

AOHG Committee on Ethics and Professional Conduct
March 21, 2020 Los Angeles, CA

Board Members Present:

Saida Largaspaeda (Chair)

Maite Muñoz (Council Liaison)

Hailey Loman (Observer)

Note: A few people were not able to make it to this first meeting.

1. Welcome and introductions

- A. The AOHG board is integrated within the organization
- B. Setting roles for the board members. These roles will be temporary for now. Agreement will be made on behalf of rotating board members and various people will sit on the board, contingent on the transcripts covered for that meeting. The interviewee will also sit on the board.
- C. A Methodology of appraisal and continual re-appraisal; a practice that does not happen once in a record's lifespan. The interviewee participates in this process, which provides a means to maintain ties with the group.
- D. Ongoing re-appraisal processes allow the interviewee to maintain control over their materials.

2. What do you want from the board?

This board is going to begin as something already deeply flawed. We will try to establish, to the best of our ability, our biases. This isn't a group of people whose aim will be to weaponize outcomes or police right or wrong, but rather, to debate difficult to answer questions that do not have a simple outcome. Our aim is to provide transparency into the process of making these decisions and to debate best practices and ethics within the archiving field.

- A. Theory and Praxis: finding a balance between the two.
- B. We do not need to take on each interview as an individual case-study, unless we want to focus on one conversation. This can occur and change organically.
- C. We decided to meet every time we have a new interview completed.
- D. Finished transcriptions must be looked over by the interviewee and approved every time. We have a no editing policy but the interviewee has the capacity to override this.
- E. Law versus ethics: Interviewees could potentially sign the consent form after their conversation.
- F. Before generating case studies, the priority is to update board members with the AOHG backlog of interviewers,.

- G. What does it mean to get better at this [oral history ethics]? The jump between Judge Steven Perren's interview (highly edited) and Mo Nishida interview which is time stamped and not edited. This is valuable to show.
- H. We now include archivist summary and an ethics summary. For the safety of the people involved the archivist must consider this boundary line. The importance of this is to remind the reader that the archivist is a co-creator and allows insight into the process of the conversation.
- I. Why would people agree to this if there are so many rules? Validating an experience? Therapeutic reasons. How to communicate that the board is not a judgement space?
- J. Predicting systemic issues: such as the conversation getting too insular.

ACTION: We always have the interviewee approve the transcript.

3. Next steps

- A. Sharing the interviews with the board rather than developing case studies, so members are up to date on the collection prior to something new. This does not need to be chronological. Agreeing that the summaries and bios will be something constantly negotiated and deliberated on.
- B. Edit the consent form.
- C. Deciding who to add to the board.

4. Other Business

Producing a bibliography on AOHG ethics and making this available online would be a nice addition. What we are using as reference.