New England Archivist Executive Board Meeting
January 18, 2019
10:00 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.
College of the Holy Cross
Worcester, MA

AGENDA

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

10:15 – 10:25 Secretary’s report (Caitlin Birch)
Approval of October meeting minutes
Membership status updates

10:25 – 10:40 Vice President’s report (Jamie Kingman Rice)
Fall 2019 symposium update
Zoom: findings from Maine Historical Society

10:40 – 11:00 Spring 2019 meeting report (Sarah Galligan)

11:00 – 11:15 Fall 2018 symposium final report (Juliana Kuipers)

11:15 – 11:30 Spring 2020 meeting report (Amber LaFountain)
Transportation to non-hotel events
A/V services procurement timeline

11:30 – 11:40 Task Force for Documentation Practices report (Sarah Shoemaker)
Listserv recommendations

11:40 – 12:00 NEA Newsletter report (Claire Lobdell)
Implementation of print/electronic option (action required)
New feature: interviews w/ new members
Request for new email account (action required)
Request for table at spring meeting

12:00 – 1:00 Lunch (on our own)

1:00 – 1:30 Strategic plan updates (Caitlin Birch)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:30 – 1:40</td>
<td>Registrar’s report (Olivia Mandica-Hart)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-member registration at free events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:40 – 1:45</td>
<td>Open positions update (Karen Adler Abramson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership Committee (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentoring Program (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 – 2:05</td>
<td>Membership Committee report (Jessica Holden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment of mentoring liaisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petition for new Roundtable: Teaching with Primary Sources (action required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:05 – 2:20</td>
<td>Inclusion and Diversity Committee report (Rose Oliveira)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Event check list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic goals discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:20 – 2:30</td>
<td>Afternoon break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 – 2:50</td>
<td>Immediate Past President’s report (Ellen Doon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awards process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:50 – 3:30</td>
<td>Treasurer’s report (Emily Atkins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey Monkey: transfer of access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WildApricot: donation function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current state of NEA finances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact of increasing costs on financial/program planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential committee/task force for financial planning (action pending)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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College of the Holy Cross
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In attendance: Karen Adler Abramson, Emily Atkins, Caitlin Birch, Ellen Doon, Liz Francis, Linda Hocking, Juliana Kuipers, Claire Lobdell, Olivia Mandica-Hart, Rose Oliveira, Cristina Prochilo, Jamie Kingman Rice, Sarah Shoemaker, Jane Ward

In attendance via video conference: Molly Brown, Betts Coup, Abigail Cramer, Sarah Galligan, Cynthia Harbeson, Jessica Holden, Amber LaFountain, Jordan Meyerl, Elizabeth Slomba

Welcome and introductions
At 10:13 a.m., Karen Adler Abramson called the meeting to order, followed by attendee introductions.

Secretary’s report
Caitlin Birch presented the secretary’s report.

Approval of October meeting minutes
Caitlin shared one addition to the minutes that Emily Atkins submitted by email and that Caitlin planned to include in the final version. The Board had already taken the action that the addition described and agreed that it could be included without further review. Karen noted that there were several typos in the minutes. She will send Caitlin an email about them and Caitlin will correct them. Caitlin moved to approve the October 24, 2018 quarterly Board meeting minutes as submitted, but with the addition submitted by Emily via email and with typos corrected. Ellen Doon seconded. No discussion. No abstentions. All members voted in favor (8-0-0).

Membership status updates
Caitlin shared an update on the outstanding membership statuses of volunteers identified in her report. She was able to confirm the status of the identified volunteers with the help of the relevant committee chairs and Emily. She clarified that the reason her report raises these issues each quarter is because she has to record current contact information for each volunteer, and when she searches the membership database for the volunteer and doesn’t return any results, that signifies the possibility that the volunteer is either not in good standing or has chosen not to make their profile viewable in the database. It isn’t actually the secretary’s responsibility to verify membership status for volunteers, and the Board may want to discuss at a future meeting how this work should be completed. Emily clarified that the role of membership secretary exists for this reason and all committee leaders should be confirming their new volunteers with the membership secretary. Rose Oliveira asked whether
committee chairs should check the membership database as a first step. Juliana Kuipers said they should go straight to the membership secretary. Karen Adler Abramson said she had a call with Sam Howes and Elizabeth Slomba to talk about the role of the membership secretary now that it’s part of the Membership Committee, and they will continue refining the role.

**Vice President’s report**
Jamie Kingman Rice presented the vice president’s report.

*Zoom: findings from Maine Historical Society*
Jamie gathered information from the Maine Historical Society about its use of Zoom to help inform NEA’s decision-making. MHS has a Pro Zoom account, which runs through one master administrator account. All Zoom meetings must be scheduled through the administrator account. Other members of the staff can have sub-administrator accounts, but they still need to schedule through the administrator account since it’s the only one that carries the MHS identity. All department heads have access to the administrator account via the login credentials for it. NEA could consider this model, although with frequent turnover in leadership, it would involve maintenance to change login credentials each time a leader rotates off the Board. MHS also has a camera with a microphone that’s configured for use with Zoom, but it can’t take additional mics.

Karen Adler Abramson said that Emily Atkins acquired mics to use with Zoom. Emily said the mics are compatible with laptops.

Karen asked for Board feedback on the MHS model. Emily said she and Abigail Cramer discussed the model. NEA has a Pro Zoom account but it’s administered through the representatives-at-large email account, meaning the reps-at-large are currently the only ones with the ability to schedule meetings. Emily and Abigail think it would be best if Kelli Bogan could set up an NEA email account specifically for Zoom and the administrator account could run through that address. Emily also suggested purchasing a second Zoom license, which is in the budget. Juliana Kuipers asked whether there’s a limit on the number of email addresses the NEA domain hosts. **Sarah Shoemaker said she doesn’t think there’s a limit but she will check with Kelli.** Jamie clarified that to use Zoom, logging in to the email address as the login name is unnecessary. The Board would simply use the email address as the login name for Zoom.

Karen asked the Board to discuss the logistics of sharing an account. Jane Ward asked whether someone who wants to schedule a meeting would just contact Kelli to do it, since Kelli would set up the email address. Juliana said that the idea is to use a central email address so that a mediator isn’t necessary. Karen asked whether there are security concerns involved with distributing the password to multiple NEA leaders. Emily said the password would only be for Zoom so it’s not a problem. Abigail said the password for Zoom and the password for the email account itself could be different. Sarah S.
asked whether two meetings could occur at the same time. Emily said the second license will allow for that. Abigail said that there are no cases so far in which two meetings have been requested for the same time slot. Jane asked whether that made a second license unnecessary. Emily said that the Board should anticipate increasing use of Zoom as time passes. The second license has already been approved in the budget but doesn’t have to be purchased if the Board feels it’s unnecessary. The Board agreed to pursue the second license.

*Fall 2019 symposium update*
Jamie said there isn’t new information to share about the Fall 2019 Symposium. She still plans to hold the meeting at the Osher Map Library and anticipates having updates to share in a month.

Juliana asked whether there’s a chair for the Program Committee yet. Jamie said there isn’t a chair yet but that she’d be interested in chairing the symposium herself. The Board discussed and agreed that a program committee cannot be chaired by a current vice president, but that Jamie should remain involved in the aspects of planning that normally fall to the vice president: making local arrangements for the symposium, selecting a chair, and supporting the chair as needed. **Jamie will move forward with finding a chair and recruiting a Program Committee.** Karen requested that if anyone has ideas for a chair, they share them with Jamie.

*Spring 2019 meeting report*
Sarah Galligan presented the Spring 2019 Meeting report. She shared an overview of the meeting schedule. On Thursday, there are three workshops: Building Advocacy and Support for Digital Archives (SAA), Oral History with the Vermont Folklife Center, and Caring for Historical Records. There is an afternoon of service from 1 to 5 p.m. at Fletcher Free Library and the Vermont Queer Archives, and there’s a meetup Thursday evening at The Archives bar. Attendees will pay for their own food and drinks. On Friday, the plenary speaker is Jean Bessette, a professor of English and Gender, Sexuality and Women’s Studies at the University of Vermont. Sessions run from 10:30 a.m. to 12 p.m. followed by the NEA Annual Business Meeting over lunch. More sessions run from 1:30 to 3 p.m., followed by roundtable meetings, a reception, and movie night. On Saturday, Vermont Secretary of State Jim Condos is the plenary speaker. Sessions run from 10:30 a.m. to 12 p.m., attendees are on their own for lunch, and two more session blocks run from 1:30 to 3 and 3:30 to 4:30 p.m. Mentoring Program networking and the new member meetup will also be incorporated into the schedule.

Sarah G. said the meeting will take place on the first and second floors of the hotel. There will be a respite room on the second floor. The lactation room will be a standard hotel room on a higher level of the building. There will be a gender-neutral restroom. Rose Oliveira asked how high up the lactation room will be. She has concerns about the difficulty of getting there with lines for the elevator. Sarah G. said she shares Rose’s concern and will request a low-level room.
Jane Ward asked when information to book hotel room would become available. Sarah G. said it would be available as soon as possible, but in the meantime it’s possible to call the hotel and secure the discounted room rate by identifying as part of NEA. Ellen asked Sarah G. to share the draft schedule with the whole Board. Sarah G. will share the schedule. Emily Atkins asked if awards would occur during the Annual Business Meeting. Sarah G. said that they would. Emily asked whether there would be programming during the roundtable meetings to engage attendees who aren’t part of a roundtable. Rose said the Inclusion and Diversity Committee is planning to do a reading group. Olivia Mandica-Hart asked whether there was an update on workshop descriptions. Sarah G. said she has two of the descriptions and is still waiting to hear back from Vermont Folklife. She will send the two she has to Olivia and to Sarah S. for copyediting by the Communications Committee. Karen Adler Abramson asked for an update on the potential of streaming the IDC session, which the Board had identified as an opportunity to pilot session streaming. Sarah G. said that she can identify when the session will occur but hasn’t explored the logistics of streaming yet. She’ll look into it. Karen volunteered to help if needed. Emily said the pilot could also be a good opportunity to test a camera/microphone setup for Zoom and suggested that the audiovisual crew for the meeting might rent equipment for this purpose. Jane asked whether an hour-and-a-half is enough time for both the Annual Business Meeting and the awards. Ellen Doon said that it was enough time last year.

Emily said that the meeting vendors were challenging to work with this year, which has compressed the timeline for everything, beginning with budget approval. Registration is opening a week late, workshop registration is opening late, etc. For financial success, sticking to the timeline is important. If the timeline in the Spring Meeting Guide isn’t working as laid out, the Board needs to think about revising it for the peace of mind of all involved. Jane said that it feels like the Board is always rushing to plan spring meetings and it seems that planning needs to begin sooner. Juliana Kuipers said that ideally (according to the guide), planning begins two years out from the date of the meeting. When the Board switched to the new meeting format, it was acknowledged that planning had to begin earlier. The quicker timeline in use for fall symposium planning doesn’t work for the spring meeting. Jane said that fall planning should begin earlier, too. Ellen said that the Board should be careful to maintain the flexibility of the fall format. Emily said that NEA’s 50th anniversary meeting is approaching and that’s going to require even more intensive planning, so she’s raising the issue now to make sure the Board is planning far enough in advance as a matter of practice. Karen said that there’s also a mentoring aspect to making sure those responsible for planning are planning early enough, since they often don’t have experience with these responsibilities before they begin their roles. Juliana asked whether it would be useful to create a meeting coordinator position with a longer term of service to add more continuity to meeting planning. The Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference does this. Jane said a meeting coordinator is a great idea. NEA used to have a Program Committee and a Local Arrangements Committee, but now the work of the LAC falls to others. Ellen said the bulk of local arrangements now occurs through the contract process. It would be good to have a coordinator responsible for negotiating each contract with the vice president’s involvement,
but without all of the work falling to the VP. Juliana agreed. Jane said the coordinator could be the person steering the planning timeline and navigating the contract process. Juliana said the Board could look for someone to fill the role for three years and develop documentation to pass on to the next person. Ellen said the role could be designed so that the incoming and outgoing coordinators overlap for six months, which would allow for onboarding. Rose asked Sarah G. if a meeting coordinator sounds like a helpful role from her perspective. Sarah G. said it does sound helpful, and it would also help to have a project management tool with the planning timeline built in so that planners would be prompted to do the right things at the right time. Karen said she would be willing to talk to MARAC about their meeting coordinator and how the role functions. Juliana supported that idea. Karen reminded the Board and Sarah G. that this is a general discussion of ways to improve the process and not a commentary on the planning of Spring 2019. Sarah G. said that that makes sense and asked if Amber LaFountain had any feedback. Amber said that the Spring Meeting Guide is helpful and that she has been experimenting with using Trello for project management of the meeting. Karen asked Amber to keep the Board posted on how things go with Trello, as it might inform the work of the Task Force for Documentation Practices. Amber asked if there’s a timeline the TFDP has that would determine when they’d need feedback on Trello. Sarah S. said there’s no strict deadline. It would be good to know if there’s a template within Trello that Amber finds helpful for managing the Spring Meeting. Amber will look into that.

Fall 2018 symposium final report
Juliana Kuipers presented the Fall 2018 Symposium report. The symposium was a success and had the second highest number of registrants for a fall event since the new meeting model was instituted. There were 150 attendees registered and 137 attended, making for a 91 percent attendance rate. The survey data for the symposium indicated a high level of satisfaction from attendees. No attendee selected the “very dissatisfied” option on the survey. The base registration rate of $50 — higher than in the past because the symposium included lunch and more content than usual — was well-received, but Juliana doesn’t recommend making this rate the standard. The Board should be as economical as possible and base rates on the specifics of each meeting. Some attendees really liked the format, which kept all attendees together in one space for the duration of the symposium. The Program Committee wanted to include small group discussions among attendees seated at the same table but ultimately scrapped that idea during planning because they were unsure how it would work in the meeting space. In retrospect, they wish they had kept it because attendees seemed intimidated by speaking in front of the whole room. Survey data was mixed about breaks — some attendees wanted more, some wanted less. The plenary was the most unsuccessful part of the symposium. Some attendees didn’t like that the plenary and lunch occurred together because it cut into networking time, but the main criticism seemed to be the plenary content. The Program Committee wanted a speaker from outside the archival community but his talk wasn’t what they expected; it seemed to be a standard talk that wasn’t tailored to the audience, and some aspects of it offended some attendees. The Program Committee didn’t have the opportunity to discuss the talk with the speaker beforehand,
only with his assistant. Picking a plenary speaker is a challenge for all program committees. Some attendees at NEA meetings like hearing ideas from outside the profession, while others want a plenary that directly addresses their work. Survey feedback indicated that attendees liked the location — the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum — of the symposium. Working with the JFK catering team went smoothly. The Spring 2018 Meeting had issues with the accommodation of vegetarian, vegan, gluten-free, and nut-free diets (and combinations of those), so the Program Committee worked hard to address dietary restrictions for Fall 2019. **Juliana will pass along documentation showing how this Program Committee handled dietary requests to help future program committees.**

Karen Adler Abramson said that it was a great meeting and suggested that since the location was a success, it may be good to repeat the JFK as a location in the future. Juliana agreed that it should be kept in mind for future Boston meetings.

Juliana said a lot of comments in the survey were about unmet expectations, so one takeaway for future program committees is to manage expectations as clearly as possible. Rose Oliveira said that one comment mentioned a lack of diversity in the types of institutions represented and another comment was about a lack of racial diversity. Another comment discussed waste and recycling, or how NEA meetings can be greener. Juliana acknowledged that these are all areas in which NEA can improve. On the point regarding diversity of institution types, that comment is somewhat frustrating because the program is formed from proposals, so in order to diversify, non-academic archivists need to submit proposals. The alternative is to have the Program Committee cold-call members from non-academic archives and ask them to present. Ellen Doon said that method had been used in the past, so it could be done if needed. Jane Ward said that attendees also sometimes forget that NEA is an all-volunteer organization. Rose said that part of how we address feedback like this is to ensure that diversity is a standard value in all NEA operations — for example, how panels are formed, how committees are formed. Emily Atkins said the Board must also consider the financial ramifications of some suggestions. NEA may not be able to achieve some of the environmental recommendations because they're simply not an option yet at the meeting venue or they're a prohibitively expensive option. Juliana said that overall, the Program Committee tried to be very mindful of diversity and sought to attract committee members from different career stages and different kinds of institutions. They hoped that would carry over into a diversity of presenters, but it didn’t really work. Even with their best efforts, it’s difficult for program committees to achieve ideal diversity. Caitlin Birch said that the Board should remember that communication goes a long way. Being open with the membership about how the Board is working to make progress in these areas matters, even if the result of that work falls short of member ideals. Having the Inclusion and Diversity Committee is already a big step forward, and perhaps the Board can be more transparent about any steps taken toward addressing environmental issues. Jamie Kingman Rice asked if the post-Spring 2019 Meeting survey could ask for suggestions about environmental steps NEA should take. Juliana said that was a good idea, but it
might be best to put it in the general membership survey instead to reach a larger audience and get feedback on greening NEA overall, not just at meetings. Caitlin suggested that Project ARCC might be a good partner for any green initiatives NEA undertakes. Juliana said there’s already member feedback suggesting a potential future meeting centered around climate change.

Karen said that she was pleased with the contributions of the Program Committee, particularly in facilitating discussion at the symposium, and thanked Juliana for the Program Committee’s work.

**Spring 2020 meeting report**
Amber LaFountain presented the Spring 2020 Meeting report. The meeting is set to take place at the Providence Marriott Downtown, April 2-4, 2020. There are twelve members serving on the Program Committee and they represent a nice geographic diversity. The committee met for the first time by conference call in December and discussed the planning process and what subcommittees would be necessary. They discussed a theme of “Inside and Outside,” which could be related to the field itself, who is in the field and how it works with outside professions, who archivists collect and who they don’t collect, what outside-the-box innovations are developing, what constitutes archival identity, who makes up the archives profession, etc. They’ve formed a theme subcommittee that will hone all these ideas into a more concise description. Other subcommittees will focus on plenary speakers, tours, day of service projects, special programming, inclusion and diversity programming, and a reception. All subcommittees are in the brainstorming phase, with a committee conference call planned for February. Amber has been in touch with Emily Atkins (and plans to be in touch with Cynthia Harbeson soon) about budget planning, with Olivia Mandica-Hart about registration projections, and with Jessica Tanny, who is interested in working with NEA again on program design.

*Transportation to non-hotel events*
Amber asked the Board for input on what’s been done at past meetings to provide transportation for attendees. The Program Committee hopes transportation won’t be an issue, but is questioning what to do if programming includes something like a tour that’s further from the meeting site. Emily Atkins said that the Board explored transportation between Boston and the Yiddish Book Center for an extra fee at the Fall 2016 Symposium. There wasn’t enough interest to go forward with it. In general, NEA does not have funding in the budget for the kind of transportation Amber anticipates might be needed. Information could be provided to attendees to help them determine transportation options for themselves, but it isn’t NEA’s responsibility to provide transportation unless there are inclusion and diversity concerns. Rose Oliveira suggested a signup that would allow attendees to connect with one another and arrange shared transportation amongst themselves. Juliana Kuipers said similar signups have been offered in the past. Emily said that having attendees arrange their own transportation also removes liability from NEA. Juliana said that if the meeting includes programming that all attendees are expected to attend and it’s far from the meeting site, then the Board would have to think about transportation, but for optional programming it’s not necessary. The Board could
include language on the meeting registration form directing attendees to contact the Inclusion and Diversity Committee if they have transportation concerns. Amber said these were great ideas, and since there’s a possibility that a reception will be held outside the meeting hotel, the Program Committee will keep all of this in mind.

**A/V services procurement timeline**
Amber said that in the meeting contract, there's a provision for A/V services that requires a decision about whether A/V will be provided by the hotel A/V or an outside vendor. She asked the Board when the decision had to be made. Emily said that now is the right time to shop around for A/V options if the Program Committee has the bandwidth to do it. There’s usually little variation in NEA’s A/V needs from meeting to meeting, so the Program Committee could provide NEA’s usual needs to vendors and ask them for quotes. If a good vendor is identified, the hotel will then need to approve that vendor. Sometimes it’s beneficial to use the hotel’s company since they’re familiar with the venue.

**Treasurer’s report**
Emily Atkins presented the treasurer’s report. The annual budget and Spring 2019 Meeting budget both passed. Amber LaFountain has reached out to begin work on the Spring 2020 Meeting budget. Membership renewals are strong in January in line with the old membership year. Check payments seem like they’re decreasing, which is good. When a member does pay by check, Emily tries to make sure that the member is continuing to monitor their online NEA account. This is the reason that subscription services may no longer pay by check — NEA shouldn’t receive dues from someone who isn’t plugged into their membership. In the case of subscription services, checks were arriving without a name or email address attached. Emily is notifying senders of the change. Emily is also preparing NEA’s taxes with NEA’s accountant and is bringing Cynthia Harbeson into the process so she can begin learning it.

**Survey Monkey: transfer of access**
Emily said that for the time being, the treasurer is the primary contact for NEA’s SurveyMonkey account. The account allows for two connected devices, which means that for now, any NEA leader who wants to log in needs to work with Emily to make sure they receive the verification code that will let them log in on their device. The Board has been using SurveyMonkey for about 10 years, and to continue to use it without limitations on devices, the Board would either have to significantly increase the amount of money spent on the account or be in violation of SurveyMonkey’s new terms. **Juliana Kuipers asked if this would be something to have the new survey coordinator explore. Emily said yes. Juliana will talk to Colin Lukens.** Rose Oliveira asked who uses SurveyMonkey. Juliana said the Membership Committee uses it for the membership survey, program committees use it after meetings, and the Education Committee uses it after workshops.

**WildApricot: donation function**
Emily expressed thanks to Kelli Bogan for all the work she did setting up a test of Wild Apricot’s donation functionality. Unfortunately, the function is not going to work for NEA. Emily tested it by making a donation herself and there were several problems. The donation became part of her membership profile. A new donation would overwrite the old donation. Donations are not itemized on any of the invoices, and for tax purposes, itemization is required. To manually manage itemization, it would be a large amount of work on the treasurer’s part. Kelli mentioned that this is a known issue for Wild Apricot and they may address it in future development. NEA could look into hiring a developer to build out the functionality now, but she doesn’t know how much it would cost yet. NEA doesn’t currently bring in many online donations, so it might not be worth it to pay for development. The Board may want to instead work on other ways to engage the membership fiscally.

**Current state of NEA finances**

Emily said that since the Board already discussed Zoom earlier in the meeting, no further discussion on that topic is needed for the treasurer’s report. She asked that whoever spearheads the optimization of Zoom gets in touch with her for the financial piece.

Emily said that she is 50 percent of the way to getting NEA tax-exempt status in Vermont, which will hopefully decrease the cost of the Spring 2019 Meeting. Jane Ward asked if tax was currently included in the meeting budget and Emily said it was. Jane said that she was slightly concerned about the projected vendor revenue in the budget. Emily said that she had asked for information on that number and didn’t hear back. Jane said that she wasn’t asked. Emily said she asked Sarah Galligan. She would like to have a conversation with some of the vendors to gain insights on how NEA works with them. The Board could begin offering vendor packages to make vending with NEA more attractive. Vendor prices could also be listed online to attract new vendors. The Society of American Archivists uses this model at their meetings. Karen Adler Abramson said that NEA is in conflict with the Midwest Archives Conference’s meeting this year, so NEA may be losing some of the usual vendors. Emily said it might be time to try some new ways of reaching vendors and encouraged the Board to be as proactive as possible.

**Impact of increasing costs on financial/program planning**

Emily said that the Board has been passing deficit budgets for years, and while actual deficits have been avoided, the margins are getting smaller. At the same time, NEA’s 50th anniversary is approaching and with it, anticipated spending. If expenses keep going up and income doesn’t keep pace, the Board is going to start relying more and more on NEA’s reserve to keep the organization healthy. The reserve should ideally be maintained for use in the event of an emergency, such as having to cancel a Spring Meeting for weather. Rose asked why, if the Board has been passing deficit budgets, the end result isn’t an actual deficit. She asked if deficit had been avoided through Spring Meeting profits. Jane said that it’s meeting profits plus the effect of money that was allocated and wasn’t spent. Emily said that Juliana worked hard to reduce the deficit when she was treasurer.
Juliana said that she tried to move the Board toward a mode of operation in which budgets reflected what the Board actually expected to spend, and she encouraged committee chairs to approach the Board with other expense requests as they arose throughout the year. New committee chairs might not be as familiar with that practice. Claire Lobdell asked when dues were last raised. Emily said they were raised in 2014. She’d like the Membership Committee to consider polling the membership about a potential dues increase. There’s a lot the Board can do around fundraising tied to NEA’s 50th anniversary, but a sustained increase in revenue will be necessary, too. Karen asked how much the Board genuinely needs to worry, and how much may simply be proactive stress management. Jane said that as someone who worked for an institution that went under, she thinks that the Board is right to look for solutions to these issues. She would be more concerned if NEA was consistently running a deficit, but she also doesn’t want to wait until a deficit exists to address the problem. Rose asked if there are steps committees should be taking, such as limiting their requests. Emily said the problem stems more from the overall landscape than individual committees. It’s hard for an organization like NEA, which experiences frequent leadership turnover, to take the long fiscal view. Discussion turned to a potential financial planning committee.

Potential committee/task force for financial planning (action pending)
Juliana said that she thinks a financial planning committee is something the Board needs. As the second signer on NEA accounts, she would be happy to serve on it. There’s a lot of pressure on the treasurer when they’re the only one with a deep understanding of NEA’s financial issues. Having a committee might also help improve financial communication with NEA’s existing committees. Ellen Doon said that NEA has grown so much and should continue with the current level of spending; having a committee that can think about how to do this in a fiscally healthy way would be good. Emily said there could be a strategic planning component for such a committee as well — strategically thinking about the ways in which the organization is growing and the financial impact of that growth. Ellen said that in regard to committee communication, there’s been a decline in committee chair attendance at Board meetings even though attendance is a job responsibility for chairs. It’s hard for committees to participate in the budgeting process properly if they don’t have the big picture view of the organization’s operations. There was general Board agreement.

Karen asked what the Board thought about the idea of forming a financial planning committee. The Board expressed support. Ellen said that a similar idea failed to garner Board support a few years ago, but the proposal then was for a financial oversight committee. The current proposal of a financial planning committee may be more in line with what the Board needs.

Cristina Prochilo asked if leadership turnover had increased with existing committees, producing a decrease in understanding of the budgeting process, or whether NEA’s expenses have just significantly changed. Juliana said that committees used to have more continuity, with members rising
to leadership after having served on the committee for several years. Ellen said increasing expenses are also a problem, though, because the cost of holding meetings in hotels keeps rising. Emily said that brings up another issue: the Board should be voting before hotel contracts are signed. Anything to do with money requires a vote. Ellen said that makes sense. By the time the contract is signed, so many people have been looped into email threads that it might as well be a vote for the whole Board. Juliana said on that note, these discussions should also occur on the Board listserv as opposed to in smaller group threads. Karen said that she’s been holding off-list conversations at times because the listserv is so faulty. Emily said that she sometimes does it because she doesn’t have a sense of who’s on the Board listserv. The Board discussed the listserv, how permissions are maintained, who’s responsible for maintaining them, and whether the list should be viewed as an extension of Board meetings (i.e. any NEA member can participate). The Board agreed that it’s important for those who use it to know who is on the Board listserv. Karen will talk to Maryalice Perrin-Mohr about sharing a list of all members of the listserv as part of her quarterly report.

Emily said that she needs to hire a bookkeeper, but would like to handle that in collaboration with Cynthia as she onboards.

NEA Newsletter report
Claire Lobdell presented the NEA Newsletter report.

Implementation of print/electronic option (action required)
Claire said that InkSpot sent prices and samples for a reduced print run of the Newsletter to both her and Emily Atkins. The print would be slightly shinier with a reduced run. If the Board chooses to adopt a print/electronic option for the Newsletter, the logistics of how members will indicate their version preference will need to be determined. Claire said that she was not sure whether that would be the editors’ responsibility. Juliana Kuipers said that Kelli Bogan might be able to explore functionality in the Wild Apricot membership database to enable members to opt in/opt out of the print version as they renew their memberships or join for the first time. Claire said the next logistical piece would then be to figure out how to deliver the digital version and how to ensure that the print version is sent to the right list of people. Juliana said that In Wild Apricot the print/electronic preference would be a field in the member profile, so member profile data would need to be exported to get a distribution list for the print run. Claire asked what the timeline would be for implementing the print/digital option. Juliana said that it would depend on when Kelli could work on the Wild Apricot functionality. An announcement could be made at the Spring 2019 Meeting to share the news that a digital option will soon be available. Claire asked what format the digital version should be. Caitlin Birch suggested beginning with a low-barrier option: a link distributed to the NEA listserv that directs traffic to a PDF version of the Newsletter. Claire asked if the link should be sent to the listserv or to all members. Caitlin said that it should be sent to all members. Wild Apricot can send messages to all members in the database. The Board discussed the fact that members can opt out of receiving
messages in Wild Apricot and decided that the functionality for that should be disabled if possible, since there are some messages that absolutely have to reach all members (a meeting cancellation, for example). The Board agreed to ask Kelli to explore two Wild Apricot functions: first, disabling the function that allows members to opt out of receiving member emails; and second, enabling a function to let members opt in to a digital-only version of the Newsletter. Once functionality is set, it will be a matter of determining who’s responsible for triggering Wild Apricot to send the Newsletter link to all members each quarter.

**New feature: interviews w/ new members**
The editors plan to include interviews with new members in future issues of the Newsletter. Elizabeth Slomba told Claire to email her and she could help make connections with potential interviewees.

**Request for table at spring meeting**
Claire said the editors would like to have a table at the Spring 2019 Meeting to do outreach and recruit new contributors to the Newsletter. Jane Ward said that she can coordinate with Claire to get arrange a table and determine when tabling would be most effective during the meeting.

**Request for new email account (action required)**
Due to time constraints, this item was not discussed during the Board meeting.

**Task Force for Documentation Practices report**
Sarah Shoemaker presented the Task Force for Documentation Practices report. Sarah thanked the TFDP for its work thus far. She said that the group has been working on recommendations and has also developed a list of parking lot issues that have arisen but are beyond the TFDP’s scope. The group’s immediate focus is on developing recommendations for the potential replacement of PBworks and the Yahoo listserv. For PBworks, Google Drive with a structure of shared folders has arisen as a solution. It could act as a place for both active documentation and inactive documentation that’s awaiting transfer to the archives.

**Listserv recommendations**
For the Yahoo listserv, Slack has arisen as a solution. Slack has functionality to organize discussion into separate threads and to assign different permissions to different threads.

The TFDP has also discussed the use of Google Calendars, where each committee might have a calendar and would make it visible to other committees. For work like meeting planning, it might make sense to have a project management tool.

Sarah S. shared two of the primary parking lot issues that have been discussed: first, the Board can adopt new tools, but all users will need to follow a set of agreed upon procedures in order for the
tools to be effective; and second, the makeup of the Board listserv is unclear, as is responsibility for maintaining it.

Karen Adler Abramson asked how soon the Board could transition away from the Yahoo listserv. Caitlin Birch said it could theoretically be very soon, but it would be a good idea to talk to Maryalice Perrin-Mohr first and determine whether she would want to manage that transition. Ellen Doon said that Maryalice agreed to stay on for a new term as Listserv Moderator, but that she might not want to continue in the role if the Board undertakes a major change to the listserv. Karen will discuss with Maryalice.

**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 seven total items that fell under review this quarter, and of those seven, none have been completed, two are in progress, three haven’t been started, and two are the responsibility of the Board and require discussion today.

**Items in Progress**

“By January 2019, the Education Committee will offer workshops on topics relating to archival advocacy and grant writing.” (4.1.1.c)

Caitlin spoke with Nadia Dixson and Becky Parmer about the above item. They reported that the item is in progress. The Education Committee has an advocacy workshop scheduled for the Spring 2019 Meeting and a grant-writing workshop scheduled for later in the spring.

Further discussion of this item ensued at the Board meeting. The Board expressed support for the progress made on this item and agreed that it would be considered complete once the workshops have occurred. Therefore, the new deadline for this item is June 2019.

“By January 2019, the Executive Board, under the leadership of the IDC and the CEC, will establish a two-year working group and/or a task force (if appropriate), to develop an outreach plan for staff and volunteers in four underrepresented repository types: public library history rooms/archives, local historical societies, religious archives, and school (K-12) archives.” (4.5.2.c)

Caitlin spoke with Rose Oliveira and Rosemary K. J. Davis about the above item. She also mistakenly sought feedback from Sam Howes as representative of the Community Engagement Coordinator, instead of from Sarah Shoemaker. Rose and Rosemary reported that the item was in progress. They have discussed it with Karen Adler Abramson and come to the conclusion that this item should be re-evaluated by the Board and NEA members.
Further discussion of this item ensued at the Board meeting. Rose said the Inclusion and Diversity Committee wasn’t clear on the desired outcome for this item, whether it was to get archivists in these types of repositories involved in NEA, or something else. IDC doesn’t want to create a task force until the objective is clarified. The Board discussed the fact that this item falls under the following higher-level item: “Identify and address changes in the landscape of the current archival workforce, including increased outreach to youth, with particular focus on young people in marginalized/minority communities” (4.5.2). The Board determined that the original intent of the item under discussion may have been to both involve archivists from diverse types of institutions in NEA and to potentially reach their constituencies, which may include young and/or marginalized people. NEA should connect with and support archivists in all types of repositories; forming relationships with more archivists who work with young, diverse populations may also help NEA increase pathways into the profession for underrepresented groups. The Board agreed to revise the deadline for this item to January 2020.

Items Not Yet Begun

“By December 2017 January 2019, the CEC will develop guidelines for organizing a day of service, defining responsibilities for volunteers, host institutions, and organizers, which will allow members, either independently or in conjunction with the Roundtable for Early Professional and Students (REPS), to initiate days of service throughout New England.” (4.1.2.c)

Caitlin mistakenly sought feedback from Sam as representative of the Community Engagement Coordinator, instead of from Sarah S. Caitlin will contact Sarah S. directly so that she can check in with Abbey Malangone about the status of this item.

“By January 2018 September 2018 January 2019, the Membership Committee should consider whether to rename the committee (i.e. Membership and Development Committee or Member Services Committee), based on new duties and charge.” (4.3.1.b)

Caitlin spoke with Sam about the above item. Sam reported that the Membership Committee is still looking for a volunteer to fill the development role on the committee, so it would not be wise to address this item right now. He suggested revisiting this item next year if a development member is added to the committee.

Further discussion of this item ensued at the Board meeting. Karen and Liz Francis are planning to have a conversation with Sam to clarify that the Membership Committee should only focus on internal development (fiscal engagement of NEA members), not external development (fundraising through foundations, etc.). Once the role of the committee’s development member is clarified, efforts will renew to fill it. The Board assigned a new deadline of June 2019 to this item.
“By January 2018, June 2018, January 2019, 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)

Caitlin spoke with Sam about the above item. Sam reported that there isn’t an update on this item as the Membership Committee is still working to fill the development role.

Further discussion of this item ensued at the Board meeting.

Ellen Doon said she thought that the Board had decided to remove development responsibilities from the Membership Committee. Since the Board also decided earlier in the meeting to pursue the creation of a financial planning committee, the work described in this item should fall to that committee. The Board agreed to remove responsibility of this item from the Membership Committee and assigned a new deadline of October 2019 in the hope that the new committee would be formed and able to work on it by then.

**Items for Board Discussion**

“By January 2018, January 2019, and building on the work of the Constituency Task Force (CTF), the Executive Board and/or a task force (if appropriate) will identify geographic areas within NEA and propose a structure for localized leadership, which will ultimately have responsibility for coordinating locally focused programming and events.” (4.2.2.f)

The Board agreed that with the decision to poll the membership about a representative-per-state model of leadership in the membership survey, this item is now in progress. The revised deadline is June 2019.

“The Board agreed that this item is still in progress. The functionality described in this item has now been tested by Kelli Bogan and Emily Atkins in Wild Apricot, and the test failed to meet NEA’s needs in the area of tax law. The Board is exploring the possibility of development in Wild Apricot to bring the functionality into tax compliance, and the new deadline for this item is January 2020.

**Registrar’s report**

Olivia Mandica-Hart presented the registrar’s report.
Non-member registration at free events
Olivia said that in December, the Education Committee held an online skill share that was free. The Education Committee wanted to include a non-member in the skill share, so Olivia registered that person as an exception. She would like to clarify the terms around these free offerings — they should either be open to the public (members and non-members) or they should be limited to members only without exception. The Board agreed that free NEA offerings should be limited to members; the only exception is if the leader of the programming in question isn’t a member. Caitlin Birch moved to instate a policy that considers free online NEA offerings as a benefit of membership, excepting instructors. Ellen Doon seconded. No discussion. No abstentions. All members voted in favor (7-0-0).

Open positions update
Membership Committee (1)
Mentoring Program (3)
Discussion of open positions was tabled due to time constraints.

Membership Committee report
Recruitment of mentoring liaisons
The Membership Committee report was tabled due to time constraints.

Petition for new Roundtable: Teaching with Primary Sources (action required)
Discussion of the roundtable petition was tabled due to time constraints. Karen will share the petition by email and Board will vote by email.

Inclusion and Diversity Committee report
Rose Oliveira presented the Inclusion and Diversity Committee report.

Event check list
Rose asked the Board to review the draft of the event check list and share feedback with the Inclusion and Diversity Committee, including on where the list should live. Juliana Kuipers suggested placing it in the policies and procedures section of the NEA website.

Strategic goals discussion
Rose gave a brief overview of the IDC’s progress toward several actions in the 2016-2020 NEA Strategic Plan for which the IDC has responsibility: 4.5.2.c, 4.5.1.d, and 4.5.3.d. The Board discussed the first of these earlier in the meeting (see “Strategic plan updates” above). Rose directed the Board to the IDC report for more detail on the latter two.

Immediate Past President’s report
Ellen Doon presented the immediate past president’s report.
Awards process
Ellen said that last year, Jennifer Gunter King recommended (and the Board accepted) a pilot in which the Nominating Committee would continue to serve following NEA elections to select winners of the Archival Advocacy Award and Distinguished Service Award. Until last year, these awards were handled by separate committees. Last year, they were handled by Board vote because the pilot had not yet occurred and the traditional committees were not formed, but the Board agreed that it would not vote this year and would instead leave selection to the Nominating Committee. Ellen said the information available on the NEA website about how winners are selected is no longer accurate and will need updating. She said two members of the Nominating Committee couldn’t continue serving through the awards season and she sought suggestions for replacement members from the Board. Ellen also recommended for the Board’s future consideration a Nominating Committee whose membership was voted on by the general membership. This would require a change to NEA’s By-laws. **Ellen will work on a call for nominations for the awards and will coordinate with Sarah Shoemaker to distribute it.** The deadline for nomination may need to be extended into March.

Adjourn
The meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Caitlin Birch