

Membership

Carrie Hintz (2014-2017; Co-Chair, 2015-2017)
Caitlin Christian-Lamb (2014-2018; Co-Chair, 2016-2018)
John Bence (2014-2018)
Hillary Bober (2014-2017)
Christiana Dobryzinski (2015-2018)
Julia Lipkins (2016-2019)
Anna Naruta-Moya (2015-2017)
Rebecca Wiederhold (2016-2018)
Lindsay Wittwer (2016-2019)

Bertram Lyons, Council Liaison (2016-2019)

Ex Officio:

Michelle Janowiecki (Intern)
Meg Tuomala (Immediate past Co-Chair)
Maureen Callahan (TS-DACS Co-Chair)
Adrien Hilton (TS-DACS Co-Chair)
Karin Bredenberg (TS-EAS Co-Chair)
Katherine Wisser (TS-EAS Co-Chair)
Laura Uglean Jackson (TS-GRD Chair)
Michele Pacifico (TS-AFG Co-Chair/Rep to NISO)
Claire Sibille-de Grimouard (Rep from ICA-EGAD)
Stephan Weatherly (Rep to ALA/Description & Access and MARC)
Sharry Watson (Rep from CAA CCAD)
Tom Wilsted (TS-AFG Co-Chair)

Vacant (Rep to ARMA)

Incoming members:

Keith Chevalier (2017-2020)
Kira Dietz (2017-2020)
Elizabeth Dunham (2017-2020)
Renaë Rapp (Intern, 2017-2018)

Incoming Chair:

John Bence (Co-Chair, 2017-2019)

Completed projects and activities

Governance

Technical Subcommittees and Task Forces

Council approved revisions to *Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning* and approved TS-GRD for another 5-year review cycle (to be completed by August 2022) in May 2017. Appointments for TS-GRD in this new review cycle are in progress. See appendix A for their annual report.

Council voted to extend term of the Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines in November 2016 (term will now end in August 2018), so that the current revision can be completed, reviewed, and published by TS-AFG.

\$11,000 approved by Council during February 2016 call to fund a DACS revision meeting in March 2017, as well as approving a change to TS-DACS description to allow a co-chair “as needed” and to add another regular subcommittee member. TS-DACS brought together a group of archival description experts at the 2016 Annual Meeting in order to evaluate existing principles and set the stage for full principles revision, which was conducted at the DACS Principles meeting in March 2017. See appendices B and C for the request for changed membership/co-chair structure, and a full report of the meeting, including revised DACS principles for community feedback, as submitted to Council, and appendix D for the TS-DACS annual report.

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for Public Services in Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries submitted a draft standard for review and approval by Standards and Council. The approval process agreed upon by the committee was to submit to RBMS first, then ACRL, then SAA. However, because of ACRL’s Standards Committee’s backlog, now ACRL will be submitted to last. This package was submitted to the RBMS Executive Committee on June 9, 2017.

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force for the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries has released a draft of its Level 1 Guidelines, now open for public comment. See appendix E for their full annual report.

Revisions to *Guidelines for a Graduate Program in Archival Studies* were approved by Council in November.

External representatives

The external representative to ARMA seat remains vacant.

Liaisons

The committee continues to use liaisons to SAA component groups for such purposes as calls for comments on draft standards. Communication with the liaisons is via the Standards collaboration listserv.

Endorsements and comments

Standards Committee participated in the following standards reviews this year:

External standards and documentation

The standards committee was asked to again consider endorsing the Role Delineation Statement developed by the Academy of Certified Archivists as an external standard. At the 2016 Annual Meeting Standards Committee voted that this was out of the committee's scope and needed to be considered by Council.

Standards Committee and TS-EAS submitted comments on ICA/EGAD Records in Context: A Contextual Model for Archival Description. See appendix F for submitted comments and appendix L for TS-EAS annual report.

Standards Committee added links to RightsStatements.org and the Intellectual Property Working Group's Guide to Implementing Rights Statements as a Non-Endorsed Standard following a January 2017 committee conference call, but did not endorse as an external standard at this time.

We added the following external standards to the Portal:

IASA-TC 03 (2005): Safeguarding the Audio Heritage: Ethics, Principles and Preservation Strategy (<http://www.iasa-web.org/tc03/ethics-principles-preservation-strategy>)

IASA-TC 04 (2009): Guidelines on the Production and Preservation of Digital Audio Objects (<http://www.iasa-web.org/audio-preservation-tc04>)

IASA-TC 05 (2014): Handling and Storage of Audio and Video Carriers (<http://www.iasa-web.org/handling-storage-tc05>)

Standards development and revision

Several standards are currently being developed or revised. Three standards are being developed in collaboration with the Rare Book and Manuscript Section of the American Library Association: Measured for Public Services, Holdings Counts and Measures, and Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy. All of these have been in active development this year.

Additionally, the technical subcommittee on archival facilities guidelines (TS-AFG) continues to work on a draft of a revision of that standard.

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force for the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for the Public Services of Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

- Draft standard was sent out for comments in January 2017 and submitted to RBMS for approval in June 2017
- See appendix G for complete report (not available in print packet due to size)

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force for the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

- Met at ALA Midwinter 2017
- Revision drafts underway as of June 15, 2017

- See appendix H for complete report

SAA/ACRL-RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy

- Development of Standard began in September of 2015 and is underway
- Draft circulated for comment in May 2017

Archival and Special Collections Facilities: Guidelines for Archivists, Librarians, Architects, and Engineers (Revision)

- Council voted to extend term of the Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines in November 2016 (term will now end in August 2018), so that the current revision can be completed
- See appendix I for complete report

Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning

- Revisions to *Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning* were approved by Council in May 2017
- TS-GRD was also renewed by Council for another 5-year review cycle (to be completed by August 2022) in May 2017
- See appendix A for complete report

Guidelines for Graduate Programs in Archival Studies

- Revisions to *Guidelines for a Graduate Program in Archival Studies* were approved by Council in November 2016
- See appendix J for council agenda item

Archival Continuing Education Guidelines

- Council passed a motion to revise the description of Committee on Education and create a Graduate Archival Education Subcommittee at the November 2016 meeting
- Committee on Education was tasked with revising and updating the Archival Continuing Education Guidelines
- ACE Guidelines were sent out for comment in May 2017

Describing Archives: A Content Standard

- Met in March 2017 to revise the DACS principles; revisions sent out for public comment in April 2017
- See appendix D for complete report

Ongoing projects and activities

Review of Standards portal (Julia and Michele) and discussion of defining a “standard” in the context of SAA Standards Committee

Committee members Michele Pacifico and Julia Stein compiled a spreadsheet of all external standards listed as endorsed on the committee’s page, recording name of standard, external organization that

developed the standard, a link to the standard, questions related to the standard, and recommendation to continue listing the standard or review it. During the May 5, 2017 Standards Committee conference call, members proposed developing straightforward, clear criteria for endorsing external standards.

Potential criteria include:

- Owned and maintained by an organization
- Something we can link to
- Currency - is it being updated, is there a schedule for updates
- Usage by membership
- Categorization of external standards - cleaning up organization
- Defining language - what does “endorsement” mean? By Standards Committee and/or by SAA as a whole – is there a difference? What does providing a link to a standard but not endorsing it mean?
- ISO standards - behind paywall, do we want to recommend standards that might not be accessible to SAA members? On the other hand, ISO is the maintainer of many standards that apply to the archival profession, so not including these would also pose a major problem.

Committee members voted to table action on criteria and next steps, pending a full committee discussion at the 2017 Annual Meeting. See appendix K for spreadsheet and the notes from conference call.

Initiatives associated with the 2013–2018 Strategic Plan

Goal 1: Advocating for Archivists and Archives

Revisions to *Guidelines for Graduate Programs in Archival Studies*, which provide a set of benchmarks for graduate programs to use to ensure that emerging professionals are equipped to succeed in the archives field (1.1).

Goal 2: Enhancing Professional Growth

All approved standards are added to the Standards Portal, delivering information effectively and affordably (2.2). Employing the use of continuous revision cycles for standards (used by both *DACS* and *EAD3*) allows for the delivery of information that keeps pace with technological change (2.2).

Reviewing the *Archival Continuing Education Guidelines* and supporting the revamped *DACS* curriculum developed by TS-DACS helps to ensure that the educational offerings available to archivists are appropriate, high value, and meet the developmental needs of participants (2.1, 2.2).

Goal 3: Advancing the Field

The committee continues to support the active revision of existing standards *Archival and Special Collections Facilities: Guidelines for Archivists, Librarians, Architects and Engineers*, *Guidelines on Reappraisal and Deaccessioning*, and *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (3.1).

Continued work on the joint task forces with RBMS will both develop new standards (3.1) and enable active participation in partnerships and collaborations (3.3).

Goal 4: Meeting Members' Needs

Continuing to use liaisons and the Standards Collaboration listserv, and seeking wider comments on draft standards facilitates communication (4.1) and creates opportunities for members to participate (4.2).

In addition to convening multiple conference calls since the 2014 annual meeting, the co-chairs continued to seek standards committee member involvement in drafting Council agenda items and reviewing drafts of those items. Additionally, we held a few discussions and votes remotely (over email) when faced with requests for quick turnaround on getting recommendations to Council. These activities improve communication among committee members (4.1) and create opportunities for broader participation among committee members (4.2).

Continuing to appoint standards committee, technical subcommittee, and task force members and chairs who are early to mid-career archivists provides expanded leadership opportunities in SAA (4.2).

Questions and concerns for Council attention

The external representative to ARMA International remains vacant pending additional research regarding a 2008 Memorandum of Agreement between SAA and ARMA International (item D.3, Council meeting minutes, August 12–13, 2013¹). Last year our Council liaison reported to standards committee that SAA staff would investigate this matter. The committee simply wishes to remind the Council of this in case it is considered a priority.

Respectfully Submitted,
Carrie Hintz and Caitlin Christian-Lamb, Co-Chairs, 2016–2017

Appendices

Appendix 1: Annual Report of the Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines (TS-AFG)

Appendix 2: Annual Report of the Technical Subcommittee on *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (TS-DACS)

Appendix 3: Annual Report of the Technical Subcommittee on Encoded Archival Standards (TS-EAS)

Appendix 4: Annual Report of the Technical Subcommittee on Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning (TS-GRD)

Appendix 5: Annual [Final] Report of the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy (JTF-PSL)

Appendix 6: Annual Report of the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (JTF-HCM)

Appendix 7: SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for the Public Services of Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (JTF-PSM)

Appendix 8: Annual Report of SAA representative to NISO

To: SAA Standards Committee

From: Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facility Guidelines (TS-AFG)

Re: Annual Report to the SAA Standards Committee

Date: July 19, 2017

Below is the annual report for the TS-AFG, 2016-2017

As of 2016 the extension for the continuing work of the TS-AFG had expired and the revised US-Canadian standard was still in draft. Michele Pacifico attended the Standards Committee meeting at the annual meeting on August 2, 2016. After discussion at the Standards Committee meeting it was agreed that the TS-AFG would request SAA Council to extend the TS-AFG to August 2018 and to recruit new members, as some of the original subcommittee members had retired.

The TS-AFG hosted an Open Forum at the 2016 Annual meeting. Michele Pacifico showed a PowerPoint presentation on the subcommittee's work to date and on the challenges of revising the standard to reflect new science and sustainability issues. It drew approximately 25 SAA members and much discussion. At the forum, several SAA members expressed interest in participating in the work of the subcommittee.

On October 11, 2016, the Standards Committee submitted a formal request to the SAA Council to extend the TS-AFG to August 2018 and it was approved. The request is attached to this report.

By May 2017, a new TS-AFG was established with both former and new members. Michele Pacifico and Tom Wilsted agreed to continue as co-chairs. The new membership is listed below.

Last Name	First Name	Role	Term	Company
Pacifico	Michele	Co-Chair	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Pacifico Archival Consulting
Wilsted	Thomas	Co-Chair	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Wilsted Consulting
Fritz	Angela	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	University of Notre Dame
Graham	Fiona	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	

Linden	Jeremy	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Image Permanence Institute, Rochester Institute of Technology
Owings	David	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	
Teixeira	Scott	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Hartman-Cox Architects
Trinkaus-Randall	Gregor	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners
Christian-Lamb	Caitlin	Ex Officio (Standards Committee Co- chair)	8/6/2016 - 8/18/2018	Davidson College
Hintz	Carrie	Ex Officio (Standards Committee Co- Chair)	8/22/2015 - 7/29/2017	Emory University
Lyons	Bertram	Council Liaison	8/6/2016 - 8/15/2019	AVPreserve

Emails have been sent to the new TS-AFG to update them on the work of the subcommittee. The entire subcommittee will not be attending the 2017 SAA Annual Meeting so arrangements will be made for a conference call in September to begin work on a new draft of the standards. Michele will meet in person with those subcommittee members in Portland. Once the draft is completed, it will need to be vetted by multiple groups, reviewed by the Standards Committee, and then develop final revisions. We hope to again have a copy editor and someone to format our charts. Michele Pacifico will be meeting with Chris Prom and Teresa Brinati during the 2017 Annual meeting to discuss the publication details.

The TS-AFG will again host an Open Forum at the 2017 Annual meeting on Thursday, July 27 from 12:15 to 1:30. In addition to Michele presenting an overview of the work on the SAA Standard, new TS-AFG member Jeremy Linden will present on IPI's research on collections preservation environments. We hope it is as successful as our previous forums. Michele will again use the forum to solicit interest in the guidelines and the subcommittee. The open forum announcement that was sent out to SAA lists reads:

[Join us for an open forum to update colleagues on the developing joint US/Canadian facility standard. Michele Pacifico, co-chair of the Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facility Guidelines](#)

(TS-AFG), and members of the subcommittee, will discuss some of the challenges in developing the revised standard for facilities and the “new thinking” about preservation and sustainable systems, review the open issues and draft content, pose questions, and seek comments on the kind of information members would like to see in the revised standard. Jeremy Linden, an incoming member of the TS-AFG, also will provide an overview of the Image Permanence Institute's (IPI) new *Energy-Saving Methodology for Library and Archives Environments*, a user guide to testing and implementing sustainability strategies for collections preservation environments. The creation of the *Methodology* was funded by a 2013-2017 IMLS National Leadership Grant.

All are welcome and encouraged to participate!

The subcommittee currently has no funding for the revised publication. We used the remaining funds leftover from our 2007 Spacesaver grant to fund the subcommittee's 2013 meeting. To date our attempts at additional grants have not been successful.

Respectfully submitted,
Michele F. Pacifico and Thomas Wilsted
Co-Chairs, SAA Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines

Society of American Archivists

Council Meeting

Chicago, Illinois

**Standards Committee – Technical Subcommittee on Archival
Facilities Guidelines (TS-AFG)**

Prepared by: Michele F. Pacifico and Carrie Hintz, October 11, 2016

BACKGROUND

The Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines was charged in August 2010 with the ongoing maintenance and development of *Archives and Special Collections Facilities: Guidelines for Archivists, Librarians, Architects, and Engineers* (“Facilities standard”), a standard adopted by SAA. The technical subcommittee also investigates the feasibility of expansion of the Facilities standard to a national standard and/or a multi-organizational standard.

The TS-AFG set out to revise the 2009 standard for archival facilities while expanding it to be a joint US-Canadian standard. A draft has been completed by the past US- CCA members of the subcommittee and is currently undergoing significant revision. The details of the joint nature of the standard and how it will be reviewed and finalized still need to be finalized.

The TS-AFG term was originally set to expire in August 2015. The term was extended to August of 2016 due to ongoing development and maintenance of the standard. The revisions to the standard have not been completed during its 5-year review cycle (extended to 6 years). This Action Item requests that the length of term for TS-AFG be extended until August of 2018.

Original Charge for the Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines (TS-AFG)

I. Purpose

The Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines (TS-AFG) of the SAA Standards Committee oversees the ongoing maintenance and development of *Archives and Special Collections Facilities: Guidelines for Archivists, Librarians, Architects, and Engineers* (“Facilities standard”), a standard adopted by SAA. The technical subcommittee also investigates the feasibility of expansion of the Facilities standard to a national standard and/or a multi-organizational standard.

II. Subcommittee Selection, Size, and Length of Term:

“TS-AFG shall be charged for five years, beginning August 2010, or until revisions to the Facilities standard are completed as described in the [Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard](#). [TS-AFG's original length of term was extended to August 2016 by the SAA Executive Committee on July 27, 2015.] After revision work is completed, if the Facilities standard continues to be an approved standard of SAA, the TS-AFG shall be re-charged for a subsequent review cycle.

The members and chair(s) of the TS-AFG shall be appointed for the length of time necessary to complete revisions to the Facilities standard, which shall not exceed five years.

The technical subcommittee shall be composed of five to eight individuals, including the chair(s), to be recommended by the Standards Committee for appointment by the Vice President. The chair(s) and at least four other members of the subcommittee shall be a member of SAA with demonstrated experience in archival facility issues. However, the technical subcommittee may include one to three members from other professions who have significant knowledge of and experience with archival facilities.

Ex officio members of the TS-AFG shall include the following:

- Co-chairs of the Standards Committee;
- Liaison from Canadian Council of Archives (CCA).

DISCUSSION [for Action and Discussion Items, should not exceed 1 to 2 pages]

Since the last publication of the standards for archival facilities, there has been new research, new preservation standards, and “new thinking” about archives facilities and how their special needs can be addressed in a changing environmental world. The TS-AFG subcommittee has spent the last two years following the issues and challenges related to sustainability, climate change, resiliency, and the technical subcommittee is working to properly address these trends and findings in the revised archival facility standard.

TS-AFG remains an active and engaged group. The Technical Subcommittee holds open forums at the annual SAA conference to discuss the challenges in developing the revised standard for facilities and the “new thinking” about preservations, systems, and sustainability for archives, review the open issues, pose questions, and seek comments on the kind of information members would like to see in the revised standard. In 2015 and 2016 attendance was very high and members are very interested in having current facility standards address these issues.

Additionally, the guidelines remain meaningful to the SAA membership. SAA sold out the first run of the standards publication and has ordered more to address the demand while the standards are being revised. This demonstrates the need for an ongoing set of guidelines around archival facilities, and indicates that the community sees value in this work.

RECOMMENDATION(S) [for Action Items only]

That the length of term of the Standards Committee’s Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines be extended until August of 2018 so that the current revision may be completed, reviewed, edited, and published.

Support Statement:

The SAA-Approved Standard: *Archival and Special Collections Facilities: Guidelines for Archivists, Librarians, Architects, and Engineers* provides valuable guidance to small, medium and large archival institutions as they seek to maintain, upgrade, renovate, or build archival facilities. The term for the Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines should be extended until August of 2018 so that the subcommittee can complete its revision to the standard.

Impact on Strategic Priorities:

The work of the TS-AFG assists in achieving Goal #3 of SAA’s Strategic Plan: “Advancing the Field.”

Fiscal Impact:

Should the facilities standard effort continue as a joint US-Canadian standard, some coordination by the SAA Executive Director will be needed. In addition, the final publication will require support from the Director of Publishing.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION [for Discussion Items only]

None

Technical Subcommittee on *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (TS-DACS) Annual Report

July 2017

The Technical Subcommittee on *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (TS-DACS) has had an active and productive year in fulfillment of its charge to oversee the timely and ongoing intellectual and technical maintenance and development of *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (DACS). This report covers the period August 2016-July 2017.

The major focus of the committee over the past year has been leading a group of archival description experts in a revision process for the DACS Principles of Archival Description (hereafter referred to as the Principles). At the annual meeting last year, the group convened for an [initial assessment of the current principles](#). Each principle was [analyzed](#) in terms of its clarity, relevance, and teachability. It was determined that a full rewrite of the principles was warranted. Members of TS-DACS drafted a funding request to SAA, which was initially rejected. We submitted a [subsequent proposal](#) with a change in venue that was accepted. The committee then went on to organize and arrange a five-day work retreat for eighteen participants held at the Lewis Walpole Library of Yale University in Farmington, Connecticut. A [full report](#) of the work meeting was submitted to SAA leadership and Council.

The work retreat successfully produced what we considered a [minimum viable product](#) (MVP) that was ready to be tested and commented on by the community at large. The idea of an MVP is to test and to test often, as taken from the software development community, in order to continually hone your product before you get too far down a potentially misguided path. We put out a request for public comment on the revised principles in April, announcing the revision process through listservs, Twitter, and direct emails. The draft was sent to fifteen first reviewers, consisting of expert practitioners and seasoned theorists. We created a [structured form](#) on Google for gathering the data that could be parsed and analyzed in a single place. Since July 1, the deadline for public comment, we've been [analyzing the feedback](#) through a combination of careful reading and a series of worksheets. We've asked our analyzers to suggest a possible resolution to the comments we received, whether that is through more revision, direct education, enhancing the DACS workshop, or with introductory remarks to the revised principles.

TS-DACS continued to polish our work on the DACS workshop revision. The [webinars and quizzes](#) were mounted on SAA's website. The workshop was taught two times and received

positive feedback on the revised format. Our intention for the coming year is to make a final push in refining and packaging the workshop content and delving into how to best educate around Part II of DACS.

One revision was made to DACS through the use of Github and our community comment mechanisms. It consisted of an [update to the crosswalks to account for EAD3](#).

TS-DACS created a [communication strategy](#) that will serve in the coming year as a basis for which to educate and advertise the standard and the work of TS-DACS. The committee also produced [documentation](#) for the SAA Vice President / President-Elect and the Nominating and Standards Committees when selecting new members for TS-DACS. The documentation outlines both requirements and expectations to help those who want to join the committee and also those doing the selecting. Lastly, the committee successfully lobbied for [changes in our charge](#) to include an additional member, allow for co-chairs, and to advocate for membership to be archival description experts.

Lastly, we commented publicly on two documents, the [Records in Contexts](#) draft revision to the suite of ISAD standards and the [OCLC report on metadata for web archives](#).

TS-EAS Report, Standards Committee
July 25, 2017

Membership 2016-2017

Katherine Wisser, co-chair
Karin Bredenberg, co-chair
Anila Angjeli
Erica Boudreau
Lina Bountouri
Florence Clavaud
Mark Custer
Wim van Dongen
Regine Heberlein
Noah Huffman
Silke Jagodzinski
Joost van Koutrik
Aaron Rubenstein
Michael Rush
Claire Sibille-de Grimouard
William Stockting
Ruth Tillman
Adrian Turner
Stefano Vitali

Subcommittee overview

2016-2017 was the first year of TS-EAS. The subcommittee is charged with the development and maintenance of the encoding standards in support of archival descriptive practices. In order to tackle this far-reaching charge, the subcommittee used the annual meeting in 2016 to devise a strategy and develop priorities. The technical subcommittee devised a series of teams to deal with the various standards in the charge. Seven teams were formed at that meeting and volunteers from the committee took lead:

- EAD Team (Rush)
- EAC-CPF Team (Jagodzinski)
- EAC-F Team (van Koutrik)
- Schema Team (Custer)
- Documentation Team (Tillman)
- Collaboration with other standards Team (Heberlein)
- RiC Team (Angjeli)

Additionally, a secretary (Boudreau) was recruited from the membership to work with the co-chairs on subcommittee documentation and meetings. Members then signed up to work on

various teams. Each team also had a co-chair member to support any needs the team might have.

Accomplishments

Below are listed the accomplishments reported by teams:

- Submitted TS-EAS feedback on draft of Records in Context (RiC) in 2016.
- Established GitHub repositories for EAD3 and EAC-CPF standards maintenance and bug reporting.
- EAD Team resolved feature requests and bug reports submitted through the GitHub repository
- Completed an implementation survey for EAD3
- Collected feedback and comments on open and outstanding EAC-CPF issues and uploaded those in GitHub
- Significant research for the justification of EAC-F, based on use cases and literature
- Preparing a release of EAD3 1.1 for community testing
- Website revisions completed at the Library of Congress and Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin (by Glenn Gardner and Gerhard Müller respectively)
- Issue webpage created and available in GitHub

Annual Meeting objectives

Each team has considered the priorities established during the 2016 meeting, accomplishments of the year, initiatives currently underway, and priorities for the next year to be discussed in the annual meeting 2017. Additionally, the subcommittee will devote some of the meeting time to conduct a self-reflection on the team structure and strategies for being more productive in the next year. Decision points that will be covered at the meeting:

- Revision of EAC-CPF
- EAG as a part of the TS-EAS charge
- Approach for EAC-F and development of examples to assist in determining that approach; development of tag library aligned with ISDF within the protocols of existing tag libraries.
- Proposal for schema and tag library maintenance strategies

Annual Report: Technical Sub-Committee on Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning (TS-GRD)

August 2016-July 2017

Submitted by: Laura Uglean Jackson, July 20, 2017

Members:

Laura Uglean Jackson (Chair)

Chela Weber (Committee Member)

Mark Shelstad (Committee Member)

Margery Sly (Committee Member)

Bethany Anderson (Ex Officio, Acquisitions & Appraisal Section)

Caitlin Christian-Lamb (Ex Officio, Standards Committee Co-Chair)

Carrie Hintz (Ex Officio, Standards Committee Co-Chair)

Bertram Lyons (Council Liaison)

Please accept the final report for the first review cycle of the TS-GRD. It outlines our activities for the year and includes recommendations to improve the review process for SAA standards.

In the TS-GRD's final year, we successfully completed the review and revision process for the Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning.

In October 2016, we submitted the full review package to the Standards Committee with a recommendation to revise the Guidelines. The TS-GRD replaced outdated forms and definitions, made minor additions and deletions to clarify procedure and make it applicable to all types of repositories, and revised the cover page to reflect the new version. All of these changes were minor, there were no substantive changes recommended or made, yet we had to go through the lengthy and somewhat cumbersome process of proposing that the standard be revised according to the Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard, sections V.C through V.D.7. We encourage the SAA Standards Committee to consider changing the process (make it simpler, faster, and more streamlined) for Standards review when the proposed changes during a review cycle are minor.

The Standards Committee approved the changes in November 2016 and forwarded the review package to SAA Council. Council reviewed and voted to approve the changes in May 2017, and implemented a new five year review cycle. The revised standard was made available online in June.

One final recommendation for improving the review process is to make explicitly clear that the sub-committee include the standard with the revised additions underlined and deletions struck through in the review package. In January, the TS-GRD chair received an email from the Council Liaison requesting the document with the revisions ASAP, so that Council could vote on the revisions at their next meeting. The *Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard* does not state that this document with the changes noted needs to be included in the review package.

The chair and committee members of TS-GRD wish to thank SAA for the opportunity to lead the first review of the Guidelines. We believe that the revised Guidelines will serve the archival community well for its collection management activities now and into the future.

Society of American Archivists Standards Committee

Final Report of the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy (JTF-PSL)

(Prepared by: Bill Landis, SAA co-chair of the JTF-PSL)

SUMMARY

The Joint Task Force on the Development of Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy (JTF-PSL) was jointly charged by Society of American Archivists (SAA) Council and the Executive Committee of the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL/RBMS) in late 2014/early 2015¹ with the following tasks:

- “Develop a definition of primary source literacy and a set of guidelines—standards, performance indicators, and outcomes directed at college and university students. These Guidelines will address primary sources wherever they might be available (e.g., in physical collections, in published volumes, in licensed databases) and will be applicable to a wide range of institutional types that offer instructional services.”
- “Consult broadly in developing Guidelines with professional organizations of those who teach and use primary sources, in addition to archives and library organizations.”
- “Ensure that the language and scope of the Guidelines are appropriate for those teaching and learning with primary sources.”
- “Publicize and conduct public hearings, public comment periods, or both to ensure that members of the archives and library professions have adequate opportunities to become aware of and contribute to the development of the Guidelines.”
- “Follow procedures outlined in SAA’s *Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard* and ACRL’s *Procedures for Preparation of New Standards and Guidelines* to ensure that the SAA Council, ACRL Standards, and RBMS Executive Committee can approve and adopt the Guidelines in a timely manner.”

The JTF-PSL conducted its work as charged between September 2015 and July 2017. This is the final report of the JTF-PSL to the SAA Standards Committee. The report is accompanied by the final version of the *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy*, along with the supporting documentation to assist the Standards Committee to review the *Guidelines for Primary Source*

¹ The full ACRL/RBMS charge is located at <http://www.ala.org/acrl/rbms/acr-rbmtfjpsl?year=2017>, and the full SAA charge at <https://www2.archivists.org/governance/handbook/section8/groups/SAA-ACRL-RBMS-Joint-Task-Force-on-Primary-Source-Literacy>.

Literacy and develop a recommendation to the SAA Council regarding the document's potential adoption as an official standard of the Society of American Archivists, per the *Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard*.

TASK FORCE WORK

Members of the Joint Task Force began work following the 2015 SAA annual meeting. The bulk of our work was accomplished through scheduled bi-weekly conference calls, which were held only as needed. Throughout the time working on our charge we have posted meeting and conference call minutes, work documents, and drafts of the *Guidelines* on our SAA-hosted microsite at

<https://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-primary-source-literacy>.

We spent six months conducting and discussing background research in an effort to ensure as broad a disciplinary perspective as possible on the topic of primary source literacy, and also seeking to identify possible successful models for our final product. This effort focused on exploring places of potential intersection with the ACRL *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*² and that document's January 2016 ACRL-approved replacement *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*^{3, 4}. We also explored the websites of a number of discipline-specific professional organizations with possible interests in teaching primary source-based research, looking for articulations of guidelines, best practices, or standards of any type.⁵ Finally we conducted a review of professional literature that touches on primary source literacy⁶, and also assembled a communication plan and draft timeline for our work⁷.

During the course of our two-years of work on the *Guidelines* we worked as transparently as possible, regularly posting updates to our SAA-hosted microsite (and the companion ALA Connect site hosted by RBMS), and seeking feedback in both virtual and in-person venues. We posted our first draft of the *Guidelines* in June 2016 and focused our efforts to gather feedback on this initial work from the library and archives communities. We solicited feedback using an online digress.it version of the draft, hosted by the RBMS Web Team, which allowed commenters to log in and supply comments directly at relevant places within the document. We also provided a primarysourceliteracy@gmail.com email address for commenters who felt more comfortable providing feedback in that way. We hosted well-attended open forums on our work

² <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency>

³ <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>

⁴ The report on this activity is available at <https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/JTF-PSLSubgroupReportACRLFrameworkDecember2015.pdf>.

⁵ The report on this activity is available at <https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/JTF-PSLSubgroupReportOtherGuidelinesDecember2015.pdf>.

⁶ The report on this activity is available at <https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/JTF-PSLSubgroupReportLiteratureReviewDecember2015.pdf>.

⁷ The report on this activity is available at <https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/JTF-PSLSubgroupReportCommunicationsDecember2015.pdf>.

leading to the first draft of the *Guidelines*, and once available on the first draft itself, at the SAA 2015 annual meeting (Cleveland, OH, 20 August), the ALA 2016 midwinter meeting (Boston, MA, 10 January), the 2016 ALA annual meeting (Orlando, FL, 26 June), and the 2016 SAA annual meeting (Atlanta, GA, 4 August).

Following a summer of gathering feedback on the first draft, we worked in subgroups to analyze feedback and determine best approaches to incorporating it into a second draft. We posted the second draft of the *Guidelines* in April 2017. We again used an online digress.it version and the primarysourceliteracy@gmail.com address as the primary mechanisms for soliciting feedback. We broadened our outreach efforts to seek feedback on the second draft by sending emails to a host of organizations representing constituencies that have interests in primary source literacy⁸. As with the first draft, we used the following meetings to solicit in-person input on our work leading to second draft and on the draft itself: the 2017 ALA midwinter meeting (Atlanta, GA, 22 January), and the ALA annual meeting (Chicago, IL, 24 June). We will hold our final open forum on the *Guidelines* at the 2017 SAA annual meeting (Portland, OR, 26 July), which coincides with the expiration of our charge.

Serendipitously, the Information Literacy Section of the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) hosted a satellite pre-conference at DePaul University in Chicago in August 2016. We were approached by organizers and encouraged to submit a panel proposal. Four JTF-PSL members (Samantha Crisp, Gordon Daines, Sarah Horowitz, and Heather Smedberg) presented a well-attended (approximately 90 participants) and well-received panel discussion of our work to that point, and then led 30-minute small group discussions, followed by a 30-minute “reporting out” discussion. This was immensely helpful, coming towards the end of our open comment period on the first draft of the *Guidelines*, to all members of the JTF-PSL as we began our work to analyze and make sense of the feedback we received.

RELATIONSHIP WITH THE ACRL INFORMATION LITERACY FRAMEWORK

The JTF-PSL’s work overlapped with a period of significant changes to the broader information literacy landscape. Throughout its work, RBMS appointees to the JTF-PSL have consulted with the ACRL Information Literacy Standards Committee on our ongoing work, and our determination not to closely mirror the structure and language of the ACRL *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*, which was adopted in January 2016. Much of the work within ACRL since the *Framework’s* adoption has focused on relationships between the

⁸ Emails were sent to the following organizations soliciting feedback on the second draft of the *Guidelines*: relevant H-Net listservs, National History Day organizers in each of the 50 states and Puerto Rico, the SAA leaders listserv and the RAO Section distribution list, the RBMS listserv, Regional Archival Associations Consortium co-chairs, Reference and User Services Association of ACRL, Modern Language Association, American Historical Association, Organization of American Historians, American Association for State and Local History, National Council on Public History, National Council for History Education, American Association of Museums, National Council for Social Studies, National Council of Teachers of English, and American Studies Association.

Framework and various discipline-specific guidelines and standards for information literacy. Primary source literacy, while cognizant of varying applications within specific academic disciplines, transcends those disciplinary boundaries in important ways. We attempted to remain discipline neutral in our work on the *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy*, while still remaining thoughtful about their relation to the broader *Framework* in which many may attempt to situate them when thinking about how best to utilize these *Guidelines*.

Finally, one of the primary areas on which we received a significant amount of feedback was the absence of examples in the drafts of the *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy*. Omitting examples of application and assessment was a conscious decision of the members of the JTF-PSL for a number of reasons:

- JTF-PSL members represent a small number of types of institutions in which instruction, outreach, and assessment of research using primary sources may be important. We did not feel that we collectively had the institutional expertise to create broadly useful and applicable examples and possibly tacitly setting some kind of “standards” or best practices beyond the learning objectives included in the *Guidelines*.
- There is as yet no infrastructure designated within either SAA or RBMS (the RBMS Executive Committee, at its meetings in late June 2016 has approved the *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy* and taken the initial steps of approving a new Instruction and Outreach Committee, which will presumably be charged with maintaining and updating the *Guidelines* for that organization) for active maintenance of the *Guidelines*. Members of the JTF-PSL were concerned with including examples in this document at a point where our group would be disbanded and there was no organizational home for ensuring representational and useful examples for communities seeking to use the *Guidelines*.

We felt that SAA’s infrastructure for case studies ePublications series⁹ are a promising model for allowing members of the archives, library, and other interested communities to provide successful and challenging examples of the application and use of the *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy* and assessment based on instruction using them. This option seemed to be one that could be successful regardless of the organization decisions to be made within SAA and RBMS about the maintenance over time of the *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy*.

Members of the JTF-PSL prepared draft documentation on what a possible ePublications series of *Case Studies on Teaching with Primary Sources* might entail, following existing models, and received enthusiastic support for pursuing this option from Chris Prom, SAA Publications Editor, and Teresa Brinati, SAA Director of Publications. Believing that the Reference, Access, and Outreach (RAO) Section of SAA would be an ideal institutional home for such an ePublications series, we then opened discussions with Su Kim Chung and Alison Stankrauff, chair and

⁹ See for example *Campus Case Studies* (<https://www2.archivists.org/publications/epubs/Campus-Case-Studies>) and *Case Studies in Archival Ethics* (<https://www2.archivists.org/groups/committee-on-ethics-and-professional-conduct/case-studies-in-archival-ethics>).

vice-chair respectively, to see if there was interest from within the section's leadership, which there was. The case studies ePublication, a single-blind peer reviewed series, presents interesting and complementary opportunities for the instruction and outreach community with RAO's Teaching with/about Primary Sources Committee¹⁰ and its work. Bill Landis, SAA's co-chair of the JTF-PSL, has agreed to serve as initial editor for the new SAA ePublications series *Case Studies on Teaching with Primary Sources*, and will work with Chris Prom and Teresa Brinati and the RAO Section leadership following the 2017 annual meeting to launch this effort.

FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS

Bill Landis will be in touch with the Standards Committee co-chairs to determine what additional supporting documentation¹¹ is needed to enable the Standards Committee to conduct its review of the *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy* to prepare its report and recommendation to Council.

¹⁰ See

<https://www2.archivists.org/groups/reference-access-and-outreach-section/teaching-withabout-primary-sources-committee>.

¹¹ Per Section IIIB of *Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard*:

<https://www2.archivists.org/governance/handbook/section7/groups/Standards/Procedures-Review-Approval-SAA-Developed-Standard>.

**Society of American Archivists
Standards Committee
July 20, 2017**

**SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development
of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures
for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries
(Prepared by: Emily R. Novak Gustainis, SAA Co-chair)**

Annual Report to Standards Committee

BACKGROUND

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (hereafter "JTF-HCM") is responsible for the development of guidelines (hereafter "Guidelines") that will provide metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries. The Guidelines will consider and address both the wide range of types and formats of material typically held--including analog, digital, and audiovisual materials--and the different ways in which collection material is managed and described. The Guidelines might also accommodate a two-tiered approach involving basic/minimum metrics and advanced/optimum metrics and/or include recommendations for institutions that wish to engage in collections assessment.

Officers

- Martha O'Hara Conway, Co-Chair, ACRL/RBMS, University of Michigan
- Emily R. Novak Gustainis, Co-Chair, SAA, Harvard University

Membership

- Adriana Cuervo (SAA), Rutgers University
- Elizabeth Haven-Hawley (ACRL/RBMS), University of Florida
- Rachel D'Agostino (ACRL/RBMS), Library Company of Philadelphia
- Lara Friedman-Shedlov (ACRL/RBMS), University of Minnesota
- Angela Fritz (SAA), University of Arkansas Libraries
- Lisa Miller (SAA rep), Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University
- Katy Rawdon (ACRL/RBMS), Temple University
- Cyndi Shein (SAA), University of Nevada, Las Vegas Libraries

SUMMARY OF MEETING ACTIVITIES

The Joint Task Force met thirty-one times between September 1, 2016 and July 25, 2017.

This includes:

- 14 standing meetings via conference call
- 12 working sessions via conference call
- 2 working meetings scheduled during ALA Midwinter (January 22, 2017) and SAA Annual (July 25, 2017)
- 3 open meetings for ALA (January 22, 2017 and June 25, 2017) and SAA membership (July 25, 2017)

Minutes through March 2 are available on the SAA microsite:

<http://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-holdings-metrics/jtf-hcm-meetings>; post-March 2, meeting discussion points were generally recorded in draft documents. Should the Committee be renewed, the posting of formal minutes for its standing meetings will resume in September.

ONGOING ACTIVITIES

The Joint Task Force is currently engaged in:

1. Refining its draft timeline for proposed 2017-2018 activities (attached)
2. Revising core documentation and drafting guidance in response to feedback received for the draft *Level 1 Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries* distributed January 11, 2017
3. Preparing scenarios for the application of the Level 1 rubric to accompany (or potentially replace) distributed "Examples and Explanations" document
4. Preparing responses to feedback received from RBMS and SAA communities

COMPLETED ACTIVITIES

During the reporting period, the Task Force:

- Completed and posted draft *Level 1 Guidelines* to SAA microsite
- Distributed call for comments and feedback on the draft Guidelines to thirty professional organizations and listservs, with comment period open from January 11, 2017 – March 3, 2017
- Compiled, categorized, and conducted preliminary review of feedback received from eighteen individual RBMS and SAA members and collectively from members of the Special Collections and Archives Council of the Harvard University Library. Comments and corresponding issues extracted from feedback received can be summarized as follows:

- Born digital and digitized content-related (19 comments)
 - Categories/types of collection material (7 comments)
 - Containers (1 comment)
 - Determining physical and digital space occupied/conducting count and units of measure (21 comments)
 - Discoverability requirement (5 comments)
 - Other (15 comments)
- Revised core document, “Categories/Types of Collection Material” in response to feedback (attached)
 - Revised core document, “Level 1 Count” Rubric in response to feedback (attached)
 - Drafted outline for *Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (Level 1 and 2 Counts)*

UPCOMING ACTIVITIES

- Consult with SAA Standards Liaison John Bence regarding extension/renewal request procedures
- Submit extension request/renewal with smaller Task Force membership (attached)

**SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development
of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures
for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries**
(Prepared by: Emily R. Novak Gustainis, SAA Co-chair)

Proposed Timeline: August 1, 2017 – August 31, 2018

Aug. 2017	Review feedback received during the Annual SAA meeting, Portland, Oregon; Prepare Task Force extension request
Sept. 2017	Submit extension request
Sept. 2017 – Jan.2018	Finalize level 1 documentation; develop and prepare supporting documentation for Level 2
Feb. 2018	Post revised <i>Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries</i> to SAA microsite, incorporating final revisions to Level 1 Guidelines and introducing Level 2 rubric and supporting documentation; issue call for comments and feedback through March 16, 2018
Mar.-June. 2018	Compile, categorize, review, and respond to community feedback; make revisions as necessary
July 2018	Prepare <i>Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (Level 1 and 2)</i> and supporting documentation for submission to SAA Standards Committee
Aug. 2018	Hold open meeting at SAA to present Guidelines release; meet with Standards Committee; submit final annual report to SAA Council

Categories/Types of Collection Material

Archival and Manuscript Material

Definition: Documents, or aggregations of documents, in any form or medium, created or received by a person, family, or organization, public or private, in the conduct of its affairs and preserved because of their continuing value.

Scope: Includes organic collections, artificial collections (including vertical files), records, and manuscripts. Manuscripts may take the form of fragments, scrolls, codices, or single or multiple sheets. Also includes data, email, and archived web content.

Published Language Material

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form of notation for language and intended for distribution.

Scope: Includes books, pamphlets, single-sheet publications, and other formats of textual material, as well as formats that present non-textual content in book form, including artists' books and graphic novels.

Cartographic Material

Definition: Collection material consisting of content that represents the whole or a part of the Earth, any celestial body, or an imaginary place.

Scope: Includes cartographic datasets, images, moving images, and three-dimensional forms. Also includes atlases, diagrams, globes, maps, models, profiles, remote-sensing images, sections, and views.

Computer Programs

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through digitally encoded instructions intended to be processed and performed by a computer.

Scope: Includes operating systems and applications software.

Graphic/Visual Material

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through line, shape, shading, pigment, etc., intended to be perceived primarily in two dimensions.

Scope: Includes material in opaque and transparent formats, including those intended to be projected. Includes conventional still images as well as still images that give the illusion of depth or motion. Includes charts, collages,

drawings, paintings, photographs (positives and negatives), postcards, posters, and prints. Includes interactive and/or dynamic materials such as advent calendars, anatomical flap books, paper dolls, volvelles, and computer aided design (CAD) and building information modeling (BIM) files.

Moving Image Material

Definition: Collection material consisting of recorded content expressed through images intended to be perceived as moving, and in two or three dimensions.

Scope: Includes motion pictures using live action and/or animation; film and video recordings, including digitally streamed content; and video games.

Notated Movement

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form of notation for movement.

Scope: Includes forms of notated movement for dance and game play.

Notated Music

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form of musical notation.

Scope: Includes choir books; table books; sheet music; vocal, instrumental, and conductor parts; and complete scores.

Objects/Artifacts

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form or forms intended to be perceived in three dimensions

Scope: Includes artifacts (objects intentionally made or produced for a certain purpose) and naturally-occurring objects.

Sound Recordings

Definition: Collection material consisting of recorded content expressed through language or music in an audible form, or recorded content other than language or music expressed in an audible form.

Scope: Includes recordings of readings, recitations, speeches, interviews, oral histories, performed music, and natural and artificially-produced sounds, as well as computer-generated speech and music.

Level 1 Count Rubric 2017_Revised

	Intellectual Units Held
	Number of Titles/Title Equivalents
Archival and Manuscript Material	
managed as items	recommended (level 1)
managed as collections	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Published Language Material	
managed as items	recommended (level 1)
managed as collections	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Cartographic Material	
managed as items	recommended (level 1)
managed as collections	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Computer Programs	
managed as items	recommended (level 1)
managed as collections	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Graphic/Visual Material	
managed as items	recommended (level 1)
managed as collections	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Moving Image Material	
managed as items	recommended (level 1)
managed as collections	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Notated Movement	
managed as items	recommended (level 1)
managed as collections	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Notated Music	
managed as items	recommended (level 1)

Level 1 Count Rubric 2017_Revised

	Intellectual Units Held
	Number of Titles/Title Equivalents
managed as collections	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Objects/Artifacts	
managed as items	recommended (level 1)
managed as collections	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Sound Recordings	
managed as items	recommended (level 1)
managed as collections	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)

Level 1 Count Rubric 2017_Revised

	Physical Space Occupied	
	In Linear Feet	In Cubic Feet
Archival and Manuscript Material		
described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Published Language Material		
described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Cartographic Material		
described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Computer Programs		
described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Graphic/Visual Material		
described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Moving Image Material		
described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Notated Movement		
described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Notated Music		
described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Objects/Artifacts		
described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Sound Recordings		
described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)

Level 1 Count Rubric 2017_Revised

		Physical Space Occupied	
		In Linear Feet	In Cubic Feet
Other Physical Space Occupied			
described online/discoverable		as needed	as needed
not [yet] described online/discoverable		as needed	as needed

Note: For the purpose of conducting the count at the local level, institutions are encouraged to record space occupied per local practice. For the purpose of aggregating data across multiple institutions, physical space occupied for all categories/types of collection materials should be aggregated and reported in cubiuc feet, except for Published Language Material, which should be aggregated and reported in linear feet.

	Digital Space Occupied In Multiples of Bytes
Archival and Manuscript Material	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Published Language Material	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Cartographic Material	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Computer Programs	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Graphic/Visual Material	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Moving Image Material	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Notated Movement	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Notated Music	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Objects/Artifacts	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Sound Recordings	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)

Level 1 Count Rubric 2017_Revised

		Digital Space Occupied
		In Multiples of Bytes
Other Digital Space Occupied		
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable		as needed
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable		as needed
<p>Note: For the purpose of conducting the count at the local level, institutions are encouraged to record space occupied per local practice (bytes, megabytes, gigabytes, or terbytes). For the purpose of aggregating data across multiple institutions, digital space occupied for all categories/types of collection materials should be aggregated and reported in gigabytes.</p>		

JTF-HCM: Proposed Membership for Task Force Extension, 2017-2018

Officers

- Martha O'Hara Conway, Co-Chair, ACRL/RBMS, University of Michigan (*staying on*)
- Emily R. Novak Gustainis, Co-Chair, SAA, Harvard University (*staying on*)

Membership

- Adriana Cuervo (SAA), Rutgers University (*rotating off 8/31/17*)
- Elizabeth Haven-Hawley (ACRL/RBMS), University of Florida (*staying on*)
- Rachel D'Agostino (ACRL/RBMS), Library Company of Philadelphia (*staying on*)
- Lara Friedman-Shedlov (ACRL/RBMS), University of Minnesota (*staying on as an SAA rep*)
- Angela Fritz (SAA), University of Arkansas Libraries (*rotating off*)
- Lisa Miller (SAA rep), Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University (*staying on*)
- Katy Rawdon (ACRL/RBMS), Temple University (*rotating off 8/31/17*)
- Cyndi Shein (SAA), University of Nevada, Las Vegas Libraries (*rotating off 8/31/17*)

**SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of
Standardized Statistical Measures for the Public Services of Archival
Repositories and Special Collections Libraries**

SAA Progress Report

July 20, 2017

Prepared by: Amy Schindler, SAA co-chair

BACKGROUND

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for Public Services in Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries is responsible for development of a new standard defining appropriate statistical measures and performance metrics to govern the collection and analysis of statistical data for describing public services provided by archival repositories and special collections libraries. The Standard will describe and quantify users of special collections and archival materials and services and their usage of the same, including reading room paging/circulation, paging/circulation of materials for other purposes, reference interactions, reproduction orders, interlibrary loan requests, and events. If feasible, the Standard may also include recommendations for gathering and analyzing statistics about special collections website visitors and their page views and file downloads. The task force was charged for two years in 2014; a one year extension was requested and granted officially bringing the work of the task force to a close in August 2017.

Officers

- Christian Dupont, Co-Chair, ACRL/RBMS, Boston College
- Amy Schindler, Co-Chair, SAA, University of Nebraska at Omaha

Members

- Moira Fitzgerald (ACRL/RBMS), Yale University
- Thomas Flynn (SAA), Winston-Salem State University
- Emilie Hardmann (ACRL/RBMS), Harvard University
- Brenda McClurkin (SAA), University of Texas at Arlington
- Sarah Polirer (SAA), Cigna Corporation
- Gabriel Swift (ACRL/RBMS), Princeton University
- Bruce Tabb (ACRL/RBMS), University of Oregon
- Elizabeth Yakel (SAA), University of Michigan

SUMMARY OF MEETING ACTIVITIES

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for the Public Services of Archives Repositories and Special Collections Libraries created by the SAA Council and RBMS Executive Committee met eight times

in-person and via conference call as a group between September 2016 and July 2017. Small groups of task force members met in separate working sessions over a dozen times between September 2016 and March 2017. The task force solicited feedback from attendees at the ALA Midwinter Meeting (January 2017) on Version 2 of the proposed standard. The task force also solicited feedback on the submitted proposed standard and discussed future work by related bodies at the ALA Annual Meeting (June 2017). The final meeting will be held at the SAA Annual Meeting (July 2017).

ONGOING ACTIVITIES

Since September 2016, Task Force members have continued discussions about the proposed standard, gathered feedback on the draft documents, and compiled continuing related initiatives. On January 18, 2017, the Task Force published Version 2 (<https://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-public-services-metrics/draft-open-for-comment>) of the document for comment. The comment period included opportunities for live feedback at the ALA Midwinter Meeting and a webinar hosted by the Nebraska Library Commission's NCompass Live series. The document was published on the SAA and RBMS websites and publicized through many mailing lists. Comments reaching 33 pages were received via emails to the co-chairs and on the SAA and RBMS websites. These comments, along with the discussions of task force members informed revisions.

The Task Force submitted the final version of the proposed standard to the RBMS Executive Committee and SAA Standards Committee on June 9, 2017. The proposed standard without accompanying documents is available on the group's website (<https://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-public-services-metrics/final-version-of-standard-submitted->).

The Task Force is compiling a list of potential ongoing and future actions related to public services measures and metrics for consideration by SAA and RBMS component groups. Individual members also plan to continue offering workshops and presentations about the group's work and the proposed standard.

NEW ACTIVITIES

- Published Version 2 of the standard for comment on January 18, 2017.
- Solicited comments received in-person during the Task Force's meeting at the ALA Midwinter (11 attendees) and ALA Annual (14 attendees) Meetings and during live broadcast of a webinar hosted by NCompass Live, a production of the Nebraska Library Commission (144 live attendees, 231 views of recording as of July 17, 2017).
- The draft standard was submitted on June 9, 2017 to the RBMS Executive Committee, ACRL Standards Committee, and SAA Standards Committee to begin the review and approval process through both SAA and ACRL/RBMS.
- Publicized submission of draft standard to RBMS and SAA mailing lists and all commenters who provided an email address.

- Developing list of post-task force action items for .

QUESTIONS/CONCERNS

- The matter of the creation of a national survey instrument and data repository has been raised by archivists and special collections librarians in each comment period and the open meetings at ALA and SAA. The Task Force urges SAA and RBMS to continue this successful collaboration to find a solution to meet this need as repositories begin adopting the standard.
- Strong interest remains from Task Force members and archivists and special collections in contact with the Task Force about future related initiatives. Post-task force action items will need to be delegated to appropriate SAA and RBMS component groups. At this time, the Task Force intends to relay potential future and ongoing activities on the SAA side through the Reference, Access, and Outreach Section. Individual members are also interested in continuing to work on some of these initiatives. These initiatives are wide-ranging in size and scope and include: creating a two page document to introduce the standard and serve a marketing function; soliciting and sharing templates for data collection for a variety of tools (spreadsheet, SpringShare LibInsight, Aeon, etc.); soliciting and sharing case studies on implementation and assessment; offering workshops (in-person and online); creating an annual survey; identifying a potential data repository; finding a stable online home for related resources.

To: SAA Standards Committee

From: Michele F. Pacifico, SAA Representative to NISO

Re: Annual Report to the SAA Standards Committee

Date: July 19, 2017

Below is the annual report that lists the actions taken with the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) on behalf of SAA from its representative to NISO, Michele F. Pacifico.

October 2016: Pacifico officially accepted by NISO as the SAA representative.

12/29/16: Voted Yes on "Proposed resolution for re-nomination of convenor of ISO/TC 46/WG 3 "Conversion of written languages"" in the "TC46 Ballot Advisory Group" group.

12/29/16: Vote Yes on ISO TC 46-SC 9, N921, Guidelines for Bibliographic references and citations to information resources? Guidelines for bibliographic references and citations to information resources. This fourth edition cancels and replaces the third edition of ISO 690:2010, which has been technically revised and updated.

“To technically revise and replace the third edition of ISO 690:2010. The current standard is out to date and does not adequately address reference to current digital content documents and online resources.”

12/29/16: Voted No on "N920, NWIP, Description and presentation of rights information in digital collections" See background comments below.

From SAA member Aprille McKay: We have a "no" recommendation for Council on this proposal. I've been in touch with Michele Pacifico about it and she gave us a copy of the text of the proposal.

We wanted to see what we could learn about where the standard was coming from. Peter Hirtle managed to talk to Emily Gore at DPLA about how this effort related to the rightsstatements.org project.

Emily says that the people at DPLA have repeatedly reached out to the Japanese authors of this proposal asking for meetings to discuss details and interoperability, but have heard nothing in response. This seems really odd since the introductory statement in the draft suggests that the proposed project would basically tell people how to use Creative Commons licenses and RightsStatements.org statements.

IPWG's recommendation at this point would therefore be that SAA votes “No.” Our reasons are that for the project to be successful, there should be close collaboration

with those groups that have developed the licenses and guidelines that ISO may wish to follow. There is no evidence that such linkages have been made.

12/29/16: Email to Standards Committee and SAA:

Below is information about a draft standard for the Dublin Core metadata element set. I have attached the full draft document. Please let me know if the Standards Committee, its sub-committees, or other SAA groups are interested in reviewing this draft ISO standard and have an opinion on how we should vote on the technical content of the draft. Voting closes January 23, 2017. If SAA chooses to vote NO, I must provide comments justifying our vote. A YES vote does not require comments.

12/1/16: Voted Yes on ISO/TC 46/SC 10 N177: Information and documentation — Management of the environmental conditions for archive and library holdings

1/23/17: Voted Yes on the ballot for the periodic review of the published standard ANSI/NISO Z39.87-2006 (R2011) Data Dictionary - Technical Metadata for Digital Still Images. This standard was last reviewed and reaffirmed in 2011.

1/24/17: Took NISO survey for SAA.

1/31/17: Sent announcement to SAA Standards Committee: Baltimore, MD

On April 24, 2017, the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) will host "[*XML for Standards Publishers: A NISO Connections Live Event*](#)." This free symposium will be held at the Library of Congress and [RSVPs are welcome](#).

2/3/17: Sent emails to SAA Leadership List and Julia Lipkins Stein, of the Standards Committee regarding "Systematic Review of ISO 30300:2011, Information and documentation -- Management systems for records -- fundamentals and vocabulary" and for review of ISO 303001.

Please review and let me know if you have comments regarding the upcoming vote on ISO 30300. SAA gets one vote in this NISO ballot. Please see our voting options below. Please forward to appropriate SAA members who are interested in this standard. I am happy to answer questions or provide more information. Thank you.

2/4/17: Sent email to Aprille McKay <aprille@umich.edu>; Nancy Y McGovern <nancymcg@mit.edu>; Nancy Beaumont <nbeaumont@archivists.org>; Felicia Owens <fowens@archivists.org>

Cc: Courtney Chartier <courtney.chartier@gmail.com>

Subject: Fwd: NISO February Newslines and Ballot N920

FYI: I thought you might want to see the current NISO newsletter since its front-page article refers to the problems with NISO Ballot N920. NWIP - Description and presentation of rights information in digital collections. IPWG's comments and SAA's vote of NO were heard by

NISO. Thank you for the attention that you gave to this and for providing me with our voting language. Best, Michele Pacifico

2-6-17: Bethany Cron, NARA, asked for copies of the ISO standards 303000 and 303001 that are under review.

2-22-17 Ken Thibodeau requested a copy of ISO 303000 and 303001.

2-12-17: Voted Yes. Do you recommend that ISO 30300:2011, Information and documentation - Management systems for records -- Fundamentals and vocabulary be confirmed, revised, or withdrawn?

3-28-17: Voted Yes on the ballot to approve the work item for ISO TC 46/SC 9 ISO 22038, Information and documentation -- Description and presentation of rights information in digital collections passed on January 29, 2017. This ballot asks voters to approve the formation of the related working group.

6-19-17: Sent email to SAA Leadership list re NISO press release, "NISO Releases Draft Technical Report, *Issues in Vocabulary Management*, for public comment.

7-18-17 Voted Yes to approve review of ISO 26324, Information and documentation of Digital objective identifier system.

Respectfully submitted,

Michele F. Pacifico

SAA Representative to NISO