

Security Committee Annual Meeting, 2022

June 30, 2022, 3-4pm Eastern

Zoom info: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84353129587?pwd=LytpcktZRHVHaWpYWDV4OGwzVWY2QT09>

Meeting ID: 843 5312 9587

Passcode: 646248

One tap mobile

+13017158592,,84353129587#,,,,*646248# US (Washington DC)

+19294362866,,84353129587#,,,,*646248# US (New York)

Dial by your location

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

+1 929 436 2866 US (New York)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

Meeting ID: 843 5312 9587

Passcode: 646248

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84353129587>

I. Welcome *Beth DeBold*, 5 minutes

A. Attendance

[Attendance Sheet](#): Margaret Gamm (co-chair), Beth DeBold (co-chair), Kim Bell (member), Beth Kilmarx (member), Gordon Daines (member), Kathleen Monahan (member), Julie Tanaka (member), Kathleen Smith (member), Erika Hosselkus (member), Maggie Kopp (member), Natalia Sciarini (member), Clare Withers (member), Eileen Dewitya (member), Kelli Hansen (incoming member), Lindy Smith (incoming member), Barbara Bieck (incoming member), Lois Fischer Black (visitor), Miriam Cady (visitor), Heather Smedberg (visitor)

B. Request for Notetaker

Notes by K. Monahan

C. Membership changes

i. *Thanks to committee members rotating off for your service*: Margaret Gamm, Danielle Culpeper, Michael Inman, and Natalia Sciarini

ii. *Welcome to new members joining us (or returning!)*: Kelli Hansen, Barbara Bieck, Mar Gonzalez Palacios, Erika Hosselkus, Lindy Smith, and Julie Tanaka

II. Report on Security-related Panels at RBMS & ALA 10 minutes

A. "Finding the Balance: an International Approach to Security Guidelines"

i. Recording: <https://rbms2022.us2.pathable.com/meetings/virtual/9EispasNH2yH5Let9>

ii. Margaret's slides:  RBMS2022_Finding-the-Balance_Presentation.pptx


- Margaret: Beth Kilmarx led session; Margaret Gamm presented on behalf of committee on the revised draft of the guidelines. Presented overview of changes and revised ToC. Panel included representative from CERL on their quick audit tool and Helen Vincent, representative from IFLA, and work worldwide on trafficking of rare materials.
- Beth Kilmarx: will check that all slides are uploaded and available. All presenters gave permission for their slides to be shared.
- Other member comments: Really helpful session with good information.

B. "Verify but Trust: "Verify But Trust: Re-assessing Best Practices for Security in Special Collections Environments" (co-sponsored by the RBMS Diversity Committee). If you registered for ALA Annual, a recording of this presentation can be accessed here:

<https://www.eventscribe.net/2022/alaannual/fsPopup.asp?efp=RIZITIJNTFQxNTU4MQ&PresentationID=1007851&rnd=0.7055475&mode=presinfo>

- Co-sponsored presentation at ALA Annual.
- Beth DeBold: Presenters: Intern from Banard, Director from Medical Library at SC (check this please), and Armando Leon who runs cultural heritage advising business.
- Beth DeBold: Approached by Fletcher Durant from ALA Publications Committee that it would be good to have an edited volume on new directions in security in special collections. Discuss in New Business further.
- Julie Tanaka and Sue Walker both suggested thinking about special edition of RBM, which may be faster and would be open-access.

C. Abolitionist Library Association Special Collections working group panel at RBMS, "Imagining Otherwise: reflecting on what the Abolition in Special Collections Survey Data can Teach Us about the Harms Enacted by Security Policies and Procedures"

i. Presentation slides:  RBMS 2022 AbSC Presentation - Imagining Otherwise

- AbSC (part of ABLA) conducted a security survey and presented on; slides shared here.
- Beth DeBold: Data worth further look by this committee and chat with AbSC about the data, if they are interested, and keep that in mind when looking at the next round of revisions from this draft. If we work towards a special edition of RBM, would hope to see they would contribute as well.
- Member comments: Doesn't sound like AbSC has read the new version of the draft guidelines, would like to hear their view on the guidelines as well. AbSC is working on the creation of their own guidelines on security in special collections.
- Big congratulations and thank you to everyone for participating and helping with all the panels this year.

III. Old Business 30 minutes

A. Guidelines Revision

i. Report on feedback from RBMS Exec (Margaret)

- Suggestion from Exec: put permanent link to draft and feedback on rbms.info and continue to get feedback, potentially even after the comment period.
- Feedback from Exec: Nothing terribly specific; guidelines were positively viewed and Exec was enthusiastic and grateful for our new draft.
- Next steps: Kelli and Beth approach ACRL committee and work with them on formatting, language, etc with that committee. Need to continue collecting feedback - publication, forum, asynchronous etc as we push towards publishing a new (hopefully final) draft in January.

ii. Report on responses (so far) to the first draft of the Guidelines revision (Beth)

- Only sharing anonymized feedback, so not going too far into specifics since this is an open meeting.
- Generally favorable, with a few specific notes.
 - Concern about the language discouraging active prosecution of theft beyond recovery of material.
 - Concern about relaxation of some of the more traditional security methods and suggesting there is more 'teeth' in the guidelines.

- Concern if lack of prosecution leads to the covering up of theft by the institutions.
- Next steps: Beth will pull out some of the comments and share them with the RBMS community more broadly.
 - Member comments: Concern about pulling out comments in advance being influential
 - Goes along with the idea of now moving the comment selection to a more formal ALA page.
 - Question: is it helpful to share so that folks already know what we've heard to limit redundancies or allow everyone to react individually to see where the trends are going and accept that we'll have a series of very similar comments
- Next Steps: Committee needs to work with ACRL rep on the new draft for January, and can include report on the comments we received during that second draft process.
 - Use the feedback to inform our decisions and wait to share our feedback as part of our response to how we made feedback.

ii. Open comment period (limited to 15 minutes)

- Feedback received from presentation:
 - Response to Theft:
 - No prosecution: facing prosecution over rare book theft is a terrible responsibility and guidance over how to handle would be really helpful. Thinking more in terms of prosecution of criminal networks rather than individual cases of theft.
 - CERL and IFLA are much more in favor of prosecution over cultural heritage theft. They have experience with networks where rare materials are moved out of country and put on other markets very quickly. They feel prosecution is the only way to cut down the organized theft rings they are facing.
 - Other countries outside of North America often treat these guidelines as authoritative, and would prefer the guidelines be closer to their theft responses.
 - Acquisitions: In the new area about acquisition and procedures, might want to include doing due diligence to make sure the acquisitions are ethically sourced.
 - Member comments: General agreement that this is important, unsure whether it's entirely in scope but feel it doesn't hurt to include.
 - Presenters felt the current draft of the guidelines was overall in-line with international standards and how they approach things.
- No comments from visitors at the meeting.

iii. Discussion/Future Work Planning

- Future projects for the committee:
 - a. Audit tool and Decision Matrix
 - b. Adding comment form and draft link to the website
 - c. Managing editing moving forward

d. Timeline, and scheduling for the summer & Fall

- Summary: have draft and some feedback and moving forwards to work with ACRL.
- Paths forward: revised based on feedback, audit tool and decision matrix to help implement guidelines based on size and circumstances of each institution
- Next steps: Publicize call for feedback again, Beth will send out feedback. Everyone can review the draft and we'll meet again in mid-September with the need to revise the draft.
 - Going back to (weekly?) working meetings again in September to get draft finalized by mid-November.
 - Other projects may be included but primary focus needs to be revision of draft for Midwinter meeting

B. Website updates

- Eileen coordinating website updates; Beth will send information to Eileen to be added.

IV. New Business *15 minutes*

- Future collaborations and other projects

- Margaret Gamm going to reach out to RBM board about special edition just on new guidelines for security.
- Other projects:
 - State laws need to be kept up to date.
 - Anonymous form created to report thefts?
 - Collaborate with AbSC?
 - Take inspiration from CERL card game to help institutions plan
- Suggestion for fall was to focus on guideline revision

- Questions and concerns

- No concerns raised.

V. Adjourn