New England Archivists Executive Board Meeting
June 29, 2018
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
College of the Holy Cross
Worcester, MA

AGENDA

10:00 – 10:15  Welcome and introductions (Karen Adler Abramson)

10:15 – 10:25  Approve minutes from March 2018 Board meeting (Caitlin Birch)

10:25 – 10:40  Review of NEA parliamentary procedure (Caitlin Birch)

10:40 – 11:00  IDC report (Rose Oliveira and Rosemary J.K. Davis)

  IDC Award: proposed changes to description (action required)
  Best Practices style sheet (action required?)
  Program/workshop registration forms: inclusion of special needs

11:00 – 11:15  Spring meeting 2018 final report (Rachel Chatalbash)

11:15 – 11:45  Fall symposium 2018 report (Juliana Kuipers)

  Budget approval (action required)

11:45 – 12:00  Spring meeting 2019 report (Sarah Galligan)

12:00 – 1:00  Lunch on your own

1:00 – 1:20  Communications Committee report (Sarah Shoemaker)

  SAA: NEA information table logistics
  Website: procedure for updating pages

1:20 – 2:00  Treasurer’s report (Emily Atkins)

  Financial report
  Program co-sponsorships
  Banking procedures (action required)
  Treasurer’s job description: recommended changes (action required)
  New proposed position: bookkeeper (action required)
FY2019 budget requests

2:00 – 2:10  NEA Newsletter report (Sean Parke)
             Feature and mini-feature articles: methods for soliciting submissions

2:10 – 2:30  Strategic plan updates (Caitlin Birch)

2:30 – 2:40  Afternoon break

2:40 – 3:10  Education Committee report (Jill Snyder)
             Webinar pilot proposal (action required)
             Skill share pilot proposal (action required)
             Spring 2019 meeting workshop proposal

3:10 – 3:15  Open positions update (Karen Adler Abramson)
             Records Management Roundtable Co-Chair
             IDC positions (4)
             Membership Committee (3)

3:15 – 3:30  President’s report (Karen Adler Abramson)
             Summer membership survey (new questions)
             Workshop policy follow up: food and multiple speaker honoraria
             Board meeting virtual attendance: proposal to open to membership

3:30 – 3:45  Immediate Past President’s report (Ellen Doon)
             Nominating Committee: vote in new members (action required)

3:45 – 3:55  Vice President’s report (Jamie Kingman Rice)
             Spring 2020 meeting: potential location

3:55 – 4:00  Fall Board meeting logistics (Karen Adler Abramson)

4:00  Adjourn
New England Archivists Executive Board Meeting
June 29, 2018
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
College of the Holy Cross
Worcester, MA

In attendance: Karen Adler Abramson, Emily Atkins, Caitlin Birch, Ellen Doon, Liz Francis, Juliana Kuipers, Claire Lobdell, Abbey Malangone, Olivia Mandica-Hart, Rose Oliveira, Cristina Prochilo, Jamie Rice, Sarah Shoemaker, Jill Snyder, Jane Ward

In attendance via video conference: Rachel Chatalbash, Abigail Cramer, Rosemary K. J. Davis

Welcome and Introductions
At 10 a.m., Karen Adler Abramson called the meeting to order, followed by attendee introductions.

Approve minutes from March 2018 Board meeting
Caitlin Birch moved to approve the March 22, 2018 quarterly Board meeting minutes as submitted. Emily Atkins seconded. Discussion: Ellen Doon noted that a statement in the minutes describing the Board’s decision to remove development responsibilities from the Membership Committee should actually read “external development.” Caitlin will make the change. No abstentions. All members voted in favor (8-0-0).

Review of NEA parliamentary procedure
Caitlin Birch led a review of parliamentary procedure. She said that the Board used to do an annual review to help new members of the Board become familiar with Board procedures and to refresh the memories of continuing Board members, and this review is an attempt to return to that practice. Caitlin reviewed the “who,” “when,” “how,” and “why” of Board voting and the Board discussed several questions related to motions and voting.

IDC report
Rose Oliveira and Rosemary K. J. Davis presented the Inclusion and Diversity Committee report.

IDC Award: proposed changes to description
Rose said that several questions related to the Inclusion and Diversity Session and Travel Assistance Award need Board attention. First: is it possible to change the terms of the award so that recipients can apply it to the cost of meeting registration if they choose? The IDC reached out to past winners and they expressed support for this change.
Jane Ward said that recipients should be able to use the award for whatever expenses they incur to attend the meeting. Emily Atkins said that meals can never be covered under NEA’s awards, but the other scholarships do include travel, lodging, and registration as reimbursable expenses. Several Board members suggested a capped number of complimentary registrations as part of the award. Rosemary suggested three registrations and said the recipients of the award could determine which members of their group would use them. Emily said that she was in favor of including registration as a reimbursable expense, but the idea of awarding complimentary registrations as opposed to simply allowing attendees to spend their award money on registration would pose challenges. Registration costs vary based on the type of registration. Emily suggested increasing the award’s dollar amount and allow recipients to spend it on registration if they choose. Caitlin Birch agreed with Emily’s approach and asked what the rationale would be for offering separate registrations instead. Ellen Doon said that it’s odd to award money and then have recipients return it to NEA in the form of registration. Emily said that it’s easier from the treasurer’s perspective to simply include registration as a reimbursable expense and noted that other NEA meeting scholarships already do that. Jane agreed that Emily’s approach makes more sense. Emily suggested adding $300 to the award total and allowing recipients to use it for registration. Rosemary and Rose agreed with this approach. Emily moved to change the Inclusion and Diversity Session and Travel Assistance Award to include $1,200 for travel and hotel expenses, of which a portion may be used to cover the registration costs of three presenters, effective as of now, to take effect for the Spring 2019 Meeting. Caitlin seconded. No discussion. No abstentions. All members voted in favor (8-0-0).

Rose introduced another question that needs discussion: can an IDCSTA winner also be a winner of another NEA scholarship? Does the revised award description need language to address that? The awarding of the IDCSTA happens earlier than the awarding of the other scholarships, so there’s a possibility that an individual could win both.

Emily said that Rose’s point also raises the question of what to do with an IDCSTA panel that has many presenters — each individual may not get much money when the award total is divided up, so should they be eligible to receive other NEA scholarships? Juliana Kuipers said that individuals should be allowed to apply for multiple awards, but shouldn’t be able to accept more than one if they win more than one. Juliana and Emily agreed that language should be added to the IDCSTA award description stating that if a panel wins and accepts the award, the individual members of that panel become ineligible to accept other scholarships. Jane asked whether similar language should be added to the other scholarships. Abigail Cramer said that scholarships don’t currently include that stipulation, so the language should be added. Juliana said that the name of the IDCSTA should also be changed to designate it as a scholarship, which would make it tax-deductible. The Board agreed. Caitlin said that the new language will require a Board vote, but Rose and Rosemary should prepare that outside of the Board meeting and circulate it by email.
Rose introduced one more question for discussion: how should the IDC scholarship be acknowledged? The announcement currently occurs during the Annual Business Meeting. Should that practice continue? The Board agreed that it should.

Olivia Mandica-Hart asked Rosemary to share an email received by a member concerning Spring Meeting registration rates. Rosemary said that the member suggested that NEA create a special rate for professionals who are local to the area where the meeting is being held, who aren’t archivists, but who might have an interest in attending the meeting because of related work.

Jane said that it’s a nice idea, but it’s at the top of a slippery slope. If instituted, some non-members would get a reduced rate while others would not. Ellen agreed and said that non-members doing related work in the region are individuals that NEA should be encouraging to become members. Juliana asked if it’s possible to be clearer about the bridge rate that already exists. Jane said the bridge rate is for members who don’t have stable employment. Emily said that the Board can brainstorm ways to be more inclusive, but this particular way would put the Board in the position of making subjective judgements about whose work qualifies for a special rate. The Membership Committee could brainstorm other ideas. Caitlin said that the Society of American Archivists offers perks to first-time attendees, and that may be something the Membership Committee could explore. Jill Snyder said that this type of outreach was part of the motivation behind the creation of the Community Engagement Coordinator role. Ellen said the CEC is more focused on engaging with the portion of the public that wouldn’t become members, while the Membership Committee is responsible for outreach to those whose work makes them a good fit for membership. Karen Adler Abramson said that the Board will encourage the Membership Committee to keep these kinds of opportunities for outreach on their radar. Caitlin said that the Spring 2018 Program Committee had ex-officio members from the Membership and Communications committees. If that practice continues, the ex-officio member from the Membership Committee could focus on engaging members of related professions at the meeting. Jamie Rice said that pre-meeting workshops seem like a good option for engagement. The Board agreed not to offer a special registration rate for individuals in related professions who are local to the meeting area, but to keep thinking about ways to make programming more accessible and affordable to non-members. Karen asked Rose and Rosemary to respond to the member email accordingly.

Best Practices style sheet
Rose reported that Samantha Strain is working on a draft of a best practices style sheet and anticipates having it done in July.

Program/workshop registration forms: inclusion of special needs
Rose led a discussion about addressing special needs in NEA programming. The IDC has been thinking about sending a form to attendees where they can indicate special needs. The committee has just started gathering information about this idea.

Emily asked whether the IDC is thinking about meetings specifically, or whether the form would transfer into information stored in the membership database. Emily said she doesn’t think it’s possible in the membership database for privacy reasons. Juliana said that rather than sending out a separate form, it would be easier to work questions into the existing registration form. Emily said that dietary needs are tricky — the Board should be as accommodating as possible, but any language on this topic should make clear that not every need will necessarily be within NEA’s ability to accommodate. Jamie said that although the Board can’t always meet stated needs, food at NEA events must be clearly marked for attendees with food allergies. The Board agreed and the IDC will continue to explore this topic.

Spring meeting 2018 final report
Rachel Chatalbash presented the final report of the Spring 2018 Program Committee. Feedback on the meeting was positive. Attendees and participants provided constructive criticism that Rachel tried to address through additions to the Spring Meeting Guidelines. Rachel presented some takeaways from the Program Committee that may be topic of consideration for future meetings:

- The hotel had strict rules about receiving shipments of vendor materials. As a result, vendor materials had to be sent to Rachel’s office and transported to the venue, which isn’t ideal. Future meetings may want to address this topic through the hotel contract.
- The Program Committee received numerous comments about the lack of gluten-free options. This year’s hotel did not offer gluten-free catering, so it’s something to consider during venue selection.
- It might be worthwhile to have the Inclusion and Diversity Committee explore childcare options for meetings. The Art Libraries Society of North America (ARLIS/NA) is doing a conference childcare pilot right now and would be willing to share information with NEA.
- Frequent changes to the program as it developed made it difficult for the Communications Committee to keep up with website updates. An online program platform that’s easier to update than a PDF might be worth exploring, or if a PDF continues to be used, it could be helpful to give a member of the Program Committee permission to edit the website so that a member of Comm Comm doesn’t have to make the changes each time.
- The fundraising structure could be reevaluated. Sponsorship rates could be raised.
- Coordination between the Education Committee and the Program Committee was challenging. Ed Comm is essentially hosting a mini-event within a larger event by offering workshops attached to the Spring Meeting, and they have a mini-budget within a larger
budget. Previous program committees have noted this challenge, too, so it would be good to search for ways to improve.

The Board discussed Rachel’s points. Jane Ward said that some of these issues may be more closely tied to what this year’s specific hotel could and couldn’t do. She said that most hotels are strict about accepting vendor materials more than 48 hours in advance, but that this hotel’s lack of gluten-free options is surprising. Ellen Doon said that dietary restrictions were covered in the contract but not gluten-free specifically.

Jamie Rice said that given the additions this year’s Program Committee has already made to the Spring Meeting Guidelines, it would be helpful to talk to next year’s Program Committee to see if the guidelines are proving helpful and whether additional information is needed. Ellen said that some issues Rachel raised relate to the venue contract and it’s too late to address those for the Spring 2019 Meeting since the contract has already been signed. It’s not too late for the Education and Program committees to work together more productively, though. Jill Snyder agreed with Rachel’s point about Ed Comm and appreciated that she raised the issues. Emily Atkins said that the treasurer should have greater oversight of the budget, which might relieve some of the problem points between the two committees. Jane asked whether workshops are supposed to be self-sustaining. Emily said that that isn’t the case anymore. Jane asked when that changed. Juliana Kuipers said the change occurred when NEA began holding the Spring Meeting at hotels. All NEA programming, whether pre-meeting or meeting, is tied up in a single agreement with the venue now. Jamie said that it seemed that the rescheduling of the canceled workshops was overly complicated and asked whether the Board could clarify a policy around rescheduling (or not rescheduling). Ellen said that some of the complication came from co-sponsoring the meeting with the Archivists Round Table of Metropolitan New York. Rescheduling would be more straightforward with only NEA to consider.

Rose Oliveira said that she was excited to explore childcare for meetings and will talk to Rachel about it. Jane said that it was a great idea, but that she would be concerned about the budget. Emily said that a plan that treats childcare as a sidecar to the meeting budget rather than a part of it could make things more feasible. She suggested piloting a childcare option in 2020.

Karen Adler Abramson said that rather than treating each of the suggestions Rachel shared in a piecemeal fashion, the Board should have a small group work on everything as a whole and revise guidelines together. Jane, Ellen, Jamie, and Juliana volunteered. Karen will invite Sarah Galligan to join the conversation, and suggested that it may be valuable going forward to always have the next Program Committee take part in discussions of lessons learned from the outgoing Program Committee.
Emily said that she is struggling with the line between what requires a revision to the official meeting guidelines, and what constitutes a smaller suggestion or lesson learned from isolated situations that may not be encountered in the planning of other meetings, and don’t need to be addressed in guidelines. Jane suggested a section at the end of the guidelines for lessons learned. Juliana agreed that keeping the guide up-to-date is important, but wants to be careful about having individual program committees lead NEA in a direction very specific to the meeting they planned. Ellen said that meeting planning starts well before the Program Committee is recruited, so there are a lot of NEA leaders (anyone involved in the early stages of planning) that should be vetting the guidelines regularly. Jane said 2018 was a tough meeting to plan and the Program Committee did a wonderful job. The Board agreed and Karen thanked Rachel for their work.

Fall symposium 2018 report
Juliana Kuipers presented the Fall 2018 Program Committee’s report. The symposium will take place on Friday, Oct. 26, 9 a.m.-3 p.m., and will be co-sponsored by the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum. The theme of the symposium centers around ethics, and the credit for the symposium title, “Our Common Code: Ethics in Archives,” goes to Colin Lukens. The symposium will include a presentation and discussion around ethics in each of three areas: appraisal and acquisitions, description, and access. Attendees will remain together for the entirety of the symposium — no breakout sessions. Juliana shared an idea from Eliot Wilczek that the Program Committee is currently considering: An output of the symposium could be a white paper that could be submitted to the Journal of Contemporary Archival Studies. The plenary speaker is the Venerable Tenzin Priyadarshi, Director of the Ethics Initiative at MIT Media Lab, and Founding Director of the Dalai Lama Center for Ethics and Transformative Values at MIT. He’ll offer a broader approach to ethics and will speak during lunch, which will be provided to attendees.

Juliana discussed the symposium budget. The JFK’s catering prices are reasonable, so lunch is a manageable expense for NEA. In addition to lunch, coffee/tea breaks are planned, but there won’t be any snacks. The JFK’s café will open an hour early for the symposium and attendees will have the option of purchasing food and drinks from there if they choose. There are catering charges at the JFK that are uncommon (such as a charge to have tablecloths laundered), and the Program Committee will try to negotiate some of those. The Program Committee would like to try a new registration option this year: a lunch-only rate for those who might be interested in hearing the plenary speaker but not in attending the full symposium. Also under consideration is how to handle day-of registrants, since lunch is included in registration but catering numbers must be set in advance. The Program Committee plans to guarantee catered lunch to all pre-registered attendees, but may offer vouchers to day-of registrants that allow them to buy lunch from the café. The proposed registration is $50, but the budget outlines a $45 option, too.
The Board discussed the Fall 2018 Symposium. All agreed that $50 is a reasonable registration rate, especially with lunch included. Juliana said that if there are at least 100 attendees at the $50 rate, the symposium will likely turn a small profit. The rate is a jump over last year, but the symposium will deliver both lunch and a good amount of programming, so it should prove worth the extra cost. Caitlin Birch said that the Board should be prepared to field questions during registration from individuals who want to handle lunch on their own and request a reduced rate. A reduced rate should not be offered since lunch is a central part of the symposium, but the Board should expect these questions. The Board agreed.

Juliana said the venue will have a lactation room. Cristina asked how NEA can proactively help attendees navigate the significant construction going on around the JFK. Karen Adler Abramson said that the construction is a valid concern, and it will be important to monitor and communicate conditions. Jane emphasized the need for clear communication with attendees and suggested linking to the MBTA website for transit options.

Emily Atkins asked about target pre-registration numbers, citing the Fall 2017 Symposium (also held in Boston) that had lighter pre-registration than anticipated. Juliana said that around 100 pre-registrations would ensure that the symposium breaks even. Karen offered support for the lunch-only registration option and is interested to see what attendees think of it. Juliana suggested including a question about it in the meeting survey.

Juliana said that the deadline for presenter proposals is July 15. The Board should spread the word and encourage members to submit proposals. The Program Committee is also soliciting submissions of ethical questions for discussion.

Caitlin moved to approve the Fall 2018 Symposium budget as submitted, with the registration rate of $50. Ellen Doon seconded. No discussion. No abstentions. All members voted in favor (8-0-0).

**Spring meeting 2019 report**
Karen Adler Abramson opened the floor to questions about the Spring 2019 Program Committee report submitted by Sarah Galligan.

Juliana Kuipers asked whether the Program Committee could wait until August to call for session proposals. She said she knows Sarah G. wants to call for proposals in early July, but she’s concerned about having two CFPs out at the same time. Sarah Shoemaker said that waiting until August would be reasonable from the Communications Committee’s perspective. Karen will ask Sarah G.
Emily Atkins said that she’s been in touch with Sarah G. about the membership status of Program Committee members and that should be resolved soon. As a general note, in the future it would be best to have the membership secretary work on questions of membership status.

**Communications Committee report**
Sarah Shoemaker presented the Communications Committee report.

**SAA: NEA information table logistics**
Sarah said that NEA will again have a table at the Society of American Archivists Annual Meeting. Unlike in years past, the focus will not be on printed material, which is difficult to ship. Instead, the table will feature NEA’s banner, a poster-size infographic that will be left at the end of the conference, and a giveaway item like pencils. The table will be staffed by volunteers from the NEA membership. Rose Oliveira, Cristina Prochilo, and Liz Francis all volunteered to take shifts. Sarah will continue to accept volunteers. Emily Atkins suggested that Sarah look into printing the poster at the hotel rather than shipping it, and Sarah said she will do that.

**Website: procedure for updating pages**
Sarah asked Board members to notify the Communications Committee when they see out-of-date information on pages that fall under their specific areas of leadership. Comm Comm can then revise the pages with current information. Karen Adler Abramson noted that the 2016-2020 NEA Strategic Plan is out-of-date on the website. Caitlin Birch explained that the software Jessica Tanny used to create the web version of the plan wasn’t something that’s easy for others to use, but that **she will transfer relevant files to Emily Atkins, who has volunteered to help with updates**. Caitlin encouraged the Board to incorporate strategies for tracking progress and making updates in the writing of the next strategic plan.

**Treasurer’s report**
Emily Atkins presented the Treasurer’s report.

**Financial report**
Emily said that the Spring 2018 Meeting had a profit of almost $400. If two workshops hadn’t been canceled the profit would have been closer to $4,500. Jane Ward said that while the Board wants meetings to break even and ideally turn a profit, NEA is also financially healthy so lack of profit isn’t as concerning. Emily agreed but said the Board should keep in mind the increasing number of ongoing costs and strive to generate revenue where possible.

**Banking procedures**
Emily led a discussion of proposed changes to NEA’s banking procedures. NEA has close to $100,000 across multiple bank accounts. Cash reserves are in a Fidelity account, which is difficult to manage.
NEA’s regular checking account is through Citizens Bank. A CD is also with Citizens; there’s an annual 10-day period during which money can move in and out of the CD. NEA has a money market account and two savings accounts for the Hale and Haas awards with Citizens. At the time these accounts were opened they took advantage of high interest rates, but now the initial rates have expired so the counter benefit to having numerous accounts which are cumbersome to maintain and reconcile no longer exists. Additionally, NEA is not fully leveraging its ability to earn money on its funds. The proposal before the Board aims to streamline the number of accounts NEA maintains, which will make it easier for the treasurer to periodically review them and to make the smartest banking choices for the organization. Streamlining would be done by moving the CD, money market, and savings accounts into a Capital One Spark Business Savings account. The introductory rate on this account would significantly increase earned interest in the first year, but even after the intro rate expires, the account would still earn more than current accounts are earning. The interest would go into the Board’s general unrestricted fund. Emily posed several questions to the Board for discussion: What amount does the Board want in its cash reserve? How fast does the Board need to be able to access that reserve? How does the Board feel about the diversity of NEA’s portfolio?

Karen Adler Abramson asked whether NEA’s accountant had been consulted about the proposed changes. Emily said that NEA’s accountant prepares the organization’s taxes, but isn’t involved in consulting. Karen suggested hiring a financial advisor to help the Board make these kinds of decisions. Ellen Doon said the Board wants to make it as easy as possible for the treasurer to do the job, so streamlining accounts seems to make sense. Juliana Kuipers said that the current setup with many accounts makes tax time difficult each year, and complications only increase with the passage of time. Juliana agreed with the streamlining proposal. Emily said that if the Board hired a financial advisor, they’d only provide advice, not management of NEA’s money, so it may not be worth the expense. Karen said the financial advisor conversation may be one to explore separately from the proposal on the table. Juliana said that Emily’s proposal is the next logical step in a line of actions that were recommended when she was treasurer. The Board discussed amounts for the cash reserve. Emily will revise her written proposal, circulate the final language by email, and bring it to the Board for a vote.

Treasurer’s job description: recommended changes
New proposed position: bookkeeper

Emily presented a proposal to hire a bookkeeper and revise the treasurer’s job description. Emily said that the treasurer’s role has evolved to require a lot of specialized knowledge and a significant amount of time and labor. If a bookkeeper were hired, the portions of the treasurer’s responsibilities related to bookkeeping could be removed from the treasurer’s job description and the treasurer could shift focus to more strategic efforts. Proposing that we alter the treasurer’s job description so that the day-to-day bookkeeping is removed from the position and the treasurer can focus on strategic efforts. Hiring a bookkeeper would be an annual cost. Beyond the reduction of
responsibilities for the treasurer, another positive to hiring a bookkeeper would be continuity — as treasurers come and go, the same bookkeeper would likely remain and serve as a source of organizational knowledge.

Karen said Emily’s proposal makes sense and asked for an estimate of hours per week that the treasurer role currently requires. Emily said it’s probably close to 10 hours. Juliana said the rate for a bookkeeper might be a little higher than what Emily has proposed, closer to $30 or $40 per hour. Emily said that she’s not sure whether the Board is ready to vote on this proposal, but thinks it would be good to bring a bookkeeper on board as quickly as possible so they’re in place before a new treasurer’s term begins. Ellen said that the Board needs to consider the magnitude of the expense, and also make sure that if the proposal moves forward, the Board has clear criteria/standards for the position. Emily reviewed the proposed job descriptions for the bookkeeper and treasurer. The Board discussed pros but also concerns about cost and security. Jill Snyder said the Board can hire a bookkeeper and try this model, and if it doesn’t work, there’s nothing binding that would prevent a return to the way things were. Emily said that she will finalize the job descriptions and bring the proposal to the Board for a vote. The goal will be to have a bookkeeper in place before the start of the next treasurer’s term, and the bookkeeper will be funded through the end of that term. Karen said the president, treasurer, and clerk will be involved in hiring the bookkeeper.

FY2019 budget requests
Emily said that she will soon be soliciting FY19 budget requests from the Board. She’ll also be soliciting requests from roundtables.

Program co-sponsorships
Emily said there isn’t yet a concrete proposal for an approach to program co-sponsorships, but there is a brainstorming document. The Board will review it independently and discuss at the fall Board meeting.

Vice President’s report
Jamie Rice presented the Vice President’s report.

Spring 2020 meeting: potential location
Jamie said that she has begun researching locations for the Spring 2020 Meeting. Providence, RI seems like a good fit. Jamie is accepting recommendations for a Program Committee chair. She’s also exploring potential dates for the meeting.

NEA Newsletter report
Claire Lobdell presented the NEA Newsletter report. The July issue is ready. Two new editors, Katy Sternberger and Danielle Castronovo, will join the committee in the fall.
Feature and mini-feature articles: methods for soliciting submissions
Claire said that the biggest challenge the editors continue to face is that it’s difficult to get members interested in writing/submittng articles. Suggestions from the Board are welcome.

Karen Adler Abramson asked whether this issue was a longstanding one. Juliana Kuipers noted that the existence of the *Journal of Contemporary Archival Studies* may be a factor. Caitlin Birch suggested that this may be a good opportunity for the Board to take a big picture view of the *Newsletter* and clarify its goals. Ellen Doon suggested adding questions about the *Newsletter* to the membership survey and the Board agreed. Jamie Rice suggested a recurring feature that would highlight a different repository (nominated by a member who worked there) in each issue. Liz Francis said she liked that idea and also suggested a feature that would spotlight a new member in each issue. Jane Ward suggested printing the text of the Fall 2018 Symposium plenary in the winter issue. Jill Snyder said member feedback could help the Board learn more about what members want to read in the *Newsletter*, and also to clarify what belongs in the *Newsletter* and what belongs in *JCAS*. Emily Atkins said that the 2013-15 membership surveys all asked questions about the *Newsletter*. Data from those surveys indicate that members were in favor of shifting to electronic delivery. Karen did an informal poll of the Board on the question of print versus electronic delivery; all but two members said they’d prefer electronic. Claire asked whether there was any action her committee should take beyond the development of questions for the membership survey. Karen asked Claire to gather information from her committee about their perspective on the *Newsletter*, and what they’d like to see from it.

The Board discussed more generally the procedure and timeline for the membership survey.

Education Committee report
Jill Snyder presented the Education Committee report. Jill joined the committee in the spring and met with former chair Stephanie Call to get background on the committee’s activities at the time Stephanie left. Andrea Belair couldn’t attend that meeting, but Jill briefed her on what was discussed. Jill and Andrea then they reviewed the 2016-2020 NEA Strategic Plan to see what actions they could tackle. They’ve now begun work on webinars, skill shares, and workshops.

Webinar pilot proposal
Jill said NEA has a commitment to reach members everywhere, but in-person webinars have been less successful outside the Boston area. Webinars offer a good solution to that problem. The Education Committee proposes a webinar program in which each webinar would be two hours in length, and could be recorded and made available later. They arrived at their proposed registration rate by looking at the rate for half-day workshops and then cutting that in half. There wasn’t an existing policy around honoraria for the instructor, so they proposed a rate. The committee plans to pilot a webinar in the fall. Jill asked for Board feedback.
Jane Ward said that students usually pay a half-price rate for other NEA programming, so their rate should be cut in half for webinars, too. Emily Atkins said the Board has a formula for calculating rates for different categories of attendees, and the proposed pricing structure doesn’t seem to follow that. Emily asked whether a new formula was needed for webinars. Jill said that the Education Committee will follow the existing formula. Caitlin Birch said that the topic of recording will need further discussion. Where will the recordings live? How will the Board provide access? How will access be restricted to those who have paid? These questions don’t need to be answer in order to pilot a webinar in the fall, but the Board should be thinking about them. Ellen Doon said that these are questions the Board needs to answer on a larger scale; plenaries are already being recorded with the goal of making them available after meetings. Claire Lobdell said that there will also be copyright questions. Juliana Kuipers said that webinars can be classified as work for hire. Jill asked whether the Board was in agreement that rates would remain the same regardless of the timing of an attendee’s registration. The Board agreed. Jill asked whether the Board liked the idea of recording webinars and making them available later. Jane asked whether Q&As would be recorded. Permission would be needed from attendees. Juliana said that consenting to recording of the Q&A is part of meeting registration policy, so it can be part of webinar registration, too. Sarah Shoemaker said that part of the pilot should be determining how many members will want online access to the recording after the fact.

Jill asked about next steps. Emily said a vote on the honoraria rate was needed. Emily moved to approve $125 as the amount NEA pays a webinar instructor during the pilot, which consists of any webinars held between now and the Spring 2019 Meeting, to be reviewed at the meeting. Ellen seconded. No discussion. No abstentions. All members voted in favor (7-0-0).

**Skill share pilot proposal**

Jill said that NEA can’t use the term skill share because it’s trademarked. The Education Committee is using the term “knowledge share” instead. Knowledge shares would be informal — any member could offer one and there would be no honoraria paid. Jill asked for the Board’s feedback on the written proposal. Emily said that she thinks it’s too much. Is a day-of representative really necessary? The Board agreed that it isn’t. Emily said that the knowledge shares are an opportunity for the Education Committee to experiment and try out different approaches, since there isn’t a financial consequence. The Board agreed to support the proposal.

**Spring 2019 meeting workshop proposal**

[Due to limited time, this item was tabled for later discussion.]

**Open positions update**

*Records Management Roundtable Co-Chair*
IDC positions (4)
Membership Committee (3)
[Due to limited time, these items were tabled for later discussion.]

President’s report
Summer membership survey (new questions)
Workshop policy follow up: food and multiple speaker honoraria
Board meeting virtual attendance: proposal to open to membership
[Due to limited time, these items were tabled for later discussion.]

Immediate Past President’s report
Ellen Doon presented the Immediate Past President’s report.

Nominating Committee: vote in new members
Ellen reviewed the proposed members of the Nominating Committee. Karen Adler Abramson noted that all proposed members are later-career archivists and asked if that was intentional. Ellen said that she did intend to include later-career members, but would welcome the inclusion of early-career members for balance. If an early-career member were added to the committee, Ellen said it would be important that the person had some experience with NEA. Does think it’s important for the person to have some experience with the organization. Ellen also posed a question about potentially having the Board elect the Nominating Committee in the future, but tabled discussion due to limited time. Liz Francis asked whether it would be possible to add a member of the Inclusion and Diversity Committee to the Nominating Committee. The Board supported that idea. Rose Oliveira and Rosemary K. J. Davis said they will discuss and put someone from the IDC forward. Ellen moved to approve the members of the Nominating Committee as submitted in the Immediate Past President’s report [Maria Bernier, Stephanie Call, Jennifer Gunter King, and Tom Rosko], with the addition of one member of the IDC. Caitlin Birch seconded. No discussion. No abstentions. All members voted in favor (7-0-0).

Strategic plan updates
Caitlin Birch reported on the implementation of the NEA Strategic Plan 2016-2020. The report recurs quarterly to ensure that the Board continues to make progress toward achieving the plan’s goals. There were 11 total items that fell under review this quarter, and of those 11, none have been completed, three are in progress, five haven’t been started, and three are the responsibility of the Board and require discussion today.

Items in Progress
“By January 2018, June 2018, the Education Committee will develop at least one education workshop for mid-career archivists on salary negotiation and career advancement.” (4.3.4.b)
Caitlin spoke with Andrea Belair about the above item. Andrea said this item is in progress and the Education Committee may have an update at the Board meeting.

Further discussion of this item ensued at the Board meeting.

Jill Snyder said the Education Committee is working toward offering a workshop for mid-career archivists at the Spring 2019 Meeting. Caitlin said at the January 2018 Board meeting, the Board brainstormed several names of potential instructors for this workshop. Caitlin will send the names to Jill. This item is in progress and the revised deadline is June 2019.

“By June 2017 June 2018, the Education Committee will identify and develop web-based resources, such as skillshares, for frequently requested educational topics that will allow the membership to gain basic, immediate knowledge of a subject or resource.” (4.4.1.a)

Caitlin spoke with Andrea about the above item. Andrea said this item is in progress and the Education Committee may have an update at the Board meeting.

Further discussion of this item ensued at the Board meeting.

Following Jill’s presentation of the Education Committee’s proposal earlier in the Board meeting, this item is in progress and the revised deadline is June 2019.

“By June 2018, the Education Committee will implement a system with clearly defined processes for hosting and successfully marketing webinars on a variety of topics, such as those offered by SAA, with the goal of mitigating issues of cost and distance and reaching a greater number of participants.” (4.4.1.b)

Caitlin spoke with Andrea about the above item. Andrea said this item is in progress and the Education Committee may have an update at the Board meeting.

Further discussion of this item ensued at the Board meeting.

Following Jill’s presentation of the Education Committee’s proposal earlier in the Board meeting, this item is in progress and the revised deadline is June 2019.

Items Not Yet Begun

“By June 2017 June 2018, the CEC will work with the NEA Web Coordinator to create a space on the website for general resources about archives for the general public.” (4.1.2.b)
Caitlin spoke with Sarah Shoemaker about the above item. Sarah S. said that because the Community Engagement Coordinator position was so recently filled, there hasn’t yet been an opportunity to work on this item. Sarah S. spoke with Abbey Malangone and Karen Adler Abramson and all are in agreement that June 2019 should be the new deadline.

Further discussion of this item ensued at the Board meeting.

**The Board agreed to a revised deadline of June 2019.**

“By June 2018, the Membership Committee and/or a Task Force (if appropriate), will develop a policy and procedures for outreach to retired and lapsed members with invitations to stay involved as presenters, workshop leaders, and newsletter contributors.” (4.3.4.c)

Caitlin spoke with Sam Howes about the above item. Sam said work on this item has not begun but the Membership Committee should be able to accomplish it by October 2018.

Further discussion of this item ensued at the Board meeting.

**The Board agreed to a revised deadline of October 2018.**

“By June 2017 June 2018, the Education Committee will develop a tiered workshop structure, with tiered pricing, that offers continuing education opportunities along three tiers (beginner, intermediate, and advanced) in order to better serve our entire membership.” (4.4.2.a)

Caitlin spoke with Andrea about the above item. Andrea said work on this item has not begun.

Further discussion of this item ensued at the Board meeting.

Emily Atkins said that this item developed out of conversations she and Stephanie Call had when Stephanie was chair of the Education Committee and Emily was registrar. Emily volunteered to discuss further with Andrea and Jill and add some historical context to this item. Karen said she’d like to be part of that conversation, too, and the Board agreed to include everyone in the discussion by holding it during the October 2018 Board meeting. The revised deadline for this item is June 2019.

“By June 2018, the Education Committee, in collaboration with the CEC, will create a mechanism for institutions to request low-cost basic archival training to their employees, volunteers, NEA members and other interested parties.” (4.4.2.b)
Caitlin spoke with Andrea and Sarah S. about the above item. Andrea said that the Education Committee has not yet begun work on this item, noting the recent appointment of the CEC. Sarah S. said that because the CEC position was so recently filled, there hasn’t yet been an opportunity to work on this item. Sarah S. spoke with Abbey and Karen and all are in agreement that June 2019 should be the new deadline.

Further discussion of this item ensued at the Board meeting.

The Board agreed to a revised deadline of June 2019.

“By June 2018, the CEC, in conjunction with the IDC and/or a task force (if appropriate), will establish a working group to develop resources for archival outreach to K-12 students and teachers. The CEC will encourage participation of NEA members as judges for National History Day, the annual history competition for 6-12 graders, reach out to all state-level NHD organizations to find out how NEA members can volunteer to serve as judges, and aim to have at least one NEA member participating annually in each of the state competitions.” (4.5.2.b)

Caitlin spoke with Sarah S., Rose Oliveira, and Rosemary K. J. Davis about the above item. Sarah S. said that because the CEC position was so recently filled, there hasn’t yet been an opportunity to work on this item. Sarah S. spoke with Abbey and Karen and all are in agreement that June 2019 should be the new deadline. Rose and Rosemary said the Inclusion and Diversity Committee has not yet begun work on this item, noting the recent appointment of the CEC and suggesting that Abbey name a manageable deadline.

Further discussion of this item ensued at the Board meeting.

Liz Francis, Claire Lobdell, and Abbey all indicated that they had worked on NHD before. The Board agreed to revise the deadline for the NHD piece of this item to October 2018. The item as a whole has a revised deadline of October 2019.

Items for Board Discussion

“By June 2018, members dedicated to development on the Membership Committee will, aided by membership survey data and the Development Task Force final report (2013), define development for NEA, identify priorities for funding opportunities, identify new and existing sources of funding, and explore, in cooperation with the NEA Treasurer, sustainable and responsible financial planning, defining areas that will benefit from development.” (4.3.2.a)

The Board agreed that the above item is now in progress. Sam, Emily, and Karen will discuss next steps. The revised deadline for this item is June 2019.
By January 2018 June 2018, the development member(s) of the Membership Committee and/or a Task Force (if appropriate), will perform a comprehensive review of newsletter and other NEA outreach tools in light of vendor support. (4.3.3.b)

Ellen Doon, Karen, and Jane Ward will discuss next steps. The revised deadline is January 2019.

By June 2017 January 2018 June 2018, the Executive Board, advised by the Conference and Education Platform Task Force (2015), will offer at least one low-cost, no-travel option for accessing in part or in full all NEA conferences, workshops, and business meetings through streaming, webinars, or similar means. (4.5.3.c)

Emily said that there are significant questions — recording logistics, storage, rights, etc. — that require discussion before any progress can be made on this item. Karen asked whether all of these questions needed answers right now, or whether they could be answered after the Board experimented through a pilot. The Board agreed to the pilot. Ellen said that a pilot only requires one willing presenter. Karen will discuss with Sarah Galligan the possibility of running a pilot at the Spring 2019 Meeting. The revised deadline for this item is June 2019.

Fall Board meeting logistics
[Due to limited time, these items were tabled for later discussion.]

Adjourn
The meeting adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Caitlin Birch