

**Association of College and Research Libraries**  
**Board of Directors Meeting I**  
Annual Conference  
Saturday, June 24, 2006  
2:00 – 5:30 p.m.  
New Orleans Marriott, Bacchus Room  
New Orleans

**Annual Conference Board Meeting I Minutes**

**Attendees:**

*Board Members:* Camila Alire, Frances Maloy, Pam Snelson, Susan Kroll, Tyrone Cannon, Mary Ellen Davis, Nancy Allen, Janis Bandelin, Lori Goetsch, Lynne King, Bede Mitchell, Dorothy Washington, and Karen Williams.

*Absent:* Rita Jones.

*Visitors:* Mary M. Carr, Kathryn Deiss, Ray English, Janet Swan Hill, Erika Linke, Debbie Malone, Tamara Miller, and Shelley Phipps.

*Staff:* Megan Bielefeld, Margot Sutton Conahan, David Connolly, Tory Ondrla, Stephanie Orphan, Mary Jane Petrowski, Irv Rockwood, and Hugh Thompson.

**1.0 Call to Order**

President Camila Alire called the meeting to order at 2:08 p.m.

**2.0 Opening Remarks**

Alire encouraged the Board to focus on good meeting practices during the Board meetings to ensure that all viewpoints could be expressed and that informed decisions would be made.

**3.0 Adoption of the Agenda**

*Action:* The Board adopted the agenda without objection.

**4.0 Open Microphone**

Ray English, Director of Libraries at Oberlin College and chair of the ACRL Scholarly Communication Committee, addressed the Board. While he would have additional information for the Board on the activities of the Scholarly Communication Committee, there were several urgent issues he wanted to bring the Board's attention early in the conference. English had been working with the ALA Washington Office staff to get ALA's endorsement of the Federal Research Public Access Act of 2006 (FRPAA). English distributed a draft resolution developed by the Washington Office with English's feedback and asked the Board to consider endorsing it. English believe that this would be the final text of the resolution but alerted the Board to the possibility that it could still face some minor revisions during the conference.

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors endorse the Resolution on the Federal Research Public Access Act of 2006 (FRPAA), recognizing that the language might be slightly changed by the ALA Committee on Legislation.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors endorsed the Resolution on the Federal Research Public Access Act of 2006 (FRPAA), recognizing that the language might be slightly changed by the ALA Committee on Legislation.

The Board thanked English for bringing the resolution forward and moving so quickly to keep the ACRL Board involved. The Board also requested that if the language of the resolution changed at all prior to receiving the ALA Council's endorsement, that the final text be delivered to the Board for their information.

A Board member mentioned a recent letter in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* from all of the publishers who were lobbying against FRPAA. Since many of them were present on the exhibits floor at conference, the Board wondered whether English recommended approaching them and expressing their displeasure. English stated that he had expected the objections of the large commercial publishers, but was disappointed in the small, non-profit publishing houses that already have open access policies similar to that proposed in the bill. The publishers' arguments are hollow, as the 6-month delay proposed in the bill would still ensure that in such fast-moving scientific research areas as would be affected by the bill, libraries will still need to maintain subscriptions to keep ready access to current information. English felt that it was fine to try and talk to the publishers, but that the key is getting grassroots supporters to write to Congress. He was also interested in trying to educate public libraries that this issue affects them, as well.

Shelley Phipps, Assistant Dean for Team and Organizational Development at the University of Arizona, addressed the Board to thank them for their sponsorship of the Living the Future (LTF) 6 conference, along with the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and the University of Arizona. The LTF conferences are offered on every non-ACRL National Conference year. Phipps provided the Board with a report summarizing some of the positive outcomes of the conference (FYI-12). A Board member asked whether the external presentations at the LTF conferences were juried. Phipps replied that they were for one of the earlier LTF conferences, but they found that it was more work than the organizers could reasonably handle, so they now entertain all proposals and try to make each one fit somewhere in the conference, even if it's as a poster session or presentation venue.

#### **5.0 Strategic Mega-Issue: Membership Survey and Research (Document 19.0)**

ACRL Associate Director Mary Jane Petrowski briefly summarized the major findings of the 2006 ACRL Membership Survey. 91% of the respondents planned to renew their ACRL membership for the following year. 8% were unsure whether they would renew or not, citing cost as the chief reason. Of the 1% who were definitely not renewing, most of them were planning to retire. It was also noted that the diversity of the membership is on the rise.

At the New Leader Orientation the previous day, Sections were given cross-tabs that provided a lot of Section-specific demographic information. Sections were very excited about this information and noted that they'd never before had access to that kind of granular data about their membership. After conference additional work will be directed to cross-tabbing out additional responses to determine exactly what people expect from a given Section.

When asked what drove their desire to join ACRL, 45% said it was not really the specific tangible benefits, but just a sense of supporting the profession. This response in particular may need to be cross-tabbed out by age to determine whether this is specifically an inclination of the boomer generation or if it's broader than that. McKinley Marketing, the consultant that administered the survey, has the full data set and can cross-tab out whatever data the association would like, but of course that will impact the budget. Already, there have been numerous requests from Sections for customized reports. It will be important to set some parameters and decide how much additional analysis the association is willing to pay for. One Board member strongly supported doing whatever the association can to support requests for additional data parsing and also suggested requiring reports back from the requesting unit about what they learn to tie it into the association's new focus on ongoing assessment.

A number of Board members complimented the richness of the data set and noted that the association has complained for many years about the membership data it was able to get from ALA. It made a great deal of sense for the association to pursue its own surveys like this to get exactly the data it finds useful. Petrowski and ACRL Executive Director Mary Ellen Davis were complimented on the outcome of this project. Davis commented that this survey differed from previous ones primarily with the implementation of a gap analysis; asking about specific program areas or services both how important they are to the membership as well as how

satisfied the membership is with the implementation of that program area or service. Compared to the previous membership survey in 2003, this one also had much better timing and a significantly higher response rate.

It will be important to identify specific actions and assign them to a group or provide resources for implementation to ensure that something useful is done with the data. Collecting the data is only worthwhile if something comes of it. It was noted that some of the top responses were in advocacy areas, so it seems valuable to keep up activity in that direction. Additionally, the membership seems to have an insatiable appetite for professional development opportunities in a variety of formats.

## **Strategic Area: The Association**

### **6.0 Reports**

The officers' reports were given at the ACRL Membership Meeting immediately preceding the Board meeting. Highlights of their comments included the following:

#### **6.1 President's Report (Document 1.0)**

- Alire had a great presidential year, highlighted by the work on grassroots advocacy. The University Libraries Section (ULS) funded part of the Grassroots Advocacy Workshop, which was presented earlier in the day, and will be continuing work on grassroots advocacy at the 2007 ACRL National Conference and with state Chapters.
- She also enjoyed the state conferences she was invited to attend and present at.
- Alire has been working with Davis and ACRL Vice-President/President-Elect Pam Snelson on the development of ACRL's planned invitational technology summit, to be held in the fall of 2006.
- Alire was pleased that the Sister Libraries program now has 6 partnerships. She hopes to get several partnerships set up with China, as well to build on the outreach started earlier in the year when she led a delegation of academic librarians on a visit to China.
- The President's Program should be a very provocative session. Alire's President's Report would be available at the program.
- Alire introduced the incoming Board members present at the meeting as well as next year's candidates for Vice-President/President-Elect.
- She finished by thanking her Leadership, Recruitment, and Nomination Committee members and her Appointments Committee members. She also thanked the Board members she had the pleasure of working with and the ACRL staff, particularly ACRL Production Editor Dawn Mueller for her superb work maintaining the President's Page on the ACRL Web site and for her work designing the Grassroots Advocacy Toolkit.

#### **6.2 Vice-President's Report (Document 2.0)**

- Snelson thanked the members who took the time to attend the Membership Meeting.
- She is working the issue of members achieving recognition as advocates for academic and research libraries as the focus for her presidential year.
- Snelson's President's Program Committee is doing some research asking provosts about their impressions about libraries. This research will better inform librarians of effective methods to communicate with their administrations and make the case for increased resources. In addition to a program at the 2007 ALA Annual Conference, a series of columns in *C&RL News* authored by administrators who were formerly librarians is planned, in which they will share any kernels of wisdom they have from having been on both sides. So far, the research is suggesting that libraries are doing better than they may think at making their case and maintaining visibility.

#### **6.3 Councilor's Report**

- ACRL Division Councilor Tyrone Cannon attended an orientation for new Council members that morning and has his first full Council meeting on Sunday morning.
- The Council electronic discussion list had been very active recently about Laura Bush's planned appearance at the conference.

- Cannon was looking forward to serving as Councilor for the next year and thanked the Board for selecting him to serve the remainder of Elaine Didier's term after her resignation that spring.

#### 6.4 Executive Director's Report (Document 3.0)

- The Operations Report (Document 3.0) is available with the other Board documents on the ACRL Web site.
- One of the primary focuses of the strategic plan is outreach to external higher education organizations and having a more meaningful impact on their agendas with respect to libraries. Recent activities and successes in this area include:
  - ACRL joined the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) – Higher Education's Free Exchange on Campus coalition, dedicated to educating people that the "Academic Bill of Rights" and similar initiatives that would act to restrict, rather than expand, academic rights.
  - ACRL is in discussions to possibly partner with the National Association of College Stores (NACS) on a digital content summit. The Board will discuss this later in the meeting.
  - ACRL partnered with EDUCAUSE and the Coalition for Networked Information (CNI) to present ACRL's first all-virtual conference.
  - The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) reached out to ACRL and invited the association to present a program track at their spring conference.
  - ACRL Board members participated in a study about the future of higher education being conducted by the Council of Higher Education Management Associations (CHEMA).
  - ACRL continued to partner with the TLT Group on a series of information literacy webcasts.
- Davis thanked ACRL Government Relations/Scholarly Communication Specialist Kara Malenfant, ACRL Government Relations Committee chair Lee Hisle, and English for their efforts to send advocacy letters and offer support for current issues, in support of the Advocacy Goal Area of the strategic plan.
- In support of the Goal Area of The Association, Davis mentioned the membership survey discussed earlier and announced that the summary findings of the survey would be available to ACRL members on the ACRL Web site the following week. Members reported being eager for more opportunities to participate and niche homes for their specific issues.
- She also thanked the staff for their work over the past year:
  - Stephanie Orphan for her leadership role in the development of the online career center, to be known as JobLIST. Her energy and efforts working with the developer and *American Libraries* were critical to its accomplishment. The site should launch about a week and a half after the conference. It will include tools for job seekers, as well as the job ads. RSS feeds are also going to be implemented. ACRL will initially experience a reduction in revenue, but it's seen as a valuable member service.
  - Hugh Thompson, ACRL Manager of Publications, is retiring after 12 years with ACRL. Thanks to his excellent work, ACRL has successful books and publications programs. Mueller will take over much of Thompson's production work.
  - Petrowski for her work carrying out the membership survey. Also congratulations to her as the recipient of the Instruction Section's (IS) Miriam Dudley Instruction Librarian Award for 2006.
  - ACRL Program Officer David Connolly for his work supporting the Board, budget, and division appointments process.
  - Tory Ondrla, ACRL Meeting and Special Events Planner, for managing the RBMS Preconference and it's associated IMLS grant. The preconference was a blockbuster success.
  - ACRL Program Coordinator Megan Bielefeld for her support of the awards and Annual Conference programs.
  - *CHOICE* Editor and Publisher Irv Rockwood, who added looking for new office space, partnering with Bowker on the development of *Resources for College Libraries (RCL)*, and getting *CHOICE Reviews Online 2.0 (CRO2)* launched to his usual duties.
  - Margot Sutton Conahan, ACRL Manager of Professional Development, for the success of ACRL's first virtual conference.

- Mueller for her consistently high quality design and production.
- ACRL Production Editor Ann-Christe Galloway for her continued production and copy editing work.
- Finally, welcome to new staff member Adam Burling, ACRL Program Coordinator, who will assist Petrowski in support of ACRL's Sections.

#### **7.0 Draft Spring Executive Committee Meeting Minutes (Document 4.0)**

There was no discussion of the draft minutes.

#### **8.0 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.

##### **Strategic Area: The Association**

#### **8.1 Approval of Midwinter Minutes (Document 5.1)**

*Motion:* That the 2006 Midwinter Meeting Board of Directors meeting minutes be approved.

#### **8.2 Confirmation of email vote, ACRL Chapter Funding Policy Revision (Document 5.2)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors confirm its email vote of March 25 – April 5, 2006, approving the revised policy on Chapter funding to read:

ACRL Chapters may spend budgeted resources on any items or activities that support the charitable and educational purposes of ACRL's strategic goals as identified in the strategic plan with two exceptions.

1) The allotted funds may not be used for payment of honoraria or travel to support librarians' presentations at ALA, ACRL, or ACRL chapter conferences and 2) The allotted funds may not be used to purchase goods or services prohibited by ALA and ACRL policy.

#### **8.3 Confirmation of email vote, Sponsorship of Center for Intellectual Property (CIP) Symposium (Document 5.3)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors confirm its email vote of May 16 – May 22, 2006, approving support in name-only the symposium, "Copyright at a Crossroads: The Impact of Mass Digitization on Copyright and Higher Education" sponsored by The Center for Intellectual Property at the University of Maryland University College, held from June 14-16, 2006.

##### **Strategic Area: The Profession**

#### **8.4 2007 Workshops and Preconferences**

##### **8.4.1 2007 Midwinter Workshops (Document 5.4.1)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve presentation of the following workshops at the 2007 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Seattle, January 19, 2007:

- **Assessment of Academic Library Effectiveness, Using ACRL Standards for Continuous Evaluation**
- **Creating the One-Shot Library Workshop Step-by-Step**
- **Managing the Changing Research Models in the Humanities**

**8.4.2 2007 Annual Conference Preconferences (Document 5.4.2)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve presentation of the following preconferences at the 2007 ALA Annual Conference in Washington, D.C., June 22, 2007:

- **Writing and Using Objectives to Improve Library Instruction**
- **Accepting an Electronic Resources Librarianship Position: The Best Professional Decision You Ever Made! Now what? Your A to Z guide to practical tips, strategies, workflow standards, and software applications you need to succeed**

**8.5 Future ACRL National Conference Dates and Locations**

**8.5.1 2011 National Conference (Documents 5.5.1 & 5.5.1a)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board approve Philadelphia as the official location for the ACRL 15th National Conference on the dates of April 7-10, 2011.

**8.5.2 2013 National Conference (Documents 5.5.2 & 5.5.2a)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board approve Indianapolis as the official location for the ACRL 16th National Conference on the dates of April 4-7, 2013.

**8.6 Fall 2006 ACRL Virtual Institute (Document 5.6)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve ACRL offering a one day Virtual Institute in fall 2006.

**Strategic Area: Higher Education and Research**

**8.7 Science and Technology Information Literacy Standards (Document 5.7)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the "Information Literacy Standards for Science and Technology."

*Discussion:* At the request of a Board member, agenda item 8.3 was removed from the consent agenda for further discussion.

*Action:* The consent agenda was approved as amended.

**8.3 Confirmation of email vote, Sponsorship of Center for Intellectual Property (CIP) Symposium (Document 5.3)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors confirm its email vote of May 16 – May 22, 2006, approving support in name-only the symposium, "Copyright at a Crossroads: The Impact of Mass Digitization on Copyright and Higher Education" sponsored by The Center for Intellectual Property at the University of Maryland University College, held from June 14-16, 2006.

*Discussion:* A Board member wanted additional information about the timing of this request. At the time the ACRL Board was asked to approve its support it was only about a month prior to the symposium. Davis stated that she probably delayed passing it on to the Board by about 3 weeks while she tried to make contact with CIP. It may be that CIP is trying to position ACRL for a financial support in the future. Another Board member pointed out that most of the registrations for the symposium were probably done by the time ACRL added its support.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors confirmed its email vote of May 16 – May 22, 2006, approving support in name-only the symposium, "Copyright at a Crossroads: The Impact of Mass Digitization on Copyright and Higher Education" sponsored by The Center for Intellectual Property at the University of Maryland University College, held from June 14-16, 2006.

**Strategic Area: The Association****9.0 Budget and Finance****9.1 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter (April) Budget Report (Document 6.1 & 6.1a)**

Budget and Finance Committee chair Susan Kroll gave her report at the ACRL Membership Meeting immediately preceding the Board meeting. Highlights of her comments included the following: The fiscal year ends at the end of August, so this report is still from the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter. Revenues for the year-to-date are better than budgeted and expenses are less than budget. The net revenue is currently running about \$400,000 better than budgeted. As an off-conference year, this was expected to be a year to spend down some of the operating reserve, and the association still probably will before the fiscal year is complete. The full impact of the first year of ACRL's dues increase won't begin to be apparent until this fall. Next year will see the second and final phase of ACRL's dues increase as well as the first phase of ALA's recently approved dues increase. Web courses continue to be a strong area of growth. Print ads continue to struggle.

*CHOICE* is also showing better revenues and lower expenses than budgeted. There are some interesting possibilities coming up for *CHOICE*, including the potential property purchase. *CHOICE* also has a number of product introductions due to launch within the next year, which should significantly impact its FY2007 revenues.

Kroll also thanked Davis and Connolly for their support of her and the Budget and Finance Committee.

**9.2 Resolution Supporting Cost of Living Increases for ALA/ACRL Staff (Document 6.2)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve a letter [attached to document 6.2] advising ALA to provide a cost of living increase for all ALA employees on an annual basis and that this cost of living increase would be met before any other bonuses and/or individual incentive payments would be made.

*Discussion:* Maloy stated that she wrote the proposed motion without having an opportunity to vet it with the ACRL Bonus/Compensation Board Task Force, so she welcomed any feedback and suggestions. This discussion started at the 2005 Fall Executive Committee Meeting during a review of the FY2005 budget performance. At the 2006 Spring Executive Committee Meeting, the Executive Committee decided that they would like to send a letter to ALA in support of improved financial compensation for the staff. ALA has concerns about its units attempting any kind of compensation outside of the ALA system, but the Executive Committee is concerned that ALA's compensation system does not keep salaries up with inflation, but then has staff pursue "stretch goals" for a small additional incentive. There are also some very real costs and effects of ALA's compensation policies on effective staff recruitment, as evidenced by several of ACRL's searches over the last few years.

There was some concern that other Divisions would not support this effort because their budgets may not perform as well as ACRL's. Nonetheless, some Board members said that they would harbor these same concerns even if ACRL had not had a record conference year in 2005. A Board member specifically heard from the Executive Director and President of a smaller Division that they did not believe that the Division's budget would be able to support larger increases for staff.

The sense of the Board was that the intent of this effort should be to stop the individual incentives until ALA can at least make cost of living increases, although there was also some concern about how cost of living would be defined. There is also concern that this effort must not put staff at risk for layoffs or other drastic budget corrections.

The issue was tabled until Board II to allow for more discussion among different stakeholders, particularly at the Division Presidents Breakfast. The task force was asked to consider the discussions there and at this meeting and come back to Board II, if possible, or the Fall Executive Committee

Meeting with a revised proposal. In the meantime, Davis should continue to pursue the other compensation and staff recognition actions approved at the Spring Executive Committee Meeting.

### **9.3 CHOICE Building (Document 6.3)**

*Motion:* Approval for ACRL/*CHOICE* to conduct one or more feasibility studies of the potential purchase of a property in Middletown, Connecticut deemed potentially suitable as housing for the *CHOICE* offices.

*Discussion:* Rockwood addressed the Board and informed them that the Acheson House, which was discussed at the 2006 Midwinter Meeting, is no longer a possibility for a purchase by *CHOICE*. Wesleyan University is now not expected to seriously consider selling the property for another year and did not like the offer *CHOICE* made earlier this year. Several other properties have been seen since that time, including another Wesleyan building, their old physical plant. For the last 4 or 5 weeks Rockwood has been looking at the Crescent Street property described in document 6.3, which is about 2 ½ blocks from *CHOICE*'s current office space. The property is larger than *CHOICE* needs, but they are looking at it with the possibility of taking on a partner in the purchase. If they can find someone interested in the other half of the building, this property looks like a good possibility. At this point, moving forward with this property would mean bringing in an architect to do a plan at \$15-20,000 and then creating a building plan. The suggested motion was amended at that morning's Budget and Finance Committee meeting to clarify that there may be multiple feasibility studies, but that ultimately *CHOICE* would only be looking for a single property.

A Board member asked whether we had considered being a landlord instead of getting a partner for the purchase. Rockwood stated that it was an outside possibility, but that the renovation work would best be done jointly. Davis added that our first inclination would be to not become a landlord, but that we would consider it if that was the only way to make a good deal work. We would rather keep the focus on the core mission of ACRL/*CHOICE*, rather than taking on landlord responsibilities.

Of the \$25,000 approved at the 2006 Midwinter Meeting for a feasibility study, about \$500 was spent looking at the Acheson House property.

A Board member suggested that having a nice working space is a great perk as part of your job. Given how hard the *CHOICE* staff works, it's hoped that they can get a very nice space for themselves, like the Washington Office now has. It would be great for helping to boost morale. Finally, it was also pointed out that if a deal isn't in motion by February or March, *CHOICE* will have to start dealing with the current landlord and decide what to do with its lease.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors granted approval for ACRL/*CHOICE* to conduct one or more feasibility studies of the potential purchase of a property in Middletown, Connecticut deemed potentially suitable as housing for the *CHOICE* offices.

### **10.0 Annual Conference Programming Recommendations**

Annual Conference Programs Board Working Group chair Karen Williams stated that the group hoped to have recommendations to the Board by August 31 for action at October's Fall Executive Committee Meeting. The group started looking at this issue at the 2006 Midwinter Meeting and has been working actively since spring. A survey went out on the ACRLLeads electronic discussion list and generated a modest number of responses. Petrowski has since pulled a good deal of information about programs from the recent membership survey. A document was prepared for dissemination to ACRL leaders to communicate that ACRL's Annual Conference program process is being actively reviewed. It was discussed at the Leadership Council and Sections Council session the previous day and the document was sent to ACRLLeads the previous day, as well.

### **11.0 ALA Board Liaison**

Janet Swan Hill, the ALA Executive Board's liaison to ACRL, updated the Board on some of the major issues facing the Executive Board at this time. Highlights included:

- Hill thanked the ACRL Board for its support of the successful ALA dues increase.
- The impact of the dues increase will be spread over a number of years. Within 4 years it is expected to lead to an overall increase in the ALA budget of \$1.2 million. That includes the likely decrease in membership at the early on, but historical trends suggest that membership tends to rebound in less time than you might think.
- \$176,000 was set aside last year to fund ALAhead to 2010 initiatives. Part of the money was set aside for an initiative fund intended to facilitate capacity building in the organization. Another part is targeted to allow continuous improvement in ALA's technology capabilities. Half the funding will support programs that specifically support the 2010 plan.
- In 2007, an additional \$110,000 in membership revenue is anticipated from the dues increase. Funding priorities for the year include advocacy for rural and tribal libraries and library funding.
- ALA is updating the backend of its Web site, including the implementation of a new content management system, which is about to come online and will allow more people to participate in updating different parts of the site. Cascading style sheets will be used to keep the look consistent throughout the site. Tests in conversion of existing pages and data are ongoing. Implementation is expected to start in June and will continue through October.
- As far as the budget impact of this Annual Conference in New Orleans, as of the previous day registration had exceeded 13,000 attendees. That puts attendance about 10% behind Orlando, a comparable conference location that makes a good comparison with ALA conference attendance in New Orleans under normal circumstances. ALA expects to provide about 500 complimentary registrations to librarians from the Hurricane Katrina impact area. A very advantageous set of incentives and promises was secured from the New Orleans Convention Center, ensuring ALA that it won't take a bath on this conference. Onsite registration had been better than expected. The ALA Executive Board also set aside \$200,000 last year to cushion against a financial impact from the decision to keep the conference in New Orleans.

A Board member asked whether ALA had ever considered using Chicago as a conference site every other year, like some other associations do in their home cities. Hill responded that ALA really doesn't save much money staying in Chicago anyway. ALA has also found that it's a significant benefit to members to move the conference around and give different regions the chance to drive in to conference. The issue is discussed regularly, but the financial impact has been assessed and keeps producing the same answer.

### **Strategic Area: Higher Education and Research**

#### **12.0 ALA Campaign for America's Libraries Goals Review (Document 7.0)**

The ALA staff who have managed the Campaign for American's Libraries have provided the Board with a survey reviewing the goals of the campaign. This is the Board's opportunity to offer any feedback it may have on the key messages and strategies used by the campaign. The Board discussed the campaign objectives and offered the following feedback:

*Are there other objectives the Campaign should be considering for its second phase?*

- Return on Investment that libraries bring to their communities.
- More emphasis on individual rather than buildings. Bullet one of the key messages contains two separate concepts: 1) Librarians are trained experts, info smart, ensure a society where everyone is information literate and 2) Libraries and changing and dynamic places. ACRL feels the emphasis should be on the people and not the buildings.
- Make the campaign more personalized.

*Do you have any suggestions for modifying these existing messages? Are there other messages that ALA should be conveying through the Campaign?*

- The messages are too place-centric. Need to recognize the virtual nature of the library and the important role a virtual library plays.
- Suggested message: Librarians save you time. The first bullet subpoints don't match the message of libraries being dynamic places.
- Libraries as economic engines could be a part of the second message, "Libraries as places of opportunity."

*Are there other audiences ALA should be targeting and if so, why?*

- People who don't use libraries, e.g., parents, donors, trustees, admissions counselors, potential students.
- Realtors, chambers of commerce, i.e., libraries as enticement to the community

*What corporations, nonprofits and media outlets that connect to the Campaign's objectives would you encourage the association to pursue and why?*

- IMLS—connection with cultural heritage
- NPR/PBS
- Athletic directors (collegiate)
- NEA/NEH
- Google
- National Science Foundation
- American Association of Museums
- Society of American Archivists—CALM committee

*What new tools and materials do you need to better conduct public relations, marketing and advocacy efforts?*

- Update and revise materials we have; they are good but need refreshing
- Update consumer research on academic libraries.
- Make ALA tools better known, e.g., license @ your library

### **13.0 NACS Higher Education Digital Content Summit (Document 8.0)**

*Motion:* To approve co-sponsorship of the "Stepping Through the Open Door: A Summit on New Modes for the Delivery of Information in Higher Education" with a financial commitment of up to \$15,000.

*Discussion:* NACS contacted ACRL in December 2005 to see if it would be interested in cosponsoring a summit with them. With a good deal of discussion, the topic of the summit was eventually framed as what new roles should the college stores and academic libraries should be playing as information flows in such different ways. As ACRL understands it at this time, EDUCAUSE is planning to participate and ARL will consider it at their July meeting.

There was some significant concern that the relationship between academic libraries and college bookstores is usually fundamentally competitive. While, on an individual basis, libraries and bookstores at the same institution can work together productively and amicably, on an industry level there are fundamental differences in their philosophies regarding copyright law, course management system participation, etc. Support was expressed for the concept of working cooperatively with NACS on the summit, but there was also concern that the background provided did not give a clear enough sense of the direction NACS intends for the summit to allay some lingering ambivalence toward the project. If ACRL were to participate, particularly given the requested \$15,000 contribution, it would be critical that it have significant input into the collaborative content planning process and that the summit look out for how the cultures surrounding the relevant issues would be addressed.

There was also some discussion about whether, looked at within the context of ACRL's strategic plan, NACS was an organization with which ACRL would want to partner and spend \$15,000 of its money and a good

amount of the Executive Director's time on. Davis reported that, while the Board would need to make its own decision about the strategic importance of the project, the group had been good to work with during preliminary discussions. She would also like some member help with the project if it moved forward.

The Board was supportive of finding common ground with a group facing similar issues from a different perspective. It was mentioned that ACRL has members who would be very interested in working on a project like this that deals with access issues.

A Board member also mentioned that ALA Vice-President/President-Elect Leslie Burger also seems to be planning a technology summit for ALA. Staff will follow up with ALA management to get more information on this.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors approved ACRL's co-sponsorship of "Stepping Through the Open Door: A Summit on New Modes for the Delivery of Information in Higher Education" with a financial commitment of up to \$15,000. The Board expects that with this commitment, ACRL will share in an active role in program planning development and have a voice in setting the date of the summit, which ACRL would like to see be set for sometime after it hosts its own technology summit in early November 2006.

#### **14.0 New Business**

There was no new business.

*The Board adjourned to Executive Session at 4:35 p.m.*

#### **15.0 NCATE BOE Appointment (Document 9.0)**

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors recommended to the ALA Executive Board the reappointment of Judith Walker of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte as ACRL's member of the NCATE BOE for a 3-year term ending in 2010. *Note:* Later in the conference, the ALA Executive Board confirmed Walker's reappointment.

#### **16.0 Performance Review of Executive Director**

The Board reviewed the performance of the Executive Director.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

**Association of College and Research Libraries**  
**Board of Directors Meeting II**  
Annual Conference  
Tuesday, June 27, 2006  
10:30 – 3:30 p.m.  
New Orleans Marriott, St. Charles Room  
New Orleans

## Annual Conference Board Meeting II Minutes

### **Attendees:**

*Board Members:* Camila Alire, Frances Maloy, Pam Snelson, Susan Kroll, Tyrone Cannon, Mary Ellen Davis, Nancy Allen, Janis Bandelin, Lori Goetsch, Lynne King, Bede Mitchell, and Karen Williams.

*Absent:* Rita Jones and Dorothy Washington.

*Visitors:* Nancy Bolt, Mary M. Carr, Ray English, Robert P. Holley, Catherine Lee, Debbie Malone, Bill Nelson, John Ober, Emily Sheketoff, Julie Todaro, and Sally Wilson Weimer.

*Staff:* Margot Sutton Conahan, David Connolly, Kara Malenfant, Stephanie Orphan, Mary Jane Petrowski, and Irv Rockwood.

### **17.0 Call to Order**

President Camila Alire called the meeting to order at 10:28 a.m.

### **18.0 Opening Remarks**

Alire reported that Director-at-Large Dorothy Washington had to miss the meeting due to obligations at her home institution.

Executive Director Mary Ellen Davis reported that the company ACRL has contracted with to provide ACRL's virtual conference attended the ALA Annual Conference at its own expense and offered 10 scholarships to the virtual ACRL National Conference for Baltimore.

ALA's Budget Analysis and Review Committee (BARC) approved the feasibility studies for the *CHOICE* property search, which the ACRL Board approved at Board I. Davis also reported that BARC made a positive comment about trusting ACRL to manage the process competently.

Past-President Frances Maloy reported that she and ACRL Meeting and Special Events Planner Tory Ondrla attended the ALA Executive Board meeting in support of ACRL's proposed date and site selections for the 2011 and 2013 ACRL National Conferences, approved by the ACRL Board at its first meeting. The ALA Executive Board approved the proposals.

### **18.1 Board I Executive Session Report of Actions**

Alire reported out the Board's action from the closed executive session at the end of the first Board meeting. As described in agenda item #15.0, the Board recommended to the ALA Executive Board a member for appointment as ACRL's member of the NCATE BOE.

### **19.0 Adoption of the Agenda**

A Board member suggested moving agenda item #27.3, the resolution supporting cost of living increases for ALA/ACRL staff to follow item #22.0, the officers' report out from the Division Presidents' Breakfast, as there was some relevant conversation that will be reported.

*Action:* The Board adopted the agenda with the proposed revision.

## 20.0 Consent Agenda (1 min.)

[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.

### Strategic Area: The Profession

#### 20.1 2007 ALA Annual Conference Programs (Document 10.1)

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the proposed slate of ACRL programs for delivery at the 2007 ALA Annual Conference.

#### 20.2 WSS Award Criteria Revision (Document 10.2)

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the following changes in the wording of for the Award for Significant Achievement in Women's Studies Librarianship, so that the new wording can be in place for the 2007 Awards cycle:

The ACRL Women's Studies Section Award for Significant Achievement in Women's Studies Librarianship, sponsored by Routledge Press, recognizes one-time achievement, by an individual or a group, during the particular year of the award. Achievement may be in any area of academic Women's Studies librarianship, including, but not limited to:

- Publication of a monograph, journal article, website, or media product;
- Talk or other presentation at a nationally recognized conference;
- Innovations in Women's Studies librarianship, including but not limited to instruction;
- Development of an exemplary program, collection, digitization project, or access tool to serve Women's Studies students and/or faculty;
- Significant creative & innovative contribution to the work of the ACRL Women's Studies Section.

### Strategic Area: Higher Education and Research

#### 20.3 ACRL Subject-Specific Information Literacy Standards -- Process Guidelines (Document 10.3)

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors take the following actions to put in place the new ACRL Subject-Specific Information Literacy Standards Process Guidelines:

1. Approve the "Tip Sheet for Developing Subject-Specific Information Literacy Standards."
2. Task the Institute for Information Literacy Executive Committee with:
  - announcing a call for self-nominations as information literacy consultants
  - overseeing the selection of people who qualify for the pool of information literacy consultants, perhaps in partnership with a subset of the faculty of the Institute for Information Literacy
  - updating the ACRL Information Literacy Peer Mentor Database with a new category of people certified as information literacy consultants for the subject-specific information literacy documents which the IIL Executive Committee would ensure remains up to date
  - providing an orientation (in-person or online) for people who qualify as information literacy consultants about their role, responsibilities, and the extent of their authority; the relationship of subject-specific information literacy standards to the original information literacy standards; general guidelines for subject-specific information literacy standards; and tips related to working within the

ACRL structure between Sections and committees. Materials for the orientation would be designed in collaboration with ILAC.

- managing the pairing of information literacy consultants with Sections, including tracking which consultants are working with which Sections and ensuring that the consultant can work with the Section throughout the term of the project
  - maintaining ongoing communication and feedback with the information literacy consultants to provide an avenue for resolution of problems and continued improvement with the process. One or more information literacy consultants may be appointed as an official member of IIL Executive Committee.
3. Task the Information Literacy Advisory Committee with:
- developing orientation and training materials for people who qualify as information literacy consultants about their role, responsibilities, and the extent of their authority; the relationship of subject-specific information literacy standards to the original information literacy standards; general guidelines for subject-specific information literacy standards; and tips related to working within the ACRL structure between Sections and committees. Materials would be designed in collaboration with IIL Executive Committee and used for the orientation for new consultants.
  - reviewing Sections subject-specific information literacy documents
  - providing feedback to the Sections chair and appropriate committee members about the recommendation
  - communicating the final recommendations related to the documents to the Standards and Accreditation Committee and/or ACRL Board.

**20.4 2006 Scholarly Communication Agenda (Document 11.1)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the Scholarly Communications Agenda for 2006-07.

**Strategic Area: The Association**

**20.5 STS Bylaws Revisions (Document 10.4)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the proposed revision to the STS Bylaws, to add two Member-at-Large positions to the makeup of the STS Executive Committee, for placement on the Spring 2007 Section Ballot.

**20.6 CJCLS Bylaws Revisions (Document 10.5)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the proposed revisions to the CJCLS Bylaws for placement on the Spring 2007 Section Ballot.

**20.7 Dissolution of the ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute Advisory Committee (Document 20.0)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors dissolve the ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute Advisory Committee and assign the Professional Development Coordinating Committee the responsibility for managing the scholarship application and selection process for the institute.

*Discussion:* At the request of a Board member, agenda item 20.7 was removed from the consent agenda for further discussion.

*Action:* The consent agenda was approved as amended.

## **20.7 Dissolution of the ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute Advisory Committee (Document 20.0)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors dissolve the ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute Advisory Committee and assign the Professional Development Coordinating Committee the responsibility for managing the scholarship application and selection process for the institute.

*Discussion:* Several Board members expressed concern that dissolving the committee would send a symbolic message of disconnection with the institute. Part of the reason the committee was established was to create a more formal link between ACRL and the institute. It was suggested that part of the Board's action could be to formally assign responsibility for communication with Harvard regarding the institute with staff.

Additionally, it was noted that the Professional Development Coordinating Committee was reluctant to take on the responsibility of reviewing the scholarship applications for the institute each year. The committee was a little overwhelmed in its first year as a coordinating committee and it had been suggested that part of the review of ACRL's annual conference programming structure could be the addition of a vetting process for programs, which would be the responsibility of the Professional Development Coordinating Committee. The Board decided that the committee was still the best fit for the scholarship review and that changes to the committee's structure would be considered later if necessary to ensure that the workload was manageable.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors approved the dissolution of the ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute Advisory Committee and amended the charge of the Professional Development Coordinating Committee to reflect the responsibility for managing the scholarship application and selection process for the institute, as well as assigning ongoing responsibility for communication regarding the ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute to ACRL staff.

## **Strategic Area: The Association**

### **21.0 Councilor's Report**

ACRL Division Councilor Tyrone Cannon reported that Council I saw a lot of discussion about the political bent of some of ALA's invited conference speakers. It was suggested that in the future no one should be invited as a speaker if they are running for office within the following year. Similar concerns were expressed about speakers with union affiliations.

Cannon also related some of the logistical problems he had experienced at this conference attending ACRL Board meetings, ALA Council meetings, and ALA BARC meetings, as he also serves on that body. Staff and the officers will continue to review all of the schedules to try to find times with the least conflicts for ACRL Board functions.

### **22.0 Officers Report of Presidents' Breakfast Discussions**

Maloy stated that the Division Presidents' Breakfast has evolved over the last few years to a more formal and expanded meeting of ALA leaders, including the ALA president, vice-president, treasurer, Executive Director, and, beginning next year, the Division Councilors. In 2005 when the Division presidents wanted to get additional Division representation on BARC, the Councilors didn't know about it. By including them in the breakfast, it is hoped that communication between Division leadership and ALA Council will be enhanced.

ACRL's officers brought up the resolution on the cost of living increase for ALA/ACRL staff at the breakfast, as ALA Executive Director Keith Michael Fiels and ALA Senior Associate Executive Director Mark Ghikas were present. Fiels repeatedly referred to the proposal as an across the board increase, which is not how the ACRL Board sees it. There was no interest from the other Division officers present to support the resolution, largely due to concerns about affordability and the potential that a larger mandated increase could result in

layoffs during financially strapped years. Fiels did state that ALA staff would be receiving a “decent” raise this year.

Brian Schottlaender, Past-President of the Association for Library Services and Technical Services (ALCTS) and incoming Division Representative to the ALA Conference Committee, reported that the Conference Committee was considering several resolutions, including the one Cannon mentioned earlier about avoiding controversial conference speakers.

The Exhibits Roundtable is preparing a resolution that would prohibit vendors from scheduling any event during exhibit hours that would divert conference attendees from the exhibits floor, such as the OCLC luncheon. The resolution may be considered during Council III.

Deanna Marcum from the Library of Congress spoke to the group about the need for better communication about bibliographic issues and asked the Division presidents to appoint three people to serve on an advisory task force planning a summit on that topic for spring 2007. Carol Diedrichs, ALCTS President, will coordinate a vote of the Division presidents on their electronic discussion list by June 30, 2006. When the ALA Executive Board heard about this plan, it was unhappy that Marcum had gone directly to the Divisions and said that the final appointments would have to come before it for approval. There was concern that a bias would be shown toward ARL libraries. The ACRL Board of Directors was encouraged to suggest names for consideration to Alire.

In other Division news, the Library Administration and Management Association (LAMA) announced that its journal, *Library Administration & Management*, is moving to an electronic-only format. The Reference and User Services Association (RUSA) is considering a similar move for its journal, *Reference and User Services Quarterly*.

### **23.0 Coordinating Committee Comments/Review of Structure (Document 21.0)**

ACRL Intellectual Freedom Committee Chair Bob Holley summarized the Advocacy Coordinating Committee’s report to the Board reviewing the first year of the coordinating committee structure. Major points included:

- Holding the meetings of multiple committees simultaneously in one large room causes some issues with the noise level affecting the ability to conduct an effective meeting.
- The Intellectual Freedom Committee has seen a drastic decline in the number of observers attending its meetings. Whereas the committee used to regularly have between 5 and 15 visitors, it had just 2 at the 2006 Midwinter Meeting and none at the Annual Conference. This has previously served as a valuable way to find interested new members for the committee.
- With the current coordinating committee meeting structure, Holley doesn’t feel that component committee chairs have time to prepare for their meetings.
- There was also concern that the standardized 2-hour meeting block for component committees may not serve everyone equally well. For some committees it is too long and wastes the committee chair’s time as the wait around for the closing coordinating committee meeting, the last hour of the coordinating committee meeting block. ACRL Standards and Accreditation Committee Chair Bill Nelson added that for his committee 2 hours was never enough time to complete the committee’s work. Nelson also stated that it was very difficult for that committee to do its work in the large multiple committee meeting room.
- The members of the Advocacy Coordinating Committee feel that this structure just serves to add an additional layer of bureaucracy. In its place, the committee suggests establishing a new unit, a Committees Council, similar to the existing Sections Council structure, with 2 Board members serving as the co-chairs of the council to ensure effective communication with the Board. The coordinating committee recognizes that this may spread the Board members too thinly by adding to their responsibilities, so the committee suggests adding an additional Director-at-Large position to the Board of Directors.
- It was also suggested that a template be created for committee minutes that would make it easy to demonstrate the committee’s work advancing the strategic plan.

- Council of Liaisons Chair Julie Todaro also commented that the chairs of the component committees still don't really understand the purpose of the coordinating structure. The chairs reported out on the activities of their committees during the coordinating committee portion of the meeting, which was interesting but didn't seem worth the extra 2½ hours that the chairs had to devote to the meeting block.

Catherine Lee, Chair of the ACRL Publications Coordinating Committee, was also present and offered that committee's perspective:

- There was some slight difficulty with the room setup and logistics for the simultaneous multiple committee meetings, but the former Publications Committee itself historically served as a form of coordinating committee, so there wasn't much of an adjustment for them.
- People who were members of multiple editorial or publication advisory boards were unable to participate fully in the meetings of both of their committees due to the simultaneous meeting times, but this issue would be eliminated in the future by limiting people to one editorial board appointment at a time.

Margot Sutton Conahan, staff liaison to the ACRL Professional Development Coordinating Committee, reported that committee discussed skipping the opening coordinating committee meeting, the first hour of a coordinating committee meeting block, and have been adding breakout meeting rooms for some of the larger component committees to help with the noise issues, but generally the committee feels that the format could continue to work with some minor revisions.

The Board discussed the feedback and made the following observations:

- The Board needs to consider the coordinating committee issues from within two distinct frameworks: logistical issues and coordinating/communication issues.
- From a coordinating perspective, the Advocacy Coordinating Committee comprises some committees that represent two distinct functions: some create agendas for the association or the profession, such as the Committee on the Status of Academic Librarians, while others implement or manage those agendas, such as the Standards and Accreditation Committee. Additional attention may be needed to find a more effective process connecting those two groups.
- It was suggested that an extra publicity blurb about the function and nature of coordinating meetings could be published with the list of ACRL meetings in *C&RL News* each Midwinter Meeting and Annual Conference to help educate members interested in observing a committee meeting.
- Some consideration was given to forming a task force or Board working group to consider the issues brought forward by the coordinating committee and make further recommendations, but the feeling of the Board was that this was still a very new process and should be given at least one more annual cycle of experience before the concept is revisited significantly.

Moving forward, the Board set out the following next steps:

- Snelson and Davis will work to pull together information from past board minutes, actions, and communications with the coordinating committee chairs, members, and component committees to share a clear goal and purpose for the coordinating committee structure with those units each year. Efforts will be made to share this information with each unit again before the 2007 Midwinter Meeting.
- The coordinating committees should have a full report of their activities, accomplishments, and challenges since they were established ready for the Board 4 weeks prior to the 2008 Midwinter Meeting.
- Staff was directed to develop the suggested strategic plan-oriented minutes template.

## **Strategic Area: Higher Education and Research**

### **24.0 Scholarly Communication**

#### **24.1 Board Update (Document 11.2)**

ACRL Scholarly Communication Committee Chair Ray English addressed the Board with several comments and highlights from his written update:

English offered his thanks to the Board for its nimble action on the Federal Research Public Access Act of 2006 (FRPAA) resolution during the first Board meeting. The resolution was also endorsed by the Public Libraries Association (PLA) Board of Directors and the ALA Committee on Legislation. The bill itself has been referred to the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. Proponents of the bill have received some encouraging support and need to keep the pressure on at this point. They are currently encouraging the chair of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, Senator Susan Collins, to hold hearing on the bill. ACRL's Scholarly Communication Committee will be drafting a letter along these lines to come from the association.

Work continues on revising the National Institutes of Health (NIH) public access policy, which to this point has included only voluntary deposit of funded researchers' manuscripts in PubMed Central. Language included in the NIH appropriations bill due to work by SPARC and other open access advocacy groups would require deposit, although it calls for the manuscripts would be openly accessible after 12 months, rather than the preferred 6 month window. There are strong indications that the Senate will support the measure. Open access advocates would still like the deposit to be immediate, even if the open access is still delayed longer than they would like.

#### **24.2 Scholarly Communication Initiative Review and Assessment (Document 11.3)**

This document offers a history of ACRL's scholarly communication initiative, a summary of major accomplishments, an update of the landscape, and an assessment of the initiative's impact on ACRL members and their view of future needs.

The assessment found that members are very supportive of the scholarly communication initiative, particularly the educational and advocacy aspects of it. It's difficult to identify specific impacts of the program, but there seems to be a widespread moderate impact and a greater impact on a core of people who seem to really follow the issue.

In the future, members would like to see the program expand in 2 areas: more formal liaison relationships between ACRL and other organizations with a scholarly communication focus, and additional research into the issue.

The Board was reminded that this assessment was called for when the Scholarly Communication Task Force, now the Scholarly Communication Committee, was first established. This should serve as a model for keeping committees focused on their purpose and for demonstrating the impact of their activities. The Board thanked English for his exceptional leadership since the program's inception. English then thanked the Board, Davis, and the ACRL staff for their support of the initiative and stated that he had enjoyed the entire effort.

#### **24.3 ARL/ACRL Scholarly Communications Institutes**

The first institute will take place July 12-14, 2006, at UCLA. Due to the overwhelming response and interest in participating, a second institute will be offered at Duke University December 6-8, 2006. The Friends of ACRL have approved a request to fund 4 scholarships of \$600 each for the institute. Applications will be due on August 15, 2006.

#### **25.0 Review and Revision of the Access Guidelines Task Force (Document 12.0)**

After a number of years considering revisions to the guidelines, the task force has recommended an outright rescission of them. ACRL Standards and Guidelines Committee Chair Bill Nelson has pointed out that there is a specific procedure for the rescission of guidelines in the *ACRL Guide to Policies and Procedures*. The Board directed staff to help Nelson shepherd the guidelines through this process and thanked the task force for its work. Director-at-Large Bede Mitchell, the Board liaison to this task force, was thanked in particular for his consistent efforts to keep this task force on point through a number of changes of the chair.

**26.0 Endorsement of ALA Resolutions: Resolution Affirming “Network Neutrality,” Resolution on EPA Libraries, Resolution on Saving Federal Libraries, Resolution Concerning Advocacy for Federal Library and Information Programs (Document 14.0)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors endorse the following resolutions:

- Resolution Affirming “Network Neutrality”
- Resolution on EPA Libraries
- Resolution on Saving Federal Libraries
- Resolution Concerning Advocacy for Federal Library and Information Programs

*Discussion:* The version of the Resolution on Saving Federal Libraries was missing some language in the final “resolved” line. This was corrected during the lunch break and that resolution was endorsed immediately following the break.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors endorsed the following resolutions:

- Resolution Affirming “Network Neutrality”
- Resolution on EPA Libraries
- Resolution on Saving Federal Libraries
- Resolution Concerning Advocacy for Federal Library and Information Programs

**Strategic Area: The Association**

**27.0 Budget and Finance Issues**

**27.1 Friends of ACRL Distribution Update**

Budget and Finance Committee Chair Susan Kroll reported on the status of the proposals the Friends Fund Subcommittee brought before the Budget and Finance Committee during this conference. Four proposals were brought forward, 2 of which were submitted late and 1 of those was missing the amount of funding being requested. Those proposals were tabled for the time being.

Two other proposals were accepted, one to provide 4 scholarships to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Scholarly Communication Institute and one from the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS) Diversity Committee to fund 2 members during the 2007 Midwinter Meeting to visit colleges in the Seattle area that have underrepresented student bodies and recruit students to academic and research librarianship and rare books librarianship in particular. The total of the approved proposals was \$3,170.

It was noted that the Scholarly Communication Institute scholarships would deviate from the current scholarship policy in that the institute is aimed at senior staff and administrators, not people in the profession for less than 5 years. The Budget and Finance Committee asked that the Friends Fund Subcommittee keep ACRL’s scholarship policy in mind when considering future proposals for scholarship funding, although a task force of Budget and Finance Committee members would work on a revision of that policy to allow for productive exceptions such as this. The committee is also requiring a brief report on the outcome of all approved proposals.

**27.2 FY07 Budget (Documents 15.0 & 15.0a)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the FY 2007 Budget with the following bottom line:

ACRL without CHOICE

Total Revenue = \$3,434,505

Total Expenses = \$3,786,791

Total Net Revenue = \$(352,286)

CHOICE

Total Revenue = \$3,152,269  
Total Expenses = \$2,983,751  
Total Net Revenue = \$168,518

*Discussion:* Although it is a conference-year, the FY07 budget intentionally spends down some of ACRL's operating reserve to fund a number of activities that advance the strategic plan. Because of ACRL's budgetary policy calling for only 80% of conference revenues to be reflected in the budget in case of a shortfall of attendance or exhibit sales, the actual deficit is likely to be much smaller than budgeted or perhaps even a small net revenue.

The decrease in membership dues revenue reflected in the budget is due partially to the expected decrease in membership resulting from the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of the ACRL dues increase and the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of the ALA dues increase, both of which take effect in FY07. It also reflects the discounted ACRL dues for the student and retiree categories.

The Budget and Finance Committee has assigned a task force to review several big picture budget issues, including the relationship the association would like between the operating reserve balance and deficit budgets and long-term investment transfer issues that may arise from negotiations with ALA over the CHOICE property purchase.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors approved the FY 2007 Budget with the following bottom line:

ACRL without CHOICE

Total Revenue = \$3,434,505  
Total Expenses = \$3,786,791  
Total Net Revenue = \$(352,286)

CHOICE

Total Revenue = \$3,152,269  
Total Expenses = \$2,983,751  
Total Net Revenue = \$168,518

NOTE: The approved budget amounts were revised during New Business, agenda item #38.0, to reflect several additions to the budget made during this meeting.

**27.3 Resolution Supporting Cost of Living Increases for ALA/ACRL Staff**

In light of the discussion at the Division Presidents Breakfast, described in agenda item #22.0, this item was not discussed further.

**28.0 Members-Only Web Site Access**

Several Sections raised issues with ACRL's member-only Web site access policies a few years ago wishing for more content to be openly available. At the 2005 Annual Conference, the Board referred the issue to the Membership Advisory Committee for its general recommendations on the topic, but the committee came back with much more specific recommendations than the Board had sought. While the Board requested a general policy recommendation, the committee recommended 2 specific content areas that it suggested be removed from the members-only restriction and offered openly.

The Board considered several next steps with this issue, including sending it back to the Membership Advisory Committee with additional instructions or forming a working group of the Board to make recommendations based on the Membership Advisory Committee's work for action at the Fall Executive Committee Meeting,

possibly for action by the full Board during the conference call portion of the meeting. There was some concern about the precedent it sets if the Board asks a unit to do some specific work and, not having received what it asked for or receiving recommendations it doesn't like, then completes the work itself instead of sending it back to the unit until they complete the task as assigned.

It was decided that the president had the prerogative to decide what course of action would be best to move this issue forward and would inform the Board of the next step taken.

A recess was called at 12:15 p.m. for a lunch break. The meeting was called back to order at 1:30 p.m.

### **29.0 Assessment Working Group Final Report (Document 22.0)**

*Motion:* Adopt the recommendations of the Assessment Task Force as articulated in the Final Report of the Task Force, as follows:

*What will be assessed?*

- 1) Each president's priority areas will be reflected in the assessment agenda. Selected activities in support of the president's selected priority areas within the strategic plan will be assessed.
- 2) In addition, during each midwinter and annual conference, a standing Board agenda item will provide time for the Board to review assessment activities and to request that assessment activities related to any priority within the strategic plan be added to the assessment agenda.

*Who will do assessment?*

- 3) The Task Force believes that a combination of staff, a committee, and expert consultants will be needed to support ongoing assessment activities related to the strategic plan, as follows:
  - a) Create an Assessment Subcommittee of the Research Committee. The Research Committee is already charged with coordination of research activities and should function to coordinate survey and research activities within ACRL.
  - b) The Subcommittee should be comprised of individuals with expertise in data analysis, survey research methodology, and outcomes-based assessment.
  - c) It should be charged with management of ACRL strategic plan based assessment using the priorities for selecting areas within the plan to assess.
  - d) There should also be an ACRL staff member charged with liaison responsibilities with the subcommittee to ensure adequate support in selection of consultants when needed, and to ensure strong communication with the Executive Director.
  - e) ACRL should ensure that each member of the Assessment Subcommittee, as well as the staff serving as liaison to this subcommittee, receives training in outcomes-based assessment.
- 4) Draft charge to the Subcommittee on Assessment:

The Research Committee's Subcommittee on Assessment (RCSOA) is charged with designing and implementing outcomes based evaluation and other assessment programs related to the ACRL Strategic Plan. The RCSOA will stay informed about outcomes based evaluation design and implementation, will manage ongoing evaluation projects designed to assess effectiveness of ACRL programs supporting highlighted, high priority areas of the strategic plan. The RCSOA will work on assessment priorities as established by the ACRL Board. The RCSOA will coordinate its assessment research with all other research activities through the Research Committee. The Chair of the Research Committee will keep the Board of Directors informed about assessment activities and results, so that assessment results can be used by the Board of Directors to improve the effectiveness of the Association.

*Discussion:* Director-at-Large Nancy Allen, chair of the Board Working Group on Assessment, stated that the group's goals had been to both fulfill its formal charge and the larger goal of creating a culture of assessment throughout ACRL's activities, so that those involved in program planning in particular would have a better critical sense of the value of their programming. Allen also reviewed the group's recommendations to the Board and highlighted that the outcomes-based assessment training for members of the proposed Assessment Subcommittee of the Research Committee and the staff liaison to that committee mentioned in 3)e) of the recommendations was available online for free as a set of 3 high quality, IMLS-funded tutorials.

Allen visited the Research Committee's meeting the prior day and explained the nature of the proposed subcommittee. She suggested that the Research Committee develop a process for the creation of the subcommittee and create it in such a way so that the members of the subcommittee would be appointed directly to it and would not necessarily need to participate fully in the Research Committee's activities. Regina McBride, a member of the Research Committee, has served as a member of the Working Group, which would hopefully facilitate the enactment of any recommendations that the Board might approve.

The Research Committee reportedly continued discussing the proposed subcommittee after Allen left the meeting and expressed concern about the overall workload that the assessment work would lead to, particularly as presidential initiatives may cover a large time span, which may lead to several initiatives running concurrently. The committee was reminded during its meeting that the budget for FY07 included funding for a consultant for assessment, which could ease the committee's workload fears for at least the initial implementation phase.

The committee was also concerned about the open-endedness of the "other" activities that would be assessed. The committee intended to create the subcommittee to assess only presidential initiative-based activities, not other Board identified assessment areas. At least one Research Committee member was resistant to the idea that the Board would assign the committee some specific areas for assessment. Several Board members pointed out that ACRL's divisional committees were, in fact, committees of the Board and could certainly be assigned specific projects in addition to the committees' overall charges.

The Board discussed narrowing the proposed charge of the subcommittee in response to the committee's feedback, but decided that it would approve the charge as written and allow the committee to gradually ramp up its involvement with assessment. Although the Board understands the Research Committee's concerns, it is clearly the most logical unit to coordinate assessment activities. It was also pointed out that the assessment of presidential initiatives would target some specific component of each initiative, not the whole of the president's activities. That may allay some of the committee's fears about workload. The Board will continue to discuss any practical issues that come up with the implementation of these recommendations with the Research Committee as needed.

Finally, it was noted that the pilot assessment project dealing with the advocacy workshops presented at the 2006 ALA Annual Conference and 2007 ACRL National Conference will be completed about 6 months after the National Conference. This project will help inform the Board regarding the costs and effectiveness of working with a consultant for assessment.

*Action:* The Board of Directors adopted the recommendations of the Assessment Task Force as articulated in the Final Report of the Task Force, as follows:

*What will be assessed?*

- 1) Each president's priority areas will be reflected in the assessment agenda. Selected activities in support of the president's selected priority areas within the strategic plan will be assessed.

- 2) In addition, during each midwinter and annual conference, a standing Board Agenda item will provide time for the Board to review assessment activities and to request that assessment activities related to any priority within the strategic plan be added to the assessment agenda.

*Who will do assessment?*

- 3) The Task Force believes that a combination of staff, a committee, and expert consultants will be needed to support ongoing assessment activities related to the strategic plan, as follows:
- a) Create an Assessment Subcommittee of the Research Committee. The Research Committee is already charged with coordination of research activities and should function to coordinate survey and research activities within ACRL.
  - b) The subcommittee should be comprised of individuals with expertise in data analysis, survey research methodology, and outcomes based assessment.
  - c) It should be charged with management of ACRL strategic plan based assessment using the priorities for selecting areas within the plan to assess.
  - d) There should also be an ACRL staff member charged with liaison responsibilities with the subcommittee to ensure adequate support in selection of consultants when needed, and to ensure strong communication with the Executive Director.
  - e) ACRL should ensure that each member of the Assessment Subcommittee, as well as the staff serving as liaison to this subcommittee, receives training in outcomes-based assessment.
- 4) Draft charge to the Subcommittee on Assessment:

The Research Committee's Subcommittee on Assessment (RCSOA) is charged with designing and implementing outcomes based evaluation and other assessment programs related to the ACRL Strategic Plan. The RCSOA will stay informed about outcomes based evaluation design and implementation, will manage ongoing evaluation projects designed to assess effectiveness of ACRL programs supporting highlighted, high priority areas of the strategic plan. The RCSOA will work on assessment priorities as established by the ACRL Board. The RCSOA will coordinate its assessment research with all other research activities through the Research Committee. The Chair of the Research Committee will keep the Board of Directors informed about assessment activities and results, so that assessment results can be used by the Board of Directors to improve the effectiveness of the Association.

### **30.0 Board Section Liaison Reports**

Board members gave brief oral reports of feedback they had received from units they had liaised with during the conference. Highlights included:

- ULS would like to see a follow-up meeting to discuss further the recent ACRL membership survey held at the 2007 Midwinter Meeting, perhaps on the agenda of the ACRL Membership Advisory Committee, since Section Membership Committee chairs serve as ex officio members of that body. CLS, EBSS, Arts, and DLS each also had a great deal of discussion about the membership survey.
- There was a suggestion that approved strategic initiative action plans be more widely publicized to provide a template for units to work from when preparing their proposals each year.
- Hot topics within CJCLS and STS included concern about developing a standard procedure for e-archiving online communities and documents, rather than just printing hard copies and filing them, interest in publishing a summary of the ACRL Research Committee's analysis of ACRL's Environmental Scan assumptions in *C&RL News*, and concern about how libraries deposit and manage data sets that might be relevant for others.
- Arts recognized that they have both competition and collaborative opportunities with the Art Libraries Society of North America (ARLIS/NA) and the Modern Language Association (MLA). Arts has also been finding ways to use the ALA online communities and virtual members on committees to keep members involved in the Section's activities on an ongoing basis.

- Several Sections have been discussing fairly substantial revisions to their bylaws. They were advised to hold off for now since the Board is looking at bylaws issues over the next year.
- It was noted that several Sections' Executive Committee meetings were very bogged down in process and would benefit from some sort of meeting management training as part of ACRL's efforts toward leadership development opportunities for members. As a short-term solution, Petrowski will be suggesting to Section leadership that they at least subscribe to ALA Parliamentarian Eli Mina's e-newsletter.
- At least 6 Sections sent representatives to the ALA New Members Round Table (NMRT) meeting, a terrific turnout. It was well worth making that effort and many round table members had questions for the ACRL representatives.
- ACRL's newly established New Members Discussion Group held its first meeting at this conference. The discussion group suggested holding some kind of committee fair at ACRL national conferences to help new members understand how the association is set up. A number of the attendees also had misconceptions about ALA's open meetings policy and didn't realize that they could attend nearly any committee or Board meeting that they would like to.
- ANSS was very opposed to any changes in the Annual Conference programming process. The Section thinks of itself as a niche group and exactly the ones who would suffer from any changes. Any further comments regarding looking at other models of Annual Conference programming should continue to be passed on to Director-at-Large Karen Williams.
- IS is also concerned about changes in the Annual Conference programming structure. IS is also looking for new ways for members to benefit from programming, such as webcasts or e-learning opportunities. The Section has also assigned a committee to use the ALA online community software and see whether they think it could take the place of electronic discussion lists.
- The Spectrum Scholar Mentor program career fair was a very worthwhile event for Aire and ACRL E.J. Josey Spectrum Scholar Mentor Committee Chair Theresa Byrd to attend. They regularly had 4 to 5 people at their table with questions throughout the event. The biggest concerns the interested attendees expressed about academic librarianship involved questions of promotion and tenure processes. They highly recommended that ACRL have representation at this career fair each time it's held.

### **Strategic Area: The Profession**

#### **31.0 Library Support Staff Certification Project (Documents 13.0 & 13.1)**

*Motion:* Appoint two or three people (ACRL's choice), with at least one from the Community and Junior College Libraries Section, to a Task Force that will discuss the issue of library support staff certification and make recommendations to the future. Approve financial support for the ACRL appointees to attend a 2.5-day conference in Chicago in the spring of 2007 (estimated cost: \$3,000 -\$4,500 depending on the number of appointees and the number of hotel nights needed).

*Discussion:* Nancy Bolt, who retired from the Colorado State Library last year and is now consulting, is currently working on a project with ALA regarding the establishment of a voluntary national library support staff certification program to be administered by the ALA-Allied Professional Association (ALA-APA). She briefed the ACRL Executive Committee on the project at its spring meeting and is now formally asking the Board to support it. ACRL's Community and Junior College Libraries Section (CJCLS) has reviewed the proposal and believes it is worth pursuing at least this exploratory phase.

ALA has been discussing the possibility of a certification program for library support staff for over 20 years and is currently exploring whether this is the time to move that forward. Many divisions have said that such a program would be interesting but no one has taken the lead on it. The goal is a national certification program with reciprocal recognition. Bolt is trying to bring all of the stakeholders together to discuss the possibilities. Recent research by the ALA Library Support Staff Interests Round Table (LSSIRT) found significant interest in such a program. 3,000 support staff responded to a voluntary online survey, 46% of them from academic libraries, reporting that 56% of them already supervise other staff. 66% of the respondents felt that a certification program would benefit library support staff. About half the states in the U.S. already have a

support staff certification program, but in her research Bolt has found that a number of them are unhappy with what they have and would be interested in participating in an ALA-supported national program. Additional background is available in document 13.0 and in the 2006 ACRL Spring Executive Committee Meeting minutes, agenda item #6.0.

Bolt pointed out that both the ALA and ACRL strategic plans have areas that would support this concept. She asked that the ACRL Board approve the appointment of representatives to the task force and funding to support their work. A number of ALA units have already agreed to appoint representatives to the task force, including the Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies (ASCLA), the Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS), the Public Library Association (PLA), ALA's Committee on Education, and the Library Support Staff Interests Round Table (LSSIRT).

The task force will begin working this fall virtually and will meet at the 2007 Midwinter Meeting to discuss issues that have come up from the virtual discussions. A 2½-day summit will be held in Chicago in the spring of 2007 to decide where the issue stands—should work on a certification project move forward or should ALA give up the idea?

Bolt mentioned that PLA had a good debate about the proposal before deciding to appoint representatives to the task force. Issues that concerned PLA's Board included:

- Does providing certification to support staff undermine the professional degree?
- How do you assess whether someone is actually meeting the competencies?
- How will it work to consider the competency of people who have been on the job for 20 years versus someone fresh out of library school with a certification?
- Can a set of core competencies that are applicable to all types of libraries realistically be developed?

Bolt emphasized that she wants all potential stakeholders involved in this process, even if they don't think it will work. She wants someone who is willing to discuss the thorny issues.

The Board amended the motion to allow the appointment of 1 to 3 representatives instead of 2 to 3, just to allow a little more flexibility to do what makes the most sense when it comes time to appoint the representatives. Snelson will provide Bolt with the names of ACRL's representative(s) late in the summer.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors, at its June 27, 2006, meeting in New Orleans, LA, approved the appointment of one to three people, with at least one from the Community and Junior College Libraries Section, to a Task Force that will discuss the issue of library support staff certification and make recommendations to the future and approved financial support for the ACRL appointees to attend a 2.5-day conference in Chicago in the spring of 2007 of up to \$3,900.

### **32.0 Support for ALA President's Emerging Leaders Initiative (Document 16.0)**

*Motion:* To support the Emerging Leaders '07 initiative with a \$1,000 stipend in FY07 for one new librarian as requested in the letter from ALA Vice-President/President-Elect Leslie Burger with the following stipulations:

- A) That ACRL be involved in the selection process
- B) That the service work of the emerging leader be on an ACRL committee.

*Discussion:* This proposal had been a hot topic of conversation among the leadership of different ALA units during the conference, with some feeling that ALA was asking its units to devote money from their own funds to support an ALA initiative. Burger had clarified that she is using some of the funding ear-marked for her presidential initiatives and is seeking additional funding here, not expecting the units to bear all of the costs for her idea themselves.

There was some concern that the proposal had an ageist slant by requiring the applicants to be under 35 years old. It was also emphasized that if the Division were to sponsor a person for this, it should get some say in the selection process. Alire included that stipulation in the proposed action for that reason.

While discussing the stipulation that the sponsored member serve perform their service work on an ACRL committee, it was pointed out that ACRL leadership has some control over that; it does not have control over opportunities to serve on ALA committees, which can be harder since it draws from a much larger pool of potential committee members. The motion was amended to require the service be performed on an ALA committee. Staff was asked to help remind the ACRL appointing authorities to also appoint the sponsored member to an ACRL committee for that year.

The Board was very supportive of the concept, but felt there were still a number of questions raised but not answered by the proposal. Burger reportedly planned to issue a revised version of the invitation letter based on feedback she received during the conference. The Board considered holding off on action until the final letter was out, but ultimately decided to go ahead and act, with the option to change the action through a virtual vote later if they were uncomfortable with the final plan for the initiative.

*Action:* The Board of Directors approved support for the Emerging Leaders '07 initiative with a \$1,000 stipend in FY07 for one new librarian as requested in the letter from ALA Vice-President/President-Elect Leslie Burger with the following stipulations:

- A) That ACRL be involved in the selection process
- B) That the service work of the emerging leader be on an ALA committee.

### **33.0 Statistics Committee Update (Document 18.0)**

Earlier in the conference, Petrowski discussed ACRL's *Academic Library Trends and Statistics* publication with ACRL Manager of Publications Hugh Thompson and Leigh Estabrook, Director of the Library Research Center (LRC) at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, which administers the statistics survey for ACRL. They pointed out a number of issues with the existing survey. Nearly 50% of the institutions attempting to complete the survey do not complete it, possibly due to frustration with some of the definitions. They are convinced that the response rate can be increased to the 60-80% range with some changes. As a pilot project, for one year they will adapt the survey to provide shorter surveys targeted to each type of library specifically. They hope this will improve the dataset, which may, in turn, improve the usefulness of the statistics and increase sales. This project typically loses a small amount of money each year.

### **34.0 ALA Washington Office Update (Document FYI-7)**

Emily Sheketoff, Director of ALA's Washington Office, appeared before the Board and offered to answer any questions they have from her written report. She noted that the Cornyn-Lieberman bill (FRPAA, previously discussed by the Board in its first meeting, agenda item #4.0) had been inadvertently left out of the report, but is currently one of the Washington Office's key issues.

A Board member asked whether ALA was working with EDUCAUSE on the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (CALEA), which ALA opposes due to its provisions allowing wiretaps on Internet access and voice over IP (VOIP). Although libraries are exempt from the act, the association still opposes these provisions, feeling they are damaging to both civil liberties and technological innovation. Sheketoff replied that EDUCAUSE had decided that pursuing litigation was not worth their money and ALA could not afford it by itself. Therefore, they are working together to lobby for legislative changes to the act.

*The Board adjourned to Executive Session at 2:40 p.m.*

**35.0 IFLA Standing Committee Nominations (Documents 17.1-17.3)**

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors approved the nominations of members for appointment to the IFLA standing committees on Art Libraries, Science and Technology Libraries, and University Libraries to be forwarded to the ALA International Relations Committee for further action.

**36.0 Council of Liaisons Appointments (Document 23.0)**

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors approved the appointment of Richard Shaw to a 3-year term on the ACRL Council of Liaisons as the liaison to the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), contingent on a continued liaison relationship between ACRL and AACC.

*The Board readjoined to Open Session at 3:20 p.m.*

**37.0 Report Out Actions from Executive Session**

Alire reported out the Board's actions from the closed executive session, as described above.

**38.0 New Business**

*Motion:* That the Board of Directors amend the approved FY07 budget (agenda item #27.2) to reflect the additions made during this meeting, which include a maximum of \$3,900 to support the attendance of 1 to 3 ACRL representatives to a Library Support Staff Certification Project Task Force conference, to be held in Chicago in the spring of 2007 (agenda item #31.0), and \$1,000 to sponsor the participation of an ACRL member in ALA Vice-President/President-Elect Leslie Burger's Emerging Leaders '07 initiative (agenda item #32.0).

*Discussion:* There was no discussion on this item.

*Action:* The Board of Directors amended the approved FY07 budget (agenda item #27.2) to reflect the additions made during this meeting, which include a maximum of \$3,900 to support the attendance of 2 ACRL representatives to a Library Support Staff Certification Project Task Force conference, to be held in Chicago in the spring of 2007 (agenda item #31.0), and \$1,000 to sponsor the participation of an ACRL member in ALA Vice-President/President-Elect Leslie Burger's Emerging Leaders '07 initiative (agenda item #32.0).

**39.0 Recognition of Outgoing Board Members**

The outgoing Board members were presented with a token of appreciation and individually recognized by Alire:

**Director-at-Large W. Bede Mitchell**

The Board will miss Mitchell's thoughtful, insightful perspective. When he shared his position and insight, it was always well thought out. He also brought an underrepresented male perspective to the Board's discussions. Alire wished Mitchell the best during his term of service as LAMA's incoming Vice-President/President-Elect and really appreciated the insights he brought to ACRL's discussions as an active member of LAMA, as well. Mitchell thanked Alire for her compliments and stated that it had been his privilege to work with such an excellent Board and staff over the last 4 years.

**Director-at-Large Rita Williams Jones**

Although Jones was not able to be present at the meeting, Alire thanked her for often acting as the Board's conscience, especially relative to diversity issues. Jones stayed engaged with the Board's activities even as she struggled with some personal and professional issues over the last few years. Alire thanked Jones for her service on the Board and to CJCLS.

**Past-President Frances Maloy**

Alire thanked Maloy for serving the association so well and congratulated her on the growth in the level of her leadership skills and sophistication in Board issues over the last few years. Maloy always demonstrated a great sense of humor and demonstrated a good balance between work, family and ACRL commitments that served as a model for other ACRL members. Alire felt she learned a great deal from Maloy and was privileged to follow her term as ACRL President.

**40.0 Passing of the Gavel**

Alire thanked Snelson for filling in for her over the last year when she had other commitments. Snelson, in turn, thanked Alire for her diligent preparation before each Board meeting and noted that the Board could never have accomplished as much without that behind-the-scenes effort.

**41.0 Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:41 p.m.