

Archives Management Roundtable Meeting
Joint Meeting with Lone Arrangers Roundtable
August 8, 2012

- I. The joint meeting of the Archives Management Round Table (AMRT) and the Lone Arrangers Round Table (LART) convened at 3:17, with Mott Linn, Chair of the AMRT giving a brief introduction to the joint meeting. Following that, the first panel gave its presentations.
- II. Panel 1: You, Me, We: Meeting Modern Challenges to Archives through Collaboration
 - A. Wesley Chenault, Head of Special Collections at VCU, "Collaboration as Strategy"
 - B. Cheryl Oestreicher, Boise State University, "Collaborative Grants"
 - C. Jennifer Johnson, Cargill Inc., "Collaboration in the Business Environment"
- III. Council Liaison: Following a brief break, Beth Kaplan, representative of the SAA Council, gave a brief review of five quick topics that apply to both Roundtables.
 - A. New blog – The SAA leadership is trying to be open and needs feedback from the members, so has instituted a new blog, *Off the Record*, and we are encouraged to utilize the blog as a means of communication with SAA leadership. Although the blog posts are usually written by SAA President Jackie Dooley, one of the recent guest posters was Dennis Meissner, who discusses results of the 2012 Member Needs and Satisfaction Survey. This post provides links to the survey results.
 - B. Communication Task Force – Out of the recommendation of the Communication Technology Working Group, a Communication Task Force was established in June 2012 and charged with advising the SAA Council on practical ways to enhance SAA's communications with a focus on three areas: intended audiences, content/messages, and tools/channels. The Task Force is expected to return its recommendations by August 2013.
 - C. Auxiliary Websites –In the past, all SAA-hosted websites had to conform to Uniform Guidelines which were stringent (e.g., permission was required to establish a blog, and the group had to provide clear and compelling functional needs that were not effectively being provided by the SAA office). This led some groups to create microwebsites outside of the SAA domain which were not directly linked to SAA. In June, the SAA passed a policy that relaxes rules on auxiliary websites. Guidelines will follow. We should inform our Council liaison (leadership is on the Drupal website). URLs will be provided.
 - D. Governance Manuals - These have been updated for Sections and Roundtables to make procedures easier and clearer. The edits to Sections IX. and X. of the are intended to reduce the potential for confusion among the many users of the Manual and to foster transparency and compliance among Sections and Roundtables. The approved changes are available on the SAA website.

- E. Mandatory Roundtable Bylaws – The Council-approved edits to the Governance manuals also adjusted policy to require Roundtables to have bylaws to make governance clear, consistent and transparent. SAA has created a template that can be filled in so that each Roundtable’s bylaws will be consistent. Each Roundtable that needs to create bylaws may wish to create a sub-group to compose the bylaws, submit the proposed bylaws to both Council Representative Beth Kaplan and Nancy Bond, have the membership vote on them, and then submit the approved bylaws to Council to ensure that they become part of the permanent record as a component of Council meeting minutes. The bylaws will be due by August 31, 2013. There is a new Leadership Resources webpage with links to found at: <http://www2.archivists.org/governance/leaderresources>

- IV. Program Committee Representative Audra Yun discussed the 2013 annual meeting to be held in New Orleans, LA, which is theme-free. It will be a joint meeting between the SAA and the Council of State Archivists. Session proposals are due by October 5, 2012. Each Roundtable and Section can endorse up to two session proposals. There is a limit of one presentation (not including Lightning Round talks) per person. More information is found at <http://www2.archivists.org/conference/2013/new-orleans>

- V. Mott then introduced the topic of the second panel. The panel will present hints and tips on how to balance the normal demands of the work day with the added demands that special projects present. How can special projects be leveraged to improve situations in archives? He noted that the size of the current panel was much diminished from its high point of seven presenters, but circumstances arose to prevent many of the original presenters from attending. Some of the topics which did not make it to today’s presentation included the challenges of a state archives collaborating with others to create a website related to the anniversary of the Civil War, an archives mandated to merge with a Special Collections unit using an anniversary to help unite them, and how collaboration transformed an anniversary into a strategic win for the organization.

- VI. Panel 2: The Anniversary Waltz: Dancing the Line Between Your Regular Work and Special Projects
 - A. Norma Riddle, Appalachian State University, “Plan Ahead – Way Ahead...How to Keep The Anniversary Waltz From Turning Into the Lambada”
 - B. Katie Howell, Central Piedmont Community College, “A Golden Opportunity”

- VII. Business Meetings: at 5:45, the two Roundtables separated into their own groups to conduct their business meetings.
 - A. Mott explained that the AMRT joined with the Lone Arrangers this year because both groups felt that management issues do not make it into the program as much as they’d like. To address some of these issues, they took two proposed sessions that had been rejected by SAA, and presented them. If AMRT members feel that

the joint session was worthwhile, please give your feedback to Mott, especially concerning whether we should hold another joint meeting.

B. Our first online election was conducted successfully and provided the following slate of officers and committee members:

Mott R. Linn, Jr., CA	Chair	8/8/2012 - 8/14/2013	Clark University
Sherry Williams, CA	Vice Chair	8/8/2012 - 8/14/2013	University of Kansas
Ann Smith Case, CA	Secretary	8/8/2012 - 8/14/2013	Tulane University
Alexandra Gressitt	Immediate Past Chair	8/8/2011 - 8/14/2014	Thomas Balch Library
Daria D'Arienzo, CA	Steering Committee Member	8/24/2011 - 8/14/2014	Meekins Archivist
Salvador Barrigan	Steering Committee Member	8/11/2010 - 8/14/2013	Inter-American Development Bank
Katherine Crowe	Steering Committee Member	8/8/2012 - 8/14/2015	University of Denver
Debra Kimok	Steering Committee Member	8/11/2010 - 8/14/2013	SUNY Plattsburgh
Katie Nash, CA	Steering Committee Member	8/8/2012 - 8/14/2015	Elon University
Elizabeth Kaplan	Council Liaison	8/27/2011 - 8/16/2014	
Kate Rogge, CA	Web Liaison	7/9/2008 - 8/14/2013	Franklin County Historical Society

C. Working Group on Accessibility in Archives and Records Management – Daria and Debra spoke about co-chairing the WGA, which was the first working taskforce created from a grassroots level, put together by the Records Management Roundtable and the AMRT. It was the conceptual idea of Russell James of the RMRT, and he asked the AMRT to join, and it has just wrapped up its work after five years. The group has tried to raise issues of physical accessibility for patrons and colleagues in archives, as well as questions of meeting accessibility and web accessibility. Usually this topic is seen in terms of electronic or web accessibility, but the group also point out that there are physical accessibility issues in accessing archives as well (as baby boomers age, the aspect of physical accessibility is becoming more important). With the increase of resources online, how do we make those accessible? How are meeting presentations made more accessible to people who need clear, uncluttered visuals? Are websites accessible to spiders and indexing software?

After five years, the working group is closing down. With its emphasis on advocacy and diversity, SAA needs to more broadly address these questions to give them clout. The WGA's last act was to compile an online source of resources for archivists and librarians about physical and general accessibility issues. This has just been posted on their website. For archivists, this document may be the single most important document because it brings together vetted resources across the spectrum of library, archives, general, historical, and practical literature. These are linked through ARMT website.

Debra added that they had created a list of guidelines for working with colleagues with physical disabilities in archives and another set for working with researchers with physical disabilities in archives, and these became best practices which are included in the SAA Standards portal. The Accessibility working group has its own website (<http://www2.archivists.org/groups/amtrmrt-working-group-on-accessibility>) maintained by Lisa Snider which will remain, although the working

group has finished its work. Now it's time for SAA to 'own' accessibility issues on a larger level.

Daria and Debra intend to write an article about the evolution of the working group. This was the first time that two roundtables got together and from the grassroots, brought issues up to SAA that ultimately ended up in becoming best practices that are now a part of SAA Standards. This shows that small groups can influence the way our profession sees these issues. Advocacy, outreach, and providing resources were goals of the working group. Links to useful articles and presentations (e.g., that provide checklists to things that can be done in an archive to ensure that it is accessible to researchers) are found on the Accessibility working group website.

- D. OCLC Reports – Jennifer Schaffner, OCLC Research Library Partnership
 - a. Addressing Born-Digital Archives and Manuscripts. The first report has not been addressed yet, but it discusses what might be the first few things to do if a disk comes into an archives collection. It presents very basic things that can be done in any archive to help with processing born-digital material, e.g., primary steps to remove material off of the original media.
 - b. Paper Finding Aids. OCLC is trying to find ways to make them more accessible, so is experimenting with faxed finding aids which are then OCR'd. They are working with research scientists to run algorithms to see if there is a fast way of getting the finding aids digitized and searchable. Jennifer also mentioned ArchiveGrid, which is now free, and finding aids can be harvested by it. OCLC is conducting a research project with what a thin discovery layer over many archival descriptions looks like.
 - c. Holistic Collection Assessment. This project is wrapping up. It reviewed all kinds of methods for backlog assessment, preservation assessment, and other kinds of methodologies to get a holistic view of a collection, and then extracted common pieces in common to make recommendations about how to adapt pieces of different methodologies to your particular situation.
- E. Matthew Beacom, ACRL/RBMS (ALA) Liaison, reported briefly about the RBMS Preconference meeting in June which concentrated on discussions of digital humanities, linked open data, and the “book as an object”. Metrics and Collections Assessment was another sub-theme; the forthcoming RBM issue is on assessment. RBMS has produced a Diversity Recruitment Toolkit and the chairs of the RBMS diversity committee will present on RBMS activities at the Joint Conference of Librarians of Color, which is coming up in September.
- F. ACRL/RBMS Guidelines for Interlibrary and Exhibition Loan of Special Collections Materials (Approved by ACRL Board of Directors, January 2012).

Jennifer reported that there have been exhibition loan guidelines in place for awhile, but that there really had not been serious discussion about loaning special collections holdings for research purposes. Roundtable members expressed their

reservations about letting original materials be loaned out through an interlibrary loan office.

Christian Dupont, member of the task force which merged the *Guidelines for the Interlibrary Loan of Rare and Unique Materials* (1994, rev. 2004) and *Guidelines for Borrowing and Lending Special Collections Material for Exhibition* (2005), talked about the upcoming session (at this meeting) on this topic, which will present some first-hand accounts and models of interlibrary loaning of archival material. He said that there is a need out there to provide optimum access to materials for both exhibition and research purposes, so there ought to be a set of guidelines on the best way to achieve this. When asked “why now?”, Jennifer said that within ALA, there is a formal timeline of five years in which all sets of standards come up for review. In this case, the guidelines were being reviewed in both committees at the same time, so rather than have two committees doing the same work, they worked on it together.

These are guidelines, not requirements. The AMRT is not being asked to decide whether to adopt them, just whether they are worthy of being sent up the chain for Council and the Standards Committee to consider. Basically, we are just being asked to endorse the guidelines, and to ask for them to be reviewed at a higher level for possible adoption.

Christian explained that these guidelines are a merger of two existing standards. Since standards expire, they need to be reviewed and updated or they will be rescinded. That is why this has come up again. Historically, the original (1979) joint ALA/SAA standard on access to original research materials has gone through many iterations, having been approved most recently in 2009 (or 2010). There was a statement within that original standard that mentioned that there are conditions under which it may be feasible to put onto loan or deposit to another institution for access materials from one institution to another. This led people to ask how and why would we do this. The Reference and User Services Association (RUSA), a division of ALA, has been maintaining ILL guidelines. In 1994, RBMS and ACRL published a complement to the ILL code for managing special collections material. These were updated in 2004, and then in 2005, ACRL and RBMS asked for guidelines about how to lend materials for exhibition, so a separate set of guidelines were established and endorsed by SAA. In 2009, the standards needed to be revisited so it was decided to merge the guidelines for research use and for exhibition, both falling under some common access principles and practices. The hard part for the task force was to make sure that all audiences would be served with the guidelines (special collections librarians, archivists, interlibrary loan staff).

Daria asked if museum colleagues were consulted in constructing the guidelines, and if it was a political mistake not to ask the archivists sooner in the process. Mott asked what happens if SAA moves it forward and makes changes, would ACRL then have to approve of the SAA changes? Jennifer replied that if this group does not think that the guidelines are reasonable enough, then don't take them forward

to Council. The process of how to make the changes and reviews, who gets multiple drafts, etc., is one reason perhaps why SAA entered the picture later rather than sooner. At this point, we should review the guidelines to move towards endorsement, or plan now to appoint a joint task force or a liaison for the next time that the guidelines come up for review.

Regarding the museum portion of the question, Christian added that AAM was experiencing upheaval at the time of the review, and they have a very different model and audience. These guidelines were written for a different purpose and model; they are intended for use by libraries, archives, historical societies, and other similar repositories to encourage and facilitate the inter-institutional loan of special collection materials including rare books, manuscripts, archival documents and documents. This was intended to be 'archives-friendly'. It is non-specific enough to fit most circumstances.

Debra said that she could understand the necessity of lending an original item for an exhibition, but why should we need to interlibrary-loan original material when digital scans or photocopies can be provided? Jennifer replied that sometimes, people do actually need the original document for their research, and sometimes they need very large collections which would be very costly to photocopy or scan in total.

These guidelines pinpoint the critical principles about access, how there is tiered decision making, what the responsibilities are of the loaner and borrower during the moment of hand-off, and what is done at that moment. Christian said that the physical lending is the key aspect, and if an archivist wants to (or is being driven to) do this, the guidelines say to develop a policy framework in a language that makes sense to your department and to the ILL librarians. The guidelines call for permanent, trained, professionals touching borrowed/loaned materials.

Jennifer said that the trend has been changing towards loaning material that would previously have not been considered. Katie Nash said that she sees the guidelines being useful because they can be adapted by each institution for its own needs. The choice between loaning out material or making copies is more of a workflow issue in her environment, and these guidelines can be fitted to either large or small institutions. Chris said that this is a way to build collaborations within your institution and extend your resources by using ILL rather than your own staff, as well as building outside collaborations with other institutions.

Katie pointed out that this would be a good reason to push to include your holdings within OCLC so others can see what you have. Chris said that you can build restrictions within your OCLC record so that people can see your deflection policies or conditions under which you will lend material. Daria asked if institutions could use the guidelines to support a decision to decline to lend something, and the answer was "absolutely." If an institution does not live up to the guidelines, then you can point to the guidelines and say, "this is why we cannot lend the material to

you at this time.” It is helpful, from a management standpoint, to have a policy and guidelines to support your decision.

Other points were made in the discussion:

- one incentive to lending items is the possibility of receiving items at some point in the future
- most ILLs have a reciprocal cost structure; it may be cheaper to operate through ILL
- tracking and documentation is monitored in ILL process
- these guidelines were also being considered by the RAO Section

Mott then asked what the Roundtable’s procedure would be at this time. Jennifer replied that we should make the decision whether to fill out the form which says that we wish this to go to Council for endorsing. Mott has sent the link out to the proposed guidelines twice on the list-serv, so he feels that people have had a chance to read and review the guidelines. The Steering Committee will vote on whether to promote the guidelines to the Council. However, since three members of the Steering Committee were not present at this meeting, Mott will e-mail all of the committee members in the next week to ask for their decision.

VIII. The meeting adjourned at 7:30.

Respectfully submitted by Ann E. Smith Case, Acting Secretary

Attendees of the 2012 Archives Management Roundtable Business Meeting:

Matthew Beacom, Yale University
Ann E. Smith Case, Tulane University
Daria D’Arienzo, Meekins Library
Christian Dupont, Atlas Systems
Aaisha Haykal, Chicago State University
Debra Kimok, SUNY Plattsburgh
Brianna Lilienthal, Shasta Historical Society
Mott Linn, Clark University
Katie Nash, Elon University
Marilyn Rackley, Atlas Systems
Norma Riddle, Appalachian State University
Jennifer Schaffner, OCLC Research
Sherry Williams, University of Kansas
Larissa Woo, Molloy College