

**Minutes of the ACRL College Libraries Section
Standards Committee
Midwinter Meeting, 2004
Virtual Meeting Minutes
11:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m., November 3, 2003**

Attending: Members - Bill Nelson (Chair), Lizabeth Chabot, Rhonna Goodman, J.B. Hill, Bethany Levrault, John Pollitz, and Jules Tate.

The meeting was conducted in a “virtual classroom” via Blackboard course management system at Manhattanville College. The meeting was hosted and arranged by Rhonna Goodman, and chaired by Bill Nelson. As prescribed by ALA, the meeting announcement was posted more than 10 days in advance of the meeting. Committee members were notified by email of procedures for attending the virtual meeting. Any interested ALA member was invited to attend; the meeting announcement on the ALA webpage explained the procedure to be followed.

Agenda items:

1. Attendees sign on to Blackboard

Before the call to order, preliminary greetings were shared among attendees as they logged into the virtual classroom. Isabella O’Neill and Michele Reid had a conflict and were unable to attend; no communication has been received from Billy Pennington.

2. Welcome

The meeting was called to order by the chair at 11:00 a.m. The members were informed that committee documents had been posted to this site in advance, and are located under “Course Documents.” The same documents (see agenda item 5) and others had been sent out in advance by the chair via email. Since only committee members were in attendance, all had this material in hand. Attendees were instructed to transmit a “?” when wishing to address the group; after being recognized by the chair, they could then type and send their comments.

3. Minutes (approved by email after last meeting)

Minutes from the previous meeting had been approved and roster corrections were made via e-mail prior to this meeting. The chair announced that a transcript of the meeting is automatically produced and is available on this site. The chair agreed to use the transcript to prepare the minutes following the meeting.

4. Review committee charge (as necessary)

The chair repeated the committee charge, which was reviewed. There was a question of whether the charge should be tied to a specific edition of the college library standards. The chair noted that these CLS standards are expected to be superceded by the ACRL “Standards for Libraries in Higher Education,” in 2004. It was agreed to consider revision of the charge after final approval of the new standards; this could be on the agenda in Orlando.

5. Documents Posted

- a. Agenda (this meeting)
- b. Minutes – Toronto
- c. Minutes – Philadelphia

- d. Current membership roster
- e. Standards Committee charge

6. Introduction of Visitors

Only committee members actually attended the meeting; there were no requests by others to be included.

7. College and Research Libraries Standards Task Force

The chair introduced the following for this agenda item:

1. The chair introduced the following for this agenda item:
 - a. Task Force Charge: to adapt these standards “for use as a document and process that would apply across all types of academic libraries...”
 - b. Second open hearing scheduled for Saturday, January 10, 2004 (2:00 – 4:00 p.m.), San Diego (Midwinter)
 - c. The draft document, “Libraries in Higher Education, Standards for (draft)” can be found on the ACRL web site.

During discussion it was explained that there was an open hearing on the new draft standards in Toronto. However, attendance was virtually nil because of the SARS scare, budget cuts, etc. and thus the Task Force decided to hold another open hearing in San Diego to supplement feedback received via email. In response to a question about the necessity of open hearings, the chair (a member of the Task Force) explained that ALA and ACRL were concerned about process, and were concerned about adopting new standards without extensive opportunity for input from members. The draft of “Higher Education” standards has been published in C&RL News, posted on the ACRL webpage, and comments widely solicited via the section electronic discussion lists: collib-l, uls-l, and cjc-l.

As a matter of interest, the ACRL Standards and Accreditation Committee approved a new procedure in Toronto which would make open hearings optional, provided it can be shown that the information was widely distributed with ample opportunity for discussion from the membership.

Anyone with comments on the draft standards is strongly encouraged to send an email to Bill Nelson wnelson@aug.edu or to Barton Lessin, the Task Force chair, aa3327@wayne.edu .

8. Reports / Discussion

a. Recent standards workshops and scheduled/proposed workshops, conducted by Bill Nelson and Bob Fernekes:

Workshop, "Assessment in Libraries: Practical Approaches for Creating a Continuous Assessment Environment," Preconference to North Carolina Library Assn. Conference, (with Robert Fernekes), NCLA, (Winston-Salem), September 23, 2003

Workshop, "Assessment of Reese Library: Practical Application of the ACRL Standards for Libraries in Higher Education" (with Robert Fernekes), Augusta State University (Augusta, GA), September 17 & October 15, 2003

Presentation, “Higher Education Standards for Libraries (2004): New ACRL Multi-type Standards,” (with Robert Fernekes) Georgia Library Association-Council of Media Organizations

conference, (Jekyll Island, GA), October 23, 2003

Accepted for presentation

Workshop, "Advancing a Culture of Engagement: Practical Application of the ACRL Standards for Libraries in Higher Education" (with Robert Fernekes), Georgia Southern University (Statesboro, GA), November 13, 2003

Workshop, "Overcoming Road Rage on the Highway to Assessment: Utilizing Standards to Advance Your Library's Mission," Association of Christian Librarians annual conference (Springfield, MO), June 7, 2004

Accepted for presentation (Tentative)

Workshop, "ACRL Standards: Practical Application," (with Robert Fernekes) Western InterLibrary Organization, (metropolitan Kansas City, MO community college district), April 23, 2004

b. Other workshop opportunities?

c. Sponsorship for state / regional workshops

These two agenda items were combined for the discussion.

The chair solicited ideas and suggestions from members regarding state and/or regional sponsors for workshops. The chair reiterated the reason for pursuing these opportunities by summarizing comments from the last two standards meetings: The standards workshop held at Midwinter attracted 78 attendees. At the ACRL meeting in Charlotte, a half-day workshop there had 66 attendees, the workshop limit—people were turned away. There is a feeling that sessions at national meetings are not really attracting the people who need it most. The committee agreed to pursue more sessions at regional or state conferences, where people can attend more readily and cheaply.

The chair mentioned that there is an ACRL board member who is willing to propose to the board that ACRL provide funding to support chapter workshops. However, the member first wants a concrete workshop proposal to carry forward; thus far there is not such a proposal.

J.B., John, Jules, and Lis have been part of groups that have sponsored one of the assessment workshops. J.B. mentioned that many state groups are looking for programming. He suggested that this would be a good opportunity to provide an in-demand session, and possibly earn some money for the chapter, as was the experience with the Louisiana ACRL chapter. Lis mentioned that NY was sponsoring a series of continuous assessment workshops funded in part by LSTA funded. In response to a question about specific geographic areas that have not had workshops, Bill said that the West and New England had not hosted workshops. Also, some workshops in the Midwest (Indiana and Wisconsin) were sponsored by private library groups and did not target the state as a whole. It was suggested that we consider applying to present a workshop at the ACRL conference in Minneapolis.

The chair would be the logical one to pursue these contacts, but is in an awkward position as he is also one of the workshop presenters. John suggested that the offer should be taken to the midwinter ACRL Chapters Council meeting. John is a member and plans to attend that meeting;

he offered to do this for the committee. He also suggested that we consider the possibility of posting something to the Chapters Council electronic discussion group.

The Southeastern Library Assn. (SELA) membership committee is willing to help sponsor workshops in the Southeast to gain visibility. They are working with the Florida ACRL chapter to sponsor a conference in Orlando.

d. San Diego Standards Committee meeting

Those committee members who will be attending the midwinter conference in San Diego will hold a meeting on Saturday (Jan. 10), 11:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

e. Orlando Committee meeting and Discussion Group

The Orlando committee meeting is scheduled for Saturday (June 26), 11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. The plan is to hold a discussion group during roughly the first hour of the meeting; the second hour would be devoted to committee business. Because of time constraints of this meeting, Liz will send an email to committee members to provide an update on the plans for the discussion group meeting in Orlando

f. New Project: “Guidelines for Academic Library Buildings” – white paper

This suggestion was made at the Toronto committee meeting that there is a need for some official guidelines for academic library buildings. The main reason for developing this document is for design professionals (such as architects and engineers) who rely on such documents from professional organizations such as ours to determine what should go into buildings. In the absence of such guidelines, state facilities planners tend to select the lowest cost options. This project is important, as librarians (and sometimes local university administrators) often do not have a say in their own new buildings. This is a particular problem for state institutions which contend with state facilities bureaucrats who believe they know more than the local campus administrators.

Jules has volunteered to draft a white paper to address the concerns identified. The chair asked for volunteers to assist him. Bethany and Rhonna agreed to assist; Rhonna suggested that this sub-committee could conduct a meeting in the Blackboard Virtual Classroom.

There was a question about whether a “Clip Note” or “guideline” should be the final product of this project. Jules suggested that we do the white paper, then decide on the final product.

g. New Project: “Guidelines for Computers in Academic Libraries” – white paper

This suggestion was also made at the Toronto committee meeting. Some committee members see a need for official ACRL benchmarks for appropriate ratios of computers to number of students, usage, and other criteria. Bethany expressed an interest in this topic.

h. Webpage to serve as a “toolkit” for the ACRL standards?

At the Toronto meeting, Liz suggested that a Web Page could be created to serve as a toolkit to assist in the application of the standards. The Web page could have links to sites of libraries that had applied the standards. Bill has compiled a list of libraries that are using the CLS standards (to varying degrees).

The list contains both large and small libraries, including many that are represented by other ACRL sections. The discussion group session in Orlando may be a start for developing this.

Because of time constraints of this meeting, Liz will send an email to committee members to provide an update on the plans for the “toolkit” project.

i. Gathering feedback on the “College Library Standards”

At an earlier meeting the committee discussed additional methods for gathering feedback on the new standards, such as posting surveys to appropriate electronic discussion lists. The discussion group session in Orland may be used to get input on this subject.

Time did not allow discussion of this issue.

9. Other Business

No other business was identified.

10. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m. The chair then requested member reaction to this meeting format via email to provide feedback to the CLS Executive Committee and to improve future virtual meetings of the committee.

Last Update: February 2, 2004