

Standards Committee Conference Call
Thursday, June 4, 2009
1:00 PM EST

Present: Polly Reynolds, Mike Rush, Autumn Simpson, Sibyl Schaefer, Chatham Ewing, Jim Cassedy, Jamie Roth, Kathy Young, Mark Matienzo, Margery Sly, Cory Nimer, Kate Colligan

- I. Updates/News – none
- II. Reminder that the Standards Committee will meet at the annual meeting on Tuesday, August 11 starting at 9 am. Please keep your schedules open that day until 5 pm. Wednesday, August 12 from 9 am-12 pm will be reserved for the DACS working group meeting, all Standards Committee and TSDS members are invited to attend. Please submit agenda items soon.
- III. Deaccessioning guidelines – The Appraisal and Acquisition section contacted Polly last week wanting to know if they could move forward with their proposal to develop deaccessioning and reappraisal guidelines (the group had been waiting on the Standards Committee to revise their mission). The acquisition & appraisal group would like to invite participation from SAA through an announcement in the newsletter and through the archives list serve and then meet in Austin. The Standards Committee agreed that the group should move forward. Polly will contact Tara Laver at the conclusion of the conference call.
- IV. Remission
 - a. Margery gave updates from the May SAA Council meeting:
 - i. Council had a few thoughts on the EAC working group revised charge. She will send questions/thoughts to Mike after the meeting.
 - ii. Council gave the Intellectual Property Working Group (developers of the Orphaned Works Best Practices) permission to post their document on the SAA website (with a few revisions/updates).
 - iii. Council was pleased with Standards Committee work on revising their mission, Council had a few thoughts:
 1. Chair term length. Council felt that the Standards Committee chair should serve more than one year in order to give more continuity to standards work. After some discussion, the Standards Committee decided that the chair will serve two years and will then become ex officio for one year to act in an advisory capacity (Polly will add language in the new charge to reflect this change).
 2. Other issues that Council thought should be addressed: approval of non-SAA standards, initiating new standards, membership, and maintenance.
 - b. Discussion of the Development & Review document that Polly sent last week.
 - i. Positive comments from the Standards Committee overall.
 - ii. Questions about initial “mission statement” – should we say “The Standards Committee is responsible for encouraging the development...” instead of “The Standards Committee is responsible for developing...”? Many felt that the Committee would not actually be developing standards. Margery suggested “initiate” instead of encourage. Additionally, others

felt that somewhere in the mission statement, language related to “monitoring” or taking responsibility for projects/standards that come to us should also be included (i.e. the Standards Committee reacts and responds to projects that come to us but we also encourage or initiate projects as well).

- iii. The group discussed whether best practices should fall under the Standards Committee responsibility, with the majority of members feeling that the SC should have some oversight into best practices. Many felt that the procedures for best practice approval and review would not be as formal as standards procedures. Mike noted that the largest difference between standards and best practices was SAA Council approval. The committee will review and comment on best practices, place best practices on the standards website/portal, and monitor best practices for eventual upgrades to standards or major changes. Polly will add best practice procedures to the development and review document.
 - iv. The role of the Standards Committee in the development and review of Thesauri/glossaries were also discussed. Many felt that the Standards Committee should not play any role in thesauri/glossaries, mainly because such tools are more publications, rather than standards. Conclusion: Standards Committee will include thesauri and glossary on the standards portal, but will not consider such current thesauri to be standards.
- c. Structure of the standards committee was discussed. Polly went over the changes from the original changes Mike had made a few weeks ago (to the charge document) (see agenda for changes). Standards Committee agreed with most of the changes with a few comments/changes:
- i. We discussed whether subcommittees should be disbanded regularly to allow for new subcommittee members. While many felt that regularly changing members might be a good idea for improving the group dynamic and work, many agreed that a standing committee does allow for continuity and we do not want to disband a group right when it might pick up momentum. The group agreed to keep more flexible language, “Subcommittees *may be* disbanded by the Standards Committee with Council approval...”
 - ii. The discussion turned to whether or not to disband TSDS at this time. Some TSDS members felt that some expertise was needed that might not necessarily be represented in the Standards Committee or a standard-specific subcommittee. Others pointed out that an increased Standards Committee size would allow for such expertise and that specific working group could be formed around a particular standard or project. The group concluded to disband TSDS with a transition plan. The transition plan would detail the standards and other projects that TSDS was working on as well as a proposal for incorporating some TSDS members into the Standards Committee.

Conference call was concluded at 2:02 p.m. EST