

**Society of American Archivists
Council Meeting
August 10, 2009
Austin, Texas**

**Action Item: Final Report of Task Force on the A&A List
Terms of Participation Review and Revision**

**(Submitted by Task Force members Christine Di Bella, Chair; Cristela Garcia-Spitz;
Meghan Petersen; Margery Sly, Council Liaison; and Brian Doyle, Staff Liaison)**

BACKGROUND

In 2008, the SAA President was charged by the Council to appoint a task force that will accomplish the following:

- Review and recommend revisions to the Archives and Archivists (A&A) List Terms of Participation (http://www.archivists.org/listservs/arch_listserv_terms.asp), including developing a definition of “inappropriate content” and a schedule for periodic review of the Terms;
- Recommend policies regarding 1) removal from the A&A List of posts at the posters’ request and 2) determining when participants may be banned from the List;
- Recommend procedures to be followed in those cases in which a participant 1) posts a “flame” on the List or 2) is banned from the List; and
- Develop a bibliography of resources that will assist the Council liaisons in monitoring the A&A List and implementing Council-adopted policies and procedures.

In working toward these items, the task force compiled background information on past SAA practice and examined terms of participation for similar professional lists. In order to solicit comment from list subscribers and SAA members, the task force developed an online survey on the current list Terms of Participation (approved by the Council at its August 2008 meeting) and publicized its group email address as a general feedback channel. The survey was announced on the A&A List and in SAA's online newsletter in December 2008. The results of the survey are presented in **Appendix A** and the text of comments received by the task force appears in **Appendix B**.

DISCUSSION

Within the task force, examination of the terms of participation of similar professional lists did not uncover significant differences from SAA's existing Terms of Participation; in fact, SAA's existing Terms were more descriptive than those of many other lists. In terms of feedback from the list and SAA communities, although the survey received relatively few responses (218 out of

a possible 5000+), those who did respond indicated a fairly high rate of satisfaction with the current terms. In fact, comments we received through the task force email list and informal conversations with others about the A&A list indicated that the far greater concern was with the conduct of the list. As a result, we are recommending a relatively slight revision to the Terms themselves, combined with a more consistent use of warnings when violations to the terms occur. Key changes in the revision are described below.

Within the Scope of the List section, we have removed the list of suggested labels for posts. Although a good idea, these labels have rarely been used and are never enforced, which has greatly limited their usefulness. To the list of off-topic subjects, we have added a small clarifying sentence to the entry related to messages from vendors, and also included a statement specifically disallowing political speech unrelated to archival issues.

The most significant addition in our revision of the Terms is a more explicit stating of the rules of netiquette, with key rules summarized. (Please note that these are taken from the Terms of Participation of SAA's Visual Materials Section mailing list.) We believe this small change will make it clearer to list participants what is considered appropriate behavior and make it easier for list administrators to address individuals when their behavior is in violation of these rules.

In response to several comments we received related to frequent announcements of blogs and blog postings, we have added a brief section addressing this issue.

We have added some language from SAA's new Creative Commons policy to the section on copyright, and indicated the different SAA roles related to administration of the list in the section on List Ownership.

Although our charge asked that we recommend policies and procedures related to removal of posts from the archives, we have declined to do so. Both the survey results and discussions within the group indicated a preference that posts not be removed at all, with the obvious exception of copyright violations. Instead we have inserted a statement into the copyright section that requests to remove messages are generally declined. In the rare cases in which postings are removed, the survey results and archival best practice suggest that there should be an indication in the list archives.

Our charge also asked that we recommend policies and procedures for banning individuals. We believe that banning should continue to be a rare event, reserved for serious violations and/or after multiple warnings (depending on the severity of the offense). The List Coordinator should first bring such cases to the attention of the SAA Director of Member & Technical Services and the two Council liaisons assigned to monitor the list. If the Council liaisons make a determination that an individual's actions warrant consideration for list banishment, the revised Terms specify procedures for probation, banning, and appeals. It should be noted that, in cases of an individual being banned, a majority of survey respondents indicated a preference that the list not be notified and that banned posters be allowed to apply for reinstatement, with most opting that this be allowed after the shortest period offered (one year), which we find to be quite reasonable.

To improve the environment and level of professional discourse on the list, we recommend a more consistent use of off-list and occasional on-list warnings for violations of the Terms of Participation, including breaches of netiquette. We also recommend that the SAA parties responsible for the list (the List Coordinator, the Director of Member & Technical Services, and the two Council liaisons assigned to monitor the list) be more visible on the list in general, and particularly in times of turmoil. In instances of entire discussions violating the Terms (often involving many participants), regardless of the warnings that are administered off-list, a gentle, public admonishment that explicitly references the behavior involved and points out its violation of the Terms of Participation could go a long way in preventing certain types of discussions from spinning out of control.

A bibliography relevant to the task of administering the listserv is included in **Appendix C**.

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT the Council adopt a relatively slight revision of the existing A&A List Terms of Participation [see below, strikethrough = deletion, underline = insertion];

THAT the Terms be reviewed on a regular five-year cycle (i.e., in 2015, 2020, etc.); and

THAT the SAA office, working with the List administrators, implement more consistent use of off-list and occasional on-list warnings for violations of the Terms, including breaches of netiquette.

Archives and Archivists (A&A) List Terms of Participation Suggested Revision, July 2009

Background and Mission

The Archives and Archivists (A&A) List was established in 1989 by Donna Harlan and John Harlan as an open forum for all topics relating to archival theory and practice. Over the years, A&A has had various homes. In late 1993, the list was migrated to Miami University. In 1998, the Society of American Archivists (SAA) assumed sponsorship of the list as a service to the archival profession. It remained hosted at Miami University under the stewardship of Robert M. Schmidt until September 2006, at which time SAA assumed full ownership of the list and responsibility for its ongoing maintenance.

Audience

The principal audiences include archivists, archival educators, and students enrolled in graduate archival education courses and program. The list is open to all individuals with an interest in the archival profession and in the preservation and promotion of archival materials. SAA membership is not required for participation in the list. Participants are required, however, to “register” with the Society of American Archivists. Please see “Responsibilities of Participants” below.

Scope of the List

Subjects appropriate to the list include all aspects of the theory and practice of the archival profession. ~~In order to maintain a highly informative and focused professional forum, SAA strongly encourages list participants to use the following labels at the beginning of all subject lines. This will allow others to filter list messages via mail rules and automatically select those types of information according to their individual needs and preferences.~~

- ~~“Calls:” (Calls for papers, survey participation, etc.)~~
- ~~“Disc:” (Discussion on various topics)~~
- ~~“Event:” (Conference, seminar, workshop announcements, etc.)~~
- ~~“FF:” (“Friday funnies,” see below)~~
- ~~“FYI:” (General announcements and information)~~
- ~~“Job:” (Job announcements)~~
- ~~“Media:” (Links to archives and archivists in the news)~~
- ~~“Qs:” (Questions)~~
- ~~“Pubs:” (Announcements re: books, chapters, papers, dissertations, and reviews)~~

Messages that are unrelated to the archives profession are off-topic and are prohibited. Other off-topic subjects include:

- Unsolicited commercial advertisements for goods and/or services (a.k.a. spam)*
(Commercial vendors are not prohibited from posting responses to list messages, but such postings should contribute in a useful way to an existing discussion or line of inquiry.);
- Messages directed to specific individuals (please contact them directly);
- Flames (~~i.e.~~, personal attacks);
- Political speech unrelated to archival issues, including but not limited to endorsing or attacking a particular political candidate or party, or the views of any candidate or party;
- Virus warnings (generally, such messages are hoaxes);
- General humor (see below).

* Excluding those nonprofit archival and allied associations listed online at <http://www.archivists.org/assoc-orgs>.

Regarding humor: The posting of humorous anecdotes (a.k.a. “Friday Funnies”), especially as they pertain to archives and/or a current thread, has a long tradition on A&A. General humor, however, is off-topic. Participants are especially encouraged to label Friday Funnies for the benefit of colleagues who may wish to filter these messages and to be mindful of the professional nature of the A&A List at all times.

Netiquette

Participants are ~~strongly encouraged~~ expected to follow the core rules of netiquette. See an excerpted version from the book *Netiquette* by Virginia Shea at <http://www.albion.com/netiquette/corerules.html>. Some key points are summarized below (1):

- Messages should trigger discussion through a question or observation, or should further a discussion by adding something new.
- Participants should remember that other readers receive messages in a different context from the author.
- Messages, especially responses, should be long enough to be understandable, including enough of the original message (by quoting or paraphrasing) to provide context. When replying to a message, avoid including the full text of long messages.
- Avoid inflammatory remarks of a personal nature. Similarly, when reading a message, be slow to take offense. In general, assume that an individual had good intentions when posting a message, but the rapidity of the medium, the lack of visual cues, and other factors may make an otherwise innocent message seem insulting. Countering with insults on the list is considered off-topic.
- Participants should consider whether their reply is of interest to the list as a whole or only to the individual making the posting. Do not automatically use the reply key (which usually responds to the whole list). The best and most experienced participants will occasionally make this mistake, which is entirely forgivable.
- Avoid posting styled text (messages formatted with html code) to the list, as many email readers and the digest readers are unable to read these messages easily.

Blog Postings

Due to the high volume of list messages, participants are discouraged from advertising blog postings and other content that is frequently updated elsewhere on the web. Blogs offer the option of subscription through RSS, which enables those who wish to follow the updates to do so. Similarly, participants should consider the medium when posting frequent updates or long expository messages to the list. A blog may be a more appropriate forum for such content.

Copyright and License Agreement

Participants retain copyright to their individual postings (“the Work”). By posting a message to the list, participants grant to the Society of American Archivists and its agents a ~~worldwide nonexclusive~~, royalty-free, ~~non-exclusive~~ irrevocable, perpetual, worldwide, and fully sub-licensable license to ~~copy, use, reproduce, modify, adapt, publish, translate, create derivative works from, incorporate into other works, distribute, publicly perform, publicly display, perform, prepare derivatives, or otherwise use the Work~~ and otherwise exploit such content, in whole or in part, in any ~~manner that would contribute to the advancement~~ form, media, or technology now known or later developed for the benefit of the archival profession. Nothing in this license is intended to reduce, limit, or restrict any rights arising from fair use, first sale, or other limitations on the exclusive rights of the copyright owner under copyright law or other applicable laws.

¹ Taken from the SAA Visual Materials Section list Terms of Participation.

Posted messages are retained in the list archives and are publically accessible. SAA will delete messages from the list archives in cases of copyright infringement. Otherwise, SAA's general practice is to decline requests to remove messages from the list archives.

Copyright Infringements

As a professional association concerned with protecting intellectual property rights of authors whose works are held in archival repositories, SAA expects participants to set a high standard of respect for copyright. Copyrighted material beyond brief quotations should not be posted to the A&A List without appropriate permissions. Participants wishing to direct others to copyrighted text are encouraged to post a link to the copyrighted materials on the Web as long as: a) such links do not circumvent any fees charged by the site and b) the URL is not to a site that is itself in violation of copyright.

PARTICIPANTS ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR ALL MATERIALS THEY POST TO THE ARCHIVES AND ARCHIVISTS LIST.

It is SAA's policy to respond to notices of alleged copyright infringement that comply with the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA). The agent designated to respond to reports alleging copyright infringements, in accordance with the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, is the SAA Executive Director.

The Digital ~~Millenium~~ Millennium Copyright Act specifies that all infringement claims must be in writing (either electronic mail or paper letter) and must include the following elements:

1. A physical or electronic signature,
2. Identification of the infringed work,
3. Identification of the infringed material,
4. Contact information for the complainant, e.g., address, telephone number, electronic mail address,
5. A statement that the complaining party has a good-faith belief that use of the material in the manner complained of is not authorized by the copyright owner or the law, and
6. A statement that the information contained in the notification is accurate, and under penalty of perjury, that the complaining party is authorized to act on behalf of the copyright owner.

DMCA Agent Contact Information

Nancy Beaumont, Executive Director
Society of American Archivists
~~527 South Wells Street, 5th Floor~~ 17 North State Street, Suite 1425
Chicago, IL 606072
Email: nbeaumont@archivists.org
Phone: 312/922-0140-606-0722
Fax: 312/347-1452 606-0728

On receipt of a conformant complaint of copyright infringement, SAA's response may include removing or disabling access to material claimed to be the subject of infringing activity and/or terminating the participation of the infringer. If material is removed or access disabled in response to a DMCA notice, SAA will make a good-faith attempt to contact the participant who posted the content so that he/she will be able to make a counter notification pursuant to sections 512(g)(2) and (3) of that Act. It is our policy to document all notices of alleged infringement on which we act.

Responsibility of Participants

Participants agree to restrict their messages to the scope of the list; to follow generally accepted principles of netiquette; to respect the interests and rights of other participants and of the Society of American Archivists; and to respect the law. The A&A List is an un-moderated forum. Participants are solely responsible for their postings.

Due to certain technical requirements, subscriber information for all SAA-hosted discussion forums must be stored in SAA's central database of member and nonmember contacts. Therefore, by subscribing to the A&A List, participants also grant SAA permission to record essential contact information (e.g., name and email address) in its central database. Personal contact information will be administered in strict accordance with SAA's Privacy and Confidentiality Policy (<http://www.archivists.org/privacy.asp>).

The Archives & Archivists List is a professional forum. SAA reserves the right to ban block or permanently remove participants if off-topic or abusive messages threaten to disrupt the functioning of the A&A List list. SAA may also block or remove participants for violating the copyright of others or for any other actions that do not conform to these Terms of Participation. Punitive action is rare and generally follows wanton numerous warnings and/or persistent disregard for these Terms of Participation. In order to ensure due process, punitive action shall take place only after formal notification of an infraction and initiation of a 90-day probation period. Upon additional misconduct within the 90 days, an individual may be banned by approval of the Council. Misconduct after the 90 days will result in a one-year probation. (Upon misconduct within this longer probationary period, an individual may also be banned by approval of the Council.) A banned subscriber may petition the Council for reinstatement after one year. Such appeals must be accompanied by a written and signed statement agreeing to comply with the Terms of Participation.

List Ownership

The Archives & Archivists List is owned by the Society of American Archivists. The SAA Council is charged with setting policy on the list. Two Council members are assigned the responsibility of monitoring the list and making recommendations for responses on behalf of the Council when issues arise. The A&A List Coordinator, reporting to SAA's Director of Member & Technical Services-SAA headquarters staff, oversees the daily operations of the list, including assisting participants with their subscriptions.

A&A List Coordinator: Meghan Petersen (mpetersen@archivists.org)

Disclaimer

The opinions expressed on the Archives & Archivists List do not necessarily represent those of SAA and are not endorsed by the Society.

Revised and approved by the SAA Council, August 1, 2006. Updated August 10, 2009.

Support Statement: As the current Terms of Participation are relatively satisfactory (indicated by a survey of List participants and review by a task force assigned to this task), only a minor revision of the text is warranted.

Fiscal Impact: None.

Survey on A&A List Terms of Participation

December 2008 – January 2009
218 Respondents

Question	Respondents	
1. Are you an SAA member?		
Yes	194	88.99%
No.....	24	11.01%
2. Please characterize your use of the Archives & Archivists List.		
I subscribe to A&A and post regularly.....	5	2.28%
I subscribe to A&A and post occasionally.....	122	55.71%
I subscribe to A&A but do not post.....	77	35.16%
I do not subscribe to A&A but I read the online archives regularly.....	3	1.37%
I do not subscribe to A&A and rarely or never read the online archives.....	12	5.48%
3. What do you view as the purpose and focus of the Archives & Archivists List?		
Professional forum only.....	74	33.64%
Primarily a professional forum.....	127	57.73%
Professional and social forum.....	19	8.64%
4. Reasons for non-participation on the list.		
I don't have time.....	21	30.00%
I rarely use professional listservs.....	3	4.29%
The posts are helpful, but have little relevance to my current professional work.....	12	17.14%
The posts are not helpful because there are too many mundane or off-topic posts.....	23	32.86%
The posts are not helpful because they often contain misinformation.....	4	5.71%
The list atmosphere is often not conducive to professional discussion.....	7	10.00%
5. What do you think about the current A&A List Terms of Participation?		
They are not prescriptive enough.....	20	9.48%
They are overly restrictive.....	10	4.74%
They provide a good balance.....	120	56.87%
No opinion.....	61	28.91%
6. Inappropriate list content. (Select all that apply.)		
<i>What types of content not specifically prohibited by the Terms of Participation would you like to see addressed by a future revision of the Terms of Participation?</i>		
Political speech (e.g., advocacy of particular political candidates.).....	107	n/a
“Friday Funnies” and similar humor.....	48	n/a
Offensive or overly personal messages.....	134	n/a
Informational messages from archives, library, and museum vendors.....	47	n/a
7. Warnings regarding violations of Terms of Participation.		
<i>Under what circumstances do you think a subscriber should receive a warning from the list administrators?</i>		
Any infraction.....	49	24.26%
Infraction plus one complaint.....	50	24.75%
Infraction plus two or more complaints.....	103	50.99%

8. Banning of subscribers. (Select all that apply.)

After a warning has been issued, under what circumstances should subscribers be banned from the list?

One additional infraction.....	46	n/a
Multiple additional infractions	127	n/a
Offensive or threatening off-list messages	132	n/a

9. Should subscribers be notified when a member is banned from the list?

Yes	75	36.95%
No.....	128	63.05%

10. Procedures for reinstatement.

When a subscriber is banned from the A&A List, which of the following is the best policy for possible reinstatement?

The subscriber may apply for reinstatement after one year.....	156	77.23%
The subscriber may apply for reinstatement after two years.	24	11.88%
Banned subscribers should not be reinstated.	22	10.89%

11. Should requests from subscribers to have their own posts removed be honored?

Yes	59	27.44%
No	109	50.70%
Not sure	47	21.86%

12. Notification regarding removed posts.

If posts are removed, should there be an indication in the List archives to show that posts have been removed?

Yes	127	59.62%
No	29	13.62%
Not applicable (Posts should not be removed.)	57	26.76%

Comments Received by the Task Force

(Identifying information removed and some comments edited for length.)

This is from my background as a long-time moderator of similar lists.

By far the easiest and fairest way, I think, to deal with errant members is to allow the Moderator discretion to enforce list policies. If someone offends in a minor way, it's probably not worth messing with. A major offense or something really bad should probably be dealt with by allowing the Moderator to set that person's account so that all submitted messages are reviewed before they are posted. That way the Moderator can let messages go through if they're OK and discard the ones that are not. Saves all the messy business of having to ban someone, deciding how long, etc., etc.

I am not in favor of enforcing policies for things that merely drive people nuts, like returning the whole original message instead of deleting it or including just appropriate passages. Ditto for personal messages sent by mistake, no matter what they say.

I assume your software allows for such a procedure. If not, I guess you are back to banning someone entirely. But I think that is going to involve tricky decisions about allowing people to subscribe in the first place. If you banned me, for example, I'm sure I could easily get back on since I have multiple email accounts and could easily create a fake SAA profile. So I'm not sure banning someone would even work. And even if people can't post freely, they should still be allowed to receive list messages in real time if they wish to read them to keep up with things. That's harmless. And at one time I did suspend people's posting privileges for infractions. That proved to be very tedious and time-consuming, so I don't do that anymore.

I used to read this listserv but was so frustrated by the off-topic socializing and personal commentary (such as "what I did this weekend") that I now delete the condensed version when it appears in my email. I could unsubscribe, but I keep hoping for better. It seems the same people keep posting and when I have to read through 30-40 emails on "what type of tattoo should an archivist get," it's ridiculous. This should be a helpful, professional listserv for the archival community, not a personal blog.

I enjoy the A&A list and find a lot of interesting and useful information there. I have no major problems with it, and any minor irritations are my own preferences and can usually be solved but skipping or deleting!! But for what it's worth:

I love RAIN, and the RAINDROPS, although I seldom read them all, it brings to my attention many articles I would not otherwise read.

Friday Funnies are fun, and since they are clearly labeled as such, anyone not wanting to read them could delete or set a filter. There are not massive numbers of them, anyway. And they are surprisingly related to archives!!

What bugs me:

- *People who don't seem to know how to exempt the list from their Out-of Office message.*
- *People who don't delete the unnecessary prior messages when replying.*
- *People who don't know how to address a private reply and hit "reply-to" which comes to the list.*
- *A couple posters - I usually skip their messages.*
- *The poor souls who preface a reply with "I'm no expert but,..." I laugh, because the REAL expert is probably going to post sooner or later (but of course won't say "I'm the expert!")!!*

I don't think posters should be allowed to remove posts - what about all the replies quoting the message?? How would all those be found? Sometimes the subject is changed. And would you then delete the messages of other people related to this? With or without their consent? As others have said, they should think before they hit Send.

And on reflection, I realize others are right about banning posters. While it might get rid of that address, they could re-up under a new id. (I have semi-fictional id's at some online sites - all using my "junk" email address)

Oh, and those subject prefixes -- JOB, PUB, whatever - I don't think that is going to catch on! Folks here are pretty good about using Friday Funnies, OT and RAIN, but the others don't seem to be taking off. Fine by me.

I value the A&A list because it has very broad reach. When I have questions, or want to showcase some work we are doing, the A&A list is high on my list of communication devices. I get good feedback both on and off the list whenever I post. This is great – I do not want for the A&A list to be diminished in this fashion.

However, as a reader, I tend to delete much of what comes across on the list because there is so much (to my mind) trivial discussion on the list. This is too bad, because I am sure I am missing good content. I am aware that many do not regard the list as I do, and enjoy the “fun” side of the list. I also cannot be alone in feeling overwhelmed with email and other forms of communication and seeking ways to maximize the value of my email communication stream.

What to do about this? I know a suggestion in the past has been to “fork” the list – split it into a “fun” list for Friday Funnies and Friday Flowers with options for political or issues discussion, and a business list for people to ask and answer serious and practical questions (I know, this quickly gets into splitting hairs). I think this is a suggestion that merits consideration. Another tack may be to gently urge people to remember that some responses are best aimed at the individual who sent them and not the entire list and to keep the list generally more businesslike, or at least to remember to use the suggested tags.

I actually do not have that big of a problem with some of the unrelated business or humor that goes on the listserv, but the problem is easy access to the threads that one is interested in. The numbering of the topics at the beginning of the posts is very helpful, and allows one to scan for topics of interest to the user. Ideally, if the listserv could label the threads with those topic numbers so that one can skip directly to those posts of interests, then the user can skip the threads/posts that they don't have time to engage in.

If possible the required use of labels for posts to the list as prescribed in the Terms of Participation would be greatly appreciated.

Can the list be set not to accept posts with out these labels? (Some way to nominate or add labels would be necessary, such as RAIN) For me, this would resolve most of my dissatisfaction with the list.

Maybe if it were a little more difficult to post and reply to the list, such as only through the list website. This would eliminate the oops replies to the list, which I have done and give people time to think about their postings. Maybe a page could be added requiring a confirmation before the messages was posted, such as was the correct label placed in the subject line and a brief review of the Term of Participation.

For me, considering the diversity of the list and the turn over, bans and warnings would be a waste of time. While not perfect the list is self-regulating. Some postings allow me to reflect on the Desiderata by Max Ehrmann, "and listen to others, even the dull and ignorant; they too have their story."

If SAA does decide to remove people or posting the information should be posted the list - "it's not the crime, it's the cover up."

As I'm sure you've seen from the recent listserv traffic, one subscriber has started to regularly post messages to the listserv every day he make a new blog post. I feel, along with many others, that this is an inappropriate use of the listserv. As noted elsewhere, there are many other ways for those who are interested in following a blog to be informed of new content. It has been suggested that, rather than just posting a link to each new post, that the blog author post his entire new blog message. I would also ask the task force to consider adding that practice to the list of prohibited behavior.

I am the author of a blog. I occasionally post messages to the listserv pointing out, or repeating, blog posts that I have feel that would be of a broad general appeal to the listserv members. I do this very rarely. I think using the use of the listserv by bloggers in this way--occasionally pointing out a post when it is highly relevant--should be protected, but that using the listserv to routinely advertise (or share) new posts should be prohibited. I realize that some judgment may

be involved to determine when a blogger is posting too regularly, but I think that is the case with many kinds of prohibited behavior.

I would like to respectfully submit that I think it's time for SAA to change the terms of participation for the Archives and Archivists Listserv so that there is some language that addresses blog postings.

Lately, there's been a spate of postings for every new blog posting in a couple of blogs.

It creates a glut of messages – and ignores the fact that people can, by their own free will, access these blogs of their free will to read as they wish.

The general method and rules that the listserv uses now seem to work, to me at least. Although it might be good in some ways to open up to any form of speech or discussion wished by the writers, a forum that has a professional demeanor and backing is more welcome in workplaces. I cannot use Twitter at work. I can only access some blogs and not others. Blogs associated with institutions are more likely to be permissible. The software used here to filter sites is frequently set against broad categories of sites, such as everything set up in Blogger, for instance.

So I try to keep up to some extent on my own time with my own Internet access, but find I can do that in only a limited way. I have not tried Twitter because I haven't had the time.

So any significant change to the listserv that makes it less professional in tenor may prevent its access in some offices.

Recent naval-gazing on the list has produced comments from several saying that they don't post questions or comments to the list because they fear ridicule or attack. I also know that most of my colleagues don't subscribe to the list AT ALL because they feel like it is more of a mosh pit of personalities than a good source of professional sharing and advice -in essence, its an overall waste of their time. It is a shame that the A&A list can't be a more useful resource for the profession.

I think the terms of participation as currently written are excellent, however, the problems seem to stem from the lack of adherence to and/or enforcement of those terms. In fact it seems like things have run amok and no one even follows the recommended format for classifying posts as questions, etc. If the terms were enforced, I believe the list could be more informational and less personal and therefore a more useful tool to the profession. The terms could be enforced with a gentle but firm hand and without the moderator having to approve each message. I am on another list where the moderator comes on list periodically to remind folks about the terms, folks who are problematic or out of line are contacted offlist, and folks who repeatedly refuse to

comply are warned and eventually removed if necessary. I would definitely welcome more active moderation of the A&A list.

I'd like to rely on the A&A list as a good source of information, but lately it has turned into a cult of personalities. [Poster A]'s posts about people's twitter comments about him are unprofessional, unethical and completely out of line with the purposes of the list. A moderator should have nipped that discussion in the bud as it has now digressed even further. And [Poster B]'s Friday Flowers, while seemingly benign, in fairness to all the other professional archivists with interesting hobbies, they really have no place on the list.

As one of those who reads the list but does not respond except rarely to the list but more frequently offlist, I have valued the list greatly.

I have gone from working at a small unit of a large institution (NARA) to now working at a lone arranger shop in two different but linked institutions, I value the list for its ability to keep me connected to the larger profession and has given me many solutions to questions that I have encountered or will come up sooner or later.

Although I have been tempted many times to weigh in on some of the discussions regarding NARA especially Anthony Clark's comments, I have been out of some of these areas for more than 8 years and the information I might add maybe outdated. There have been times where I have wanted to defend my former workplace but feel it's not appropriate.

I may feel more confident about posting comments once I gain more hours of regular employment and therefore more stability.

People continuously state that if one does not want to read certain emails, they can just hit the "delete" key. That is not possible for those of us who subscribe to the digest version. In order to get to the pertinent professional emails, we need to scroll down through all the "junk." For instance, the banishment issue that has been going on for the last two days is ridiculous for those of us who believe this should be a professional listserv offering answers to professional questions.

Bibliography: List Serve Administration

- "Australian Listserv Issues." *Informaa Quarterly*. 18 (2002): 36.
- Berge Collins Associates. "Resources for Moderators and Facilitators of Online Discussion." Available online, <http://www.emoderators.com/moderators.shtml> (viewed 17 July 2009).
- Collins, L.H. "Practicing Safer Listserv Use: Ethical Use of an Invaluable Resource." *Professional Psychology Research And Practice*. 38.6 (2007): 690-698.
- Cox, R.J. "Listservs and Difficult Appraisal Decisions: The Archives and Archivists Listserv Great Debate (Part 2)." *Records and Information Management Report*. 23.8 (2007). (Also available online, <http://www.sis.pitt.edu/~rcox/MARACNov07.htm>. Viewed 17 July 2009.)
- Flynn, Nancy, and Randolph Kahn. *E-Mail Rules: A Business Guide to Managing Policies, Security, and Legal Issues for E-Mail and Digital Communication*. New York: AMACOM, 2003.
- "Guidelines for the Australian Listserv." *Informaa Quarterly*. 18 (2002): 08-9.
- Marshall, Jonathan Paul. *Living on Cybermind: Categories, Communication, and Control*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 2007.
- Milbury, Peter. "A Day in the Life of a Listserv Moderator." *Technology Connection* 3.2 (Apr. 1996): 28.
- Pearce-Moses, Richard, Robert F. Schmidt, Mark Shelstad, and Anita M. Weber. "The Archives & Archivists Listserv and Its Impact Drivel, Informational Deluge, and Pearls Among Swine." Recording of panel at SAA Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., August 2001. St. Petersburg, Fla: Convention Recordings International, 2001.
- Robison, R. D. "Managing a Listserv, CLSEUDUC-L." *Clinical Laboratory Science*. 13 (2000): 19-20.
- Schwartz, Alan. *Managing Mailing Lists*. Cambridge [England]: O'Reilly, 1998.
- Shea, Virginia. *Netiquette*. San Francisco: Albion Books, 1994.
- Sloboda, Brian. "Netiquette'--New Rules and Policies for the Information Age." *Management Quarterly* 40.4 (Winter 1999): 9.
- Strawbridge, Matthew. *Netiquette: Internet Etiquette in the Age of the Blog*. [Cambridgeshire, U.K.] : Software Reference Ltd, 2006.

Steele, T. M. "Risk Management for Listserv Moderators and Operators." *National Online Meeting*. 17 (1996): 367-374.

Tenenbaum, J.S. and Constantine, G.E. Untangling the Web - Internet Legal Issues for Associations. Available online, [http://blogs.asacenter.org/Acronym/1232_131Tenenbaum_Esq. Jeffrey_084827_Jan14_2008_Time_122023PM.pdf](http://blogs.asacenter.org/Acronym/1232_131Tenenbaum_Esq._Jeffrey_084827_Jan14_2008_Time_122023PM.pdf) (viewed 17 July 2009).