



**Association of College and Research Libraries**  
**Board of Directors Meeting I**  
Midwinter Meeting  
Saturday, January 21, 2006  
2:00 – 5:30 p.m.  
Westin Riverwalk Hotel – Sabino Room  
San Antonio

## **Board of Directors Meeting I Minutes**

### **Attendees:**

*Board Members:* Camila Alire, Pam Snelson, Susan Kroll, Elaine Didier, Nancy Allen, Janis Bandelin, Lori Goetsch, Rita Williams Jones, Lynne King, W. Bede Mitchell, Dorothy Washington, Karen Williams, and Mary Ellen Davis.

*Absent:* Frances Maloy.

*Visitors:* Marianne Rough, Julie Todaro, Leslie Bjorncrantz, Pat Wand, Janice Simmons-Welburn, Sandra Yee, Mary Reichel, Debbie Malone, Tyrone Cannon, Barbara Jenkins, Cynthia Steinhoff, Jennifer Pastenbaugh, Deb Robertson, Carl Bengston, and Katie Whitson.

*Staff:* David Connolly, Kara Malenfant, Tory Ondrla, Stephanie Orphan, Mary Jane Petrowski, Irving Rockwood, Margot Sutton Conahan, and Hugh Thompson.

### **1.0 Call to Order**

President Camila Alire called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

### **2.0 Opening Remarks**

Alire greeted everyone and recognized visitors Julie Todaro and Cynthia Steinhoff, this year's candidates for ACRL Vice-President/President-Elect, and Marianne Rough, Carl Bengston, and Debbie Malone, three of the four candidates for ACRL Director-at-Large.

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**

*Motion:* It was moved that the agenda be adopted with agenda item 10.0, Strategic Mega-Issue Discussion: Diversity, moved up to follow agenda item 5.3, as a Board member would have to miss the last part of the meeting and wanted to ensure that she would be present for that discussion.

*Action:* The Board adopted the agenda as revised.

### **4.0 Open Microphone**

Mary Reichel, chair of the 2007 ACRL National Conference – Baltimore, addressed the Board to thank them for their support. She stated that everyone involved continued to share a great deal of excitement about the conference. The call for papers had been released and a May 2006 deadline was set for most proposals.

### **5.0 Recognition of Honored Colleagues**

#### **5.1 Moment of Silence in Honor of Ilene Rockman and Gerald Hodges**

Alire asked that everyone stand and share a moment of silence in honor of Ilene Rockman and Gerald Hodges, who both passed away in the months prior to the Midwinter Meeting.

## **5.2 Ilene Rockman Special Presidential Recognition Award (Document 1.1)**

*Motion:* That the Board approve a Special Presidential Recognition Award in honor of Ilene Rockman's significant contributions to ACRL and academic libraries.

*Discussion:* Alire encouraged everyone to read the touching memorial letter included with the document, written by Esther Grassian. Rockman's many contributions to the association and the profession, particularly in the area of information literacy, warrant special recognition of her efforts.

*Action:* The Board approved a Special Presidential Recognition Award in honor of Ilene Rockman's significant contributions to ACRL and academic libraries.

## **5.3 Joint Resolution in Honor of Gerald Hodges (Document 1.2)**

*Motion:* That the Board endorse the Joint Memorial Resolution honoring Gerald Hodges.

*Discussion:* The proposed resolution had been crafted with the input of a number of ALA units and was coordinated by the Director of ALA's Chapter Relations Office, Michael Dowling. The resolution would recognize and pay tribute to the contributions of Gerald as an ambassador for ALA, and for libraries everywhere. In addition to the many units considering endorsement, the resolution will go forward to ALA Council during the Midwinter Meeting.

*Action:* The Board endorsed the Joint Memorial Resolution in Honor of Gerald Hodges.

## **6.0 President's Report (Document 2.0)**

President Camila Alire reported to the Board on recent activities. Highlights included:

- She has really enjoyed her visits to ACRL Chapters, which have provided the opportunity to emphasize her presidential focus on advocacy and promote the grassroots library advocacy workshop that will be offered at the 2006 Annual Conference. Dr. Robert Cialdini has been confirmed as the featured speaker. Dr. Cialdini has a strong reputation for his presentations on the power of personal persuasion. Alire is also pleased to announce that the University Libraries Section (ULS) will be cosponsoring the workshop.
- Alire has also taken advantage of the opportunities offered by her travel to Chapter conferences to speak in other venues, particularly if there is a library school in the vicinity. She has spoken to the students about the opportunities available in academic and research libraries and encouraged the rest of the Board to take advantage of any opportunity they might have to reach out to future librarians.
- In the spirit of the international agreement ACRL signed with CONPAB several years ago, she also had the opportunity to speak at the International Academic Librarians Colloquium sponsored by the University of Guadalajara Libraries and held during the Guadalajara's International Book Fair (FIL).
- Finally, Alire looked forward to leading a delegation of academic librarians to China in March, with a planned itinerary including Xi'an, Beijing, and Shanghai.

## **7.0 Vice-President's Report (Document 3.0)**

Vice President Pam Snelson reported to the Board on recent activities. Highlights included:

- Snelson has been enjoying visits to sections and other units of ACRL as Vice-President.
- Her President's Program Planning Committee has been working with the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign's Library Research Center to research administrators' perceptions of the value of libraries, the results of which will help inform her President's Program.
- The appointments and nominations process for 2006-07 has begun and is in progress at this conference.

## 8.0 Executive Director's Report (Document 4.0)

Executive Director Mary Ellen Davis reported to the Board on recent activities as described in staff's Operations Report. Highlights included:

- A great deal of progress had been made in the area of advocacy, particularly with reaching out to higher education associations. A connection was established with the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), with recent meetings held both at the recent Educause conference and at their offices in Washington, D.C. Based on discussions with Davis, AAC&U rewrote the brochure for their conference on student engagement to encourage librarians to be selected as part of the teams applying to participate in the institute and AAC&U arranged for ACRL member Patty Iannuzzi to participate as a facilitator at the institute. This developing relationship with AAC&U will help to replace the connection lost when the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) ended operations in 2005. Additionally:
  - The Higher Learning Commission invited ACRL to co-sponsor a program track at their upcoming Annual Conference. The program will tie into the conference theme "The Future-Focused Organization: 2016 – Ready or Not?" by examining future-focused issues such as learning spaces, scholarly communication, and planning the library of the future. Davis and ACRL members Mary Case, Beth Dupuis, and Hal Shill will be presenting the program at the conference. Davis finds it very promising that the Commission sought out ACRL's involvement.
  - ACRL partnered with Educause and the Coalition for Networked Information (CNI) to develop ACRL's first Virtual Conference, which will be offered April 20 and 21.
  - Davis is working with the Council of Higher Education Management Associations (CHEMA) to develop a white paper on the future of higher education in time for a joint conference this summer.
  - The National Association of College Stores (NACS) has approached ACRL and Educause about developing a summit on digital content.
  - ACRL is partnering with the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) on the upcoming Scholarly Communication Institute.
  - Members of the Council of Liaisons have also been successfully working with their target associations.
- Work has continued on the new online career center, which has ACRL partnering with *American Libraries* and ALA's Human Resource Development and Recruitment office. Davis thanked *College and Research Libraries News* Editor-in-Chief Stephanie Orphan for all her work on this project. She also noted that ALA Executive Director Keith Michael Fiels was very excited about this collaborative project, which could serve as a model for other joint projects requiring co-development/co-investment by division and ALA general fund units.
- Davis introduced Kara Malenfant, ACRL's new Scholarly Communication/Government Relations Specialist. Malenfant has been working closely with the ALA Washington Office and with ARL and is the new staff liaison to ACRL's Advocacy Coordinating, Research, Scholarly Communication, and Government Relations Committees, among others.
- ACRL Manager of Publications Hugh Thompson now reports to Associate Director Mary Jane Petrowski and will be working more with technology support, having passed responsibility for the production of *College and Research Libraries* and *RBM* to ACRL Production Editor Dawn Mueller. Thompson presented an overview of ALA's new Online Communities software at the Sections Council meeting the previous day.
- Tory Ondrla, ACRL Meeting and Special Event Planner, has taken a leadership role managing the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) grant awarded last summer for this year's RBMS Preconference. Publicity will start shortly and it looks to be a very successful program. RBMS has had a very good track record with these preconferences, both with attendance and reputation.
- Davis thanked CHOICE Editor and Publisher Irv Rockwood for his analysis of CHOICE office space options. The Budget and Finance Committee specifically thanked him for the great job he did of analyzing the different possible options.

*Approved June 24, 2006*

- Following her maternity leave, ACRL Editorial Assistant/Classified Ads Manager Elise Parker chose to resign and stay home with her new baby. Davis noted the strong leading role Parker had taken during the initial development of the online career center.
- Petrowski has been single-handedly handling support for ACRL's Sections for nearly 18 months. The search for a Program Coordinator who would take on much of this responsibility has not yet succeeded but will hopefully produce a final candidate in the coming months.
- Davis thanked ACRL Program Officer David Connolly for his continued great support of the Board of Directors, Budget and Finance Committee, and management of the ACRL office.
- Davis thanked Megan Bielefeld, who ably manages Chapters, awards, and all of ACRL's special events and programs at the ALA Annual Conference.
- Finally, Davis thanked Margot Sutton Conahan, ACRL's Manager of Professional Development, for her leadership in the collaborative effort with CNI and Educause to plan a Virtual Conference and for her work on the next ACRL National Conference, which Davis noted was already at 48% of its fundraising goal.

A Board member asked Davis to expand on the item in her written report mentioning plans to maintain ACRL's membership with the American Council on Education (ACE) for one more year. Davis replied that one of the reasons ACRL has kept this membership was its hope to be invited to join the Washington Secretariat, which is convened by the Executive Director of ACE. Davis has learned this year that membership in the Secretariat is limited to 50 participants and already excludes a number of higher education associations based in Washington, such as NACS, because of this limitation. As it appears increasingly unlikely that ACRL will be able to join the Secretariat and there aren't many other benefits to ACRL for a membership with ACE, it may not be renewed next year.

On behalf of the Board, Alire took this opportunity to recognize the ACRL staff for its superb support.

## **9.0 Councilor's Report**

ACRL Councilor Elaine Didier reported to the Board on recent activities. Highlights included:

- Activity on the ALA Council discussion list has centered around the upcoming Annual Conference in New Orleans, particularly the suitability of the site to host a group this size of ALA by June, potential health issues that may cause problems, and the manner in which the ALA Executive Board made the decision to keep the conference in New Orleans following the Hurricane Katrina disaster.
- The Cuban libraries issue has resurfaced within the previous few weeks and has been discussed in the context of both national politics and international issues.
- Other hot issues on the discussion list have included former U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright's selection as a keynote speaker for the Annual Conference, both in terms of the content her speech may include and the effectiveness of the speaker selection process, and the upcoming ALA dues increase proposal.
- Issues expected to come up at the Midwinter Meeting included a Council vote on the ALA dues increase proposal, a resolution in protest to the Academic Bill of Rights being lobbied to state legislatures, a look at the balance of type-of-library representation on ALA standing committees, the creation of four additional Council slots for representatives of ALA's round tables, as it was pointed out that some of ALA's round tables have larger memberships than some of the smaller divisions, and a potential response to a proposed ballot initiative in Missouri which would require that 65% of all revenues directed toward schools be spent on classroom instruction activities, which would not include libraries, unlike the library-inclusive language used in the No Child Left Behind Act.
- The division councilors have also been discussing means to increase division representation on ALA Council and have asked the ALA Committee on Organization (COO) for information on how the current makeup of Council representation came to be. The "at-large" councilors would be unlikely to vote to eliminate any of their positions, so this is expected to raise some sensitive issues.

**9.1 ALA Dues Increase (Document 18.0) (also see agenda item #25.1 from Board II)**

The Board discussed the proposed ALA dues increase and agreed that a vote on a formal endorsement should wait until the Board's second meeting at the end of the conference to give Board members an opportunity to hear from ACRL members on the issue. In the meantime, the sense of the Board was requested so that if the proposal came to an ALA Council vote before the Board had a chance to discuss it further, Didier would have some idea of the Board's position.

A Board member was particularly concerned that ACRL could make a better case for the increase to its members if there was a promise of increased technology support or other direct benefit to division members. It was pointed out that, while ALA has made no such promises related to the dues increase, it has moved forward on a number of technology-related projects that ACRL members would begin to see results from as the year goes on, including a new content management system for the Web site due to launch this spring, the new online communities which had begun a soft rollout, and the addition of a knowledge management system. Additionally, there was some sense that ALA Executive Director Keith Michael Fiels really seems to understand and value division members and the importance of their place in larger ALA. It was thought that Fiels might believe that by growing ALA's overall revenues, it could help reduce tension that sometimes appears to exist between ALA and its divisions over the handling of some smaller expenses, such as bank fees for membership charges and phone bills.

Other comments included offering support of ACRL's parent organization in general and it was noted that the FAQ ALA prepared for the proposal was clearly modeled after the one that ACRL developed for its successful dues increase proposal in 2005 and much of the same logic applied.

The sense of the Board was that if the proposal came to an ALA Council vote before the Board had a chance to discuss it further, Didier should vote to support the proposal.

**9.2 Type-of-Library Representation on ALA Committees (Document 18.1)**

Didier explained that the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) had been studying the ways that its members participate in ALA as part of its strategic planning process. One of the discoveries was that academic and research, school, and public librarians were not well-represented on several key ALA committees, including the Budget Analysis and Review Committee (BARC), the Public Awareness Committee, and the Committee on Legislation. AASL's Division Councilor, Terri Kirk, proposed this resolution as a way of drawing attention to this perceived inequity and to attempt to correct for it. Kirk shared the resolution with ACRL and PLA in hopes that they would also support the resolution.

There was some concern that this might interfere with the proposal for more division representation on BARC, which was being considered at this conference, but it was pointed out that this resolution did not specifically refer to divisions, but only to the type of librarian. A Board member wondered whether more clarification of what "balanced representation" meant in the resolution, but it was agreed that AASL was intentionally trying not to be very prescriptive when they crafted the resolution.

More information about this proposed resolution may be available after the Division Presidents Breakfast at conference and this item will be discussed further at Board II, if warranted.

**10.0 Strategic Mega-Issue Discussion: Diversity (Document 23.0)**

The Board selected diversity as one of two mega-issues that they wanted to focus on for 2005-06, and a small working group was established in October 2005, consisting of Board members Janis Bandelin, Karen A. Williams, and Dorothy Ann Washington as Chair. The group was charged to:

- review the literature for this issue;
- commission a white paper on this topic;

Approved June 24, 2006

- develop an outline of what a useful white paper should cover;
- identify author(s) for the white paper, who will receive a \$1,000 honorarium for the project;
- talk to the author about the content, process, and timeline for the white paper; and
- provide an update to the Board at the 2006 Midwinter Meeting.

To date, the working group has held two conference calls and worked through email to review the literature and share citations.

The working group reviewed their activities to this point and some of the highlights of their report, including several key articles that have informed their work, such as Dr. E.J. Josey and Ismail Abdullahi's 2002 article, "Why Diversity in American Libraries," from *Library Management*, and Mary Jo Lynch's 1998 piece, "Racial and Ethnic Diversity Among Librarians: A Status Report," from *American Libraries*. They also highlighted diversity-related items in Charting Our Future: ACRL Strategic Plan 2020 and in the 2003 ACRL Environmental Scan, they identified diversity-related activities, units, and initiatives within ACRL, they agreed that the white paper should focus on underrepresented racial and ethnic groups, and they identified five potential authors for the white paper. Dr. Teresa Y. Neely, director of the Zimmerman Library at the University of New Mexico, has accepted the invitation to co-author and the task force will invite another person to co-author. The task force suggested the ACRL 2002 white paper on Recruitment, Retention & Restructuring: Human Resources in Academic Libraries as a guide to develop the outline for the diversity paper with the diversity paper main areas as recruitment, retention and advancement.

The task force stated that they want the white paper to define where we are quantitatively and would need to establish a benchmark to track change in the future. Lynch's 1998 article, available on the ALA Web site at [www.ala.org/ala/ors/reports/racialethnic.htm](http://www.ala.org/ala/ors/reports/racialethnic.htm), was based on a question included with that year's ALA salary survey. ALA's current Director of the Office for Research and Statistics, Denise Davis, is preparing a preliminary article based on the first 3000 responses from the current ALA demographic survey, but the report doesn't break out the data by type of library. The article will appear in the February 2006 issue of *American Libraries*. A Board member suggested looking at the ARL salary survey to see if it shows anything helpful in this area. It was also suggested that the task force might have to think about establishing a separate project to collect the necessary data.

Another Board member suggested that since ACRL is surely not the only ones thinking about this issue, it should be clearly communicated to ALA that we need a specific kind of data, rather than relying on what they decide to collect. There are probably other units that want this data as well that could be consulted. It was also pointed out that while Denise Davis may not have broken out the data by type of library in the article analysis, she should be checked with to see whether the relevant raw data may have been collected and could be reanalyzed to extract the information ACRL is seeking. This seemed like the most logical first step. If these possibilities weren't fruitful, it was also suggested that ACRL could use the appendix portion of ACRL's Trends and Statistics survey as a method for conducting a one-time survey.

A Board member also requested more information about how the 1998 information was compiled and how the instructions read, as self-reported responses or responses from library directors on behalf of the entire library could be quite interpretive.

This may also be an issue of concern for other library associations and a quality white paper with concrete conclusions and recommendations could enhance ACRL's reputation as a leader in the field.

Alire congratulated the task force on a very good start and thanked Washington for her leadership. The task force hopes to have confirmed the authors by February 2006. They projected a submission date of May 19, the deadline for submission of agenda items to ACRL for Annual Conference.

### **11.0 Fall Executive Committee Meeting Draft Minutes (Document 5.0)**

There were no comments regarding the draft minutes from the Fall Executive Committee Meeting.

### **12.0 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.

#### **12.1 Approval of Annual Conference Meeting Minutes (Document 6.1)**

*Motion:* That the 2005 Annual Conference Board of Directors meeting minutes be approved.

#### **12.2 Confirmation of Email Vote, NSSE – IL Items (Document 6.2)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors confirm its email vote of July 25 – August 1, 2005, approving the submission on behalf of ACRL the chart of information literacy behaviors to the National Survey of Student Engagement with the understanding that additional edits to the chart might still be made before final submission.

#### **12.3 Confirmation of Email Vote, Revised FY 2006 Budget (Document 6.3)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors confirm its email vote of October 3 – 6, 2005, approving the revised FY2006 ACRL budget as presented in the attached spreadsheet, with budgeted ACRL total revenues of \$1,853,923, total expenses of \$2,379,833, and net revenues of (\$525,910).

#### **12.4 Confirmation of Email Vote, Additional 2006 AC Programs (Document 6.4)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors confirm its email vote of December 12 – 19, 2005, approving the 2006 annual conference program sponsored by the AASL/ACRL Interdivisional Committee on Information Literacy and the program sponsored by ACRL's Institute for Information Literacy.

#### **12.5 RBMS 2007 Preconference Dates (Document 6.5)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the 2007 RBMS Preconference dates of June 19–22, 2007.

#### **12.6 RBMS 2008 Preconference Site Selection (Document 6.6)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve a proposal to hold the 2008 RBMS Preconference in Los Angeles.

#### **12.7 Doctoral Dissertation Fellowship Award Criteria Revision (Document 6.7)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve revised eligibility and criteria for the ACRL Dissertation Fellowship as follows:

##### **Eligibility**

The recipient of the fellowship must meet the following qualifications:

- Be an active doctoral student ~~enrolled in the academic librarianship area~~ in an accredited degree-granting institution
- Be engaged in researching a topic related to academic librarianship
- Have completed all coursework

Approved June 24, 2006

- Have had a dissertation proposal accepted by the institution
- A recipient of the fellowship may not receive it a second time.
- Applicant need not be an ACRL member

### **Criteria**

Proposals will be judged primarily on merit with emphasis on the following:

- Potential significance of the research to the field of academic librarianship. (No attempt will be made to define academic librarianship, but the subject should be consistent with topics usually published in *College & Research Libraries* [or key refereed library and information science research journals](#) or presented at ACRL meetings.)
- Validity of the methodology and proposed methods of analysis
- Originality and creativity
- Clarity and completeness of the proposal
- Presentation of a convincing plan for completion in a reasonable amount of time  
Evidence of a continuing interest in scholarship such as a previous publication record

*Action:* The Board approved the consent agenda.

## **13.0 Budget and Finance Committee**

### **13.1 ACRL FY05 Financial Annual Report (Document 7.1)**

ACRL's Budget and Finance Committee Chair, Susan Kroll, mentioned that at her request the Board had received ACRL's confidential 3-year financial plan, which has traditionally been shared only with the Budget and Finance Committee, in order to provide those Board members who were interested a better look at the overall financial picture of the association.

Kroll noted several key points in the FY2005 financial annual report, including:

- the 2005 ACRL National Conference in Minneapolis generated \$625,000 in net revenue;
- ACRL had revenues of \$3.6 million;
- CHOICE had another outstanding year, with record revenues of \$2.7 million, an increase of 9% over budget;
- CHOICE's electronic subscriptions continue to grow, while seeing print subscription revenues continue to fall; and
- ACRL used the interest earned on its long-term investment fund to fund some strategic initiatives for the first time.

### **13.2 FY06 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report (Documents 7.2 & 7.2a)**

Kroll pointed out that it is always difficult to tell how things are headed from the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter report, but everything appears to be about on track so far for the year. This is a spend-down year as ACRL prepares for the next National Conference, to be held in FY2007.

Davis noted that an error had been discovered in the FY2006 budget approved by the Board last year, which resulted in the budgeted net deficit being reduced by about \$10,000. This error was due to a missing link to the Executive Summary worksheet in ACRL's budget workbook from a new project with a small revenue stream.

### **13.3 FY07 Budget Assumptions Revised (Document 7.3)**

Kroll stated that during FY 2007, CHOICE would launch a major new product, *Resources for College Libraries* (RCL) while enjoying its first full year of revenues from *ChoiceReviews.online Version 2.0* (CRO2). In addition, CHOICE will introduce two derivative products built on the CRO2 platform, *ChoiceReviews.online Plus* (CRO+) an aggregated version of CRO that combines CHOICE reviews with an a la carte menu of reviews from other publishers, and *ChoiceReviews.online Personal Edition* (CROpe) a lower priced version of CRO designed for individual users. Because of its expanded and improved offerings, CHOICE was projecting revenues of over \$3 million for the first time. Still, some caution was warranted when looking at advertising revenues. Although these have shown improvement since the downturn following 2001, they had not returned to anywhere near the strength they had prior to that.

An outline would be provided at the joint Board/Budget and Finance Committee meeting later in the conference to better define how the two units can work together effectively to budget in alignment with the strategic plan. If time allowed, the financial goals in the financial plan would also be discussed at the joint meeting and the Board was asked to review them in preparation for that meeting.

### **13.4 CHOICE Building (Documents 7.4 & 10.0)**

*Background:* Earlier in the day, ALA's Budget Analysis and Review Committee (BARC) invited ACRL to their meeting to discuss the possible purchase of office space for CHOICE using CHOICE net assets. Rockwood, Davis, Kroll, and Alire asked BARC to endorse in concept ACRL and CHOICE looking at a property purchase in the Middletown, Connecticut area and asked for permission to pursue a feasibility study of a particular property that was on the market. Rockwood informed the Board that CHOICE's office has been in its present building since 1966 and currently rents about 5,371 square feet of space, which they have occupied for the last 15 years. The current space is okay, but does not allow for any kind of meetings or training. Middletown's commercial real estate market is fairly hot right now, meaning prices are rising, but available properties are sparse.

CHOICE is currently looking at a property owned by Wesleyan University known as the Acheson House, which has formerly housed Weekly Reader and, later, the Wesleyan University Press. The building is currently used as a small residence hall. While they are not certain that the building would work for CHOICE's needs and would definitely need significant work, it seems very worth looking into. The next step would be to finish negotiating with ALA on a memorandum of agreement. It is unprecedented in ALA history for a division to be looking at purchasing property, so every step must be invented as the process moves forward.

Wesleyan's past policy has been to make good on any environmental issues or hazards on properties it sells. They are also believed to be interested in finding the right buyer for the property. Rumor has it that CHOICE is considered an attractive buyer. The property is so named because it used to be the home of Dean Acheson's family, the former Secretary of State and one of Wesleyan's most distinguished alums. Because of this notable history, the university is thought to be interested in finding a good steward for the property.

The Board approved the concept of purchasing office space for CHOICE at its strategic planning and orientation meeting in September 2005. When the Acheson House property came on the market, it spurred further action to look into the possibilities while that property was available. Because of timing issues with the meeting schedule at Midwinter, this action was already approved by the ACRL Budget and Finance Committee and BARC and is being presented to the Board at this meeting because it is the first action meeting the Board has scheduled at the conference. Ultimately, ALA, as the legal entity that includes ACRL and CHOICE, would have to give the final approval for a purchase.

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors request that ACRL/CHOICE explore the concept of purchasing a building using non-endowment net assets to house the CHOICE office and undertake a feasibility study regarding the Acheson House property.

*Discussion:* The Board thanked Rockwood for his thorough and useful study and analysis of the issues involved and agreed that it appeared to make long-term sense to buy a property rather than continue to pay rising rents. In response to a question about fallback options if the Acheson House property proved unsuitable or if a purchase couldn't be negotiated, Rockwood stated that he would continue working with Trevor Davis Commercial Realty in Middletown to actively monitor what comes available. Another option might be to build a new property, but the location would be an issue. To find land to build a new location would likely mean relocating to an office park outside of the downtown area and could make staff recruitment and retention difficult.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors requested that ACRL/CHOICE explore the concept of purchasing a building using non-endowment net assets to house the CHOICE office and undertake a feasibility study regarding the Acheson House property.

#### **14.0 Cultural Communities Fund Donation (Document 8.0)**

There was a brief discussion about a possible conflict of interest for a number of Board members regarding this agenda item, as a number of them have either previously hosted or applied for funding to host exhibitions sponsored by ALA's Public Programs Office (PPO). It was decided that no one needed to recuse him or herself from this discussion or vote, as nearly every member of the Board had some previous involvement with the program and they would have to take those experiences into consideration as they approached the discussion.

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board approve a pledge for the Cultural Communities Fund in the amount of \$50,000, payable by July 2007. ACRL will work with the ALA Public Programs Office to identify recognition for ACRL and programs designed for academic librarians and ACRL members.

*Discussion:* Deb Robertson, Director of PPO, and Jennifer Pastenbaugh, a member of the Public and Cultural Programs Advisory Committee, were present at the meeting to answer any further questions the Board might have about a potential donation. The Board was reminded that PPO had first approached them for a donation to the fund at the 2003 ALA Annual Conference, at which time the Board said that they would like to wait until they finished the development of the new strategic plan to see if such a donation would fit with the association's goals. PPO returned at the 2005 Annual Conference, but the Board was still not confident that they had enough information to make a decision. After a review of the proposal, the Budget and Finance Committee had recommended a donation of \$20,000. The Executive Committee developed a list of additional questions for PPO at its fall 2005 meeting. The answers to those questions are included as part of the documents for this item.

After some discussion, it was decided that an ACRL donation would not count toward the challenge grant, as such funds would have to come from an unrestricted donation to ACRL during the time of the challenge grant in order to qualify. Donations to ACRL are typically specified for a certain project or event and are thus restricted. Nonetheless, PPO feels that an ACRL donation to the fund would show that ALA as a whole supports the project and would help recruit additional donors. PPO would be happy to receive any donation amount from ACRL. \$50,000 had been suggested because that was the level of the Public Library Association (PLA) donation. To date, PPO had received \$205,000 in donations eligible for the challenge grant, with just under \$1 million needed by 2008 to qualify for the grant.

PPO hopes that once it has established an endowment of at least \$1 million, they can begin using the interest earned by the endowment to fund future programs. At a current payout estimated at 8%, a \$1 million endowment would provide \$80,000/year to fund programs. The long-term goal is a \$5 million endowment.

*Approved June 24, 2006*

There was a sense among the Board that it put ACRL in a difficult position that ALA had signed off on this challenge grant and now wanted additional units to donate to the fund as a show of solidarity, without having first consulted those units to determine the feasibility of a donation for this purpose.

Other highlights of the discussion included:

- The Board must carefully consider whether this is where ACRL's money should go in light of last year's dues increase to support the strategic plan, although there was agreement that these programs benefited libraries in general. This donation's connection to the strategic plan was open to some debate, with some Board members failing to see a strong link and others believing that it would support the advocacy and learning goal areas of the strategic plan, as well as making a strong symbolic statement by getting ACRL's name out in front of the community and showing members their dollars at work in their own community.
- There was some concern that PPO's programming may not benefit community colleges as much as 4-year schools.
- Sections may express concern about a donation like this while the Board emphasizes the limited resources available for Annual Conference programming at the same time.
- It was suggested that the funding for the donation could come from the \$17,000 in action plan funding that was not allocated this year, drawing the rest from the operating reserve.
- There was some concern that if ACRL were to donate less than the suggested \$50,000, PPO may not provide much recognition to ACRL. Robertson assured the Board that PPO would work with ACRL to recognize it as supporting specific initiatives for academic libraries, as well as providing the more general recognition all donors receive on the Web and in print ads.

The Board amended the motion to provide a \$20,000 donation, rather than \$50,000.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors approved a pledge for the Cultural Communities Fund in the amount of \$20,000, payable in the current fiscal year. ACRL will work with the ALA Public Programs Office to identify recognition for ACRL and programs designed for academic librarians and ACRL members.

### **15.0 ULS Grassroots Advocacy Movement Proposal (Document 9.0)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the funding request to support the ULS proposal "Campus Advocacy: A Grassroots Movement for Influencing Campus Dynamics."

*Discussion:* This was a revision of an action plan proposal originally submitted for the Board's review at its strategic planning and orientation meeting in September 2005. At that time, the Board approved a \$5,000 proposal, which is being used to co-sponsor the grassroots library advocacy workshop, to be held at the 2006 Annual Conference in New Orleans. Sandy Yee, ULS Chair, Janice Simmons-Welburn, ULS Vice-Chair, and Barbara Baxter Jenkins, ULS Executive Committee Member-at-Large, were present and emphasized their belief that this proposal directly supports the strategic plan and Alire's presidential focus on the goal of grassroots library advocacy.

This proposal features the repurposing of a number of resources to leverage the widest possible effect from each element. Initially the proposed workshop for the 2007 National Conference would be developed, drawing on the work of the 2006 Annual Conference grassroots library advocacy workshop. Jenkins is a member of the task force developing that workshop. Then a competitive process would be developed by a subgroup or committee within ULS for chapters to apply to run similar workshops regionally using the core material developed for the National Conference workshop. Both sets of workshops would utilize the toolkit being developed to launch at the grassroots library advocacy workshop at the 2006 Annual Conference.

ULS has already been in discussions with Reichel, who has offered them her chair's prerogative workshop slot at the 2007 National Conference, and with Chapters Council, as they will be encouraging the regional officers to

attend the National Conference workshop to get a sense of what they may be able to offer regionally. This workshop would be designed specifically with the National Conference audience in mind, as opposed to those who might attend ALA conferences and would have the chance to attend the 2006 Annual Conference workshop. The details for plans to notify the Board of the achievements and outcomes of the workshops were still being worked out, but ULS assured the Board that they planned to measure and report back to the Board in some manner.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors approved the \$15,000 funding request to support the ULS proposal “Campus Advocacy: A Grassroots Movement for Influencing Campus Dynamics,” with up to \$8,000 supporting the development of materials and presentation of a workshop at the 2007 National Conference and an additional \$7,000 in FY 2008, \$500 each for up to 14 chapters for program expenses to offer campus advocacy continuing education.

#### **16.0 Transformation of Academic Libraries Summit: Technological Implications on Teaching, Learning, and Scholarship**

As it reviewed ACRL’s support of the strategic plan at its fall 2005 meeting, the Executive Committee noted the glaring gap in terms of supporting technology issues. The Executive Committee came up with the idea of a summit with invited participants, which would last about 2 days. Since that time, they have invited ACRL member Jim Neal to help them develop the idea. They decided to hold a summit in the fall of 2006 and plan to commission a white paper. The services of a consultant who has experience with planning this type of summit will be secured. The planning group would also like to add one more person to their group to represent community college perspectives.

The goal for holding this type of summit includes getting ACRL’s name associated with technology issues to show members that the association has heard and is responding to their interest in that area, as reported in the research used to inform the strategic plan’s development. The summit and white paper should lay out a roadmap for future efforts that are distinct from what other organizations are already doing. ACRL may not be positioned to be a leader in technology, but it should be sure that it is recognized as a party that should be involved in the conversation.

#### **17.0 Board Mega-Issues Task Force Updates**

##### **17.1 Advocacy (Document 11.1)**

The task force described in its written report how it clarified its charge and the expected outcomes for the group’s work.

##### **17.2 Assessment**

This group planned to do some additional work at the conference and would be included on the Board II agenda instead. See agenda item #28.2 Approaches to Assessment.

##### **17.3 Structure**

Due to the Board’s work on structure prior to conference and at the ACRL Leadership Council the prior day, this group had nothing new to report. An update would be ready for Board II. See agenda item #28.1.

#### **18.0 CONPAB ACRL Complimentary Membership (Document 12.0)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board approve a one-year complimentary institutional membership for CONPAB in ACRL.

*Discussion:* When Alire visited Guadalajara, CONPAB-IES (National Council of Higher Education Libraries of Mexico) asked if ACRL would be willing to offer them a complimentary one-year institutional membership. CONPAB would still have to pay ALA dues or work out an arrangement with ALA’s Chapter Relations Office.

*Approved June 24, 2006*

This would support the cross-border international agreements ACRL signed in 2003 and may lead to additional cooperative efforts in the future.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors approved a one-year complimentary institutional membership for CONPAB in ACRL.

**19.0 New Business**

There was no new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.



**Association of College and Research Libraries**  
**Board of Directors Meeting II**  
Midwinter Meeting  
Tuesday, January 24, 2006  
1:30 – 5:00 p.m.  
Westin Riverwalk Hotel – Sabino Room  
San Antonio

**Board of Directors Meeting II Minutes**

**Attendees:**

*Board Members:* Camila Alire, Pam Snelson, Nancy Allen, Janis Bandelin, Lori Goetsch, Rita Williams Jones, Lynne King, W. Bede Mitchell, Dorothy Washington, Karen Williams, and Mary Ellen Davis.

*Absent:* Frances Maloy, Susan Kroll, and Elaine Didier.

*Visitors:* Marianne Rough, Carl Bengston, John Popko, Julie Todaro, Janet Swan Hill, Louise Sherby, Loriene Roy, and Cynthia Steinhoff.

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

**20.0 Call to Order**

President Camila Alire called the meeting to order at 1:29 p.m.

**21.0 Opening Remarks**

Alire recognized several 2006 award winners who had been announced during the Midwinter Meeting, including:

- The James B. Duke Library at Furman University, for which ACRL Director-at-Large Janis Bandelin serves as Director of Libraries, was one of the winners of ALA's John Cotton Dana Library Public Relations Award.
- Ray English, Director of Libraries at Oberlin College and present at this meeting in his capacity as Chair of ACRL's Scholarly Communication Committee, is the 2006 ACRL Academic/Research Librarian of the Year.
- This year's recipients of the ACRL Excellence in Academic Libraries Awards are the Thomas Tredway Library at Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill., and the Rochester Institute of Technology Libraries, Rochester, N.Y. An award in the community college category was not made this year.

Alire also noted that Frances Maloy, ACRL Past-President, was absent from the Midwinter Meeting due to the arrival of a new baby just weeks earlier, and that ACRL Division Councilor Elaine Didier and ACRL Budget and Finance Committee Chair Susan Kroll had to miss the Board II meeting due to unavoidable conflicts with important meetings regarding their home institutions.

**22.0 Adoption of the Agenda**

*Motion:* It was moved that the agenda be adopted.

*Discussion:* A Board member requested that agenda item 23.6, regarding proposed bylaws changes for CJCLS, be pulled from the consent agenda and be discussed as an open agenda item. It was also noted that ACRL Intellectual Freedom Committee Chair Bob Holley had been informed that agenda item 26.1, the ALA Intellectual Freedom Committee's "Guidelines for Implementing RFID Technologies in Libraries: Privacy and

Approved June 24, 2006

Intellectual Freedom Concerns,” would not be moved on by the ALA Council at the Midwinter Meeting. Holley asked that the item be removed from the agenda.

*Action:* The Board adopted the agenda as revised.

### **23.0 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.**

#### **23.1 Legislative Agenda (Document 13.1)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the 2006 Legislative Agenda as submitted.

#### **23.2 Arts Program Revision for 2006 AC (Document 13.2)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve a proposed revision of the Arts 2006 Annual Conference program, originally approved at the Board’s 2005 Annual Conference meeting; the program will now focus on Preserving New Orleans, the Fate of Media Collections in the wake of Katrina.

#### **23.3 LPSS Program Revision for 2006 AC (Document 13.7)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve a proposed revision of the LPSS 2006 Annual Conference program, originally approved at the Board’s 2005 Annual Conference meeting; the program’s topic will now be Behind Katrina: Race, Law and Politics.

#### **23.4 ULS Bylaws Revisions (Document 13.4)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the proposed ULS bylaws change outlined below for placement on the Spring 2006 Section Ballot.

The proposal is to combine the Organization & Bylaws Committee with the Policy and Planning Committee. The new committee proposal information is below:

**Name:** Bylaws & Procedures Committee

**Charge:** To review and make recommendations to the Executive Committee regarding the section's future direction, goals and objectives, and policies. To prepare and, subsequently, maintain and revise a policies and procedures manual for the Section. To ensure proposals and changes are consistent with the Bylaws of the Section. To make proposed revisions in the Bylaws of the Section.

**Members:** 8 maximum; 4 minimum

*Note: After the Midwinter Meeting, upon further review of the ULS bylaws, it was determined that the ULS Executive Committee already had the authority to make this change and that it would not be necessary to include this proposal on the ballot.*

#### **23.5 ANSS Bylaws Revisions (Document 13.5)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the proposed ANSS bylaws change outlined below for placement on the Spring 2006 Section Ballot.

**Current Wording:**

ARTICLE VI. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Section 1. Composition. The Executive Committee shall consist of the elected officers and the chairs of standing committees who shall be voting members, ex officio.

**Proposed Changes:**

Section 1. Composition. The Executive Committee shall consist of the elected officers and the chairs of each standing committee. Voting members shall include the elected officers and, ex officio, a Chair (or designate) from each standing committee.

**23.6 CJCLS Bylaws Revisions (Document 13.6)**

*This item was removed from the consent agenda and is discussed immediately following the consent agenda, prior to agenda item 24.0.*

**23.7 Guidelines for Media Resources in Academic Libraries Task Force Final Report (Document 17.1)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the revised “Guidelines for Media Resources in Academic Libraries.”

**23.8 Review and Revision of the Access Guidelines Task Force Extension Request (Document 17.2)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve an extension of the Review and Revision of the Access Guidelines Task Force, with a final draft to be submitted for review prior to the Spring Executive Committee Meeting.

*Action:* The Board approved the consent agenda, as revised.

**23.6 CJCLS Bylaws Revision**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the proposed CJCLS bylaws revision outlined below for placement on the Spring 2006 Section Ballot. Only those sections with changes are included here. Additions are shown in brackets and bold italic print and deletions are shown with strikethroughs.

ARTICLE IV. MEMBERSHIP

Membership in this Section shall consist of ~~any~~ personal or institutional member[s] of the American Library Association electing membership in the Association of College and Research Libraries and the Community and Junior College Libraries Section.

ARTICLE VI. DUTIES OF OFFICERS

Sec. 2. The chair shall

- (a) preside at all meetings of the Section,
- (b) act as chief administrative officer of the Section,
- (c) make appointments to all ad hoc committees and fill committee vacancies as needed,
- (d) serve ex-officio on all Section committees except the Nominations Committee,

Change current (e) to [g] Add [f]

(e) *[be responsible for verifying the currency and accuracy of positions and committees in CJCLS and ACRL documentation.*

(1) *The up-to-date record of the positions and committees will be their listing and function statements in official CJCLS documentation in whatever form is designated by the Executive Committee. In cases of questions, the approved minutes will be the verifying factor.*

(2) *Maintenance of this listing may be delegated as established by the Executive Committee.]*

*[(f) upon taking office, provide the Section's Webmaster with a list of the Executive Committee members for the year. Update this list as necessary. This Executive Committee list as posted on the Web site will provide the number required for a simple majority of the Committee.]*

*[g] perform other duties as required by the position.*

#### ARTICLE VII. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Sec. 4. A quorum at an Executive Committee meeting shall consist of a simple majority of the ~~voting~~ members of the Committee including at least one officer.

#### ARTICLE VIII. STANDING AND AD HOC COMMITTEES *[AND POSITIONS]*

Sec. 1. Standing committees shall be established and discontinued by ~~approval of membership at the annual meeting~~ *[vote of the Executive Committee]*. The motion to establish shall include the name and function of the committee, which may be changed by a vote of the Executive Committee.

Sec. 3 *[All changes, once approved, shall be changed in the committee name and function sections in the established documentation of the Section, and in all other sources as appropriate.]*

Sec. 4 *(Was Sec. 3)* Members of standing committees *[and those filling positions as designated in the Bylaws]* will ordinarily be appointed for two-year terms with the exception of the nominations committee whose members shall have one-year terms. Members of all other committees may be appointed to one-year terms to meet special circumstances. Members and *[those holding positions]* may be appointed for additional terms, but in no case shall serve for more than four consecutive years. Approximately one-half of the committee members should be appointed each year

Sec. 5 *(Was Sec. 4)* Committees carry out their business by meeting at the ALA annual conferences, midwinter meetings, ~~and may also do work by telephone or correspondence~~ *[or by any other means approved by ALA]*.

#### ARTICLE IX. NOMINATIONS

Sec. 2. The Committee will present the names of at least two candidates *[when possible]* for each position to be filled. All candidates must be members of the Section, and give written consent.

#### ARTICLE X. ELECTIONS

Elections shall be by ~~mail~~ ballot as part of the ALA election process.

#### ARTICLE XII. MEETINGS

**[Sec. 4. All Section meetings, except those dealing with nominations and awards, are open to registered attendees of the Annual and Mid-winter Meetings.]**

ARTICLE XIV. ~~MAIL AND ELECTRONIC VOTES~~ [Voting]

Sec. 1. Membership. ~~Mail~~ ~~v~~ [V]otes of the membership of the Section may be authorized between meetings by the Executive Committee, provided all members are canvassed simultaneously. Such mail ~~[or electronic votes]~~ shall be conducted under the same requirements as votes at meetings.

Sec. 2. Executive Committee. Mail or electronic votes of the Executive Committee may be taken provided they are authorized by the officers of the Section and all ~~voting~~ Committee members are canvassed simultaneously.

*Discussion:* Board members expressed concern that the proposed additions in Article VI, Section 2, items e and f, appear to be in conflict with the use of ALA's membership database to maintain the official record of the association and each of its sections. The Board was clear that the authority for the official rosters resides in the ALA membership database and this bylaws change suggests otherwise. Articles VIII, Section 3 could also cause confusion. While the Executive Committee has the authority to establish and discontinue committees, these committees must be added to the ALA membership database so that official rosters, etc. can be generated.

The Board would like the Bylaws Committee to work with CJCLS to clarify the language and assure the Board that the final proposed language would not be in conflict with Chapter 3.9 from the *ACRL Guide to Policies and Procedures*, excerpted below.

**3.9 Committee rosters**

The ACRL office maintains and publishes the official list of all division and section committees. The ACRL office should be notified of all changes in committee membership so the database and rosters can be kept current. The ACRL office prepares the ALA Handbook of Organization entries. ACRL's copy deadline for the handbook typically has been mid-July, which requires that all completed committee acceptance forms be in the ACRL office by July 1. Appointments to committees are recorded in the ALA membership database. Dynamic rosters for the committees are available in the members-only section of the ACRL Web site and reflect changes as soon as they are made to the database. The rosters are published in a members-only section of the Web to ensure the privacy of individuals.

*Action:* The Board referred the proposed CJCLS Bylaws revisions back to the ACRL Bylaws Committee to clarify language on committee membership as it relates to the ALA and ACRL rosters; the proposed revisions will not appear on the spring 2006 ballot.

**24.0 Budget and Finance**

**24.1 FY 2007 Budget (Document 14.1)**

Friends Fund Subcommittee Chair John Popko was present to answer any questions in Kroll's absence. Popko stated that the Budget and Finance Committee had reviewed the preliminary FY2007 budget, prompting a number of questions, but none had a material affect on the budget to date. Highlights of the budget included:

- Over \$500,000 in Member Services revenue is budgeted, as are nearly \$4 million in dollars in Publications revenues (including CHOICE) and \$2.1 million in Education revenues, as it is a National Conference year, for total revenue of over \$3.5 million (not including CHOICE).
- Approximately \$1.1 million in Member Services expenses are budgeted, as well as nearly \$16,000 in Special Projects expenses, almost \$3.7 million in Publications expenses (including CHOICE),

and over \$1.7 million in Education expenses, for a total of about \$3.7 million in expenses (not including CHOICE).

- Due to ACRL's conservative budgeting practices, if the National Conference were as successful as planned it would raise net revenue by about another \$300,000, bringing it to a positive \$150,000, rather than the budgeted deficit of \$(151,083).
- In the current preliminary budget, the ending operating reserve would be nearly \$1.6 million, \$1 million more than the mandated operating reserve of almost \$600,000.

#### **24.2 Friends Support for Sister Libraries (Document 14.2)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the expenditure of \$450 from the Global Connections portion of the Friends of ACRL Fund for the ACRL International Relations Committee in support of its Sister Libraries Seed Grant Program, with the understanding that these funds will be used to defray further the travel, lodging, and meal expenses of the Mexican librarians beyond those funds already authorized by the Board.

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

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors approved the expenditure of \$450 from the Global Connections portion of the Friends of ACRL Fund for the ACRL International Relations Committee in support of its Sister Libraries Seed Grant Program, with the understanding that these funds will be used to defray further the travel, lodging, and meal expenses of the Mexican librarians beyond those funds already authorized by the Board.

#### **24.3 Budget and Finance Authority to Approve Friends Fund Expenditures (Document 14.3)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors authorize the Budget and Finance Committee to approve Friends expenditures recommended by the Friends Fund Subcommittee up to and including \$5,000 per project in accordance with the ACRL Strategic Plan.

*Discussion:* At its joint meeting with the Budget and Finance Committee the previous day, the Board indicated that it would like to find ways to leverage the Budget and Finance Committee's expertise to help better manage ACRL's time and finances. This motion came out of those discussions and was approved by the Budget and Finance Committee.

When a Board member pointed out that the Friends Fund Subcommittee's charge did not explicitly mention alignment with the strategic plan, Popko responded that the committee was established before the approval of the current strategic plan and that he thought that would be an excellent addition to the subcommittee's charge, which he would pursue at their next meeting at the Annual Conference.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors authorized the Budget and Finance Committee to approve Friends expenditures recommended by the Friends Fund Subcommittee up to and including \$5,000 per project in accordance with the ACRL Strategic Plan.

#### **25.0 ALA Board Liaison**

Janet Swan Hill, the ALA Executive Board's liaison to ACRL, presented an oral report. Highlights included:

- There would be a Council forum to discuss the resolution regarding the Academic Bill of Rights. Parties interested in discussing the matter further were encouraged to attend.
- ALA Council voted earlier that day to support the ALA dues increase proposal. Swan Hill asked that the ACRL Board formally endorse the proposal and support it with ACRL members. She particularly hoped that Board members would make the point that ACRL couldn't exist in its current form without the support provided by being a part of the larger ALA organization.

Approved June 24, 2006

- Regarding New Orleans' status as the site of the upcoming Annual Conference, Swan Hill stated that there was a fair amount of disinformation mixed in with the good information in the discussions taking place electronically and at the Midwinter Meeting. She assured the Board that there will definitely be enough hotel rooms and that most of the conference hotels are already back to normal operations to the extent that they do have daily housekeeping service. The temporary housing contract that Dillard University has with the Hilton New Orleans Riverside Hotel for Dillard's students will end with the semester in May, so contrary to rumor ALA's attendees will not be throwing people out on the street when they arrive in June. ALA's Conference Services is posting accurate information to the Web as quickly as possible to fight the disinformation that's out there. Ultimately, people will have to use their own best judgment to decide whether or not to attend, but Swan Hill assured the Board that ALA staff and leadership were doing the best that they can to ensure a fabulous experience. She also mentioned the 2 volunteer days that ALA was organizing with the New Orleans Public Library and the city to assist local libraries. Payment of \$10 and a day of your time gets bus fare to a volunteer site, lunch, and a commemorative t-shirt. Volunteer opportunities will be available on both Friday and Tuesday during the conference.

Board members responded that the FAQ for the New Orleans conference was superb and they hoped that it would continue to be updated as new information comes forward, it was also suggested that weekly or bi-weekly updates would be helpful, even if the update was only that there was no fresh information to share at that time. Board members also suggested that some of the testimonials from ALA members that were making the rounds via email would be powerful additions to the Web site. Finally, a Board member expressed hope that academic libraries would not be ignored when looking for opportunities to assist local libraries recover, as they badly need the help, as well.

#### **25.1 ALA Dues Increase (Document 19.0)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors endorse the ALA dues increase proposal.

*Discussion:* As discussed when considering at Board I whether to instruct the Division Councilor to vote in favor of the ALA dues increase proposal, this was seen as an opportunity to formally recognize that it is time for a dues increase and that ACRL is supportive of ALA's efforts.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors endorsed the ALA dues increase proposal.

### **26.0 Intellectual Freedom Committee**

#### **26.1 ALA Intellectual Freedom Committee's "Guidelines for Implementing RFID Technologies in Libraries: Privacy and Intellectual Freedom Concerns" (Document 15.0)**

This item was pulled from the agenda at the ACRL Intellectual Freedom Committee Chair's request, as ALA Council was apparently not ready to act on it.

#### **26.2 Resolution in Support of Academic Freedom and Against the So-called "Academic Bill of Rights" (Document 15.1)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors endorse Council Document 36, Resolution in Support of Academic Freedom and Against the So-called "Academic Bill of Rights" and instructed the ACRL Councilor to support the guidelines if they are voted upon by ALA Council.

*Discussion:* At least one Board member was unclear as to what the offensive parts of the Academic Bill of Rights (ABOR) were. Other Board members answered that their perception was that it was not clear how the balance of perspectives referred to in ABOR would be implemented or enforced. Ordinarily institutions have managed this with policies they have developed and implemented themselves. ABOR implies that there would be some external "court" that would enforce the balance of perspectives without stating how that would happen. While ABOR sounds open at face value, it could end up restricting what is done in a classroom or even a library, thus undermining intellectual freedom.

Several Board members also commented that the reference to ABOR in ALA's resolution as "so-called" was unnecessarily inflammatory and that it may be worthwhile to suggest a change to something less judgmental, such as "self proclaimed," but the Board decided that they should vote on the resolution as it was presented to them and let ALA Council decide whether they wanted any further changes. The Board did appreciate ALA's interest in getting ACRL's input as the voice of the academic library community, which would be most affected by ABOR.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors endorsed Council Document 36, Resolution in Support of Academic Freedom and Against the So-called "Academic Bill of Rights" and instructed the ACRL Councilor to support the guidelines if they are voted upon by ALA Council.

## **27.0 Scholarly Communications**

### **27.1 Scholarly Communications Initiative Update (Document 16.1)**

Ray English, Chair of the ACRL Scholarly Communication Committee, presented highlights from his written update regarding activities of the ACRL scholarly communications initiative, including:

- After such a long search, English is delighted to have ACRL Government Relations/Scholarly Communication Specialist Kara Malenfant on staff and actively working on scholarly communication and legislative advocacy issues.
- Great progress on scholarly communication issues has been seen recently. Significant developments and activities of the committee have included:
  - The National Institutes of Health's (NIH) Public Access Working Group has recommended that the new NIH policy be made required and that the embargo window be shortened to 6 months from 1 year. Hopefully Congress will give a clear signal that this is what they want.
  - Senator Joseph Lieberman's CURES bill looks encouraging, with an important provision that all Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) agencies make their research publicly accessible within 6 months. This provision uses the same language as the NIH, but covers all HHS agencies.
  - The Research Councils of the United Kingdom (RCUK) are close to announcing a final policy on open access to research that is funded by the research councils.
  - Planning continues on the joint scholarly communication institute ACRL is planning with the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), with Malenfant and ACRL Board and Scholarly Communication Committee member Karen Williams representing ACRL on a working group that is developing the content for the institute.
  - The ACRL/SPARC forum at this conference attracted approximately 250 people and examined author rights and related institutional archiving practices. About 85 people attended the discussion group meeting the following day.
  - The committee has been developing an assessment of ACRL's scholarly communications program. They are planning to survey a 10% sample of ACRL members this spring.

The Board had several comments and questions about the joint ACRL/ARL Scholarly Communication Institute for English, raising the following additional points:

- The institute is limited to 100 participants, who will be chosen in an open, competitive process expected to be similar to the process used to select participants in ACRL's Immersion Institutes for information literacy. Diversity in terms of the size and type of institutions selected will be actively sought.
- It is expected that the content will be repurposed and offered again in other venues, such as possibly offering a condensed version of it as a workshop or preconference at a Midwinter Meeting or Annual Conference. The committee is also considering whether the content would be well suited as an online course as part of ACRL's Web-CE offerings. A Board member also encouraged the

committee to consider possibly offering it at a regional level for regional universities, limiting the eligible applicants to that region.

Alire also once again offered her congratulations to English on his 2006 ACRL Academic/Research Librarian of the Year Award.

### **27.2 Statement on Preservation of Scholarly Electronic Journals (Document 16.2)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors endorse the statement, “Urgent Action Needed to Preserve Scholarly Electronic Journals.”

*Discussion:* English clarified that endorsing this statement would not involve endorsing any particular product. Endorsing this statement would mean only that ACRL endorses in concept the importance preserving electronic journals and encourages institutions to find and help create solutions that would allow that preservation. A press release was planned if the Board endorsed the statement.

The Board suggested that the statement could make a valuable addition to ACRL’s collection of best practices and encouraged English and the Scholarly Communication Committee to rework the content so that it takes the form of a guideline or effective practice.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors endorsed the statement, “Urgent Action Needed to Preserve Scholarly Electronic Journals.”

## **28.0 Board Mega-Issues Task Force Updates**

### **28.1 Structure**

The Board’s Structure Working Group presented a brief oral update.

The day prior to the Midwinter Meeting, the Board had a very effective meeting regarding several issues related to the association’s structure. Board liaisons gave a brief update of the ideas that came out of this session at the section executive committee meetings.

The Board is interested in considering possible changes to ACRL’s Annual Conference program funding and structure. Member research has emphasized the high priority that members give to professional development opportunities, yet there is always feedback from members about the redundancy of the content of Annual Conference programs, of inconsistent quality, and about the length of the programs. The Board discussed funding for annual conference programming, but did not make recommendations, preferring a mechanism to address quality and structure first.

The Board would like to bring about improvements in the content and delivery quality of the programs offered by ACRL units, while keeping in mind the level of resources available. It was again emphasized that ACRL sections and committees are not required to offer Annual Conference programs, as the Board worries that some units offer programs in response to this myth, rather than because they see an actual need for a program in their topical area.

The Board is reconstituting the Board’s Structure Working Group with the addition of some non-Board representation to look at this issue. The specific charge and timeline for this group’s work are:

**Charge:**

- Create a more structured association-wide vetting process with the goals of improving quality content/quality of delivery, alignment with the strategic plan, topic timeliness, balance in equity issues across units, addressing scheduling limits, and addressing mechanisms for repurposing of content generated.
- Examine opportunities to provide alternative and less formal professional development venues at ALA annual conferences.

**Timeline:**

A report needs to be completed by April 5, 2006, to meet the agenda deadline for the Spring Executive Committee Meeting and for a full Board conference call during that meeting. Mary Jane Petrowski will be working with the Task Force on this assignment.

**Implementation:**

Whatever recommendations the Board approved, this will impact 2008 ALA annual conference.

The Professional Development Coordinating Committee was informed of this work during its meeting at this conference.

The Board feels that in strategic planning, it is important to look at all elements of structure, and the Board realizes it also needs to look at its own structure, asking if it is nominated and comprised in way that best supports the strategic plan. As an example of change in this area, the Nominations Committee was reshaped at the 2005 Annual Conference to become the Leadership Recruitment and Nomination Committee. The Board has reviewed options, and confirmed its commitment to a representative board structure. It has added to the charge of an existing Board working group, asking that it look at ways to ensure that there is openness, consistency and inclusiveness in Board structure. One method of increasing openness could be the introduction of Board Advisory groups. New charges for the working group include:

- Consider the benefits of forming advisory boards (higher education, new leaders, and technology) to inform the Board.
- Consider the representational structure of the Leadership Recruitment and Nomination (LRN) committee.
- Continue work on revising the nominating and Board recruiting process for candidate selection and recruitment, reviewing the nomination process for directors at large, including the representational structure of nominations and including the balance of nominations from all sections and committees.
- Consider ways to create board interns as a way to introduce emerging leaders to the work of the Board.
- Assume that the size of the board should remain generally the same.

**28.2 Approaches to Assessment – Interim Report from the Board Working Group on Assessment (Document 20.0)**

The Board's Assessment Working Group, chaired by Nancy Allen, with members Dorothy Washington and Regina McBride, presented a written interim report of their activities and recommendations to date. Highlights included:

- There is agreement that ACRL should have a process in place for ongoing assessment to evaluate how successful the association is in supporting the strategic plan and how the activities are making a difference within both the association and the profession. This working group would not be responsible for conducting the assessment, only for setting up and defining the process by which

assessment would take place. Because this could impact the Research Committee's work, McBride has been added as a new member to the Research Committee to ensure good communication between the two groups.

- It has been suggested that the area of the strategic plan to be assessed each year be determined by the goal area selected as a focus by each president. The impact of specific spin-offs resulting from each president's focus, such as Alire's Grassroots Library Advocacy Workshop and Toolkit, could be assessed.
- The working group had three additional suggestions which they asked for the Board's feedback on:
  1. That the association should always have some assessment of the Sustainability Strategic Area, because it is so critical to the health of the association.
  2. That instead of just assessing the strategic objective that a president chooses to focus on within a goal area, the area assessed be broadened to include all objectives in that goal area.
  3. That a time be set up on the Board's annual calendar where the assessment priorities would be set for the following year.
- It is time consuming, costly, and difficult to conduct ongoing assessment, so ACRL will have to focus its efforts on a few things at a time, but it is important to help the association keep its focus on what it wants to accomplish and who the audience for its activities is.
- The examples of assessment design included in the document are short-term snapshots of specific programs, not the kind of long-term assessment that could tell us the impact of our advocacy efforts. We would have to either choose to measure the impact of all the different advocacy programs over time or we would need a large-scale assessment of change in advocacy behavior on the part of members.
- The working group would like to start the assessment process this year with a pilot project that it is continuing to develop. They suggested starting with the Grassroots Library Advocacy Workshop at this year's Annual Conference and the ULS advocacy workshop being developed for the 2007 National Conference, which will then be rolled out to Chapters. They also pointed out that there was \$10,000 for assessment budgeted in FY2006.

A Board member pointed out that we don't want to just assess the things that are easy to measure, so some criteria are needed to choose what to focus on. It was also suggested that the Board might want to dedicate 45 minutes at one of its meetings each year to determining the assessment focus for the next year. Some historical background was offered regarding ACRL's efforts toward ongoing assessment in the past. In the 1990's, the Board set performance indicators each year, such as "increase the number of attendees who attend professional development events and rate the event positively." The Board stopped this practice when the new strategic plan was adopted in 2004, so that it could develop assessment practices tied to the plan.

The working group noted that assessment is typically a job that staff undertakes, but that ACRL's staff already carries a very full workload. It would require a good deal of expertise to manage particular types of assessment, with the skill to build out databases to record and analyze the results. A great deal of coordination would also be required to look at areas on an association-wide basis. In the longer-term, it might be worthwhile to look at setting up a service center for ALA-wide assessment work. Assessment will also require volunteer input and work. At this point, a new standing committee is envisioned, as the Research Committee has already had its workload increased significantly in the last year. The new committee would look at different assessment methodologies for different programs. A well thought out calendar will be essential to ensure pragmatic results.

Assessment will need to be coordinated with all the surveys that ACRL conducts, such as the membership survey and the statistics survey. The number of "asks" must be kept down to prevent

survey fatigue, and the use of the information collected must be maximized. Someone would need to manage implementation for all survey work, possibly a staff person.

Hearing general support from the Board for this in concept, Davis stated that she would add money for an assessment consultant or an additional staff person to the preliminary FY2007 budget.

### **29.0 ALA Presidential Candidate**

As only one of the candidates for ALA Vice-President/President-Elect had contacted ACRL about speaking to the Board, Alire noted that it is not ACRL's responsibility to get candidates on the agenda. Although in recent years both candidates have usually spoken, it is still the candidate's responsibility to seek us out if they are interested in appearing.

Loriene Roy, candidate for ALA Vice-President/President-Elect, gave a brief professional history of her work in and out of ALA. She has served as the chair of the Committee on Education and worked with ALISE. Roy teaches in the areas of reference and information literacy, typically to public librarianship classes. She does a lot of joint work with students and often has interests that cross over with ACRL's Instruction Section. She works a lot with tribal colleges and with the Pathfinder program. Roy supports LIS education through practice and requires her students to get some practical experience before graduation through the use of a capstone project. She also just finished a report on the first five years of ALA's Spectrum Scholar program, which will be on the ALA Office for Diversity Web site.

### **30.0 Chapters Council Fund Allocations**

#### **30.1 Additional Flexibility in Reimbursable Items (Document 21.1)**

*Proposal:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve a policy allowing ACRL Chapters more flexibility in items that can be reimbursed. Examples include travel expenses, scholarships to attend local conferences, and computing (server, software).

*Discussion:* ACRL currently allows \$1 per ACRL member living in a Chapter's region, limited to reimbursement for supplies, printing, and postage. With the advent of email, Chapters now do little mailing and don't find this policy useful. Under the current policy, requests for reimbursement are so rare that the full amount allowed has not been included in the budget in recent years. Assuming that this more flexible policy increases the likelihood that Chapters will request reimbursement, another \$8,000 to \$10,000 would have to be added to future budgets. Board members wondered whether Chapters hoped to fund travel that would not be consistent with other ACRL and ALA practices, such as to reimburse librarian speakers for presenting at conferences. If this was allowed, there was concern over the use of member dues to support Chapter conferences that attract a lot of non-members and that providing funding for speakers at these regional conferences could give them an edge over the programs presented at ACRL National Conferences. It was also questionable whether ALA policy would allow the use of funds to purchase computer hardware and software.

Given the concerns about conflicts with existing policies, the Board considered establishing a task force or referring the item back to Chapters Council for a more specific proposal, but decided that they would support increased flexibility as long as it was in line with other ACRL policies. The existing policy most similar to this request was the Section Basic Services Funding policy, chapter 4.4.2 in the *ACRL Guide to Policies and Procedures*.

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve a policy allowing ACRL Chapters to spend budgeted resources in ways that are consistent with the basic services guideline, 4.4.2 in the *ACRL Guide to Policies and Procedures* reading:

Sections may spend Basic Services funds on any items or activities that support the achievement of the ACRL strategic goals with the following two exceptions: 1) Basic services funds may not be used for payment of honoraria or travel to support librarians' presentations at ALA, ACRL, or ACRL chapter conferences and 2) Basic services funds may not be used to purchase goods or services prohibited by ALA and ACRL policy. Sections may use Basic Services funds to support their program(s) at the Annual Conference.

*Discussion:* It was suggested that Chapters may need further education about other funding opportunities that are available to them, such as the action plan funding that Chapters Council can apply for to support activities intended to increase ACRL membership or the Friends Fund for scholarships that Chapters might propose funding. There is also an existing policy that would reimburse Chapters \$10 per new ACRL member for innovative efforts to bring in new members to the national ACRL, but this funding has never been requested.

Carl Bengston, an active member of a large Chapter who was present at the Board meeting offered that the existing policy probably wasn't an issue for larger Chapters, as they have a broader membership and revenue base to draw on, but that smaller Chapters could benefit greatly from a more flexible policy. A Board member also noted that some of the tension bringing this issue to the foreground at this time was that there is an impression that the existing Chapter funding policy is enforced more consistently than it used to be.

The Board decided to approve the motion on the table to give Chapters some increased flexibility, but using the specific language relevant to Chapters in the Basic Services Funding policy, rather than just referring directly to it. The Board also wanted to communicate that if the Chapters Council has additional, more specific proposals for allowed expenses in mind, they are invited to bring those detailed proposals to the Board at a future meeting for consideration.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors approved a policy allowing ACRL Chapters to spend budgeted resources on any items or activities that support the achievement of the ACRL strategic goals with the following 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.

### **30.2 Change Chapter Funding to Allocation (Document 21.2)**

*Proposal:* Chapters Council requests that the Board investigates the possibility of making the funds an allocation to each Chapter instead (including policy and legal issues).

*Discussion:* Due to concerns about the legal and tax implications of such a change, the Board did not act on the Chapters Council proposal to change the method of payment for allowed expenses from the current policy requiring original receipts for reimbursement to one of a lump allocation of the maximum allowed amount for each chapter each year. Staff has been instructed to investigate these implications and bring that information to the ACRL Executive Committee at its spring 2006 meeting for further consideration.

### **31.0 Council of Liaisons Update (Document 22.0)**

Julie Todaro, Chair of the ACRL Council of Liaisons, distributed a mockup of the Council's Web pages that they have been developing and noted that the conflict of interest statement page should be removed, as she had mistakenly believed that it had previously been approved by the Board when in fact it had been referred to the ACRL Committee on Ethics for further review. She then offered a brief oral update. Highlights included:

Approved June 24, 2006

- The Council had been working on improvements for the application forms and the process for adding liaison relationships based on the policies approved by the Board in 2005.
- Four people have been approached to serve as liaisons. Even with the addition of these liaisons, the project would still remain within the financial limits the Board approved several years earlier and which have been included in the budget.
- Liaison applications are due February 15 and the Council expects to bring recommendations forward to the ACRL Executive Committee at its spring meeting.
- Advocacy Coordinating Committee Chair Helen Spalding will be appointing a new chair for the Council this year. Todaro doesn't think that the chair necessarily has to be a liaison, but they must be experienced with ACRL as a whole.
- Todaro is planning a short article on the Council of Liaisons to appear in *College and Research Libraries News* this spring.
- Todaro has asked the Council to review their activities reports within the context and rubric of the strategic plan. Future reports will be prepared in the same manner.
- Todaro enjoyed the new Advocacy Coordinating Committee meeting structure. She felt very prepared and found it to be the most productive the Council of Liaisons has ever been in a short amount of time.

### **32.0 Update on Michael Gorman Summit**

Alire had asked 4 people to represent ACRL at ALA President Michael Gorman's Forum on Education for Librarianship, which was held earlier in the conference. In addition to ACRL Board members Bede Mitchell and Lori Goetsch, ACRL members Theresa Byrd and Mark Winston also attended. Mitchell offered a brief overview of the summit. Highlights included:

- Prior to the forum a Web site made available three papers that addressed the topic area for participants to read in advance. The papers included "Patterns, Perceptions and Predictions: Librarianship in the Early 21<sup>st</sup> Century," by Fiona Black, attempting to define what librarianship is today; "Curricula for Librarianship," by John Budd; and "Accreditation Standards," by Gorman, which describes ALA's role in library education.
- Each of the papers was assigned a presenter, including ALA Past-President Carol Brey-Casiano discussing Black's paper and Tom Leonhardt discussing Gorman's. Each of these was followed by brief presentations by 3 people selected to react to that topic, then an open mic question and answer session with the audience.
- A final session had each table of 8 people discussing any and all topics related to the previously discussed topics, with notes taken to be forwarded to Gorman. These notes will be available on Gorman's president's page on the ALA Web site.
- The forum could ultimately have an effect on the ALA Committee on Accreditation, the one area of library education that ALA has direct impact on. It also seems possible that the forum could lead to a future ALISE discussion.
- There were approximately 450 attendees, close to half of which were library educators.
- Mitchell and Goetsch found the roundtable discussions especially useful. The open mic sessions often lacked focus and served in some ways to reinforce the divide between educators and practitioners. It would have been interesting to see how a technique like appreciative inquiry could have helped the process.
- One of the more interesting discussions to come out of the day regarded the growth of distance learning in library education. This seemed like a concrete issue that could result in a more focused dialogue at a later date.
- Overall, it was a little difficult to see what the outcomes of the forum were supposed to be. The papers were particularly interesting, however, and are recommended for those with the time and interest.

A Board member suggested that Gorman include a listing of any future activities that come out of the forum's discussions to keep everyone informed.

**33.0 New Business**

Board member Nancy Allen shared some information about the ALA Board's discussion on mass digitization and rights that she attended, facilitated by the ALA Office for Information Technology Policy (OITP). There was a report from Sherrie Schmidt, Chair of the ALA OITP Committee, and Rick Weingarten, Director of OITP, on a proposed ALA policy for digitization, being developed by a task force that includes ACRL member Jim Neal. Other academics on the task force include Nancy Davenport and Schmidt. Key to the discussion was a paper written by attorney Jonathan Band for OITP, "The Google Library Project." Allen called this paper the clearest, most comprehensive document about the legal issues surrounding the Google book project that she has seen and highly recommended it to the Board. Davis will send the paper to the Board following conference and it is also available on the Web site.

ALA has not been particularly well informed on digitization issues, but is working with other stakeholders to consider all of the issues involved, such as the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), the Digital Library Federation (DLF), the American Association of Museums (AAM), the Society of American Archivists (SAA), and the American Association of State and Local Historical Societies (AASLHS). OITP plans to gather a group of stakeholders in Chicago this spring to discuss the issues further and look at some policies that the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) manages. Work on the development of the summit's agenda continued at this conference and funding for the summit has been budgeted. There is a sense that there needs to be a considerable education process about this issue through all areas and divisions of ALA, and to tie all of them together with a consistent policy rubric.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.