

Regional Associations Group: Meeting Notes  
1:00-2:30 pm, Wednesday, August 14 2013 (Windsor Room)  
Society of American Archivists Annual Meeting

Meeting Leaders:

Amanda Focke (Society of Southwest Archivists) and Rachel Chatalbash (Archivists Round Table of Metropolitan New York, Inc.)

- Introductions
- Jackie Dooley, SAA President, spoke on the significance of this group
- A history of how this group has evolved was provided (Rachel Chatalbash)
- Results of the online vote on statement of purpose, goals, and membership structure were reviewed; all proposed items were unanimously approved by vote (Rachel Chatalbash)
- Overview of group name, listserv, and steering committee structure (Amanda Focke)
- Issues for breakout groups to discuss were outlined (Amanda Focke)
  - Group name ideas
  - Listserv / communication method – brainstorm ideas
  - Steering committee structure
    - Discuss proposal of 3 multi-state reps, 2 state reps, 2 local reps, 1 non-voting SAA rep
    - Nominations / self-nominations and method of nominations?
    - Term of service – 1 year or 2?
    - Call for nominations to run in September with online vote to follow
    - Leadership within the steering committee to be determined by the SC once they are elected
- Review of upcoming votes and timeline: group name, listserv, and steering committee structure vote will be sent out as soon as possible; call for nominations will follow

The meeting attendees broke into seven groups to discuss the issues listed above (20 minutes)

Notes from breakout group reports:

*Discussion re: group name:*

Group 1: Allied Associations Group

Group 2: Local state and regional archival association (“losara”)

Group 3: No suggestions; liked current name

Group 4: Liked current name; also came up with Archival Regional Consortium

Group 5: Archival Associations Collaborative

Group 6: Regional Archives Associations Group

Group 7: Regional Archival Associations Group; Regional Archival Associations Consortium

*Discussion re: listserv:*

Group 1: Yes to having a listserv; the listserv should be limited to official representatives.

Group 2: The listserv should be limited to official representatives.

Group 3: The listserv should be open to official representatives plus anyone else who wants to join; who will moderate the listserv?

Group 4: The listserv should be open to official representatives plus anyone else who wants to join.

Group 5: The function and goals for the listserv must be clearly defined.

Group 6: It would be preferable to have a smaller listserv; perhaps there can be two listservs - one for steering committee and one more encompassing; the idea of having two people for every regional was presented.

Group 7: Who will maintain the listserv?

*Discussion re: Steering Committee:*

Group 1: Suggested increasing the committee members from 8 to 10; would the regionals groups pay dues to this group (modeling after National Coalition for History)?; terms of service on steering committee should be staggered—half would be one year the rest would be two—and after the second year all members would have two year terms.

Group 2: Did not discuss changing the number of members; questioned whether you are voting for a regional versus an individual; the committee should have staggered two year terms but for this first round of elections, the terms should be two and three years rather than one and two; one regional should not be allowed to serve more than two consecutive terms; concern about the need for good geographic representation – there needs to be a mechanism for mandating broad geography.

Group 3: The proposed composition makes sense; terms should be two years; nominations should come from the Boards of the regionals; what is the function of the steering committee?; do you have to be a liaison to be a steering committee member?

Group 4: Terms should be two years but staggered; at first this group was very concerned with geographic representation issues, but then realized that the purpose is to have very active members to get it going – perhaps we don't worry about geographic representation for this initial steering committee; need to have an odd number of people in the steering committee.

Group 5: Suggested expanding to three representatives from each type of regional; encouraged self-nominations for the ballot.

Group 6: Believes that the terms should be two years staggered; okay with current representation but worried about geographic representation issues; a nominations committee should be developed; what happens if someone steps down in the middle of their term?

Group 7: Agreed that terms should be two years; suggested decreasing the number of members on steering committee to 5 or 6; approves of the idea of self-nominating or having someone else nominate you.

Conclusion: All attendees agreed, based on a suggestion from the Society of Florida Archivists, that **Amanda Focke and Rachel Chatalbash would put together a provisional structure for the regionals to approve by vote; this structure will be revisited again in two years.**

Discussion / brainstorming specific goals for initial year (10/2013-9/2014), to be shared with the group's Steering Committee, once established:

- Association of St. Louis Regional Archivists: Create a local speakers group; facilitate speakers who are interested in offering educational programs; perhaps the group could support the formation of regional organizations in underserved areas.
- Society of Southwest Archivists: Could there be an annotated version of the directory of these regional groups?; perhaps there could be a survey of the groups to gather information about them; let's make it a goal to find out more about how other regionals function.
- Archivists of Central Texas: Interested in outreach events such as the Oregon Archives Crawl; could the group work to create a guide that focuses on collaborative events; the Archivists of Central Texas is really informal – are there others like that? (followed by a show of hands).
- Rocky Mountain Archivists: Would like to see a master calendar; would like people to be able to attend events for adjoining regionals.
- Society of Ohio Archivists: would like to see how other organizations have organized their governance; it would be great to be able to find out what mechanisms exist and what works.
- Donna McCrea (SAA Council): this group was formed, in part, to serve as a clearing house for advocacy issues and this new entity should work on that.
- Society of North Carolina Archivists: Perhaps an exchange or scholarship program where people to go other regional conferences could be established.
- Archivists of the Houston Area: Is there a way for regionals that are not non-profits to function under SAA's or another regional's umbrella?
- Archivists Round Table of Metropolitan New York: In response to Archivists of the Houston Area: if SAA is an umbrella, this can cause issues with grant funding; the groups that already have non-profit status would run into financial and legal issues; however, there may be ways to act as an umbrella of sorts without legally doing so.
- MARAC: Advocacy is the most important issue that we need to be looking at as this group goes forward; this is going to be the vehicle and opportunity for us all to be able to collaborate and communicate with each other; this group can do great things if we let it.

- Seattle Area Archivists: Perhaps this group could help coordinate offsite backups of records around the country.

All attendees were thanked for their participation in this meeting.

--Submitted by Rachel Chatalbash, Archivists Round Table of Metropolitan New York, Inc.