



**Association of College and Research Libraries**  
**Board of Directors Meeting I**  
Midwinter Meeting  
Saturday, January 20, 2007  
2:00 – 5:30 p.m.  
Westin Seattle Hotel – Whidbey Room  
Seattle

## **Midwinter Board I Meeting Minutes**

### **Attendees:**

*Board Members:* Pam Snelson, Julie Todaro, Camila Alire, Susan Kroll, Mary Ellen Davis, Nancy Allen, Janis Bandelin, Mary Carr, Lori Goetsch, Lynne King, Debbie Malone, Dorothy Washington, and Karen Williams.

*Absent:* Tyrone Cannon.

*Visitors:* Leslie Bjorncrantz, Trevor Dawes, Jennifer Dorner, Dave Dowell, Elizabeth Dupuis, Rod Hersberger, Lee Hisle, Albie Johnson, Terri Kirk, Michael LaCroix, Erika Linke, Regina McBride, Tamara Miller, Mary Reichel, and Scott Walter.

*Staff:* David Connolly, Margot Sutton Conahan, Kathryn Deiss, Kara Malenfant, Dawn Mueller, Tory Ondrla, Stephanie Orphan, Mary Jane Petrowski, and Irving Rockwood.

### **1.0 Call to Order**

President Pamela Snelson called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

### **2.0 Opening Remarks**

Snelson welcomed everyone and encouraged the Board to be mindful of good meeting practices.

### **3.0 Adoption of the Agenda**

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

### **4.0 Open Microphone**

**Rod Hersberger**, candidate for ALA Treasurer and Dean of the University Library at California State University at Bakersfield, gave a brief campaign pitch and biography of himself.

**Mary Reichel**, Chair of the 2007 ACRL National Conference in Baltimore and University Librarian at Appalachian State University, gave a brief update of conference developments. Highlights included:

- There had been more than 1,100 advance registrations to date, about 250 more than for the 2005 conference in Minneapolis.
- Exhibit space was nearly completely sold out.
- The Colleagues Committee had pledges for \$217,000 in donations so far, exceeding the \$185,000 goal. The 2005 conference raised just over \$225,000 in total donations. The Executive Committee was deeply appreciative of the generosity of the vendors and libraries that had donated.
- ACRL should be very proud of the 80 scholarships that will be awarded for the conference, totaling \$45,000.
- Virtual Conference registration will open when the early bird registration for the face-to-face conference closes.
- Reichel thanked ACRL Manager of Professional Development Margot Sutton Conahan and Meeting and Special Events Planner Tory Ondrla, as well as every member of the conference subcommittees for their hard work.

In response to questions from Board members, it was also stated that the registration cost for the Virtual Conference would be \$195 for ACRL members, as opposed to \$325 for early bird registration for the National Conference itself. Like previous conferences, a daily registration rate would also be available at this year's conference.

At this Midwinter Meeting, both Sections Council and the Professional Development Coordinating Committee have discussed the idea of using the many contributed papers that were not accepted for presentation at the ACRL National Conference to develop a pool for "second tier" presentations at the Annual Conference. It was made clear that it would not be realistic for the National Conference's Contributed Papers Subcommittee to decide on such a pool at the same time that it selects those for acceptance to the National Conference and that a process for this would have to be carefully considered. The idea generated some interest as a possible source for quality ALA conference programming and as a way for ACRL members to have another, slightly less prestigious opportunity to present papers. No decisions or next steps were set at this time.

**David Dowell**, an ACRL representative to ALA's Library Support Staff Certification Project Task Force and Director of the Library and Learning Resources at Cuesta College, reported to the Board on the task force's progress. The task force met for the first time the previous morning and will meet again in March 2007. At the Annual Conference, they might need to ask the ACRL Board for additional support for a specific certification proposal. The project would need the Board's endorsement for ACRL's involvement to continue. Dowell also briefly reviewed the task force's purpose and reported that an IMLS grant proposal had been submitted to help finance the assessment piece of the plan.

**W. Lee Hisle**, Chair of ACRL's Government Relations Committee and Vice President for Information Services & Librarian of the College at Connecticut College, reported that the Legislative Advocate (LA) position approved by the Board as part of the recommendations of the Task Force on National Advocacy, which Hisle had also chaired, has been announced with a call for volunteers. The Board acted on these recommendations at the 2005 Midwinter Meeting.

Hisle thanked ACRL Scholarly Communication/Government Relations Specialist Kara Malenfant for all of her staff support and for getting the Government Relations Committee to this point. Hisle emphasized his belief that this advocacy plan needed to be a Board and presidential priority to be effective. The committee can work through procedures, but without Board support they won't find people who really want to do the work, not just get another title to add to their résumé.

Snelson encouraged Board members to commit to return to their home states and identify people who would be good at this and would be willing to do it and to prompt them to apply.

Hisle took several questions from Board members, bringing up the following points:

- Information about the LA position was currently up on the Web site, the application would be up soon.
- A recruitment push was planned for this spring. Hisle hoped to kick off the program with at least 20 people signed up and ready to show that the program was viable. Hisle think that it would be great to have 150 LA's someday, but believes 20 is a realistic and workable number to start.
- Ideally, LA's would attend ALA's National Library Legislative Day in Washington, D.C. each spring, but it would not be a requirement. They should, however, definitely be familiar with their home district legislators and their staff.

**Regina McBride**, Chair of ACRL's Assessment Subcommittee of the Research Committee and Associate Dean at Southern Illinois University, asked the Board to clarify the scope of the subcommittee's first assessment assignment. McBride summed up assessment as measuring "what was before," "what you did," and "what happened." The Board stated that one piece is looking at each year's incoming vice president's identification of a high-priority section of the strategic plan and following any activities that spring up around that area. The Board then also looks at the strategic plan once a year and decides whether there are any other specific areas that

should be identified for assessment. As this is the first meeting held since the assessment plan was approved at the 2006 Annual Conference, the Board hasn't had such a discussion yet. It is currently scheduled for discussion at Board II and will be included on the Board II agenda for every Midwinter Meeting and Annual Conference.

McBride also asked for clarification regarding the PowerPoint presentation that the Board asked the subcommittee to prepare about the basics of assessment. Snelson stated that this was planned for the ACRL Leadership Council at this summer's Annual Conference. It should comprise a 15-minute introduction to outcomes based assessment to help leaders understand how to frame the assessment piece of their strategic action plan proposals.

## **Strategic Area: The Association**

### **5.0 Reports**

#### **5.1 President's Report (Document 1.1)**

Snelson referred the Board to her written report for an update of her activities. She added that the Board had a successful strategic planning day on the Thursday preceding the Midwinter Meeting, the results of which were shared with the membership at the ACRL Leadership Council on Friday.

#### **5.2 Vice-President's Report (Document 1.2)**

Vice-President/President-Elect Julie Todaro referred the Board to her written report for an update of her activities. She also reported to the Board that ALA's Emerging Leaders '07 initiative was more time-consuming than anticipated, due in part to the large number of emerging leaders assigned to work on the projects that ACRL proposed. Todaro added that she planned to tie work on her presidential focus area into ACRL's effective practices.

#### **5.3 Councilor's Report**

Division Councilor Tyrone Cannon was unable to make it to the Midwinter Meeting. A brief Board discussion clarified that no proxy is allowed at ALA Council sessions if the division councilor isn't able to come to conference.

#### **5.4 Executive Director's Report (Document 1.3)**

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

- ACRL held another Immersion program and the first of the newly developed track 3 Immersion program – The Intentional Teacher.
- ACRL's *2005 Academic Trends and Statistics* was published.
- CHOICE launched *Resources for College Libraries* and upgraded CHOICE's online offering to *ChoiceReviews.online 2 (CRO2)*.
- ACRL continued its outreach and advocacy efforts. Davis met with staff at both the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and Educause fall meetings to continue exploring possible collaborations. As a result of one of the conversations at Educause, Diana Oblinger, vice-president for Educause's Learning Initiative invited ACRL to present a poster session about ACRL's information literacy efforts at the ELI annual meeting in January. ACRL staff put together a poster on information literacy that David Free, an ACRL member and Librarian at Georgia Perimeter College, is presenting at the ELI meeting, since any of the ACRL members who might usually do so were at the Midwinter Meeting. ACRL worked with the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU), which is continuing to have an ACRL member teach at their workshop. It's heartening to see a librarian integrated into their work.
- ACRL's Fall Virtual Institute was successful. Evaluations and budget performance were both good.
- *JobLIST*, the online career center produced by ACRL and *American Libraries*, finally launched. At this Midwinter Meeting *JobLIST* was also powering the placement center in the first test of the communication tool part of it.

- ACRL held its invitational technology summit in November. Snelson and Davis would be hosting a program with an overview of it on Monday. The report is nearly finished, with participants still signing off on it.
- *C&RL News* Editor and ACRL Web Developer Stephanie Orphan's position will be split, with Orphan focusing on the Web aspects. Web CE has become a professional development priority for ACRL's members and ACRL's fastest growing revenue stream. The new *C&RL News* Editor position will include marketing and communication responsibilities for ACRL, as well.

## **6.0 Fall Executive Committee Meeting Draft Minutes (Document 2.0)**

There was no discussion of the draft minutes.

## **7.0 Consent Agenda**

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

The following items are placed on the consent agenda.

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

#### **7.1 Approval of Annual Conference Meeting Minutes (Document 3.1)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the 2006 Annual Conference Board Meeting minutes.

#### **7.2 Dissolution of ACRL Electronic Text Centers Discussion Group (Document 3.2)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the dissolution of the ACRL Electronic Text Centers Discussion Group.

#### **7.3 Policy Establishing Criteria for Section Dissolution Due to Inactivity (Document 3.3)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the following policy for defining section inactivity:

Prior to any action to dissolve a section of ACRL, association staff and board section liaisons are required to make efforts to offer supportive intervention with struggling sections. A sufficient amount of time as determined by the staff, board, and section representatives should be given to address concerns. Any formal recommendation to dissolve a section must meet one of the following three criteria:

- Failure of elected officers to meet, virtually or face-to-face, for two consecutive years as documented by ACRL staff. The Board would then take action to dissolve the section based on evidence of failure to meet.
- Section is no longer relevant or meeting its purpose as outlined in the section bylaws and determined by a 2/3 majority vote of members voting on a resolution to dissolve the section as part of the annual ballot process. This resolution can be put on the ballot by the section's executive committee or by petition of 25 section members. The dissolution would be decided by the ballot in a regular election and no Board action would be required.
- Section takes a vote to dissolve at an annual membership meeting and it is passed by a majority vote of members present and voting. Written notice of the proposed vote on dissolution would be provided to members at least one month before consideration. The dissolution would be decided by the vote at the membership meeting and no Board action would be required.

**Strategic Area: The Profession**

**7.4 Confirmation of Email Vote, IFLA Nominations – Rare and Precious Books and Manuscripts Standing Committee (Document 3.4, plus confidential supporting document 3.4 Backup)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors confirm its email vote of August 14 – August 25, 2006, approving Richard Clement as nominee to represent ALA on IFLA's Rare and Precious Books and Manuscripts standing committee based on the recommendation of the ACRL International Relations Committee.

**7.5 Confirmation of Email Vote, IFLA Nominations – Social Science Librarians Standing Committee (Document 3.5, plus confidential supporting document 3.5 Backup)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors confirm its email vote of August 14 – August 25, 2006, approving Elizabeth Cooper as nominee to represent ALA on IFLA's Social Science Librarians standing committee based on the recommendation of the ACRL International Relations Committee.

**7.6 RBMS 2009 Preconference Site Selection (Document 3.6)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve a proposal establishing the University of Virginia as the host and site of the 50th annual RBMS pre-conference, to be held July 6-9, 2009.

*Discussion:* At the request of a Board member, agenda item 7.3 was removed from the consent agenda for further discussion.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors approved the consent agenda as amended.

**7.3 Policy Establishing Criteria for Section Dissolution Due to Inactivity (Document 3.3)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the following policy for defining section inactivity:

Prior to any action to dissolve a section of ACRL, association staff and board section liaisons are required to make efforts to offer supportive intervention with struggling sections. A sufficient amount of time as determined by the staff, board, and section representatives should be given to address concerns. Any formal recommendation to dissolve a section must meet one of the following three criteria:

- Failure of elected officers to meet, virtually or face-to-face, for two consecutive years as documented by ACRL staff. The Board would then take action to dissolve the section based on evidence of failure to meet.
- Section is no longer relevant or meeting its purpose as outlined in the section bylaws and determined by a 2/3 majority vote of members voting on a resolution to dissolve the section as part of the annual ballot process. This resolution can be put on the ballot by the section's executive committee or by petition of 25 section members. The dissolution would be decided by the ballot in a regular election and no Board action would be required.
- Section takes a vote to dissolve at an annual membership meeting and it is passed by a majority vote of members present and voting. Written notice of the proposed vote on dissolution would be provided to members at least one month before consideration. The dissolution would be decided by the vote at the membership meeting and no Board action would be required.

*Discussion:* A Board member related a discussion a small group at Leadership Council had the previous day about the third proposed criterion. Members worried that some subfaction of a Section could plan to show up at the Section's annual membership meeting and hijack the vote in favor of dissolution. It was pointed out that one month's written notice of the intent to hold a vote on dissolution was required, and theoretically the Board has good enough liaisons to each Section to be aware of such plans and the proposed policy would require an attempt at intervention by staff and the Board liaison in any case.

After further discussion, it was decided that the third criterion should be removed and the second revised to address concerns that the Board should have the final responsibility for oversight of such a significant action.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors approved the following policy for defining section inactivity, as revised above:

Prior to any action to dissolve a section of ACRL, association staff and board section liaisons are required to make efforts to offer supportive intervention with struggling sections. A sufficient amount of time as determined by the staff, board, and section representatives should be given to address concerns. Any board action to dissolve a section must meet one of the following criteria. In its request to the board for dissolution, a section can demonstrate its inactivity in one of the following ways:

- Failure of elected officers to meet, virtually or face-to-face, for two consecutive years as documented by ACRL staff. The Board would then take action to dissolve the section based on evidence of failure to meet.
- Section is no longer relevant or meeting its purpose as outlined in the section bylaws and determined by a 2/3 majority vote of members voting on a recommendation to dissolve the section as part of the annual ballot process. This recommendation can be put on the ballot by the section's executive committee or by petition of 25 section members. The recommendation for dissolution would be voted on and used as indication of inactivity for the section's request for dissolution to the board.

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

#### **8.0 First International Public Knowledge Project Conference Support (Document 4.0)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve \$1,000 to support a Public Knowledge Project Conference session, drawn from the Scholarly Communication program budget.

*Discussion:* It was pointed out that the Scholarly Communication program already has this money in its budget, but wanted the Board's approval for the use of ACRL's name. The Board was curious about whether the Canadian Library Association (CLA) would also be offering their support to the conference. Several people in attendance thought that it would.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors approved \$1,000 to support a Public Knowledge Project Conference session, drawn from the Scholarly Communication program budget.

#### **9.0 CONZUL Permission to Adapt Info Lit Best Practices Guideline (Document 5.0)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors support the application of Council of New Zealand University Librarians (CONZUL) to adapt the ACRL statement, *Characteristics of Programs of Information Literacy that Illustrate Best Practices: A Guideline*, for New Zealand universities.

*Discussion:* It was pointed out that ACRL has granted this sort of permission to other groups in the past and was also held up as a great example of the spread and impact of ACRL's standards.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors approved CONZUL's request to adapt the ACRL statement, *Characteristics of Programs of Information Literacy that Illustrate Best Practices: A Guideline*, for New Zealand universities.

#### **10.0 Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations Membership (Document 6.0)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve organizational membership for ACRL in the Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations (NDLTD).

*Discussion:* Davis was recently in Pittsburgh and was approached by members of NDLTD, who were interested in working with ACRL. She attended an NDLTD Board meeting as a guest and was asked if ACRL would like to become a member of NDLTD. It was pointed out that ARL is already a member. NDLTD is trying to strengthen its organization and, since ACRL is interested in open access and digitization, it seems a good fit.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors approved ACRL's organizational membership in NDLTD.

### **11.0 ALA President's "Toward A National Library Agenda" Summit (Document 15.0)**

ALA President Leslie Burger recently circulated a discussion draft of "Toward a National Agenda for Libraries," a document intended to bring the disparate needs of the many different stakeholders for all types of libraries together in a broadly stated National Library Agenda that can be translated into action at the local, state and federal levels. This draft was developed following a summit held in Washington, D.C. in late 2006 to discuss the need for an Agenda and develop specific recommendations for consideration by the library community. Burger is now asking ALA units as well as the broader library community to review this draft document and provide feedback.

The Board discussed the draft and raised the following main points:

#### General points related to academic libraries

- ACRL members would not find this document useful to have in hand when advocating for academic and research libraries. This draft might serve its purpose if it were a national agenda for *public* libraries, but research and scholarship must be added if academic and research libraries are to be included. Research is mentioned only in the context of children's libraries, and scholarship is not present at all.
- Although there are many ways that academic and research libraries provide for the public, their work is not reflected in the agenda. There seems to be little recognition here that academic and research libraries serve the public at all, particularly public university libraries, or that public libraries perform research and scholarship functions, as well.
- The same can be said of the noticeable lack of mention of the teaching that goes on in all types of libraries. Given the "65%" rule controversy generated by the No Child Left Behind Act definitions, recognition of librarians as educators and libraries as educational institutions must be a critical piece of any agenda. Every year we advocate for libraries to be classified as educational environments to open up federal and state revenue streams. We must continue to identify and include ourselves in this category even if others don't.

#### Some specific suggestions

- The third bullet point from the bottom under "The American Public Deserves:" on page 4, reading, "Libraries that value reading and create and sustain collections that encourage users to read for pleasure, information or enlightenment" is extremely limiting, particularly given the work done in academic libraries.
- The description of college and university libraries as "... a hive for intellectual activity ..." on page 5 was not well-liked, although with rephrasing this might be an ideal place to include the concept of the library as a place for teaching or scholarly activity.
- Requests for funding programs like the proposed "nationwide virtual library" on page 5 hurt the credibility of libraries when there are already scores of virtual libraries with national access operating.

#### Suggestions for additional content

- There is no mention of the changing demographics in the U.S.
- The modern concept of libraries providing a personalized service, that everyone finds something different in the library that is of value to him or her, is absent.
- The document needs a crisper introduction. References to a "National Library Agenda" and "our nation's libraries" can lead people, especially young legislative aides, to think that the focus is on libraries like the Library of Congress or other libraries of a national scale.

- The audience for the agenda is unclear, making it difficult to read critically. While it is clear that it's intended for use at National Library Legislative Day, the usefulness of it beyond that seems doubtful. There were also concerns about its utility as a handout for Legislative Day, as legislators want to hear personal, specific stories about what goes on in an individual's own district more than national agendas. Additionally, legislative offices are reputed to pay attention only to handouts that come on a single sheet with easily read main points in a "background"/"need" approach rather than rhetoric. Without including specific "new money for" or "designate new revenues for" requests, legislators will find it easy to tell us that they support our initiatives without actually taking any helpful action.

The Board was generally supportive of the plan to formulate an agenda that can be clearly communicated and translated into action, and looked forward to seeing a revised document that is more explicitly inclusive of the academic community. Board members were asked to forward any other thoughts they might have about the draft to Snelson, who would submit ACRL's feedback in February. Board members asked that the final feedback also be shared with them.

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

#### **12.0 S.O.S. for Information Literacy Project Endorsement (Document 7.0)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors endorse, and allow ACRL Instruction Section to endorse, the S.O.S. for Information Literacy project to the extent outlined in the document, as recommended by the IS Executive Committee.

*Discussion:* Scott Walter, 2007 candidate for ACRL Vice-President/President-Elect, was in attendance and familiar with the project and answered a few questions about how other organizations fit into this for the Board, clarifying that this online collection of lesson plans and ideas has no single portal, comparing it to when Wisconsin and Ohio started their own repository. The project grew out of a K-12 focus initially, a "gateway to educational materials" idea. It creates a portal, but also has a publication, which is different than other projects.

A Board member commented that there already exists a plethora of resources like this, but that's okay. Like with efforts to educate about scholarly communication and affect the environment, with information literacy it makes sense to try many different avenues until one proves the best model. This project looks like it's very thorough. It was suggested that a sunset or review period be added to the motion; since this is an ongoing project it should be reviewed in the future to ensure that it remains something ACRL wants to associate its name with. Jennifer Dorner, Chair of IS, joined the meeting at this point and agreed that the Board's suggestion for a review process made sense. She had a couple of IS committees in mind to which this responsibility could be added.

The Board also clarified with Jennifer that IS was not suggesting that the project get free advertising in ACRL publications, but hoped that a short article about the project could be included in the IS newsletter or *C&RL News*. With that clarification, the Board struck the request that "ACRL or IS assist in promoting S.O.S. in ACRL 2007 Conference publications" from the list of items the project requested as part of the endorsement.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors endorsed, and allowed the ACRL Instruction Section to endorse, the S.O.S. for Information Literacy Project to the extent outlined below:

1. Inclusion of ACRL logo on the S.O.S. home page (with link to [www.ala.org/acrl](http://www.ala.org/acrl)).
2. Inclusion of ACRL/IS logo on S.O.S. home page (with link to <http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/aboutacrl/acrlsections/instruction/homepage.htm>)
3. Link to ACRL Information Literacy page (<http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlissues/acrlinfolit/informationliteracy.htm>) from the S.O.S. "Resources" page.

4. New section of Educators' Spotlight Digest (online magazine) devoted to ACRL information literacy initiatives, publications, etc. (see <http://www.sosspotlight.org> for recent issue).
5. Launch new S.O.S. site (including materials for higher education) at ACRL Conference 2007.
6. Include ACRL and/or ACRL/IS logos on all print publications, presentations, etc.
7. ACRL/IS include a link to S.O.S. from appropriate web pages.

Further, the IS Executive Committee will perform a biennial review of the continued viability of the project and, after each review, provide the ACRL Board of Directors with a recommendation to either continue or withdraw the endorsement.

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

#### **13.0 Budget and Finance Committee**

##### **13.1 ACRL FY06 Financial Annual Report (Document 8.1)**

There was no discussion of this item.

##### **13.2 FY07 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report (Documents 8.2 & 8.2a)**

Susan Kroll, Chair of the ACRL Budget and Finance Committee, highlighted a few items from the FY07 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report, noting that CHOICE was off to a promising start with its new product launches for the year, particularly the advance sales of *Resources for College Libraries*. Membership dues and Web CE revenue has also been strong for ACRL so far this year.

##### **13.3 FY08 Budget Assumptions Revised (Document 8.3)**

Davis stated that the only item in the budget assumptions that had not been included in the preliminary FY2008 budget at this point was the proposal for an assessment institute to be held in the spring of 2008, as it was not clear that the content providers would be available.

#### **14.0 Board Working Group Updates**

##### **14.1 Leadership Recruitment and Nomination and Board Composition Revisions (Document 9.0)**

Board members spent a few minutes relating feedback they had heard about the proposed changes to the Board composition and nomination process at their tables during the discussion part of Leadership Council the day before or otherwise during the conference. There were a broad variety of reactions. Highlights of the comments included:

- Type-of-activity sections tended to like the idea, while type-of-library sections did not.
- Some had a sense of empowerment being taken away, suggesting that the Board might as well just appoint its own members outright.
- One group commented that representational leadership was problematic and a move toward a knowledge-based selection process was a good and obvious one.
- Some thought hiring staff or consultants to fill needed knowledge bases makes more sense than adding them to the Board.
- This might be a way to bring newer librarians to the Board.
- Care needs to be taken to ensure that ARL librarians who work at institutions large enough that they get to specialize do not dominate the Board. This process may not yield the desired result.
- Subcommittees of the Board can always be appointed to bring needed knowledge bases to the Board.
- The larger nominating committee might yield greater diversity.

- There is some perception that the existing process doesn't work so well, so there is nothing to lose by trying something new. The Board clearly put a great deal of thought into the process, so perhaps it might work well.
- A shorter term for Board members would yield more flexibility in keeping the right mix of knowledge bases on the Board as needs change.
- Some members got rather excited about the idea of using the ACRL Environmental Scan to determine Board needs, commenting that if they thought the Board would use the scan to affect ACRL structure they might actually fill it out.

#### **14.2 Annual Conference Programs Update (Document 16.0)**

The Board discussed the Annual Conference Programs Working Group's update, led by Karen Williams, the working group's chair. Major points of discussion included:

- The working group's preliminary recommendations have been revised somewhat since the version shared with the Board for the Fall Executive Committee Meeting following a conference call the group had with Davis, Snelson, and ACRL Associate Director Mary Jane Petrowski to revisit the original intent of the Board's review of program planning practices and to clarify staff's current role in coordinating program planning.
- There was concern that although the recent ACRL member survey identified professional development as one of members' top priorities, there is no way to determine exactly what respondents think of as professional development. It would be a good idea to do a follow-up targeted survey to distinguish the level of interest between Web CE offerings, workshops, conference programs, etc. It might also be helpful to determine whether respondents have attended recent conferences, as the member survey only asks about future attendance plans.
- In response to the second recommendation, that responsibility for chairing the Conference Program Planning Committee be given to someone other than the president, Past President Camila Alire stated that she felt her role was very inactive, as staff does a superb job of coordinating the planners. She supports moving responsibility for chairing to someone from the Professional Development Coordinating Committee. Davis pointed out that historically presidents chair this committee because they are responsible for allocating the funding set aside for conference programs. It would be extremely difficult politically for staff to take on that responsibility, so it must remain with some empowered member body.
- Some felt that the association's current practice misleads program planners into believing that the Board reviews programs for content, as expressed in the third recommendation, "Examine the Board's role in approving annual conference programs. These currently appear on the consent agenda, but members might have the impression that the Board has greater involvement. Consider eliminating Board approval from the process." The rigorous peer-review process for ACRL National Conference programs may reinforce this impression, leading people to believe that the ALA Annual Conference ACRL program development process is at least somewhat similar.
- A Board member proposed that the working group take a fresh look at the issue with a broader concept of what constitutes Annual Conference programs, to include not only peer-reviewed programs but also a peer-reviewed publications track (e.g., contributed papers, possibly around a common theme each conference). There were suggestions that it might be productive to channel the significant number of rejected paper proposals submitted for ACRL National Conferences through a second-tier process like this, although it was also said that attempting to manage the distribution of scholarly information in our field would be a tremendous undertaking. The systematic routing of rejected submissions for one conference to another possible venue doesn't happen in any other discipline because the task is so large. It should remain the responsibility of the submitter to revise, if necessary, and resubmit their proposal to other venues.
- Other comments that came up relating to the peer-reviewed publications idea included:
  - The idea was raised at a Section executive committee meeting earlier in the day to an enthusiastic response, once they started thinking about different ways that Annual Conference

- programs could better benefit their members beyond giving the Section a cyclical purpose to pursue.
- Davis cautioned that if all 17 ACRL Sections did their own call for papers for every Annual Conference, staff would not be able to offer much support. It is currently a manageable but significant job coordinating the call for papers for each biennial National Conference as it is.
  - One Section recently suggested creating ACRL's own digital repository for all papers submitted for ACRL National Conferences.
  - One Board member supported the current panel-based Annual Conference programming culture as an opportunity to bounce research off your peers before submitting it to peer-reviewed journals for publication.

Williams stated that she was sympathetic that the issue is interwoven with other considerations, but the focused charge of this working group was definitely Annual Conference programming alone. She supported the idea of a follow-up targeted survey to help determine specifically what the membership is looking for in its professional development opportunities. The final recommendations will be submitted in time for the Spring Executive Committee Meeting.

On the topic of the member survey, a Board member mentioned their discomfort using the current all-membership open survey method, knowing that only the most enthusiastic or most upset of members respond. While a positive political message of inclusively and seeking everyone's input was recognized, in the future the association might try a mix of global and random survey methods. Other members felt that a balanced group of members did respond to surveys and, while various tools could be used, an all-member survey was still a valid methodology.

#### **14.3 Delivery of Information Summit Update (NACS Summit)**

ACRL's joint conference with the National Association of College Stores (NACS), and EDUCAUSE will be held March 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> in Denver. Each group is selecting attendees to invite from their constituencies.

#### **14.4 Interest Group Structure**

Recognizing that structure issues have been a long-term project of the board, predating many current Board members, there was a short summary of the work done so far. The Board's work at its strategic planning work session the Thursday prior to Midwinter grew out of a charge to the Interest Group Structure Working Group from the Board at the 2006 Annual Conference to create a report with options on possible changes to the association's structure. The proposed changes the Board arrived at on Thursday, creating a new type of unit called an interest group and revising the Board's composition and nomination process, are being disseminated throughout ACRL's leadership at this meeting. A survey seeking feedback from members was posted to the Web with a March 1<sup>st</sup> deadline. A new Structure Implementation Working Group will deal with the input received, sorting through the responses and making specific recommendations to the Board to move the new structure ideas forward.

#### **14.5 ACRL Summit on Technology and Change in Academic Libraries Report**

A summary report from the summit has been distributed to the Board and will be available at a 2-hour forum on Monday, to be hosted by Davis and Snelson. An essay based on the discussion is also being developed, but won't be shared publicly until all of the summit's participants have reviewed it, had a chance to comment, then signed off on the final revision. That process is almost complete, but in the meantime this highlights update has been prepared.

The summit attracted some media attention, with Roy Tennant writing a column about it for *Library Journal*, and Steven Bell blogging about it. A Board member mentioned that the *LJ* column quickly spread across her campus.

### **15.0 ACRL Board Expectations and Responsibilities (Document 10.0)**

As situations sometimes arise when Board members have schedule conflicts between their duties as Board members and their other interests and responsibilities, it is helpful to have a clear written guideline to follow. Snelson drafted the proposed language and brought it before the Board to see if there is consensus around it.

It was pointed out that there is another revision of the Board Expectations and Responsibilities already prepared as part of the Leadership, Selection, Recruitment, and Development Working Group's (LSRD) work, as well. After some discussion about interpretations of Article IX of the ACRL Bylaws and a suggestion that this might be added to the Bylaws review that's underway, the Board decided that Snelson's proposed language would be included in the next LSRD revision of the document. While ACRL is a voluntary organization and no one can be compelled to come, it is important to have such a written policy to make the Board's culture and priorities clear to incoming or potential Board members.

### **16.0 New Business**

#### **ALA Executive Board Update**

ALA Executive Board member Terri Kirk gave the Board a brief update, as Janet Swan Hill, ACRL's ALA Executive Board liaison, was unable to attend the meeting. Highlights included:

- The EPA library closing is currently stopped thanks in large part to the efforts of ALA's Washington Office.
- A plan is in place to implement suggestions resulting from ALA's recent Web usability survey. A summary can be found under "wikis" on ALA's homepage. Significant improvements should be seen by June.
- The Library of Congress is hosting a forum on Sunday about the future of cataloging.
- About 2,000 people responded to ALA's most recent member satisfaction survey. Results were quite favorable and generally showed increased satisfaction over previous surveys.
- The ALA Emerging Leaders '07 Initiative has started working. 117 people were selected to participate.
- 69 Spectrum scholarships were offered in 2006. 2007 is the program's 10th anniversary. Rubber bracelets were being sold at the Midwinter Meeting as a fundraiser for Spectrum scholarships.
- A report on the implementation of ALAhead to 2010 will be available on the Web shortly.
- The ALA Membership Committee wants to remind the Board that the ALA General Membership Meeting is a good time to bring issues to the attention of the ALA Council. These meetings are held Saturdays before the general session.

#### **Leadership Council Attendance**

Several Board members expressed concern that the Leadership Council did not seem well attended the previous day. It was generally believed that this was not a trend, but a single dip in attendance that may have been related to poor weather delaying member's arrivals in Seattle.

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



**Association of College and Research Libraries**  
**Board of Directors Meeting II**  
Midwinter Meeting  
Tuesday, January 23, 2007  
1:30 – 4:30 p.m.  
Westin Seattle Hotel –St. Helens Room  
Seattle

## **Midwinter Board II Meeting Minutes**

### **Attendees:**

*Executive Committee Members:* Pam Snelson, Julie Todaro, Camila Alire, Susan Kroll, Mary Ellen Davis, Nancy Allen, Janis Bandelin, Mary Carr, Lori Goetsch, Lynne King, Debbie Malone, Dorothy Washington, and Karen Williams.

*Absent:* Tyrone Cannon.

*Visitors:* Rickey Best, Nancy Davenport, Trevor Dawes, Erika Linke, Locke Morrissey, Teresa Neely, Bill Nelson, Joyce Ogburn, Lorna Peterson, John Popko, and Jim Rettig.

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

### **17.0 Call to Order**

President Pamela Snelson called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

### **18.0 Opening Remarks**

Snelson reminded the Board to be mindful of good meeting practices and recognized the 2007 candidates for ACRL's Board who were in attendance.

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

*Discussion:* To better accommodate the schedule of a guest, it was requested that agenda item 23.0 be moved up to immediately follow 21.0.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors adopted the agenda as revised.

### **20.0 Consent Agenda**

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

The following items are placed on the consent agenda.

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

##### **20.1 Legislative Agenda (Documents 11.1, 11.1a, & 11.1b)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors adopt the 2007 ACRL Legislative Agenda.

##### **20.2 Guidelines for Academic Status of College and University Librarians Revision (Document 11.2)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the revised version of the "Guidelines for Academic Status of College and University Librarians."

##### **20.3 Revision of LPSS Executive Committee Membership (Bylaws Change) (Document 11.3)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the following revision to the LPSS Bylaws, adding the position of section webmaster as a member of the LPSS Executive Committee.

*[changes in brackets]*

Article VI. Committees--The Executive Committee shall consist of the elected officers *[and the section WebMaster]*. In addition to the Executive Committee, LPSS will have those committees deemed appropriate for its smooth operation by the membership. Committee chairs and members shall be appointed by the Vice-chair/Chair-elect.

#### **20.4 Resolution in Support of “Orphan Works” Legislation (Document 11.7)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors endorse the ALA resolution in support of “orphan works” legislation.

#### **20.5 Tribute Resolution in Honor of Spectrum’s 10<sup>th</sup> Anniversary (Document 11.8)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors endorse the ALA tribute resolution in honor of Spectrum’s 10th Anniversary and permit the ACRL Intellectual Freedom Committee to endorse it, as well.

*Discussion:* There was no discussion about the consent agenda.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors approved the consent agenda.

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

#### **21.0 ALA Presidential Candidates**

The 2007 candidates for ALA President, Jim Rettig and Nancy Davenport, were each allowed 5 minutes to address the Board to articulate their qualifications for office and vision for ALA should they be elected.

#### **22.0 Strategic Mega-Issue Discussion: Diversity Working Group Final Report (Documents 12.0, 12.0a, 12.1-12.4)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors receive the Diversity White Paper entitled “Achieving Racial and Ethnic Diversity Among Academic and Research Librarians: The Recruitment, Retention, and Advancement of Librarians of Color” as a document to help inform their decisions and to direct their actions toward continued implementation of the strategic objectives as outlined in ACRL Strategic Plan.

*Discussion:* As part of its ongoing strategic planning process, the Board keeps a list of “mega-issue” questions, which reflect concerns and challenges faced by the profession and the association in many areas of the strategic plan. The Board considers these mega-issues in shaping the framework for addressing these questions through constant revision of the Strategic Plan, and through annual prioritization of member effort, budget, and staff resources. Following the Board’s 2005 strategic planning and orientation session, a Diversity Working Group was established, consisting of Directors-at-Large Janis Bandelin and Karen Williams and chaired by Director-at-Large Dorothy Washington. The group presented its findings for the Board to discuss.

Part of the working group’s charge was to commission a white paper. They selected Teresa Neely, Director of the Zimmerman Library at the University of New Mexico, and Lorna Peterson, Associate Professor at the State University of New York at Buffalo, who were present at the meeting to discuss the paper’s content and assist the Board’s discussion. The authors began with an overview of the paper. Highlights included:

- The development of the paper was a collaborative effort with all the members of the working group and the authors thanked the Board for the opportunity to work on it.
- The paper has not yet been edited. The authors recommend that the Board have that done next.
- It is important to understand that the diversity concept as we discuss it stems from the racist history of the United States, where opportunities were often dictated by who was allowed where and when. Library

science has a long history of recruitment focused on race because of that history. The authors offered a brief history of the acceptance of minorities in U.S. library schools.

- In 1989, ACRL established a Task Force on the Recruitment of Underrepresented Minorities and published a plan of action.
- In 2002, ACRL released a white paper prepared by ACRL's Personnel Administrators and Staff Development Officers of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group, *Recruitment, Retention & Restructuring: Human Resources in Academic Libraries*. The authors see little real change since that time, which could be seen positively or negatively.
- The profession needs to have a discussion about the validity of the long-held goal to increase the percentage of underrepresented minority librarians to equal to their proportion of the population.
- A comprehensive web-based tool for recruitment is needed.
- There is a lack of available research on the retention of librarians in general, particularly minorities. Articles the authors did find identified some positive factors for improving retention rates, including having responsible work to do, collegial relationships, good salaries, a mentoring system in place, geographic location, and the relationship of library to parent institution. Mentoring came up more often than any other feature when it came to improving retention.
- The profession has a problem with reliable statistics when it comes to demographics. There's been an increasing reliance on graduation data, then U.S. Census data.
- While there is plenty of available literature on leadership in the profession, there has been little specifically written about advancement. Issues enhancing advancement opportunities that come up in what literature can be found include a desire for more distance education so people can improve their credentials, mentoring, and diversity cohorts – minorities stand a better chance of promotion when there is more than one minority in their library. More research needs to be conducted in this area, as these and other factors conducive to creating an environment where advancement is possible are written about as valuable in an anecdotal sense, with little research confirming them. Statistics on the number of minorities in director and assistant director positions are particularly critical.
- ALA, ACRL, the Association for Library and Information Science Education (ALISE), ARL, and other professional library and information science organizations need to undertake a profession-wide, concerted, collaborative effort to provide resources on recruitment, retention, and advancement, both focused specifically on underrepresented minorities and in general.

The Board then discussed the white paper and asked questions of the authors. Key points included:

- The type of recruitment Web site the authors propose would be for librarians in general and would also have areas specifically addressing underrepresented librarians. Good examples of such recruitment sites included [www.discovernursing.com](http://www.discovernursing.com) and [www.becomingalibrarian.org](http://www.becomingalibrarian.org), which focuses specifically on New Jersey. ALA's new [www.librarycareers.org](http://www.librarycareers.org) site is still too scattered, organizing information by ALA Division or group, rather than pulling everything together in a comprehensive manner. This critique is supported by ALA's Web usability study, which showed that people look for organization by content matter and should not have to figure out the structure and language of ALA to find what they're looking for.
  - It was also noted that the Discover Nursing campaign and [www.discovernursing.com](http://www.discovernursing.com) were sponsored by Johnson & Johnson at a cost of some \$30 million and resulted in great results and buzz. While the library profession couldn't do something on that scale, a visitor at the meeting suggested that it would be great if ALA could find a library champion willing to sponsor a significant campaign in return for the ability to add their branding to the initiative.
  - Of the recommendations made in the white paper, establishing this Web site was the one the authors would most like to see action on first.
- Neely doesn't believe that setting quota-style goals focused on bringing the number of underrepresented minority librarians up to the level of their proportion in the population is necessarily a logical goal. It's a goal that has never been reached and probably never will. The profession should focus instead on finding the people that will best serve a population's needs and bring the skills and cultural knowledge needed for

each library. At a local level, libraries should focus not just on who looks like their population, but who has the curricular background to support and reflect the needs of their particular campus.

- Getting a better command of the research data and benchmarks means committing time and funding. ACRL will first need to determine exactly what it wants to find, what it wants to do with the data, how far back it will need it, and how much time and money will it cost to find it. It could be as simple as establishing a research agenda for diversity or recruitment, getting people to take on small bits of it, and handing out small grants. This could be a good project for which ACRL should apply to IMLS for a grant. ACRL should partner with the ALA Office for Research and Statistics on such a project.
- A Board member suggested that it could be a good idea to start any effort by collecting the resources already produced by state library associations, for example the Colorado Library Advisory Board's Special Populations and Issues Committee has a diversity toolkit at [diversity.aclin.org](http://diversity.aclin.org). By sharing those resources very visibly within ACRL, it could get ACRL units to begin thinking about how they could contribute resources or data that would help.
- The authors felt strongly that any effort should involve collaboration with ALISE or ALA to be successful. The issues identified in the white paper are not unique to academic and research libraries.
- The issues surrounding retention and advancement piqued the interest of several Board members, as the literature that they had seen always focused on recruitment. It also feeds into issues that members have experienced around succession planning; some have even seen difficulty filling high-level positions in academic librarianship due to qualified people being reluctant to take on administrative roles.
- Some of the recommendations in the white paper are dependent on individual institutions to implement, not the association.
- Several Board members mentioned that they have no ethnic diversity on their staffs due to geographic demographics. When wondering how they could make a minority feel comfortable as part of their staff, the authors returned to the idea of having a cohort of more than one on campus, if not necessarily in the library. Diversity training could also be helpful in teaching staff how to make people feel comfortable and respected.

The Board decided it will begin by having an online discussion about each of the 4 recommendations on page 6 of the report to decide which it should take action to address first and whether ACRL should submit a proposal as part of ALA's Ahead to 2010 strategic initiative funding, possibly with another ALA unit as a partner. Such a proposal would fall within goal area 4 of Ahead to 2010. It does not appear that a process has been developed yet for these submissions, but once that has been established the Board will also consider whether it would like to offer some matching ACRL funding if it submits a proposal. These online discussions will also ideally produce some substantive thought to bring to the Spring Executive Committee Meeting for consideration of further actions.

Potential partners to approach when thinking about project proposals to submit for ALAhead to 2010 funding or an IMLS grant application included ALA's Office for Human Resource Development and Recruitment (HRDR), the Public Library Association (PLA), the American Association of School Librarians (AASL), or ALISE, possibly also bringing in ORS or ALA's Office for Diversity.

The Board thanked the working group and the white paper's authors for their excellent work and leading such a stimulating discussion.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors received the Diversity White Paper entitled "Achieving Racial and Ethnic Diversity Among Academic and Research Librarians: The Recruitment, Retention, and Advancement of Librarians of Color" as a document to help inform their decisions and to direct their actions toward continued implementation of the strategic objectives as outlined in ACRL Strategic Plan.

**Strategic Area: Higher Education and Research**

**23.0 Scholarly Communications Initiative Update**

Joyce Ogburn, Co-Chair of ACRL's Scholarly Communication Committee, thanked the Board for its support of the proposal that ACRL join the NDTLD, approved in Board I (see agenda item #10.0). The committee also plans to review the other relationships that ACRL has to see where else scholarly communication relationships would be valuable.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> joint ACRL/ARL Scholarly Communication Institute was wildly successful. 25% of the attendees from the first two institutes also attended a reunion at this Midwinter Meeting. The ACRL-SPARC Forum at this Midwinter also saw a terrific turnout, with excellent evaluation scores. Ogburn's provost at the University of Utah was one of the speakers, which she appreciated as a good sign of support for open access issues from her administration.

The ACRL Scholarly Communication Committee would like to take the initiative to develop a joint research agenda, and has already spoken to the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and the Coalition for Networked Information (CNI) about such a project. The committee is also considering trying to bring in funding organizations that share an interest in scholarly communication issues, such as the Mellon Foundation, as interested parties to help advance the agenda.

Finally, Ogburn thanked Malenfant for being very helpful in support of the committee's work.

**24.0 "Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure" Approval (Document 13.0)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors add ACRL's endorsement to AAUP's "1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure."

*Discussion:* Bill Nelson, Chair of ACRL's Standards and Accreditation Committee (SAC), spoke to the Board on behalf of that committee and the ACRL Committee on the Status of Academic Librarians. When revising one of the standards some time ago, the then-chair of the Status Committee sent a query to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) to find out if the "1940 Statement on Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure" was still current. AAUP replied that it was, and later followed up with a letter of request asking that ACRL add its endorsement to that statement. In 1946, ALA was the 2<sup>nd</sup> organization to endorse the document, which now has over 180 total endorsers, including 16 new organizations in 2006 alone. SAC reviewed this request and concurred with the Status Committee's recommendation that ACRL add its endorsement.

The Board discussed the proposed endorsement and agreed that as the association for academic librarians, it made sense for ACRL to endorse the statement. There was some discussion about whether it would be redundant for ACRL to endorse a statement that ALA has already endorsed, but it was concluded that historically it would not be redundant and, in fact, there are many examples of ACRL adding its own weight to ALA's endorsements where an issue impacts academic and research libraries and librarians.

When asked if SAC had looked at the statement to see if there were any discrepancies between ACRL's standards and this statement, Nelson replied that the Status Committee had done so and was believed to have vetted the statement quite thoroughly. It was noted that many of ACRL's standards and statements also pull from the AAUP statement quite extensively.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors approved the addition ACRL's endorsement to AAUP's "1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure."

**Strategic Area: The Association**

**25.0 Budget and Finance**

**25.1 FY 2008 Budget (Document 14.0)**

Kroll reminded the Board that they reviewed the FY2008 budget assumptions, including the approved FY2008 strategic initiative action plans, during Board I. The preliminary budget incorporates all of that information. She highlighted the expected continued growth of Web CE programs and revenue and the projection of a flat publications budget in ACRL's preliminary budget, as well as the inclusion of two new product launches in CHOICE's budget.

**25.2 Friends of ACRL Review Task Force (Document 17.0)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the creation of the Friends of ACRL Review Task Force with the charge, membership, and timeline listed below.

**Charge:** To make recommendations to the Board of Directors regarding possible changes to the Friends of ACRL program, including the identification of the strategic goal(s) to become the basis of a pilot targeted fundraising campaign and to write a case statement for that campaign.

**Specific tasks:**

- Recommend a structure for ACRL that separates out the fundraising responsibilities from the disbursement of Friends monies. Include in the structure recommendation the charges and tasks for all involved committees and units. Due: April 16, 2007.
- Examine the role of the Colleagues Committee and corporate donors, and any potential relationship with the Friends program and individual donors. Recommend an articulation of the responsibilities of these two programs. Due: April 16, 2007.
- Consult with the ACRL Board and Budget and Finance committee and recommend one or two areas for fundraising tied to specific objectives that advance ACRL's strategic plan. Due: April 16, 2007.
- Recommend a pilot fundraising campaign for the identified areas. Include in the campaign an assessment tool. Due: June 1, 2007
- Consult with ALA Development Office staff to see what support is available for the development of ACRL's fundraising program. Due: June 1, 2007
- Develop a case statement for the pilot fundraising campaign. Due: June 1, 2007.

**MEMBERSHIP:**

Specific Requirements of Membership Composition:

- The current members of the Friends Fund Subcommittee
- Two members of the Board of Directors
- The Executive Director (ex officio)

**TIMELINE FOR COMPLETION OF WORK:**

**Date interim report is due:** 2007 Spring Executive Committee Meeting

**Date final report is due:** 2007 Annual Conference

*Discussion:* During the joint ACRL Board of Directors/Budget and Finance Committee meeting the previous day, there was an extensive discussion about the direction of the Friends of ACRL fundraising program. It was decided that a task force should be established to consider a number of the issues raised and report back to the Board at the 2007 Annual Conference. It was agreed that the charge and timeline in the proposed motion captured the outcome of those discussions clearly and concisely.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors approved the creation of the Friends of ACRL Review Task Force with the charge, membership, and timeline listed below.

**Charge:** To make recommendations to the Board of Directors regarding possible changes to the Friends of ACRL program, including the identification of the strategic goal(s) to become the basis of a pilot targeted fundraising campaign and to write a case statement for that campaign.

**Specific tasks:**

- Recommend a structure for ACRL that separates out the fundraising responsibilities from the disbursement of Friends monies. Include in the structure recommendation the charges and tasks for all involved committees and units. Due: April 16, 2007.
- Examine the role of the Colleagues Committee and corporate donors, and any potential relationship with the Friends program and individual donors. Recommend an articulation of the responsibilities of these two programs. Due: April 16, 2007.
- Consult with the ACRL Board and Budget and Finance committee and recommend one or two areas for fundraising tied to specific objectives that advance ACRL's strategic plan. Due: April 16, 2007.
- Recommend a pilot fundraising campaign for the identified areas. Include in the campaign an assessment tool. Due: June 1, 2007
- Consult with ALA Development Office staff to see what support is available for the development of ACRL's fundraising program. Due: June 1, 2007
- Develop a case statement for the pilot fundraising campaign. Due: June 1, 2007.

**MEMBERSHIP:**

Specific Requirements of Membership Composition:

- The current members of the Friends Fund Subcommittee
- Two members of the Board of Directors
- The Executive Director (ex officio)

**TIMELINE FOR COMPLETION OF WORK:**

**Date interim report is due:** 2007 Spring Executive Committee Meeting

**Date final report is due:** 2007 Annual Conference

**25.3 ACRL Use of CHOICE Assets (Documents 18.0 – 18.2)**

*Motion:* That CHOICE financial policies and the ACRL Guide to Policies and Procedures Section 6.10.2 "CHOICE Reserve Fund" be revised as shown below to allow ACRL to make use of a predetermined portion of CHOICE assets for ACRL operational expenses effective September 1, 2008 (FY 2009).

**6.10.2 CHOICE reserve fund**

CHOICE has a separate reserve fund, rather than participating in a general ACRL or ALA Publishing Reserve Fund. As is true for all ALA current funds, the Choice Reserve Fund does not bear interest. CHOICE will maintain a mandated Reserve Fund equal to 25 percent of the average annual operating expenses over the four most recently completed years, excluding ALA overhead. This objective does not preclude consideration of needs to develop and improve the Choice program through current budget funding. The ACRL operating budget contains an expense line for the mandated reserve for CHOICE, and it is appropriately budgeted as part of the annual budget preparation process.

*Source: ACRL Board, January 1989, January 1992, revised June 1997*

~~a. Should any surpluses be generated by Choice beyond those needed to pay reasonable indirect costs to ALA, to improve the Choice program, and to create the reserve fund outlined above, they will be dedicated to the further development of Choice, and will not inure to the benefit either of the ALA General Fund or of ACRL programs other than Choice.~~

~~b. Choice is assessed by ALA at an overhead rate that is a percentage of total indirect costs. This rate may be revised from time to time, on the basis of procedures and allocation methods identical to those used in the 1987 indirect cost study.~~

- a. Should Choice experience major financial problems in the future, the first attempt to resolve them will be from the Choice Reserve Fund. As a second level of support, ACRL will examine its overall program requirements and financial status to determine if assistance can be given to Choice. The final responsibility for resolution of such problems will rest with the ALA General Fund.
- b. It is recognized that, as with the ACRL budget, BARC and the ALA Executive Board still have purview over the Choice budget in a general sense, but the detail budgeting procedure and decisions follow the current process involving Choice staff, the ACRL Executive Director, the ACRL Budget and Finance Committee, and the ACRL Board.

~~The Choice fund balance may not be used for ACRL operating expenses. However, it may be made available for the Choice Long term Investment Fund, or for special projects that are appropriately funded from the Choice fund balance.~~

AND INSERT:

- c. Choice's net asset balance may be used to support ACRL's initiatives, programs, and services. The specific amount to be contributed to ACRL by CHOICE shall be determined on an annual basis via the regular ALA/ACRL budgeting process. Some preliminary assumptions that will guide this process include:
  - That CHOICE shall at all times maintain an Operating Fund balance no less than 75 percent of total expenses for the previous fiscal year.
  - That the financial needs of previously planned and approved major CHOICE capital expenditures, e.g., the purchase of CHOICE office space, shall take precedence over monies to be made available to ACRL.
  - That CHOICE shall at all times retain sufficient monies to fund necessary product development expenses.
  - That the amount to be contributed to ACRL by CHOICE in FY 2009 shall be initially set at \$100,000 with the final amount to be determined during the course of the FY 2009 budget process. We anticipate the amount of this contribution will increase in successive years, reaching \$200,000 by FY 2011.

*Discussion:* Kröll noted that this policy revision would bring CHOICE in line with the fiscal policies governing *College and Research Libraries* and *College and Research Libraries News*. It is consistent with most association revenue stream practices for net revenue from the association's publications to support member programs and services. This revised policy is intended to make better use of CHOICE's growing net operating assets, while still protecting the assets for uses supporting the growth of CHOICE's business. The association should be careful not to use these funds to support ongoing initiatives in case of unexpected financial downturns, instead directing them toward specific, targeted goals. The amount would be determined on a year-by-year basis.

A few points were raised during the discussion, including:

- It was clarified that the current policy precludes use of CHOICE funds for "capital" as well as operating expenses.
- While print subscriptions are likely to continue to drop and ad revenue will decline in any downturn, overall trends and product lines are good. From 2001 to 2003, during the most recent significant downturn in the market, CHOICE still performed quite well.

- A visitor cautioned the Board that, in his experience, when societies start to use publication revenues, their prices start to skyrocket. For the good of the membership and the industry, he urged the Board to proceed with care. It was pointed out to him that this has already been the policy for years with *C&RL* and *C&RL News*. The association is already very dependent on publications revenue, and it has helped keep membership dues down for years without causing significant rises in subscription costs.
- This will affect the way that ACRL and CHOICE budget summaries are present in the future, as they've historically been kept separate.

*Action:* The ACRL Board of Directors approved a revision of the CHOICE financial policies and the ACRL Guide to Policies and Procedures Section 6.10.2 "CHOICE Reserve Fund" as shown below to allow ACRL to make use of a predetermined portion of CHOICE assets for ACRL operational expenses effective September 1, 2008 (FY 2009).

### **6.10.2 CHOICE reserve fund**

CHOICE has a separate reserve fund, rather than participating in a general ACRL or ALA Publishing Reserve Fund. As is true for all ALA current funds, the Choice Reserve Fund does not bear interest. CHOICE will maintain a mandated Reserve Fund equal to 25 percent of the average annual operating expenses over the four most recently completed years, excluding ALA overhead. This objective does not preclude consideration of needs to develop and improve the Choice program through current budget funding. The ACRL operating budget contains an expense line for the mandated reserve for CHOICE, and it is appropriately budgeted as part of the annual budget preparation process.

*Source: ACRL Board, January 1989, January 1992, revised June 1997*

- a. Should Choice experience major financial problems in the future, the first attempt to resolve them will be from the Choice Reserve Fund. As a second level of support, ACRL will examine its overall program requirements and financial status to determine if assistance can be given to Choice. The final responsibility for resolution of such problems will rest with the ALA General Fund.
- b. It is recognized that, as with the ACRL budget, BARC and the ALA Executive Board still have purview over the Choice budget in a general sense, but the detail budgeting procedure and decisions follow the current process involving Choice staff, the ACRL Executive Director, the ACRL Budget and Finance Committee, and the ACRL Board.
- c. Choice's net asset balance may be used to support ACRL's initiatives, programs, and services. The specific amount to be contributed to ACRL by CHOICE shall be determined on an annual basis via the regular ALA/ACRL budgeting process. Some preliminary assumptions that will guide this process include:
  - That CHOICE shall at all times maintain an Operating Fund balance no less than 75 percent of total expenses for the previous fiscal year.
  - That the financial needs of previously planned and approved major CHOICE capital expenditures, e.g., the purchase of CHOICE office space, shall take precedence over monies to be made available to ACRL.
  - That CHOICE shall at all times retain sufficient monies to fund necessary product development expenses.
  - That the amount to be contributed to ACRL by CHOICE in FY 2009 shall be initially set at \$100,000 with the final amount to be determined during the course of the FY 2009 budget process. We anticipate the amount of this contribution will increase in successive years, reaching \$200,000 by FY 2011.

## **26.0 Summit on Technology and Change in Academic Libraries (Document 19.0)**

Davis and Snelson held a very well attended program the previous day discussing a summary document prepared from ACRL's Summit on Technology and Change in Academic Libraries, which was held in November 2006. This invitational summit focused on how technologies, on the one hand, and the changing climate for teaching, learning, and scholarship, on the other, will likely recast the roles, responsibilities, and resources of academic libraries over the next decade. Prominent academic and research librarians from all types of libraries joined chief academic officers, chief information officers, publishers, and other major industry stakeholders bridging the worlds of academia and technology.

At the previous day's program, a full room of 45 to 50 people received the summary and heard a bit about the summit's discussions, then had the opportunity to ask questions. Since the Board has not had a discussion about the summit's outcomes yet, Davis and Snelson included it on this agenda.

The Board received the summary that had been shared at the previous day's program and a draft of the full report that was being circulated to the participants of the summit for their approval. Greg Wegner, of the Learning Alliance, authored the report and was working with the feedback from the summit's participants to refine it. Until all of the participants had signed off on the report, it would not be shared publicly. A Board member who participated in the summit expressed concern about whether the report reflected the conversation that actually took place and intended to share that perception with Wegner.

The Board's discussion at this meeting focused on the section of the report titled, "Roles for ACRL" and how those roles and activities might be implemented. Board members were asked to identify any areas that resonated with them. Davis informed the Board that \$10,000 had been included as a placeholder in the preliminary FY2008 budget for initiatives it might see coming out of this. This would not be the only discussion the Board would have about the summit, but should serve to start Board members thinking about it.

Major points raised during the discussion included:

- The conversation at the summit ended up being very wide-ranging and far beyond the originally intended focus on technology. Still, although the summit did have some very exciting discussions about technology, it was suggested that the report be retitled to indicate the summit's eventual focus on the broader area of the dissemination of information.
- While it was not the conversation the Executive Committee envisioned when they had the idea, the summit could still spark some valuable discussions.
- Suggestions in the report reinforce the importance of pursuing liaison-type relationships with other higher ed associations and organizations.
- Discussions that came up in the program discussion the previous day brought up the value of ACRL offering more training for support staff and librarians, ACRL providing help for those organizations in which change is occurring very slowly, and help for library administrators to see things in a new framework, breaking out of doing things just as they've always been done.
- Many of the roles and activities suggested for academic and research libraries and librarians are already being effectively performed. It may be that there is not enough awareness or promotion of these activities and that ACRL could increase promotion and articulation of these roles and activities. It's probably not that unusual for any profession to have that gap between the work that they do and the perceptions that related stakeholders have of what they do. One way to address this gap could be to launch an aggressive informational marketing campaign targeted to the types of magazines and journals that the summit's stakeholders read.
- Some saw valuable suggestions in the report for potential conference programs.

The discussion turned to the best way to use or share the report. While there was undeniable value in hearing the unvarnished views of stakeholders about academic and research librarians and of ACRL, there were many concerns that sharing this report publicly could give campus administrators an erroneous impression of their

libraries. The report was not considered reflective of the work being done at many modern libraries. It was generally accepted that the document should be shared internally, e.g., within the library world, but there was considerable debate about the value of sharing the document externally because of these concerns about perception vs. reality.

If the report was not to be released with a press release and big announcement, possible alternatives discussed for sharing the report included posting it to the Web and not publicizing it; not posting it, but writing ACRL's own summary to share; using the report as the core to launch a new blog, asking ACRL members to provide examples of how they already do some of the things mentioned in the report; hiring consultants to suggest the best next steps; commissioning a white paper using the report as a starting point; and launching the report at a conference program using a panel to lead a discussion of it.

It was decided that the report should be shared freely once all of the participants had signed off on it. At the same time, ACRL would release a supplement or companion piece in tandem with the report to address some of the erroneous perceptions it includes. Additionally, it was suggested that the name of the document be changed to refer to "perceptions" rather than "findings" to help emphasize that it is not necessarily factual and is not based on research. It was considered critical that the report be properly framed to clearly indicate that it is not a product of ACRL, but rather of an ad hoc group, with a summary prepared by a consultant. Once the final report is signed off on by all of the participants, it should be shared with the Board.

Davis added that a program slot had been held for follow-up from the summit at the upcoming ACRL National Conference in Baltimore. She asked for the Board's feedback regarding whether it would like to see the report shared in that manner and what kind of program would be best. Jim Neal, Vice President for Information Services & University Librarian at Columbia University and a participant at the summit, would help plan the program. The Board's consensus was that the program should go forward in Baltimore, with Budget and Finance Committee Chair Susan Kroll and Directors-at-Large Nancy Allen, Janis Bandelin, and Lynne King agreeing to help Davis and Neal with the planning.

### **27.0 Assessment Activities Review (Document 20.0)**

At the 2006 ALA Annual Conference, the Board approved a number of recommendations from the Board's Assessment Working Group. In establishing the Assessment Subcommittee of the Research Committee, the action called for the subcommittee to assess selected activities in support of each ACRL president's selected priority areas within the strategic plan. Additionally, during each midwinter and annual conference, a standing Board agenda item is to provide time for the Board to review assessment activities and to request that assessment activities related to any priority within the strategic plan be added to the assessment agenda. This is the first such discussion.

The Board briefly reviewed the activities associated with the current president, vice-president/president-elect, and past-president's priority areas. It was noted that a consultant had been hired to perform an assessment of the grassroots advocacy workshop offered at the 2006 Annual Conference in support of Alire's selected priority area, but that the consultant had difficulty getting librarians who had attended the workshop to offer the names of some faculty on their campuses for the consultant to contact. The next such opportunity to assess activities associated with this priority will be a workshop to be offered by the University Libraries Section (ULS) at the 2007 ACRL National Conference and a subsequent rollout of that content to Chapters for their use offering their own regional workshops. Director-at-Large Nance Allen offered to assist the Assessment Subcommittee in getting started with this assessment.

The Board agreed that at this time the subcommittee should remain focused on the strategic plan priority-area activities of each president, vice-president/president-elect, and past-president. As the subcommittee gains experience, the Board will consider adding additional activities in the future. The Board emphasized that the subcommittee should maintain good communication with the Board and ask for help and guidance as needed.

**28.0 New Business**

Snelson announced the winners of ACRL's major awards, including Academic/Research Librarian of the Year Betsy Wilson, and Excellence in Academic Libraries winners Georgia Institute of Technology, Trinity University, and Hostos Community College/CUNY.

The tentative agenda for the Board's spring conference call during the Executive Committee meeting will include a discussion on the proposed interest group structure and the bylaws overhaul. The call will be at 11:00 a.m. EASTERN.

The Board agreed that no strategic planning meeting would be necessary on the Thursday preceding the ALA Annual Conference.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:36 p.m.