

**Association of College and Research Libraries**  
**Board of Directors Meeting II**  
Midwinter Meeting  
Tuesday, January 28, 2003  
1:00 – 4:30 p.m.  
Pennsylvania Convention Center, Room 202B  
Philadelphia, PA

**Board II Minutes**

**Attendees:**

**Board Members:** Helen Spalding, Tyrone Cannon, Mary Reichel, Mary Ellen Davis, Theresa Byrd, Lois Cheperon, Patricia Kreitz, Pat Wand, Pamela Snelson, Bob Rose, Bede Mitchell, Rita Jones, Erika Linke, Deborah Dancik

**Visitors:** Tom Kirk, Larry Hardesty, Marianne C. Rough, Irving Rockwood, Jeffry Larson, Maryhelen Jones, Pamela Moffett Padley, Paul Beavers, John Popko, Ray English, Sue Martin, Lee Marie Wisel, Margaret Nichols, Daniel J. Slive, Barbara Walden, Paula Goedert, Bob Walter

**Staff:** Stephanie Orphan, Margot Sutton Conahan, Mary Jane Petrowski, Hugh Thompson, **MED, Mary Ghikas isn't on the sign-in sheet and I don't remember if she was there—should I add her?**

**Call to Order**

President Helen Spalding called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

**Announcements**

Spalding welcomed Board members and guests to the meeting and introduced self.

**16.0 Adoption of the Agenda**

- Spalding moved to have item 29 (Border Agreements with Mexico and Canada) moved up to follow item 17 (Divine/Rowecom).
- Rose moved to have item 18.1, Membership Committee Structure, taken off the consent agenda and moved to immediately follow the consent agenda.
- Rose moved to put item 24.1 (Spectrum Scholar Mentor Program) on the consent agenda; Spalding indicated that the item required discussion and should not be added to the consent agenda.
- Rose moved to put item 28 (DLS Award) on the consent agenda; Spalding explained that the item should not be added to the consent agenda.

**Motion:** Linke moved and Dancik seconded to accept the changes of moving items 29 and 18.1.

**Action:** The Board unanimously agreed to accept the changes to the consent agenda.

**17.0 Divine/RoweCom (Doc. 17.0)**

Goedert, ALA Legal Counsel, explained the RoweCom bankruptcy filing and how it would affect the association and its members.

- RoweCom filed for bankruptcy, in line with the EBSCO agreement to buy the company.

- For libraries that paid for subscriptions through RoweCom, the libraries are creditors that have a claim against RoweCom in its bankruptcy and can form a committee of library creditors to demand of the trustee in bankruptcy that certain actions be taken.
- When it is decided what happened to cause the RowCom failure, if inappropriate use is discovered, directors and officers could be liable, and if they have liability insurance, libraries could get money.
- Divine, the parent organization, may be liable due to its treatment of subsidiaries.
- RoweCom clients will receive information via the mail regarding the creditors' committee.
- ALA is a publisher; EBSCO has asked publishers to accept a lower payment amount so it can continue to provide subscriptions to customers.
- Publishers cannot form a creditors' committee as they may or may not be owed money.

### **29.0 Border Agreements with Mexico and Canada (Doc. 15.0)**

The International Relations committee used a toolkit to develop an agreement document to be signed by ACRL and similar organizations in Canada and Mexico. Working with our international neighbors is a priority of the current president. Goedert (ALA Counsel) was invited to comment on the draft agreements.

- Goedert advised that the documents not use the term “partnerships,” as formalizing the cooperation should be handled on a case-by-case basis and ACRL’s goal to further relationships could be read as an obligation to coordinate with these organizations.
- Suggestions were made regarding some of the terminology in the documents:
  - change second sentence of the documents to read “to strengthen our relationship with academic libraries in Mexico” (rather than “our partner”)
  - change “reinvigorating our partnership” to “reinvigorating our relationships” (1<sup>st</sup> paragraph)
  - remove “cooperate and coordinate” from the second paragraph so that it reads: re-affirm their commitment to promote international activities
  - remove the third paragraph of the document
- Goedert recommended also removing the last sentence of the first paragraph.
- It was suggested the first paragraph instead end with: Selected activities will be mutually agreed upon in writing from time to time.
- There was discussion regarding who is responsible for translation of the document into French and Spanish. Goedert clarified that only the Mexican representative would sign the Spanish document and the Canadian representative sign the French document; Spalding would sign the English document. A translator would be needed to verify that the intent of the documents is the same. ALA will be bound by the English translation, CONPAB would be bound by the Spanish translation.

*Motion:* Reichel moved that the CONPAB and CACUL agreements be changed, as follows:

- Par. 1, Sentence 1: change “our partner” to “academic libraries through [CONPAB and CACUL]”
- Par. 1, Sentence 2: change “partnerships:” to “relationships”
- Add to end of Par. 1: “Selected specific activities will be mutually agreed to in writing from time to time.”
- Par. 2 (line 9 of document): delete “cooperate and coordinate”
- Par. 3: delete paragraph
- Add final paragraph to read: “ALA will be bound by the English version of this document.”

Wand spoke in favor of a motion and an end to the debate.

*Action:* The Board approved signing the agreements as revised with CONPAB and CACUL.

## 18.0 Consent Agenda

[In order to allocate more Board time to the matters of highest priority, it is recommended that we develop a consent agenda for more routine matters on which there is little perceived need for debate or on which more meaningful debate will take place in other forums and need not be repeated in the Board's discussions. We will act on these items as a group. **Any item may be removed** from the consent agenda if **any member** of the Board of Directors requests separate consideration of the item.]

The following items are placed on the consent agenda:

18.2 Approval of "Guidelines Regarding Thefts in Libraries" and "Guidelines for Curriculum Materials Centers"	(A)	5.0	19.0	Beavers
18.3 Coutts-Nijhoff Award Eligibility Change	(A)	1.0	20.0	Walden

*Motion:* Wand motioned and Rose seconded that the consent agenda be approved.

*Action:* The Board unanimously agreed to approve the consent agenda.

## 18.1 Membership Committee Structure (Doc. 18.0)

Expansion of the ACRL Membership Committee was discussed.

- Currently the Membership Committee is made up of 8 members and 2 interns.
- It was noted that it must be clarified that additional members would be ex officio (members by virtue of their office), not regular members, and that ex officio members do not vote.
- It was proposed that if the document were sent back to the Membership Committee, the Committee should clarify why they would replace members with the members outlined in the document.
- Petrowski explained that the background for the change involved wanting to have people "rowing in the right direction"; there is a disconnect between what goes on in Sections and regular membership functions; Section membership would pull in all "type of library" groups.
- Discussion was held regarding the length of terms for section chairs. It was explained that term lengths vary across Sections, and if committee membership is based on position as chair, there may be a lot of turnover. It was suggested that each Section could determine who represents them.
- It was commented that the membership committee has looked at the issue more closely and the Board should move ahead and approve.
- There was confusion regarding whether the current membership would be completely replaced by Section committee chairs or whether there is a regular Membership Committee and section chairs are ex officio.
- It was unclear whether Section membership committee chairs had been consulted to agree to being a part of this restructuring.

Spalding asked for a straw vote on the motion as written.

11 voted in favor of the motion; there were two abstentions.

*Motion:* Reichel moved and Kreitz seconded that the Board agree in principle to the expansion of the Membership Committee and take time to work the details out later. **(MED—I have text of motion as written, should that be here or ok as is?)**

*Action:* The Board unanimously agreed to approve the motion in principle.

## 19.0 Council of Liaisons (Doc. 7.0d)

This item was carried over from the first board meeting. ACRL is working to develop specific guidelines for appointing members to the council of liaisons and deciding to which organizations we should liaison. The document caps the monetary amount that each liaison can receive per year at \$1,500. It was recommended that a place be held in the FY04 budget for an additional \$4,500 for liaison activity, bringing the total to \$15,000.

*Motion:* Kreitz and Brevik moved and Snelson seconded that the placeholder be made in the FY04 budget.

Discussion followed:

- AERA was identified as a key organization to which ACRL should liaison. The question was raised as to whether this had been discussed and whether liaisoning to AERA could be pushed forward. AERA would fit under item #3 in the document.
- Regarding recommendations for which organizations ACRL will liaison with—the question was raised as to whether the Board makes recommendation based on council’s input or vice versa. It was stated that both of these methods would be used.
- The financial impact was commented on in that increasing the amount for Council of Liaisons would increase the deficit for FY04 and be an ongoing expense.

*Action:* The Board unanimously approved the principles, practices, structure, responsibilities and funding for the Council of Liaisons as described in Document 7.0d and to keep a placeholder for increased Council of Liaisons funding in the FY04 budget..

## **20.0 Scholarly Communication**

20.1 Report on Activities (Doc. 9.1)

20.2 Position Statements (Doc. 9.2)

English, chair of the Scholarly Communication Committee, commented on the report and position statement:

- The antimerger point paper is moving along. Its intent is to provide new rationale for the justice department for judging mergers in the publishing industry and to get more publicity for that issue.
- The ACRL/SPARC forum had an overflow crowd.
- Sue Martin, visiting part-time program officer for scholarly communication, was introduced and acknowledged for her excellent work.
- English and Martin had meetings with many people at Midwinter.
- During the spring, English and Martin would be working on a Web-based toolkit for scholarly communication.
- The positions statements were drafted by Martin and discussed by the Scholarly Communication Committee. The committee would like to reconceptualize the position statements to focus on principles; the position statements will be redrafted for the spring Executive Committee meeting or the Board meeting at Annual Conference.
- English stated that he hopes we can work as an association to improve the way we’re organized in advocacy efforts, particularly at the national level.

Comments from the Board:

- English and Martin were commended and encouraged to keep in mind that ACRL can address issues across all library types (community colleges, small libraries, etc.). English agreed and stated that this was being done.
- Regarding toolkit and advisory services, it was asked whether ACRL needs to think about how to cover the costs associated with them.
- It was stated that there is potential for collaboration between the council of liaisons issue and the scholarly communication issues.
- It was stated that the toolkit would generate income.

## **21.0 Strategic Planning**

21.1 FY03 Funding for Strategic Planning (Doc. 10.1)

21.2 FY04 Funding Request (Doc. 10.2)

The current ACRL Strategic Plan expires in 2005; it is a crucial time for ACRL.

- The Budget & Finance Committee recommends that \$15,300 be spent in FY03 for focus groups at National Conference and a forum at Annual Conference. This will draw down the current budget but is an investment in the future.
- It was asked if there is a way to quantify what was paid for the previous plan and to explain how the total expenditure would result in a better plan.
  - It was explained that the cost includes funding for a membership survey (\$7,000 to \$10,000); the figures for this went up after the Board decided to begin in Toronto.
  - The Board was also hoping to develop a document to take out to individual states.
  - Tecker Consultants has expertise working with professional associations.
  - Staff should be relieved from the burden of creating the strategic plan but still need to be involved.
  - Part of the money is for a one-day session to learn how to tie the plan to resource allocation.
  - Professionals are needed to create the strategic plan.
- An overview of the strategic planning process was provided:
  - Staff gathers information to share with consultants (Tecker has worked with ALA and PLA and the amount they are charging us is discounted).
  - Focus groups will be conducted at the ACRL National Conference.
  - An open discussion session will be held in Toronto.
  - Tecker will do qualitative research through in-depth phone interviews with leaders, nonmembers, and staff.
  - A membership survey will be developed.
  - Tecker will facilitate the Board retreat.
  - A first draft of the strategic plan will be developed and there will be a day-long strategic plan analysis.
  - At Midwinter 2004, there will be a strategies and megaissues discussion.
  - A plan implementation/action planning day will be held for staff.
- It was stated that the strategic planning process is a capital investment that pays off over the years.
- The question was raised as to whether we should take the money for the strategic plan out of our operating reserve. It was explained that there is no built-in mechanism for doing this, but that the funds can be recognized as such.

*Action:* The motion related to Document 10.1 was passed with one abstention.

Regarding Document 10.2, it was commented that ACRL should make efficient use of the funds and time spent on the strategic planning process.

*Action:* The motion related to Document 10.2 was passed with one abstention.

*Motion:* Linke moved and Dancik seconded that item 23 of the agenda be moved to be discussed before item 22.

*Action:* The Board unanimously approved the motion.

A member of the ALA Committee on Legislation entered the meeting to ask if anything had been done related to Council's USA PATRIOT Act resolution.

*Motion:* Cheperon moved and Dancik seconded that the councilor's report and legislative agenda (items 30 and 33) be moved forward to be discussed following item 23.

*Action:* The Board unanimously approved the motion.



### **23.0 Scholarships from Friends Fund (Doc 22.0)**

- Popko stated that the document presented was self-explanatory.
- The action was read and it was asked that it be amended for clarity.
- The question was raised as to whether the \$500 scholarship includes registration. The intention was to follow previous criteria. It was suggested that “up to \$500” be used to cover the free registration. It was explained that the focus of the committee was not to give a specific amount to recipients but to expend a specific amount as donated.
- It was noted that there was still time to add to existing scholarships; there was a question as to how the additional scholarships would be advertised.
- ACRL staff related that there were 140 applicants from 117 institutions for existing scholarships. There were 28 minority applicants for the original 50 scholarships.
- It was stated that ACRL could add to the existing scholarship and increase the number of scholarships awarded to 64.

Reichel made a friendly amendment to change the final sentence of the action to: “according to the criteria and procedures being used for the scholarships previously budgeted.”

The friendly amendment was accepted.

Spalding expressed that the 86 applicants who don’t receive scholarships should receive early-bird registration to the conference regardless of when they register.

The amended motion was read.

*Action:* The Board unanimously approved the motion as amended to expend the accumulated donations in the Professional Development Scholarship Fund supplemented by a portion of the accumulated donations in the unspecified funds to a total not to exceed \$7,500 additional scholarships for the Charlotte National Conference according to the criteria and procedures being used for the scholarships previously budgeted.

### **30.0 Legislative Agenda (Doc 24.0)**

Absent a member of the Government Relations Committee to ask for approval of the Legislative Agenda:

*Motion:* Dancik moved and Rose seconded that the 2002-2003 ACRL Legislative Agenda be accepted.

*Action:* The Board unanimously approved the motion to accept the Legislative Agenda.

### **33.0 Councilor’s Report**

#### **31.1 USA PATRIOT Act (Doc. 25.0)**

- Walter explained that the ALA Committee on Legislation was working with the Intellectual Freedom Committee on a draft “Resolution on USA Patriot Act and Related Measures that Infringe on the Rights of Library Patrons.” He shared some minor edits to the draft with the Board.
- Walter stated that if ACRL votes to support the resolution, wording to this effect would appear on the resolution submitted by Council.

*Motion:* Wand moved and Snelson seconded that ACRL support the resolution.

It was suggested that in the first line “responsibility of our nation’s leaders” be changed to “United States’ leaders”; Walter agreed to take the suggestion back to his committee.

*Action:* The Board unanimously approved the motion to support the draft.

## **22.0 Budget and Finance Committee**

### 22.1 WESS Conference (Doc. 11.1)

- While working with a travel agent to plan its 2004 conference in Paris, WESS was informed that it would have to put down \$33,000 in advance funds to hold hotel rooms for the conference.
- WESS has been talking to the Budget & Finance Committee regarding this; the committee discussed the situation and recommended approval of advancing the \$33,000, provided the two conditions included in the document (that ACRL staff approve the arrangements and WESS obtain written commitments from vendors totaling at least \$30,000) are met.
- Linke amended the motion to reflect that “the Budget and Finance Committee recommends approval of a loan” rather than “approval of the proposed budget.”
- It was noted that the executive director and the manager of professional development would be working with a contact in France to see if there is a different way to arrange this hotel registration.

*Action:* The Board unanimously passed the motion to approve a loan of \$33,000 to WESS, for the Wess conference, if the following 2 conditions are met:

1. Mary Ellen Davis and her staff are satisfied that arrangements for deposits and prepayments are satisfactory;
2. WESS obtains written commitments from vendors for financial support for the conference totaling at least \$30,000 by February 28, 2003.

### 22.2 FY04 Draft Budget (Doc. 11.2)

- The draft budget results in a deficit of \$431,957 for FY2004.
- It was mentioned that the proposed budget reflects requests granted throughout the year.
- Items mentioned relating to the deficit were:
  - Money is spent in advance for the 2005 National Conference, from which revenues will not be recognized until 2005.
  - It may not always be necessary to spend the money budgeted.
  - ACRL is not required to put the \$100,000 in the LTI.
  - In addition to the mandated operating reserve, ACRL has money to fund initiatives that are not revenue generating.
- It was noted that amounts budgeted for the LTI are taken out at the end of the first half of the year and at the end of the year. Last year ACRL was not notified about the moving of the budgeted funds to the LTI; this year ACRL asked ALA to wait for approval. The question was raised as to whether the Board wants the executive director to hold off on putting \$50,000 into the LTI at end of February for Fiscal03, or wait until after National Conference.
- Linke agreed that it would be best to wait until after National Conference to transfer FY03 funds to the LTI.

## **24.0 Spectrum Scholars**

### 24.1 Spectrum Scholar Mentor Program (Doc. 12.1)

*Motion:* Byrd moved and Reichel seconded that the ACRL Spectrum Scholar Mentor Program be named for E. J. Josey and that scholarship monies be given in his name.

- It was suggested that the motion be passed by acclamation rather than by vote.
- It was noted that ACRL is working to get information from the office of diversity to find out if it can identify which scholars are ACRL scholars and recognize them as E. J. Josey scholars; the timing of scholarships is an issue: ACRL wants recipients to attend the President’s Program at Annual Conference, but the scholars are not named until just before conference.

- The motion was amended to state that “any money give for the ACRL provided Spectrum Scholar Scholarships” be given in the name of E. J. Josey, rather than “ALA Provided Spectrum Scholar Scholarships.”

*Action:* The Board unanimously approved the motion by acclamation.

#### 24.2 Spectrum Scholar Travel Grants (Doc. 12.2)

- It was explained that an email sent in fall 2002 regarding PLA travel grants for Spectrum Scholars to its National Conference, inspired the ACRL Spectrum Scholars Mentor Task Force to ask the Board for travel grants to ACRL’s 12<sup>th</sup> National Conference in Minneapolis.
- It was stated that if ACRL is serious about recruiting minorities we need them to be at National Conference.

*Motion:* Byrd moved and Kreitz seconded that the motion be approved.

- Discussion followed:
  - It was asked whether the proposed travel grants be in addition to regular National Conference scholarships or a portion of the 50 already designated.
  - It was commented that the Task Force does not want to take away from the conference scholarship initiative or scholarships for library school students, but wants to see Spectrum Scholarships for National Conference funded as a separate scholarship program.
  - Clarification regarding the initiative for library students was made. It was stated that there is no allotment of these scholarships for minorities, but they have priority.
  - Questions were raised regarding scholarship criteria. The Task Force would be agreeable to following existing criteria (as discussed for scholarships from the Friends Fund).
  - It was stated that the criteria for existing student scholarships gives preference to ALA/ACRL members and institutions providing supplemental assistance; registration is waived and students receive a \$530 travel stipend.
  - The Task Force wants the Spectrum Scholar travel grants to include everything: registration fee, hotel, transportation, and food. It was noted that this would differ from our regular student scholarships and it was commented that we should not give Spectrum scholarship recipients something different from that received by recipients of regular library school scholarships.
  - It was stated that if ACRL is serious about diversity these scholarships have to go above and beyond what other scholarships give.
  - Questions were raised as to whether ACRL gives scholarship recipients a per diem for food and the definition of institutional support. It was stated that UC-Berkeley provides competitive funds for students.
  - It was stated that the ACRL library school scholarships were developed to attract students from particular regions. The comments were made that Spectrum Scholars need more; ACRL scholarships are unique (a recipient can’t receive more than one); and that a ceiling must be put on the expenses.
- It was suggested that the motion be approved in principle while the Task Force works out a more specific motion with points taken from the discussion.
- Byrd, Dancik, and Snelson agreed to rewrite the motion and bring it forward again at the Board meeting held at Annual Conference.
- The executive director expressed a desire to ensure that there is common language used in the motion related to the meaning of “Spectrum Mentor Scholar,” whether or not the scholarships are for students only, etc.

Byrd withdrew the motion.

## 25.0 Supplemental Funding for Chapters

- It was stated that grants for funding are available for Sections but not for Chapters and that there needs to be a way to provide funding for Chapters.
- Current funding for Chapters was outlined:
  - Chapters get \$1 per ACRL member in the area, whether they are Chapter members or not
  - Chapters are the only ACRL group to receive a free speaker; a particular Chapter cannot receive a speaker more than once every other year; six speaker visits occur each year
  - *Chapter Topics*, the Chapter's newsletter is supported by ACRL
  - The Chapter discussion list receives support from ACRL staff
- Chapters are legally separate from ACRL or affiliated with a State Library Association
- ACRL requests an annual report from Chapters but does not necessarily receive the report from each Chapter
- Chapters must request the funding of \$1 per person.
- A request was made that staff get data regarding past Chapter spending, grants historically given to Chapters, who claims money, etc.
- It was pointed out that we want to be fair to Chapters but not provide funding if it is not needed.
- The system for notifying Chapters about available funding was explained: ACRL runs membership numbers and sends the figures to the Chapter chairs. The average range of a Chapter budget is between \$200 and \$400.
- Several Chapter officers have requested a lump sum distribution in the past; ACRL has clarified that they have to ask for reimbursement based on a budget.
- Some issues were raised:
  - It can be problematic for Chapters to request money because of different fiscal years; request must be received by ACRL by the end of ACRL's current fiscal year.
  - It is the Board's intent to reach out to membership through Chapters, but this has not been addressed in three years.
- It was requested that the Board follow up on recommendations from the Supplemental Funding Task Force and implement them.
- It was stated that there is a communication problem between Chapters and ACRL but also that not all Sections use their funding each year either, which is a comparable situation.
- The question was raised as to whether the notion of supplemental funding for Chapters can be rolled into the strategic planning process.
- Based on past demand, the Fiscal 04 budget allocates \$5,000 for Chapters.
- It was suggested that the Budget & Finance Committee look at supplemental funding to help units do more or find a way for them to save up money over time to fund a project.
- It was suggested that Chapters be allowed to use base funding for things other than speaker's luncheons, such as funding liaisons projects; it was noted that if Chapter's funding is made more flexible, the same would have to apply to Sections.
- It was stated that any Section or Chapter can approach the Board at any time for special requests, and they will be reviewed in light of fiscal policy (for example, the Immersion Program).
- It was stated that nothing has materialized since the last strategic plan, but that no proposals had been received to vote on.
- Concern was expressed that Chapters don't have access to additional funds to do their own programming.
- It was suggested that we continue with the current budget of \$1/person in each region, but inform Chapter leaders that if they have specific programs that fall in line with ACRL, ACRL will give 50% more. This would help give Chapters a sense of being supported.

- The executive director explained that allowing for carry-over of funding from year to year would require excessive staff time.

It was decided that a written motion related to Chapter funding would be introduced under New Business.

*Motion:* Wand and Byrd moved to have items 28 and 36 moved to follow the current discussion.

*Action:* The Board unanimously agreed to move items 28 and 36 up.

### **28.0 DLS Award (Doc. 21.0)**

Jones, chair of DLS, explained that the Section was 12 years old and wants to honor individuals in the field of distance learning.

- The idea of the DLS award was introduced to the ALA award committee, but there was a need to clarify the award level. DLS wants to offer \$1,000 for a conference scholarship, funded by Hayworth Press; this would be a recognition award, and under ALA guidelines, recognition awards must be \$5,000.
- Jones stated that clarification was received from Keith Brown staff liaison to the ALA Endowment Committee that although the ALA procedures list categories with assigned dollar amounts, at the division level there is flexibility, so ACRL can have a recognition award that is for \$1,000.
- It was stated that the motion was passed and approved by the ALA Award Committee on January 27, pending explanation and action sought at the ACRL Board meeting; the process was reversed because the financial commitment was not in place by ACRL agenda deadline.
- Jones expressed that she is seeking a motion and approval pending the receipt from Hayworth Press of a letter of commitment for the funds (she has an email to this effect).

*Motion:* Rose moved and Reichel seconded approving the DLS award.

- The question was raised as to what would happen with the award beyond the three-year pilot phase. It was expressed that the Section hopes for success and would continue to offer the award.
- The executive director expressed surprise Brown would approve the award level without confirmation from the ALA Award Committee and expressed that ACRL would want confirmation from the ALA Award Committee.
- It was noted that the three-year trial period was in accordance with ALA award guidelines.
- It was mentioned that there are other ACRL recognition awards less than \$1,000; these awards were grandfathered in before the existing guidelines were set.

The motion was amended to state that the Board would approve the award in principle pending staff clearance and confirmation from the sponsor.

*Action:* The Board unanimously approved the amended motion.

*Motion:* Dancik and Linke moved and Kreitz seconded that the meeting be extended to 4:45 p.m

*Action:* The Board unanimously agreed to extend the meeting.

### **36.0 Executive session: RBM editor appointment (Doc. 23.0)**

The associate director was not present to discuss item 26.0 (Membership Business Plan); the Board moved on to item 27.0.

### **27.0 ACRL/ARL Recruitment to the Profession (Doc. 14.0)**

- Spalding and Davis met with the Recruitment Task Force and have requested from the Budget & Finance Committee that \$25,000 be earmarked for recruitment in FY04. The Task Force is working on specifics for allocations.
- There is already \$40,000 “for consultants” in the FY04 budget; the recruitment funding could fall under this.
- Although the Task Force has made no decisions, it had discussed developing a campaign that would dovetail with the @ your library campaign.
- Concern was expressed over there only being one community college representative on the Task Force and it was noted that ACRL could increase the size of the task force if it is deemed that broader representation is necessary.
- Concern was raised over proposals for uncoordinated advertising campaigns; the response was that the Task Force would build on activities that are already in place.

*Motion:* Reichel moved and Rose seconded that the meeting be extended by 23 minutes.

*Action:* The Board unanimously agreed to extend the meeting.

- It was noted that there are plans to put more information on the ACRL Web site related to recruitment.

### **26.0 Membership Business Plan (Doc. 13.0)**

- Petrowski explained that the big ideas in the plan were shared at the fall Executive Committee meeting and were endorsed, and that the plan was also shared with Sections and the Membership Committee.
- Feedback from the Membership Committee was positive; minor editorial changes were made. No motion to approve the plan was made from the Membership Committee.
- The question was raised as to whether or not the plan is the business of the Membership Committee as it reflects fiscal implications; it was explained that although the plan is staff-written, the Membership Committee should have brought a motion to recommend the plan.

*Motion:* Spalding moved and Reichel seconded that the Membership Business Plan be accepted.

- Some items regarding the plan were pointed out:
  - In some areas, Chapters are mentioned, but not Sections. All units should be included.
  - Sections had expressed an interest in hearing back about the plan.
  - The plan has an assessment component and a report will be made at the end of each year, as the Membership Committee is a committee of the Board.
  - Concern was expressed in regard to the proposed telemarketing campaign; it was explained that ACRL is looking to reach out to deactivated members: for every 122 members, 132 are lost; a pilot telemarketing project (by RESPECT marketing) would be undertaken to find out why individuals choose whether or not to maintain membership; it is not known if it will work or not but references are good; ACRL hopes to reduce deactivated member percentages.
- It was noted that the current strategic plan ends in 2005, and in the business plan strategies are for 2003 to 2005. The question was raised as to how to reflect 2005 going further; it was explained that the Membership Business Plan is not stagnant and will evolve to be in synch with the new strategic plan. Recommendations will be incorporated regarding promotion, retention, and recruitment issues coming out of Task Forces.

*Action:* The Board unanimously approved the motion to accept the Membership Business Plan.

A question was raised regarding how E. J. Josey would be notified of the acclamation for Spectrum scholarships in his name. It was explained that he is currently ill, although it is not serious. It was stated that ACRL was

looking into the possibility of a commendation for Dr. Josey at Annual. If this is done, the scholarships would be announced at the awards ceremony. It was recommended that he be notified by telephone immediately following the Midwinter Meeting. **Mary Ellen—Theresa jumped in and asked this question at this point and this was when the decision was made to drop 34 and 32 from the agenda. It was spontaneous discussion.**

Item 34, (Documents 8.0 and 8.0a, the executive director's written report) was removed from the agenda. Item 32, Academic Libraries in Afghanistan, was removed from the agenda and will be brought to the International Relations Committee for consideration.

### **31.0 California's Proposal to Suspend Legislative Authority over Standards for Libraries (Doc. 16)**

*Motion:* Rose moved and Wand seconded that ACRL urge the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, the Board of Governors for the California Community Colleges, and the Governor and Legislature of the State of California to not suspend the authority of the Board of Governors, California Community Colleges to establish standards for community college libraries.

- The question was raised as to what language would be in the letter sent and to whom would it go out if the motion passes. It was explained that Council has a procedure as to how resolutions are carried out, and ACRL would follow similar guidelines.

*Action:* The Board unanimously passed the motion.

### **35.0 New Business**

*Motion:* Cheperon moved and Reichel seconded that in order to further the ACRL strategic plan to reach out to members on a local level and to assist in expediting chapters programs, that ACRL allot chapters \$1.50, a 50% increase, for each national personal member living within the geographic region served by the chapter, for fiscal year 2004.

- It was pointed out that the motion would increase the FY04 budget deficit by \$13,000 to \$449,000.
- It was mentioned that it was thought that the 50% increase would be based on the current amount budgeted for such funding, rather than accounting for every ACRL member being claimed by a Chapter (budgeted numbers reflect historic request amounts). However, if the increased funding is advertised, more Chapters may request the funding, which would throw the budget numbers off.

*Motion:* Dancik moved and Kreitz seconded that the meeting be extended by 5 minutes.

*Action:* The Board unanimously agreed to extend the meeting by 5 minutes.

- It was noted that for clarity, the ACRL Guide to Policies and Procedures should be consulted.
- It was suggested that the Board agree to pass the concept and adjust the wording after the meeting adjourns to match the wording in the Guide to Policies and Procedures regarding funding of Chapters.
- The question was raised as to whether the additional funding should be included only in the budget for FY04 or included in perpetuity. This would require a change to the Guide to Policies and Procedures; it was agreed that the budget increase should be only for FY04; language should be parallel to that used for Sections.
- It was mentioned that supplemental funding is something that could be dealt with during the strategic planning process.

*Action:* The Board unanimously approved the motion to increase the allotment to Chapters based on each national personal member living in a Chapter's region.

The ACRL staff was thanked for their preparation of the Briefing Book.

*Motion:* Reichel moved and Kreitz seconded that the executive director share with the Membership Committee the Board's agreement in principle that Section leaders be members of the Council on Liaisons.

*Action:* The Board approved the motion.

Linke stated that supplemental funding for chapters must be clarified as it relates to the budget. The current FY04 Budget stands at \$5,000 for Chapters—should it be increased to \$18,000 to represent \$1.50 for each ACRL member or to \$7,500 to represent a 50% increase on the budgeted amount.

The Board directed staff to budget \$10,000 for Chapters funding in FY 04.

*Motion:* Reichel moved and Rose seconded that the meeting be extended by 7.5 minutes.

*Motion:* At 5:20 p.m., Cannon moved and Kreitz seconded that the meeting be adjourned.

*Action:* The Board unanimously approved the motion to adjourn the meeting.