Committee members present: Jennie Callas, Randolph-Macon College; Lawrie Merz, Messiah College; Janet Fore, St. Mary’s College; Beth Hoppe, Union College; Erin Smith, Westminster College; Jane Currie, Loyola University Chicago; Nancy Weiner, William Paterson University; Doris Ann Sweet, Assumption College; Jill Gremmels (chair), Davidson College.

The committee heard updates on the three CLIP Notes in progress:

1. **Web Research in Academic Libraries**: Rebecca Sullivan, compiler; Erin Smith, lead editor. This Note is very close to having camera-ready copy ready to go to ACRL.
2. **Collection Development in a Changing Environment**: Susanne Clement and Jennifer Foy, compilers; Doris Ann Sweet, lead editor. This Note has been reviewed by the lead editor and committee chair. The compilers have made changes, and the newest version has just been distributed to the entire committee for review by July 9.
3. **Strategic Planning**: Eleonora Dubicki, compiler; Jennie Callas, lead editor. The compiler has sent out the survey and reminders but has not yet achieved the required 65% response rate.

Compilers of all three of these Notes have faced the same problem with insufficient response rate. Although the **CLIP Notes Guidelines** state, “Since all survey participants have already agreed to participate, a high response rate should be expected,” this has not been the case recently. It is particularly discouraging for the committee since all respondents were queried in 2009 to confirm their willingness to participate in CLIP Notes surveys. A small but not insignificant problem is personnel changes at participating libraries causing the surveys to be directed to old email addresses. The committee agreed that each member will look at the current list of respondents on ALA Connect and flag any changes she is aware of (deadline: July 31).

The committee had a sprightly and exciting discussion about the future of CLIP Notes, considering many possibilities in light of new models of publishing, the value of CLIP Notes, and problems of recent surveys. The committee agreed to prepare a proposal to go to the CLS Executive Committee at Midwinter 2011, to include:

1. A more robust literature review, using **Annual Review** articles as a model.
2. Continue the survey, with the following enhancements:
   a. Erin will investigate the feasibility of adding all institutions in the appropriate Carnegie classifications to the list of survey recipients.
   b. Lawrie will ask a statistician about recommended response rates and see what other publications are requiring.
   c. Encourage purposive sampling, wherein a compiler can seek out the best examples of the topic at hand, whether or not those libraries responded to the survey.
d. Require more analysis of the survey results. Currently the survey data are presented with little or no analysis. The committee wants to encourage compilers to take an approach more like that in a typical journal article.

3. These changes will mean that “compiler” is no longer the correct designation for the creator of a CLIP Note. That person will truly be an author and should be credited as such. The committee also believes that the lead editor should be credited in the publication.

4. Allow and encourage varieties of electronic publication, on a case-by-case basis.

These changes should increase the value of CLIP Notes to both readers and authors. CLIP Notes would have more of a “best practices” quality, with examples drawn from a greater pool than samples the survey respondents sent in. The stronger literature review would become a central feature of the publication, rather than an introduction. Electronic publication, as an add-on or download, would make linking to documents on websites easy and decrease the importance of page-length limits.

Jill will look at the current Guidelines for Compilers, identify sections that will need to be revised to reflect these changes, and ask for volunteers to edit the sections.

Doris Ann suggested investigating the possibility of an additional type of CLIP Notes, following an example of the Fiction-L listserv. These “CLIP Notelets” could focus on smaller topics, such as patron-driven collection development, and serve either as a preview of a regular CLIP Note or as a quicker, crowd-sourced style of note, perhaps as a wiki. Jill will pursue this idea with Kathryn Deiss.

The committee discussed three possible ideas for future Notes: exhibits, mission statements (both of which were popular in earlier editions), and fun in the workplace (following up on the CLS program at Annual). The group agreed, however, not to pursue new Notes until the revised guidelines have been submitted and approved.

The Midwinter meeting will be virtual, using chat rather than a conference call. Jennie offered to investigate chat options and report back to the chair.

The meeting adjourned at 10:20 a.m. with the chair thanking departing committee members: Christopher Millson-Martula, Debra Rollins, Kathryn Silberger, Lynda Duke, and Rachel Crowley, and welcoming new committee members: Kelly Ansley, Jane Currie, Nancy Frazier, Beth Hoppe, and Melinda Dermody.

Respectfully submitted,
Jill Gremmels, Chair