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1. **Welcome from the Chair and Introductions**

The 2012 SAA Security Roundtable was called to order by Kara McClurken at 5:35pm. Participants introduced themselves with their name and organizational affiliation.

1. **Announcements**

Kara McClurken announced that the Preservation Section is holding a fundraiser for their Disaster Relief Fund through the sale of aprons. Aprons are $20 each and available adjacent to the conference registration desk.

Ms. McClurken also indicated that there are many volunteer opportunities available within the Security Roundtable, which will be discussed later in the meeting. Interested participants should contact Ms. McClurken or Brittany Turner. The meeting will also welcome Frank Boyles, a representative of the Government Affairs Working Group, which is seeking a Liaison from the Security Roundtable.

Ms. McClurken outlined some of the upcoming projects, including additional website development, reconstruction of the Security Roundtable Mission Statement, and proposed revisions to the SAA Code of Ethics to strengthen the existing statement on security.

Ms. McClurken also explored the possibility of hosting a SAA Security Workshop as offered previously. The workshop is traditionally taught by Mimi Bowling, and the most recent workshop in North Dakota was well attended. She suggested that Roundtable members remind others that the workshop is available and to consider the possibility of hosting the workshop at a Security Roundtable member’s own institution.

Finally, Ms. McClurken noted that the SAA Security Roundtable website has very little information. She proposed that Security Roundtable members work together in order to create resources for users interested in improving guidelines. The website should point to RBMS guidelines, templates, tips for hands-on and practical security solutions, etc., which would be especially useful for those who cannot come to meetings regularly. She asked that members contact her if they are interested in helping with the technical aspects of the website expansion or if they had suggestions for resource development/inclusion.

1. **Update on ACRL/RBMS Security Guidelines Endorsement**

Brittany Turner summarized the previous efforts to explore endorsement of the ACRL/RBMS Security Guidelines, which have been ongoing for at least two years. She introduced Alvan Bregman, Chair of the RBMS Security Committee, who has been integral in the growing collaboration between the SAA Security Roundtable and ACRL/RBMS Security Committee.

Mr. Bregman noted that this is his first time attending and SAA meeting despite the fact that our interests overlap greatly. One of the initiatives of the ACRL/RBMS Security Committee is to develop a closer working relationship between the two groups, which has included the appointment of Ms. Turner as a member of his committee.

Mr. Bregman explains that many of the concerns raised in the SAA statement regarding the endorsement of the Guidelines were well received by his group. This will now provide an opportunity to work together when expanding and reformulating some of the advice and best practices highlighted in the Guidelines. For example, marking may be one of these areas and the appendix may be reconsidered in the context of identifying unmarked archival material in support of future repatriation. He expressed his hope that the conversation continues in a more formalized way.

Kara McClurken emphasized Ms. Turner’s work on behalf of the endorsement, and thanked her for her efforts.

1. **Election of Roundtable Officers**

Kara McClurken explained that the Security Roundtable is a relatively informal group. She had distributed a call for nominations via the listserv, but received none. Renna Tutten expressed her desire to assist with the work of the Security Roundtable in a less formalized manner.

Ms. McClurken expressed a desire to explore online voting for 2012, since there are nearly 250 members of the Security Roundtable, but many are unable to attend the meeting. She also noted that the Security Roundtable Bylaw revision may lead to a shift in the organization of its leadership.

*In a vote of acclimation, Kara McClurken was nominated as Chair of the Security Roundtable. Kara McClurken was unanimously elected as Chair of the Security Roundtable.*

*In a vote of acclimation, Brittany Turner was nominated as Secretary of the Security Roundtable. Brittany Turner was unanimously elected as Secretary of the Security Roundtable.*

1. **Presentation and Discussion: “Having Our Cake and Eating It Too: Access and Security in the Reading Room”**

The 2012 presentation focuses on balancing access and security in the reading room. The panel includes Lori Burrell, Alvan Bregman, Richard Dine, and Michael Knight.

Lori Burrell serves as the Manuscript Librarian at the University of Rochester Rare Books and Special Collections and Preservation Department since May 2011. During last year’s discussion, the Security Roundtable explored the balance between access and security, spawning the idea for this presentation. Ms. Burrell’s department has been in the process of reviewing and revising their access and security policies and she would like to share information about what this process has meant for her institution.

Ms. Burrell explained that the work at her institution has expanded beyond the reading room, considering everything from the structure of stacks to the procedures at the reception desk to materials access and everything in between. This could be described as general department security.

Ms. Burrell’s library is comprised of four full-time staff members, three part-time staff members, and four to five students who work on special projects and staff the reception desk. Their hours are 9:00am until 5:00pm Monday through Friday and 11:00am until 3:00pm during the academic year. The reading room is closed 15 minutes before the department closes. The collection includes items regarding Frederick Douglass, Kodak history, YWCA local chapters, and the University Archives collections. In July of 2012, there were over 70 visits. Each staff member teaches an average of 5 classes per year. There are 10 exhibits per year, and many of the exhibits have an online component.

Prior to September 2011, the access policies in Ms. Burrell’s library included a greeting by a student or paraprofessional assigned to the reception desk. Researchers would fill out a registration form and their photograph identification would be photocopied and kept with the completed form. The form included a request for local and home addresses, telephone number, email address, and institutional affiliation. There was a second form designated for manuscript materials specifically, which included contact information and institutional affiliation. For rare books, there was a book slip. All forms were kept in a work room extending back to the 1990s. Researchers were required to complete a new form for each academic year.

During the pre-2011 period, researchers were permitted to use one box or cart at a time. The materials were moved from the stacks directly into the reading room, and reception desk staff was not involved in the transfer. Researchers usually corresponded with staff prior to their visit, but there were also many walk-in users. On Saturdays, the department was staffed by a paraprofessional who paged and reshelved materials.

As far as general department security, there was a video monitor under the reception desk and two camera in the reading room during working hours. There were no cameras in the work room where staff and stacks coexist. With the exception of one part-time staff member, all staff had keys at all times as well as the ability to turn the alarm system off and on. The general security was monitored by University Security, but there was still total internal control.

Since July 2011, Ms. Burrell has looked at the procedures at other institutions and performed local site visits. Each professional staff member now staffs the reception desk at least two hours per week, with the remaining time covered by trained student staff members. The process of registration has been streamlined and there is now a manual of appropriate reception desk activities. The request for ample contact information on forms resulted in many researchers leaving these areas blank. The registration forms have since been restructured and integrated into a combined form that requests contact information and collection access needs into one form, although the book slip still exists. Researchers have also been restricted to using one folder at a time while the cart remains near the reception desk, and the contents of the folders are counted before and after use. This proved to be extremely time consuming and has subsequently been applied only to high value 19th century collections like Susan B. Anthony and Frederick Douglass. Reception staff have been instructed to avoid traveling through the work room, which helps the archivists identify use, preservation concerns, and digitization needs. Appointments are now required with at least 48 hours advance notice, and this policy is highlighted on the website and all researcher communications. This policy ensures that the appropriate staff member is on site. Professional staff are now responsible for paging collections that are their curatorial responsibility, which eliminates the paraprofessional third party.

In the future, the great risk to collections due to staff/stacks coexistence will be addressed. This may be accomplished through moving, the construction of barriers, or limiting the number of people who have stack access. A buddy system may also be employed. Public spaces will also continue to be evaluated. The video monitor may be moved to a more prominent position to help ensure that researchers know they are being monitored. They may also assign a staff member to the reading room any time collections are being used. Traditional physical keys may be exchanged for key cards, which will assist in creating access logs. There is also an interest in adopting a system like AEON to track access points and use history of the material. Although the paper system is good, there are only so many access points available. The book slip may also be eliminated to make tracking easier.

Alvan Bregman thanked the Security Roundtable for inviting him to participate. He currently works at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, and previously worked at the University of Illinois. He is the Chair of the RBMS Security Committee and while at their pre-conference he participated in a session on security and public service, so both groups are thinking along the same lines. Preservation and access are two poles around which our work revolved, and our responsibility is to balance our attention between the two despite the essential natures being different. He refers to this as security under the rubric of preservation, with security being restrictive, protective, controlling, and quantitative in contrast to access which is open, permissive, giving, and qualitative. Both goals need to be balanced, with both remaining a priority through consistent framing and improved policies.

Mr. Bregman noted that the charge we have been given, to “ensure unimpeded access,” may not be desirable. An access to impediment is not necessarily desirable, especially when that barrier is based on reasonable, tested rules and policies which have been set in place to regulate archival space and collections. These are not impediments to users, and when we think of rules and procedures as barriers, we begin to eliminate or circumvent them. Similarly, not all requests are time sensitive nor are all demands orders. We have an option to deal with the request that we have in an orderly way, and Mr. Bregman suggests employing a 48 hour rule. These policies are appropriate when they are consistent and transparently presented. The general principle is the same regardless of the specific practice, and we should always take the time we need to ensure our material is mediated in a way that allows it to be used effectively while also allowing it to be secured.

Mr. Bregman asserted that it is our responsibility to guard against accidental damage, vandalism, and theft, which will require that we use our judgment. Guidelines and resources like Everett Wilkie’s book set out best practices for keeping collections safe and facilitate theft discovery. Many of these recommendations are the same regardless of whether the collection is in a library or archives. The fundamental principle of providing the most access while keeping collections secure is intertwined with the concept of providing the most security while keeping collections accessible. When we frame security policies positively, we see the most success. For example, lockers enhance security but they also maintain privacy, as the level of exit screening may be reduced. Registration forms require the disclosure of contact information, but they also provide necessary information on the use of collections which improves our ability to better serve users.

Mr. Bregman also advocated for the redesign of monitoring to ensure that it is concentrated on watching materials without fixating on people. Reference interviews also allow us to develop a connection to users so that they may be approached in the reading room more easily. It becomes less of an imposition if you’re familiar and collegial. He noted, however, that this is an ideal and is difficult to attain. Many institutions cannot implement all guidelines due to space, finances, policies, etc. and that sight lines, resources, and additional staff are something to strive toward. The problem is not implementing or enforcing procedures when you are empowered to do so, even if it is in a limited way. We frequently choose to avoid the implementation of these protections because we are reluctant to make users uneasy or do not wish to appear as if we are creating “impediments” to access. When this concern arises, we should think about how we can reframe the practice in a positive way, combining security with public service.

The RBMS Security Committee employs a proactive approach to encourage outreach and these approaches are built upon consistency. Rules apply to everyone, including staff. If no bags are permitted, no bags are permitted and lockers are used by everyone. When we make it convenient to follow rules, help others to understand the relevance, and apply them equitably, the rules are successful. It is also useful to review the items being distributed to researchers, and advance notice helps with this challenge. The concept of instant delivery is contrary to security, and as such, the preferred approach is a measured delivery time that ensures ample opportunity to review. This is the challenge of the “golden minimum.” Unprocessed collections may be made available upon request, with an opportunity to review what is being used before it reaches the hands of the user. We can also ensure the integrity of material coming in and out through counting and weighing with precise scales. Ultimately, good public service equals good security. The two go together and it is our responsibility to implement the guidelines we are able to while setting goals for those that are more challenging. We have no choice but to strive to do the best we can in support of prevention, which will always be better than attempting to respond to a theft. If it seems like preventative measures are too time consuming, one need only consult with an institution that experienced a theft to see how time consuming the alternative can truly be.

Richard Dine, a Training Specialist with the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), develops his security training along ADDIE guidelines. His challenges are multi-faceted, as he must address policies, culture, trust, and communication. The goal at NARA has been to recalibrate culture to balance access with protection. Security at NARA must also be scalable. Institutions need to explore their individual needs, as well as the extent that staff and researchers are currently balancing security. Once that information is available, training programs may be designed. However, this is a multi-year process.

At NARA, the first year focused on revising existing content, making it available online, and practicing the training live in person and via webinar. By making the training available to NARA and others, the team was able to focus on content as well as culture. Staff got to know the Holdings Protection Team and understand their purpose. It alleviated the fear that the team was present to run stings or get people into trouble. Despite the “bad apples,” many staff and researchers care deeply about preservation and security, even if they don’t know it initially. Mr. Dine brainstorms with the staff and users, incorporating their knowledge and suggestions.

The second year provided training on confronting researchers. It was necessary to overcome an unwillingness to confront users and staff, avoid legal issues, protect staff safety, and address internal theft, which comprises over 75% of thefts. The training stressed the fact that there are no exceptions to policies and if a staff member encounters a problem, they should feel comfortable communicating with the Holdings Protection Team rather than changing the policy themselves. The process needs to ensure that people are comfortable communicating any concern to the Holdings Protection Team, since safe conversations about policy issues pave the way for safe conversations about possible theft risks, policy violations, and red flags without feeling like a “snitch.” The second year training also looked at movements, couriers, and exhibits. Exit inspections were introduced and Security Officers were trained on recognizing archival materials when conducting these searches.

Year three will be 2012/2013 and will begin with a refresher on the trainings delivered during the previous two years. This will help identify opportunities for internal awareness training topics such as trust. Management is also interested in incorporating self-assessment. In the first year, staff were empowered to communicate and brainstorm. Year three provides a good opportunity to see how staff feels about that previous communication and the subsequent development of the program. Holes in the training can also be plugged, ensuring that the right tool is used for each module and demonstrates a sense of humor (i.e. PowerPoint, Jeopardy, Video, etc.). Videos have been very successful, modeling appropriate behavior with existing equipment and resources while using staff as the “actors.” Internal awareness has been more challenging, so using familiar faces and places has been particularly useful. Using in-house resources to create these resources has been valuable since the low-cost implementation of the training program helps ensure its sustainability.

Mr. Dine noted that evaluation is always challenging, since loss prevention cannot be measured the same way as an inventory. Since we frequently don’t know about a theft until after it has occurred, it is difficult to pinpoint the success of training in that respect. One strategy is to ask employees for feedback, recording “saves,” and implementing the “secret shopper” concept as a way to help identify gaps and assess effectiveness rather than a catalyst for punitive action. Anecdotally, the training has been helpful. As of the meeting, the trainings have been delivered at over 12 institutions, with over 500 participants, as well as an upcoming webinar for SAA. The training videos are not available on YouTube, since there is discussion of NARA vulnerabilities, but the team is available to meet with various institutions. However, there is currently no travel budget unlike the first year of the program. There are ways to schedule these visits with institutional assistance.

In conclusion, Mr. Dine asked how many participants have formal policies at their institutions and a majority raised their hands. When asked how many provide training, only two raised their hands. When asked about researcher training, only one hand was raised.

Michael Knight, the final speaker, is an archivist serving on the NARA Holdings Protection Team. He acknowledged the tradition of weighted access services, with stack reference interviews for certain researchers being employed as recently as 2000. The focus has since shifted to a more balanced approach between access and security after several high profile incidents, including the Clinton hard drive. The negative reinforcement of these incidents underscored a need for security policies, which was again echoed through the discovery of the Les Waffen thefts. Waffen, a 40 year NARA veteran, stole thousands of items, including several from the Babe Ruth collections, making them available for purchase on eBay. Waffen was discovered when a donor saw some of his gift listed for sale on the site, and Waffen received 18 months. Victims of Barry Landau have faced similar trauma, as Landau stole thousands of items from dozens of archival institutions primarily east of the Mississippi River. Landau’s thefts included important documents from the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Presidential Library, assisted by an accomplice as well as a customized overcoat. Policies regarding overcoats had not been consistently enforced at the FDR Library and Archives. Landau was recently sentenced to a seven year sentence after he was caught by staff of the Maryland Historical Society, who had previously participated in one of the Holdings Protection workshops.

NARA identified similar oversights occurring at its 44 institutions across the country. NARA was forced internally and by stakeholders to review security measures, and the agency quickly realized that policies lacked cohesion and hadn’t been updated in decades. There had not been a systematic evaluation of best practices agency wide, there was ample inconsistency from facility to facility (i.e. minimum researcher age), and there were major discussions about the lack of uniform policies. Many situations had not been considered from a security standpoint. The Archivist of the United States created the Holdings Protection Team in December of 2009. The team was comprised of eight members: a team leader, trainer, and three archivist/security specialist pairs assigned to the Presidential Libraries, regional facilities, and the Washington, DC area. It was particularly important to have the security/archivist teams, since the two sectors “don’t always speak the same language.” The team-based approach made it easier to communicate and develop trust.

The mission of the Holdings Protection Team is to review directives and guidance, collect standard operating procedures, and initiate outreach programs to NARA facilities and other institutions. Some of the earliest external institutions included the New Mexico and New York State Archives, which had suffered losses and offered additional perspectives to the team. Another focus is the communication within NARA, as it was traditionally difficult to communicate across units and branches. At the management level, buy-in was cemented in the Washington, DC area.

One of the biggest challenges was unraveling those lines of communication. For example, if an incident happened at a NARA facility in Alaska, how would the incident be reported up the change of command? There were no statistics of how often this happens, no hard numbers on how much has been lost, no numbers highlighting “saves,” no numbers on potential theft or damage, and no tracking of what records are missing from stacks beyond the individual units. There is no physical or intellectual control of records to the necessary levels. After the management buy-in and creation of a nationwide program, they began the site visits to all facilities in an effort to underscore the fact that this is not merely another decree from DC without any resources for implementation. There is a real desire to partner with the sites to enforce security across the agency in a uniform way. Many facilities began to see the benefit of this collaboration immediately, as the uniformity across the agency reduced instances of researchers engaging in behaviors they had been permitted to do at other sites. The standardization of policies relieved the burden on staff, as there was now a ready-made scapegoat – the Holdings Protection Team. This allowed staff to have increased confidence when addressing the public and enforcing rules. It also bridged the communication gap between policymakers in College Park, MD and people on the ground across the country who are actually responsible for implementing policies.

The scalability of the program for institutions big and small has also been key. While it is true that NARA has more resources than many institutions to a certain extent, the speed with which the program has been developed allowed for the creation of short and long range goals. The short range goals are applicable for anyone, since they can be done on the fly without many resources. This includes the review of existing policies, interacting with researchers, implementing guidelines in a uniform way, etc. For example, many institutions didn’t know what to do if a theft was suspected. Answering these questions doesn’t require a lot of money; one only needs to improve communication and inspire cultural change. This area is one where many archivists are uncomfortable, as this type of researcher interaction isn’t done regularly. It takes practice, not resources. Access policies are another area for rapid improvement. Systems are ok, but policies also need to be strengthened and tested to ensure that they are being enforced. Access restrictions and controls are notoriously circumvented, leading to situations like Les Waffen. Almost all staff interviewed identified red flag behaviors, such as working at night and on weekends, bring boxes out to his car on break, etc., yet no one ever raised these concerns in a documented, organized way. Not only did it expand weaknesses in the existing system, but staff also exposed themselves to moral, ethical, and legal issues.

Long range goals do require resources, such as the exit inspections, which are costly due to the Security Officers, increased monitoring equipment, and training on appropriate use. Without training, these tools are essentially very expensive paperweights. Another long-term goal is the National Research Card system. Currently, all facilities issue paper researcher cards, but there is no way for Philadelphia to notify DC, even though the researcher could access both sites in the same day. A national system would pull up researcher records on a nationwide computer system, which would include information on researchers who are subject to a universal ban, have been involved in multiple saves, or those on the “BOLO” (be on the lookout) list who require additional monitoring from staff. There have already been six saves from two researchers at the downtown Washington, DC facility since August 1. Ultimately, even if an institution doesn’t have ample resources, they can’t give up. There is much that can be done without any additional support.

A participant asked whether a National Researcher Registration Card was really feasible? Mr. Knight indicated that they did not know yet. It had been discussed since 2006, and the implementation of any system across 44 institutions is challenging. He believes NARA is culturally ready, but the financial support is not yet available. This will be a priority in coming years. The cards would be for researchers only and would not include staff.

A participant asked if this was counter to the principle of equitable enforcement, and Mr. Knight clarified that the card would be required for anyone engaging in researcher, regardless of whether they are NARA employees. Anyone doing research is subject to the same rules. This was not always the case in the past.

A participant asked whether this program would be extended to non-NARA researchers? Mr. Knight explained that there is a desire to share lists of banned/suspected researchers, although this has not been implemented yet. NARA is starting to partner with some institutions, like the Smithsonian and Library of Congress. The banned list is also finally on the intranet, which is important since the hard copy was frequently out of date. If someone from an outside institution maintains an internal ban list, they should contact the Holdings Protection Team to negotiate an agreement for sharing.

A participant asked if that type of sharing could lead to lawsuits? Mr. Knight indicated that this was not an issue yet, because it hasn’t been instituted. Ultimately, it is probable that shared lists would only include information on known thieves which would be public record and not subject to claims of libel, slander, or discrimination.

A participant asked whether documentation on NARA’s decision making process for bans might be available to other archives? Mr. Knight indicated that this is not available and the process is currently being updated. Most recently, they completed an update on a 7-day ban for research room staff, which would allow time to review related records, conduct an investigation, and follow up with the researcher. At NARA, rules for banning tend to be published in the interest of transparency, so other institutions may be able to access them that way. Institution-specific policies would be something to discuss with general counsel. In addition, many policies are word-of-mouth and are not necessarily written, as was the case with the New York State Archives. If staff knows they can alert partner institutions informally, they may feel free to do so. Mr. Dine added that this issue should be addressed in trainings. Shelby Sannett added that they cannot give out directives, but it could be based on federal regulation codes. Ms. Burrell added that it also depends on whether an institution is public or private. Mr. Bregman noted that something like banning should never be arbitrary. Whatever the policy is, it should be enforced exactly in every instance. It should be written, formalized, and staff should be encouraged to use it when necessary. For example, registration may include a signed rule to abide by the rules or be subject banning. If the rules are broken, then the chain for banning would go into effect. Ms. Sannett noted that while NARA can’t share their internal information, they can facilitate or guide general discussion of guidelines and procedures to see what might be useful and customizable. In May, she and Mr. Dine offered a webinar through SAA entitled “Protect Your Holdings and Provide Access,” which is still available online. It includes more detail of points covered by all panelists, as well as visuals, suggestions, and contact information.

A participant asked how patron use should be recorded? If there is a paper slip, should there also be electronic or database monitoring? Ms. Burrell indicated that this is not currently available at her institution. At present, researchers sign in upon each visit in addition to the annual registration form. The 70 visitors per month estimate is slightly high, but is a rough estimate of their typical volume. There are eight to ten desks in their reading room, and one third of the reading room is obscured from view when seated at the reception desk. This is why there is heavy reliance on the monitor and reception staff. The only limit on users is the number of available seats, and they have never needed to turn anyone away due to space. The monitoring system does record, and there is a need for additional training on using the system. There is a staff member dedicated to changing and storing the CD on a daily basis. There are occasional glitches associated with updates, and the view is sometimes blocked. Mr. Bregman offered the suggestion of assigning seats, keeping the obscured seats vacant to be used in cases of overflow only. Ms. Burrell added that the one set of outlets in the first row helps with that issue. Mr. Dine indicated that they observed blind spots when making the training video, and Mr. Knight added that sight lines are an area worth working on, especially when staff is not present in the reading room. It is challenging to focus solely on security, since short staffing often necessitates multitasking for research monitors. If they’re working on other things, it’s the same as not being present. Due to the high volume at College Park (150 to 300 per day), there is an entire staff dedicated to monitoring. Other sites with 12 researchers per month may have only one staffer.

A participant asked if staff is trained on how to monitor the reading room? People tend to focus on the front quarter of the room. Mr. Knight explained that that isn’t addressed specifically, but it is recommended that staff occasionally look up and avoid becoming immersed in other work. There is also attention given on approaching and addressing researchers, giving direction, and incident response. Mr. Bregman reiterated that it is good to focus on the materials. If you know you got back what you distributed, it avoids making this personal. No monitoring is 100% effective, but keeping it unpredictable is valuable. Determined people are quite watchful, so vary the order that the room is checked. Tell people you’re recording them if you have a CCTV system. Make a point of checking when they leave the reading room. Be active to prevent “casual” or “invited” theft. Gregor Trinkaus-Randall added to avoid having a regular monitoring schedule, such as checking every 15 minutes on the dot. This would enable a thief to inherently know when to watch out. Mr. Knight noted that it is important to have staff on hand at all times. He recognized that this is challenging for many facilities, but it is rarely impossible. If it becomes extremely challenging, all research should be conducted by appointment only to ensure that there is always monitoring. Requiring signs indicating surveillance, and even large monitors to see the reading room on camera, are useful deterrents.

A participant asked if criminal background checks are conducted on staff? Mr. Knight indicated that all NARA employees are subject to a criminal background check. A participant asked if this was also true of universities with high turnover in paraprofessionals or students? Ms. Burrell expressed her belief that with students there are rules regarding background checks and that it may be illegal. This is a huge risk, and sometimes only one staff member is alone in the back with student workers. At present, these checks are not being conducted. A participant shared that this is an issue he is grappling with, since there is high turnover and the checks can be costly. Some are quoted near $1,000. Mr. Knight questioned the effectiveness in these instances. The participant explained that all workers are students, but there have been a number of serious breaches at one facility. Yet the checks can be expensive and time consuming. Mr. Knight added that they contract with an agency for the checks. Kara McClurken added that it depends on the level of the check and where it is being conducted. For example, it could be done on every student, but not staff since faculty status is based on the law when they were hired. She has not been permitted to sign a voluntary waiver permitting the check on herself; the process cannot be applied to faculty retroactively. It also depends whether the student is from Virginia or elsewhere, since a broader geographic area changes the cost. Mr. Bregman emphasized that an atmosphere of trust is important and team building is often necessary. For example, there should not be jokes about theft since it is very serious. If the seriousness is reinforced, people will have trust and understand the importance of security, especially in problem situations. A participant added that even if criminal background checks are prohibited, students and volunteers could be provided to offer references and that these references should actually be contacted. If there is a problem and references are a condition of employment, many would-be thieves won’t come back.

A participant asked if appointments requirements are waived for students of the college or university? Ms. Burrell said no. These are high value collections and it requires significant time to provide the requested materials. She added that avoiding the word “appointment” may be useful, as this sounds like office hours. Instead, explain that the archivist would like to work with the student, find a time that works with the student schedule, and address the research needs collaboratively. It is less wasteful of everyone’s time. Mr. Knight agreed, suggesting a positive spin. Although appointments aren’t required, letting staff know in advance ensures the collections are on site and an expert is available to assist. Mr. Bregman agreed, indicating that this provides a higher level of service rather than restricting access. It also allows multiple students to access the same box.

Ms. Sannett pointed out that many interesting questions have arisen from the discussion. Proposals for SAA New Orleans 2013 are due October 5. She serves on the SAA Education Committee this year and would like to help with security proposals. She also suggested that participants consider submitting a proposal for a pre-conference workshop or program session.

Mr. Trinkaus-Randall asked if it would be beneficial to expand the scope to include disaster preparedness and environmental monitoring, since those are also destructive? Ms. Burrell explained that within the past year additional funds were identified and a fireproof safe was purchased. Some high value items were selected for storage in the safe. Mr. Knight again referenced the inter-unit barriers at NARA, nothing that the offices that deal with those issues rarely communicated before the creation of the Holdings Protection Team. Now they are coordinating more. The 2011 earthquake resulted in a shelving collapse at an affiliated archive; instead of notifying Preservation, they contacted the Holdings Protection Team, which contacted the relevant offices and teams to examine the problem as a group and worked with the institution to rectify the situation. This led to the development of close relationships with various offices, including Emergency Preparedness, Research Services, Agency Services, and Preservation. Mr. Dine added that there are also continuity of operation training models being developed. Mr. Knight pointed out that the Holdings Protection Team also interacts with dissatisfied researchers, since they are more understanding as a group than individuals. They interact with whoever they need to.

Ms. McClurken urged participants to send session proposals, such as banning, to the listserv. Mr. Dine added that we are all in this together, especially after Landau.

1. **Executive Council Updates**

Terry Baxter introduced himself as the Executive Council liaison. He explained that the minutes of their meeting will be available online within a few weeks.

35% of membership completed a member survey which will be reviewed by Executive Council. Information from the survey will be available through Jackie Dooley’s blog, offtherecord.archivists.org. The Executive Council will divide up information from the survey and begin preparing reports which are due by mid-October in preparation for the strategic planning meeting in January 2013. Concerns and ideas should be sent to Mr. Baxter and he will pass them on.

The nominations process structured information around the elected offices in order to make the nominations process more transparent. He urged participants to look at the descriptions of offices, and if it appears to be a good match, contact the Nominating Committee or self-nominate. Quality people frequently fail to come onto the Nominating Committee radar.

Mr. Baxter is trying to engage with groups as a member rather than just a liaison, as he find it to be more rewarding. He looks forward to learning more about what the group does, since it helps him serve better. Participants should contact him with questions and ideas for the Executive Council, or even just to keep up with what they are doing. He will also pass information back to us. Gregor Trinkaus-Randall added that there is a push for more involvement of Executive Council members as liaisons to all groups rather than just being an anonymous contact. They need to be engaged.

A participant asked about the hierarchy of SAA, and how the Executive Council fits in with everything else? Mr. Baxter explained that it is the decision making body for SAA, and action on the legislative level is done by the Executive Council. For example, Mr. Trinkaus-Randall may make executive decisions on his own as President. Constituent groups do much of the work as well. There are nine elected counselors, as well as a President, Treasurer, and Vice President making up the 13 member body. Mr. Trinkaus-Randall added that the work of the Executive Council outlined much of the work to be done by staff, whereas membership driven work comes from other groups, like task forces, working groups, and committees. He clarified that the Executive Committee is comprised of the Treasurer, Vice President, President, and one third-year Executive Council member that may make occasional decisions based on the nature of the decision or need for expediency.

1. **Government Affairs Working Group Announcement**

Frank Boyles explained that a revised Advocacy Agenda is due in June and the Government Affairs Working Group has been established to advise on the legislative priorities. The group exists to help implement the agenda and is looking for volunteers for the Security Roundtable. It is a constituency group that has interest in public policy, since legal issues effect security all the time. He is seeking volunteers to assist with monitoring legal and policy issues regarding security and to also offer expertise to help identify what the SAA position should be on relevant legislation. Policies may be proposed to the Executive Council and they may also be disposed of, so there is no guarantee, but it helps to inform those recommendations and they usually listen. Anyone interested should contact Mr. Boyles using the SAA directory. Gregor Trinkaus-Randall added that the new Advocacy Agenda will be a series of issue briefs written on particular topics, but there may be additional topics that haven’t yet been identified and that may include security.

1. **Adjourn**

Kara McClurken summarized the meeting, highlighting the Code of Ethics revisions, development of resources, expansion of the website, proposal of sessions, and sharing of information with the RBMS Security Committee. If interested in volunteering, please contact Ms. McClurken or Brittany Turner. Brittany Turner will send the draft minutes in mid-to-late October, and Ms. McClurken will send a reminder email calling for volunteers. There seems to be some momentum and an opportunity to move things forward. Ms. McClurken and Ms. Turner hope to provide more opportunities to volunteer and share the workflow.

Gregor Trinkaus-Randall added that the advance work spent on the RBMS Security Guidelines, particularly the generation of contacts and anticipation of questions, helped move the endorsement along and made it much easier for the Executive Council to make a decision. Preparing the necessary information beforehand expedites recommendations tremendously and pays off when a proposal is in front of the Executive Council.

*The 2012 SAA Security Roundtable Meeting was adjourned at 7:25pm.*

*Respectfully prepared and submitted by*

*Brittany Turner, Secretary, Security Roundtable*