

New England Archivists Special Board Meeting
May 25, 2005
NEDCC, Andover, Mass.
10 AM – 2 PM

10:00-10:10 Welcome

10:10-10:45 Mission statement and Branding Committee Report

Shall we adopt the reworded mission statement presented by the Branding Committee?

Is the Branding Committee headed in the right direction in their deliberations?

10:45-11:30 Student Representative & Parliamentarian

Shall the Board be expanded to include a Student Representative and Parliamentarian?

(Items I.4 and I.5 on the Future Planning document)

11:30-12:00 Membership & Recruiting

How shall the NEA recruit new member and retain old members?

(Item V.2 on the Future Planning document)

12:00-12:15 Break

12:15-1:15 Conferences

Shall the NEA continue with twice-yearly conferences or adopt a different conference structure?

(Item III.1 on the Future Planning document)

1:15-1:45 Honoraria

Shall the NEA revise its policies on granting honoraria and expenses to speakers?

(Item III.3 on the Future Planning document)

1:45-2:00 Wrap up

Review progress for the day and decide future steps

**New England Archivists Special Board Meeting
May 25, 2005
NEDCC, Andover, Mass.
10 AM – 2 PM**

In attendance: Paul Carnahan (presiding), Karen Adler Abramson, Liz Andrews, Mary Caldera, Lois Hamill, Tom Hyry, Mary Ide, Nora Murphy, Anne Ostendarp, Jonathan Penyack, Aimée Primeaux, Susan von Salis, Anne Sauer, Mark Savolis, Kelcy Shepherd, Elizabeth Slomba, Karen Spicher, Jane Ward

Welcome

Paul Carnahan started the meeting; attendees introduced themselves. Paul discussed the agenda, the order of business and what parts of the discussion he and Mary Ide would be handling.

Mission statement and Branding Committee Report

The issues to be addressed: Shall we adopt the reworded mission statement presented by the Branding Committee?; and is the Branding Committee headed in the right direction in their deliberations?

Mary discussed the Branding Committee's report (Appendix A) and what the committee is looking at in order to develop a graphic identity. The Branding Committee reviewed the mission statement, organization name, and the intended audience. The committee is requesting a revision of the mission statement and have put forward a mission statement draft for the Board's approval. There was a discussion regarding the report and Mary said that the formal report will be submitted to the Board before the October Board meeting.

Mary asked the Board to review the proposed mission statement (Appendix B) and added that if the Board needed to discuss at length the mission statement, the discussion should be extended to further meetings. She discussed how the Branding Committee approached revising the mission statement. There was a brief discussion about the intended audience for the mission statement and how language may differ for a non-archivist audience versus archivist. Mary said that the statement was mediating between the two audiences. It was discussed whether the mission statement should be added to the bylaws and the need of the membership to vote if it were added. If the bylaws were amended, NEA may need to refile the bylaws with the Massachusetts Secretary of State's office. It was suggested that the Board discuss the mission statement, then look at procedures.

The Board discussed various suggested language changes. It was suggested that "their" from "their institutions" be taken out and left at "individuals and institutions." There was a discussion about why "NEA is" was not used, what of the language should be, and the way the statement is written. Next, the Board discussed why "arranging" was not included as part of responsibilities. Arrangement was left out due to possible confusion of lay people and a desire to have a short list of responsibilities. The discussion continued on the need to include to arrangement, on other possible terms or even leaving out the terms, about the activity of arranging, and on the need for succinctness. There was a

discussion of the purposes part of the bylaws versus intent of mission statement and the changes in NEA over 30 years. The Board set aside the discussion on arranging and went on to other proposed changes. There was discussion over the use of the term “best practices,” whether it should be just practices, other terms for “practice,” and how “best practices” sounds like a buzzword. It was mentioned that there was an expectation that mission statement would be revised every few years or so. So the Board had discussed the following changes: take “their” out, omit “best” from “best practices” and let stand “theory and practice.” The Board then returned to the issue of “arranging.” It was suggested that phraseology after “responsibility” be taken out and that link to “what is an archivist” on website be created instead. There was a discussion of the need to keep the phraseology that defines what an archivist is and why one should become a member of NEA. Problems of linking to other documents outside the mission statement in the mission statement were mentioned. The discussion continued regarding what an archivist is and does, how that relates to the list of descriptors in mission statement and the importance of a mission statement for publicity purposes and for developing a graphic identity. The goal of the mission statement is to have a public presence, to be inviting, to present an attractive organization, to define who we are and to present a professional organization and demeanor.

Paul asked for a non-binding poll of the Board on the issue of arrangement. Five members for including arrangement; four voted against; eight were neutral.

Concern was expressed that NEA members may not be happy that mission statement was changed without consultation. It was mentioned that the mission statement embodies the spirit of the bylaws.

The proposed mission statement read as follows: *New England Archivists represents individuals and their institutions responsible for acquiring, describing, preserving, and making accessible records of continuing value. NEA serves as a forum for its members to educate themselves and others about archival theory and best practices, to collaborate with other archival and related professional organizations, and to advocate for the importance of archival records and archival work to the public.*

It was moved that the Mission Statement be approved as proposed with taking out “their” from “their institutions” and “best” and “s” from “best practices.” The motion was seconded. Discussion ensued regarding “arranging” and “describing.” In a non-binding poll of the Board, two voted to include “arranging” while 16 voted to take out “describing” as well. A friendly amendment was proposed and accepted suggesting that “describing” be removed from the mission statement. *It was moved that the Mission Statement be approved as proposed with taking out “their” from “their institutions”; “best” and “s” from “best practices”; and “describing” from “acquiring, describing, preserving, and making accessible.”* Six members voted in favor of the motion; 2 voted against. The motion passed.

The revised mission statement now reads as follows: *New England Archivists represents individuals and institutions responsible for acquiring, preserving, and making accessible*

records of continuing value. NEA serves as a forum for its members to educate themselves and others about archival theory and practice, to collaborate with other archival and related professional organizations, and to advocate for the importance of archival records and archival work to the public.

Mary then said that the approval of mission statement will aid the Branding Committee in their next steps. The committee is recommending no name change for NEA. Mary reported that the Branding Committee wants a sense of where to go next: resolving the graphic design issue; is the committee doing the work the Board wants; and if there is a need for interim report before October.

There is an offer from Doug Scott, the graphic designer at WGBH, to help with visual suggestions for the graphic look and feel and to work on developing tag lines. The offer is free. The Board briefly discussed whether to hire a graphic designer. Board members asked Mary some questions about Doug Scott's offer and the Board decided to accept his offer of help.

The Board then discussed the branding report and what things that the Branding committee should be doing. It was suggested that historians should be added to the "top five markets" audience in the report. The Board discussed getting input from the membership in a session at the Fall 2005 conference, when to get feedback from the membership and showing the membership graphic identity options from the graphic designer. It was said that there was nothing set in stone regarding the October due date for Branding Committee's final report. If Branding had three options available by September, they could offer a view of the options to the membership through the website and listservs. The Board further discussion a suggestion of a blurb for newsletter, whether Scott could develop the options in the time frame suggested, and how to get membership comments in time for the October report. The Board agreed that the Branding Committee should get comments from the membership on the graphic identity; ask Scott for options by September; display the options on the website and post announcements on the listservs; write a blurb for October newsletter issue; have a table at the Fall 2005 conference with the options for the membership to review; and have a final report by the January board meeting with no interim report required.

The Board tabled the recommendation for review of mission statement every three years. A recommendation regarding the updating of the mission statement will be in the final report.

Attendees briefly discussed graphic identity issues, concerns over color scheme, image issues, aesthetic concerns, use of graphics elsewhere. It was mentioned that suggestions to be emailed to the Branding Committee.

Student Representative and Parliamentarian

Issue to be addressed: shall the Board be expanded to include a Student Representative and Parliamentarian? (Items I.4 and I.5 on the Future Planning document)

Student Representative

Mary opened the discussion by saying that the idea for a student Board representative came from the Fall 2004 membership input sessions. There is a strong feeling from the membership that a student representative would reach out to new members and help nurture new membership. She offered to work with Jeannette Bastian to develop the position, which would be a non-voting Board member. Mary suggested that they start with students from Simmons and eventually open up the position to students from other programs with archival interest. The Board discussed student involvement, the strong interest from Simmons, concerns over travel costs for student, student commitment to attending board meetings, how to get students involved in the Board and NEA, and number of archival programs other Simmons. It was suggested that there be a trial run of the position for two years; it was mentioned that there was Simmons SCoSAA NEA representative from the student archives group. The discussion turned discussing the position as more of an outreach role than a board position, the idea of developing a Board position then recruiting in the regional archival programs, the use of different recruiting methods of filling the position and the encouragement of students attending the Board meetings. It was suggested that the Board work on outreach to graduate programs and there be a trial period for two years for the student representative position. The Board would work with the Simmons SCoSAA to develop position which would have a one year term; two different students would be appointed to the Board. A representative-at-large would monitor the position and serve as a Board mentor. The Board discussed the trial period, evaluation of the impact, and the involvement of the Outreach chair and a Representative-at-large. The Board anticipates a report from the Representative-at-large and the Outreach chair evaluating the position in Fall 2006

Aimée Primeaux, Susan von Salis and Mary will develop the proposal for the student representative in time for the June Board meeting. Simmons will be contacted regarding their current NEA liaison. It was suggested that the student representative write a column for the newsletter and attend board meetings. The Board briefly discussed whether the bylaws would need to be amended.

Parliamentarian

Mary said it was her personal suggestion that a position for a Parliamentarian be created. The idea came from her need for parliamentarian help during Board meetings during her term as president. She said that it would be helpful for a long-term member appointed to the position to track votes and procedures during the meetings. A Parliamentarian's role is to remember procedure, previous votes and the bylaws. She suggested that the position be a non-voting Board member and simply to keep track of the bylaws, parliamentary procedures, previous votes and offer assistance to officers and committees regarding Board procedure.

There was a discussion of the helpfulness of the position for the committees and Board members, need for communication to committees about policy changes, about Board members responsibilities. The Board continued review what this position should be and the responsibilities regarding procedures and tracking documentation. It was also mentioned that the addition of a Parliamentarian would affect some of the job

responsibilities of the Secretary. Attendees also mentioned the various needs for running meetings, liaison communications, the need of board members to communicate to their committees, how to make communications work and defining the role of a Parliamentarian. It was also mentioned that the role of the Parliamentarian was strictly separate from the role of the Secretary, especially in regards to communications to the Board and committees. The Board also briefly discussed the committee reports presented to the Board, where kept and the possibility of the reports available on the website.

Mary offered to refine the job Policy and Procedure Secretary/Parliamentarian job description in time for the June Board meeting, with the assistance of Elizabeth Slomba.

Membership and Recruiting

Issue to be addressed: How shall the NEA recruit new member and retain old members? (Item V.2 on the Future Planning document))

Discussion delayed to a future meeting.

Conferences

Issue to be addressed: Shall the NEA continue with twice-yearly conferences or adopt a different conference structure? (Item III.1 on the Future Planning document)

Nora Murphy mentioned possible changes to the current conference structure: two meetings a year as is currently done; one large meeting a year; two meetings, but one is a session-based meeting, the other just workshops; or other structures. NEA is required to have one annual business meeting. Paul added that some of the reasons to change include the amount of work involved in planning two meetings a year and the possibility of attracting other audiences. Liz Andrews mentioned meeting fees and how NEA cannot have \$25 meetings anymore because of increased costs and how the bigger meetings get, the higher fees and increased costs. The Board discussed suggestions to move away from “talking head” sessions, with some attendees noting membership preferences for workshop/interactive sessions; the value of networking opportunities and which conferences structure increase networking opportunities; workshops held outside of NEA conferences; the difficulty of finding speakers and new speakers; other conference structures, especially SAA conferences; the need for two conferences every year, but not necessarily the same; the introduction of small, regional-based events which may led to more but smaller, local meetings; the quality of speakers; meeting costs and the shift in the expected costs of meeting; and vendor contributions and affect on conference budget planning. There was a suggestion that conferences showcase archives that do things well and that, instead of conferences, a series of open houses, different institution-based events and so forth, and featuring more opportunities for networking. It was commented that open houses in different regions of New England could fracture the membership. The conferences do attract new members and provide networking opportunities. But some members have difficulties attending because of conflicts with other professional groups’ conferences. The Board discussed the structure of conferences, workshops versus speaker-based conferences; whether the Board should have some input in the meeting

planning, offering more advanced planning and more directions for meetings; and sequencing meetings and how planning today will affect Fall 2006.

The discussion turned to planning for workshops. Karen Spicher described the role of the Education committee; how they have expanded workshop over the past four years, found more instructors, continued repetition of three introductory topics, offered SAA workshops and some advanced workshops. She added that the Education committee planning for workshops to be held at conferences was dependent on the conference facilities, rooms, audio-visual availability, and need for all these elements in place as well as the confirmation of the workshop teachers before finalizing Local Arrangements plans. The advantages to this is that the Education committee is not responsible for finding rooms for the workshop and that Local Arrangements does most of the planning work; the disadvantages are that the Education committee is limited to how far they plan ahead. Another challenge is finding instructors who are able to plan and deliver a workshop for the honorarium amount we can offer. The committee wants to move towards developing a workshop schedule and get one on the website, at least for the rotating basic workshops. They want to be able to plan further ahead and know the need for more advanced workshops, as well as a need for advanced conference sessions.

The Board discussed developing drop-in workshops; more advanced and better planning for conferences and the effects of advance planning on conferences; the discontinuity between conferences; the advantages in longer lead time on continuity between conferences better planning; the difficulties with honoraria; and NEA resources affecting the quality of programs and speakers and the need for recruiting quality speakers. Attendees discussed successful programming of regional archival groups such the Connecticut River Archivists and benefits of small events. Kelcy Shepherd asked if there should be a member survey regarding conferences and whether the information from the future planning retreat was enough for the Board to use for this discussion since the Board does not have concrete number or demographics. Mary cited information from the future planning report that it is daunting to put on two conferences a year. The Board discussed encouraging members to attend conferences and the work burden on volunteers to plan for two meetings. There was a discussion of what goes into planning for small regional events. There was a discussion of small regional talks and meetings versus conferences and it was mentioned that is hard to project what will work.

Mary revisited the membership survey. The Board discussed the need for a successful survey, what is need for a membership survey, what will the membership pay for a conference, conference structure, and bringing in other organization, and collecting information on the membership's opinions on these matters. Concerns about collecting demographic information were mentioned. Membership's need for more information on the current membership before developing a recruitment plan was discussed. Anne Sauer was asked about gathering the demographic information from A*Census. She replied that the information should be out soon but that the data needed to be review and sanitized for identifying information before being released. It is expected that the date should be released during the summer. The Board discussed what information was now available from A*Census, what would be available eventually, and that possibly the information

may not be that useful in the end. After more discussion about NEA is likely to learn from A*Census, it was suggested that Membership should hold off on a membership survey in case A*Census does have similar information. Attendees discussed why non-NEA members do not attend NEA conferences, why NEA needs to find out about why members attend or do not attend first, and conflicting information about non-NEA members. It was suggested that information about NEA conferences may not be getting on other organizations' calendars and that dates are not publicize enough in advance; this suggestion will be communicated to the PR coordinators. The Board then turned to discussing surveying members and the possibility of trying some different than surveying membership about current conferences. Liz Andrews then addressed the large conference issues and the importance of vendor costs making the conferences possible. Use of conference profits for other programs was discussed as well as concerns about surveys and whether they are helpful. The Board also discussed the feeling that the membership is looking for something different and commented on well SAA's special sections meetings work for their membership. It was suggested that NEA try to plan future conferences to include session for smaller groups of archivists to meet over common topics. The Board's discussion touched on previous conferences structures, the Spring 2003 Worcester meeting, better reporting from Local Arrangements and Program Committees, and the upcoming Fall 2005 conference structure, fees, attendance and issues.

The Board agreed that the Program and Local Arrangements Committees should continue to try different meeting structures. If it is not possible to have individual section meetings at the Fall 2005 Conference, then they should be tried for the Fall 2006 conference. Difficulty of cost containment, registration fees, costs of meetings and finding facilities were mentioned. It was agreed that Nora would continue to plan for conferences as before and that Nora would communicate the Board discussions and ideas to upcoming conference committees and that she would sum up the discussion regarding conference planning for the Board. It was discussed that Board could give the Program and Local Arrangements committees a mandate for structure of a conference. It was also agreed that there is a need for membership information, a financial analysis of conference costs and income, and a need for A*Census information. And the Board agreed that a program committee could be named before a location was chosen and that the Education Committee could be brought in as early as possible.

Honoraria

Shall the NEA revise its policies on granting honoraria and expenses to speakers? (Item III.3 on the Future Planning document)

There was a brief discussion of the value of honoraria, the recruitment of speakers, and how costs may affect registrations.

Paul discussed the current honoraria policy and mentioned specific points in the policy such as no travel nor meals nor hotels. Honoraria cover everything and conference registration can be paid in lieu of honoraria payment for those speakers who can not accept honoraria. The workshop honoraria policy is very different. The Board discussed the confusion over honoraria; discussion of past practices; honoraria amounts and the

need to raise the honoraria limits; speakers and registrations. Originally, it was thought that outside speakers would be rare. It was suggested that an amount of total honoraria be set and the amount of honoraria distributed to individuals left to the discretion of the program committee. There was a discussion about the inequities of the honoraria system and about an honoraria cap. If honoraria amounts were left to the discretion of the program committee, there should be guidelines; attendees discussed approaches to distribution.

It was moved that the total cap of honoraria for conferences be raised to \$1500, effective for the Fall 2005 conference. The motion was seconded. The Board discussed the Fall 2005 budget for honoraria and amounts to be paid for keynote speakers as well as set amounts of honoraria. *All members voted in favor.*

The Board then turned to discussing how much honoraria for keynote speakers, the need for flexibility in offering honoraria; and the use of honoraria and the limits of the budget. The Board discussed at length equitable payment for honoraria recipients; offering equal amounts to outside speakers; need for program committee discretion in offering honoraria and problems with leaving the amounts of honoraria to the committee's discretion; and the difference between keynote speakers versus non-NEA member speakers. It was suggested the Board be removed from decisions about giving honoraria; discussion about offering equal amounts to outside speakers. It was agreed that all outside speakers will be offered equal amounts of honoraria and that keynote speakers may be offered a higher honoraria amount. It was also suggested that there be guidelines for the program committee in regards to distributing honoraria. Then there was discussion of raising the limit of honoraria for the keynote speaker, of keynote speaker costs, and of the amount of the honoraria budget left over for the session speakers.

It was moved that the limit for honoraria for keynote speakers be raised to \$500, effective for the Fall 2005 conference. The motion was seconded. *All members voted in favor.*

The Board discussed the guidelines regarding who gets offered honoraria and suggested that language referring to the "Program Committee will determine who and how" and that adding a bullet that NEA does not offer travel or hotel reimbursement. Elizabeth will revise the policy and send out the revisions to the Board.

Wrap up

Paul reviewed the meeting's accomplishments.

It was moved that the Board meeting adjourn. It was seconded; no discussion. *All members voted in favor.*

The meeting adjourned at 2 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Elizabeth Slomba, Secretary