

Association of College and Research Libraries
Spring Executive Committee Meeting
Thursday, May 3, 2007
8:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
ALA Washington Office Meeting Room
Washington, DC

Spring Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Executive Committee Members: Pam Snelson, Julie Todaro, Camila Alire, Susan Kroll, Tyrone Cannon, and Mary Ellen Davis.

Visitors: Mark Bard.

Staff: David Connolly.

1.0 Call to Order

President Pamela Snelson called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m.

2.0 Opening Remarks

Snelson reminded the Executive Committee to be mindful of good meeting practices, particularly during the conference call with the full Board of Directors. That will be the only opportunity for the directors-at-large to participate in the discussions, so it will be important to make sure they get a chance to speak.

Snelson also thanked the ALA Washington Office for once again hosting the Executive Committee in its conference room.

3.0 Adoption of the Agenda

Action: The Executive Committee adopted the agenda as presented.

Strategic Area: The Association

4.0 Reports

4.1 President's Report (Document 1.1)

Snelson referred the Executive Committee to her written report for an update of her activities. In particular, she enjoyed attending the Excellence in Academic Libraries award presentation ceremonies, particularly at Hostos Community College/CUNY, due to their tremendous enthusiasm and pride in the award.

Snelson reported that progress had been made in fulfilling the Executive Committee's fall 2005 action regarding compensation issues. Snelson successfully worked with ALA Executive Director Keith Michael Fiels to get ACRL Executive Director Mary Ellen Davis' job responsibilities reviewed, leading to an equity adjustment to Davis' salary. Davis is also continuing to find ways to provide additional recognition for ACRL staff. Snelson thanked ACRL Past-President Camila Alire and ACRL Vice-President/President-Elect Julie Todaro for their help keeping these issues alive with ALA management.

Davis thanked the Executive Committee for its support and perseverance in pursuit of this recognition for staff. The Executive Committee expressed its wish that it could do more to recognize ACRL staff and again expressed its appreciation for the hard work and support of staff.

Snelson added that her next report for the Annual Conference would include a report on a discussion she had the previous day with Scott Jaschik, an editor at *Inside Higher Ed*. Jaschik was primarily interested in hearing about the type of articles that would be useful to academic and research librarians.

4.2 Vice-President's Report (Document 1.2)

Todaro referred the Executive Committee to her written report for an update of her activities. She added that she appreciates the monthly calendar of her duties as vice-president/president-elect that the Executive Director sends and she planned to speak with next year's VP, Erika Linke, about what to expect in the coming year.

Following up on a discussion item from the Midwinter Meeting, Todaro wrote a response to the essay for ACRL's Summit on Technology and Change in Academic Libraries, held in November 2006. She felt the response was respectful of the process used to craft the initial essay and included both what she saw as good about the essay and questions that arose as she read it from the perspective of someone who was in attendance at the summit.

4.3 Councilor's Report

ACRL Division Councilor Tyrone Cannon reported that there had been two major topics of interest on the ALA Council discussion list since the Midwinter Meeting. The first was a discussion about some irregularities involved with promotion by ALA's Social Responsibilities Round Table (SRRT) of its members who were candidates for Council in this year's election. The Executive Committee then noted that ACRL staff prepares a list of all ACRL members who are candidates for ALA Council each year for publication in *C&RL News*.

The second topic was ALA's establishment of a new office focused on advocacy. Some councilors were concerned that adding another office to ALA does not help with efforts to streamline an organizational structure that is already perceived as too complex. Fiels sent a letter to the Council discussion list explaining that advocacy efforts had been operating under the auspices of ALA's Public Information Office (PIO) and that a new salary line for a director for the new office would be the only major new expense, as the other full-time position in the office is an existing one that will move from PIO. The Executive Committee asked that Cannon share Fiels' letter with the Board for their information.

The Advocacy Office director and a new Web Usability Officer for ALA's Information Technology and Telecommunications Services (ITTS) department are the first non-revenue generating full-time positions added to ALA's general fund budget in the last five years. The Web Usability Officer position is a response to ALA's 2006 Web usability study and long-term recommendations made by the member group that was brought in for a retreat to discuss the state of the ALA Website and study results.

Executive Committee members commented that they looked forward to improvements in ALA's Web site, as currently the search engine results are unsatisfactory, it takes too many clicks to drill down to the information you want, there were concerns about outdated information being present on ALA's part of the site, and there were hopes that the improvements would see the creation of a more external-facing site, rather than an internal-facing one that makes sense only to staff and the most active members. The current site is an embarrassment in its representation of an information-based field. The reorganization of the site will focus on grouping information by content, instead of by ALA structure. It was also noted that when ACRL Sections host their sites on offsite servers, the content is not indexed by the ALA search engine, yet another reason to encourage Sections to work within ALA's Website.

It was pointed out that the ilovelibraries.org site that was being developed would help meet the need of sharing information about libraries with the general public. Concern was expressed that ACRL was not approached to offer input on what material about academic and research libraries should be included.

Davis stated that she has raised that point with ALA's Web Editorial Board, of which she is a member, and expressed concern that the mock-ups seen to date focused primarily on public libraries. An Executive Committee member suggested that there should be different domains created to target different audiences. The Board might discuss this issue further at the Annual Conference once ilovelibraries.org had launched.

4.4 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:

- The 13th ACRL National Conference was very successful, adding new programming as well as improving on existing programs. Davis applauded the Board's commitment to scholarships, noting that they had made a clear difference in bringing in a younger, more diverse range of attendees.
- This spring also saw the rollout of the essay from ACRL's Summit on Technology and Change in Academic Libraries and response, mentioned earlier by Todaro, and ACRL's co-sponsorship of the New Modes of Information Delivery in Higher Education Forum, with EDUCAUSE and the National Association of College Stores (NACS). Executive Committee members mentioned their recent experiences with presenting at conferences and citing the technology summit essay and wondered how they might best assess the impact of such papers. Suggestions included citation searches and surveys. It was agreed that this was an issue that should be discussed at another time in more depth.
- Davis and Snelson also facilitated a discussion on the ACRL Summit on Technology and Change in Academic Libraries at the spring meeting of the Coalition for Networked Information (CNI).
- The Operations Report includes quite a list of consulting activities, thanks to the presence of ACRL Content Strategist Kathryn Deiss on staff. Deiss' consulting also allows her the opportunity to keep in touch with what's happening in libraries and to meet potential new authors for ACRL's publishing program. Staff is exploring a new program where staff or members could help institutions conduct a self-study for improvement or preparation for accreditation visits. Unfortunately, the first institution planned for this program is the University of Puerto Rico, in late May and early June, and has been complicated due to tax code and business issues. An Executive Committee member suggested that ACRL might look to LAMA's speakers or consultants bureau for a model to look at as the Board and staff consider where to go with this program. It was pointed out that the Budget and Finance Committee has also considered this kind of program as they've looked for ways to help interested retired members find ways to keep contributing to the profession.
- It was pointed out that the mention of the 14th National Conference on page 11 of the report mistakenly repeats the theme from the 13th conference. Staff will correct this and repost the report.
- Davis was surprised but pleased to report that ACRL membership was at an all-time high despite the implementation of the recent dues increase, partly due to the "conference effect" boost provided by March's National Conference in Baltimore. Executive Committee members suggested that this called for a highlight in *C&RL News* and could be tied in with a general reminder of the benefits that members receive from the association. It was also noted that the number of organizational members continues a slow decline. It is apparent that it would require a deliberate marketing effort to turn that trend around.
- In staffing developments, interviews are being conducted for a new *C&RL News* editor. Stephanie Orphan, who is currently the Editor of *C&RL News* and ACRL's Web Developer, is not leaving the association, but will instead be able to focus more on Web development and ACRL's online course offerings.
- Several Executive Committee members commented that they and others they had heard from had really enjoyed ACRL's Virtual Conference and other Web Continuing Education offerings. Davis highlighted the fact that ACRL had recently added an institutional rate for its one-shot Webcasts,

to great response. The Executive Committee encouraged staff to begin marketing more strongly for the group rate as they become comfortable that participants are still satisfied with their experience.

- The ALA communication preference issue that had been interfering with Chapter communications, a concern raised at the 2007 Midwinter Meeting, had been addressed through Davis' efforts working with ALA's Member and Customer Service Department and ITTS.
- An Executive Committee member asked for more information about the discussion about the gaps in research or evidence needed to inform library scholarly communication programs, as seen by ACRL and other interested parties, mentioned on page 4 of the Operations Report. Davis replied that these are preliminary talks, intended to establish clear ideas of what data is needed and what steps to take next to find and disseminate that data.

5.0 2007 ACRL Midwinter Meeting Board Minutes (Document 2.0)

There was no discussion of the draft minutes.

6.0 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

6.1 Approval of 2006 Fall Executive Committee Meeting Minutes (Document 3.1)

Motion: That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the 2006 fall meeting minutes.

6.2 Establishment of the Librarianship in For-Profit Educational Institutions Discussion Group (Document 3.2)

Motion: That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the establishment of the Librarianship in For-Profit Educational Institutions Discussion Group, with a purpose and responsibility as follows:

To provide an opportunity for librarians in for-profit educational institution to network, share knowledge, join together to advocate for issues that specifically affect them, and to recruit new members for ACRL from librarians who are not currently ACRL members.

6.3 Establishment of Senior Administrators Discussion Group (Document 3.3)

Motion: That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the establishment of an ACRL Senior Administrators Discussion Group, with a purpose and responsibility as follows:

This group of administrators, who are direct reports to the library Director, will meet to discuss topics of interest related to their role within their library and their institution.

Discussion topics could include:

- Relationship building with the director/dean
- Assistant/Associate Librarians' role in library development
- Developing partnerships across the institution
- Strategic planning
- Budgeting
- Management/personnel issues

Strategic Area: Higher Education and Research

6.4 Procedure for Maintenance of ACRL Policy Statements (Document 3.4)

Motion: That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the following revision of section 14.11 of the *ACRL Guide to Policies and Procedures*, concerning the review of ACRL “policy statements.”

14.11 Procedures for development and review of policy statements within ACRL

ACRL has well-established procedures for the development and maintenance of standards and guidelines documents. There are, however, a number of statements that have been developed by ACRL units that articulate a policy statement, or serve as a checklist or a model statement. ~~The Standards and Accreditation Committee does not have responsibility for development and maintenance of these statements. That responsibility resides in the ACRL units.~~ The Standards and Accreditation Committee recommends the following process for development and maintenance of statements that are neither standards nor guidelines:

1. Committees developing documents specify the purpose and audience for the document. The committee should decide early on in the process whether it is developing a standard, guideline, or policy statement. If there is doubt as to whether the document might be a standard or guideline, the committee should consult the Standards and Accreditation Committee. If the document is to be a standard or guideline, the procedure in the *ACRL Guide to Policies and Procedures*, section 14.8 should be followed.
2. The committee prepares the first draft and distributes it to affected groups for comments.
3. After the review period, the draft is revised and prepared for publication and final approval by the unit.
4. Once the policy statement has been approved by the unit, it should be sent to the Standards and Accreditation Committee for review~~ACRL Board of Directors~~.
5. After review the Standards and Accreditation Committee will send the document, along with recommended action, to the ACRL Board of Directors.
6. Each policy statement approved by ACRL is reviewed every five years for currency. After review, the statement may be (1) continued in force without change, (2) revised to address current needs, or (3) rescinded.

Action: The ACRL Executive Committee approved the consent agenda.

Strategic Area: The Profession

7.0 Revised CJCLS FY08 Action Plan Proposal (Documents 5.0 & 5.0a)

Motion: That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the revised Community and Junior College Libraries Section (CJCLS) action plan proposal for 40 scholarships of \$50 toward member participation in ACRL e-Learning Webcasts, with a focus on new technology.

Discussion: The Board first looked at this action plan proposal last fall at its Strategic Planning and Orientation Session and sent it back to the Section with notes that the Board supported the concept, but would like to see the course developed first. At that time, the CJCLS had planned to develop the specific course that its members would receive slots in, but the Section now believes that there are enough great courses available from ACRL that they don't need to be involved in the development of one at this time. The focus of this revised plan is thus solely on scholarship support to expose new members to the courses and opportunities available.

The Executive Committee liked the proposal, but would like to see a stronger articulation of outcomes-based assessment of all of the action plan activities it funds and still did not feel that the assessment plan in this proposal was adequate. It was suggested that the motion be revised to require at least one person from CJCLS to attend the ACRL Leadership Council in June at the Annual Conference, where training in developing outcomes-based assessment skills would be offered. This attendee should then share this information with the CJCLS Executive Committee, so that it can be used to revise the assessment plan. The revised plan must be shared with the Board of Directors in July 2007.

The Executive Committee was very supportive of providing this funding to help community college librarians take advantage of professional development and appreciated CJCLS' efforts to revise this proposal based on the Board's feedback.

Action: The ACRL Executive Committee approved the revised CJCLS action plan proposal for 40 scholarships of \$50 toward member participation in ACRL e-Learning Webcasts, with a focus on new technology, with the caveat that a CJCLS member be required to attend the ACRL Leadership Council's assessment training (Friday afternoon at the upcoming ALA Annual Conference in Washington, D.C.), that member must share the assessment training information with the CJCLS Executive Committee, and CJCLS would be required to resubmit the assessment section of the action plan immediately after the ALA Annual Conference in Washington, D.C.

8.0 Offering ACRL Virtual Conference on a Regular Basis (Document 6.0)

Motion: That the ACRL Executive Committee approve a policy stating that ACRL hosts a Virtual Conference each spring during a non-national conference year. (The next Virtual Conference would be offered in the spring of 2008.) Content/topics for the Virtual Conferences will be determined based on issues identified by our members. The Virtual Conferences would increase member involvement (feedback included comments from members who were delighted to be able to participate without the cost and time required for travel). The Virtual Conferences would also generate revenue for the Association.

As needed, ACRL may also choose to host a virtual conference in the fall. These would be scheduled in response to particular "hot" topics or issues where a timely conference would have more impact for the attendees.

Discussion: The Executive Committee was pleased to see this communication from the Professional Development Coordinating Committee (PDCC). Although it is very supportive of having additional virtual offerings, the Executive Committee was concerned about whether it was appropriate to institutionalize a specific event through policy and noted that even the ACRL National Conference does not have a policy regarding its frequency. An Executive Committee member proposed that perhaps ACRL should, in fact, have an official policy regarding the frequency of its National Conference, but there was not much support for the idea.

There was some support for approving the proposed policy to obligate the association to continue developing virtual conferences. Members should be assured that they could count on a virtual conference being offered in the non-National Conference years at a minimum. If it doesn't make sense sometime in the future, the Board could rescind the policy. The PDCC saw the first virtual conferences developed as a staff initiative and worried that if staff got too busy the virtual conferences might cease. The Executive Committee was confident that there was no question on that point, and that the virtual conferences will continue on a regular basis until and unless the environment changes and they no longer make sense. The question here is whether there ought to be an actual policy stating that.

The Executive Committee also expressed concern that ACRL's rapid recent expansion in this field could tax the market and staff's ability to keep up. It was pointed out that the agenda for the current meeting was full of ideas to add or expand activities, but ACRL continues to struggle with giving up any older programs.

An Executive Committee member expressed some confusion about the differences between the various virtual events that ACRL offers, and stated that ACRL should clearly define them. Examples included virtual institutes, virtual conferences, virtual national conferences, classes, Webcasts, Webinars, 2-day courses, and 3-week courses.

The Executive Committee supported the PDCC's interest in being involved with future virtual conferences. The Executive Committee would be supportive if the PDCC wanted to propose a revision to its charge to include this responsibility. The Board could act on such a request at the next Annual Conference or, if the PDCC felt that it was important to revise its charge prior to the Annual Conference, the Board could take action virtually.

Action: The motion was withdrawn and an amended motion was proposed.

Motion: That the ACRL Executive Committee approve a policy stating that ACRL hosts a Virtual Conference each spring during a non-national conference year.

Action: The ACRL Executive Committee defeated an amended motion that ACRL hosts a Virtual Conference each spring during a non-National Conference year.

9.0 Academic/Research Librarian of the Year Award Frequency and Presentation

The Board has a small working group discussing frequency and presentation issues with the Academic/Research Librarian of the Year Award. The group is expected to bring recommendations to the Board at the Annual Conference meeting. Since the first effort at change, presenting the award at a keynote during the ACRL National Conference rather than during the President's Program at Annual Conference, had taken place just a month before this meeting, the Executive Committee discussed its perspective. Cannon and Budget and Finance Committee Chair Susan Kroll are both members of the working group and will bring any comments back to the other member of the group, chair Frances Maloy.

Executive Committee members generally agreed that the National Conference was a much preferable venue for presentation than the President's Program, which is attended by far fewer people than the National Conference keynotes. Since the National Conference occurs every other year, possible options to continue presenting the award there included changing the award to a biennial one, which would definitely require a change in the name of the award, or presenting the awards for the current year and the previous year at the same time at the National Conference. The award winners would still receive recognition in *C&RL News* in the year for which they received the award.

If the award were a biennial one, one possible name for it could be the Academic/Research Librarian of 20XX [specify current year]. It was suggested that it would even increase the prestige of the award to give out half as many. Even if the award continues to be an annual one, it might be a good idea to explicitly give the award selection committee permission and encouragement not to give an award if the current nominations are not found compelling. It was pointed out that this has been the case on occasion with the Excellence in Academic Libraries Award.

The other issue to consider is the reception for the award winner that has traditionally followed the award's presentation at the President's Program. In negotiating with YBP, the award's sponsor, to increase the amount of the award this year from \$3,000 to \$5,000, no money was provided for a reception and YBP instead hosted the winner at its booth on the National Conference exhibits floor. It was suggested that, if the award were awarded annually but presented biennially at the National Conference, YBP might want to host the award winner in non-National Conference years at its booth at the ALA Annual Conference and continue to host the National Conference year winner at its booth at that conference.

10.0 Top 10 Assumptions – Next Steps (Document 8.0)

At the 13th ACRL National Conference a month earlier, the ACRL Research Committee unveiled a list of the top 10 assumptions for the future of academic libraries, which the committee has been charged to update for each ACRL National Conference. The Executive Committee discussed the difference between a list of assumptions and a list of trends, and agreed that this was definitely a list of assumptions. Unfortunately, that results in a less provocative list than some had hoped for. If the instructions for the Research Committee's next list, to be announced at the 2009 ACRL National Conference in Seattle, need to be revised, this is the ideal time to do so.

Main points of discussion and suggestions from Executive Committee members included:

- If the list remains one of general assumptions, it will not change much before the next National Conference.
- ACRL's strategic planning process assumes that the strategic plan will be reviewed every year and modified if needed based on changes in the environment. Every second year will see a detailed environmental scan produced. These assumptions started out with an internal purpose of guiding planning and were only later suggested for public release. Perhaps a top trends list should be produced in addition to this list as something more appropriate for responsive action and public attention.
- Some agreed with comments made in articles and blog postings that the list could be more practical; something with concrete action steps for ACRL and even more so for academic libraries.
- An Executive Committee member would like to see ACRL assess other related top issues lists, such as the Top Technology Trends list produced annually by the Library and Information Technology Association (LITA) and the excellent lists produced by EDUCAUSE, as well as the OCLC environmental scan and lists from other pertinent organizations, such as the Medical Library Association and other special library associations.
- ACRL's environmental scan should be framed within these assumptions. These make good umbrella statements, but they need to be laid out with supporting statistics or examples to provide a benchmark, along the lines of Bowker's annual review. Davis agreed to check with staff to see whether the Research Committee could still ensure that the environmental scan due to be released this summer is tied to the assumptions.
- The assumptions and environmental scan should be tied to the Strategic Plan and the other top issues lists mentioned above. All information produced as part of the strategic planning process should reference other related strategic planning documents.
- Perhaps with so much other quality scanning already being done with relevance to the profession, ACRL should work *with* another organization that has a stronger program currently in place.
- The release of a new ACRL environmental scan or top assumptions list could be a good subject for a special issue of *C&RL News*, with related articles throughout the issue.
- While not wishing to derail the momentum the Research Committee already has and its new Assessment Subcommittee's work, the charge for the Research Committee should be reviewed. It could also be useful to appoint someone to the committee from the OCLC office of research. The Research Committee should have members who are already skilled; it is not a good place for inexperienced members to have to catch up with the process. This may be a case where the association needs a strong knowledge-based committee, without offering slots to new, inexperienced members of the profession just to give them opportunities to participate.
- The chair of the Research Committee should be brought in to this conversation for further discussion.
- This is the time to be very clear about whether a list of top ten assumptions is all the Board wants. The assumptions list as umbrella statements with supporting data is useful, but still doesn't provide opportunities for good publicity. Perhaps another group should be asked to put together the more provocative list.

Next steps will include:

- Asking the Research Committee to connect the environmental scan to the assumptions.

- Todaro will review the charge and keep this discussion in mind as she finalizes the 2007-08 committee appointments.
- The Board will receive the environmental scan at the Annual Conference.

11.0 Diversity White Paper – Next Steps for Dissemination and Recommendations (Documents 9.0 & 9.0a)

At the 2007 Midwinter Meeting, the Board received and discussed the new white paper on diversity that it had commissioned, “Achieving Racial and Ethnic Diversity Among Academic and Research Librarians: The Recruitment, Retention, and Advancement of Librarians of Color.” The Board had attempted to continue discussing the paper using ALA’s online community, but that venue did not engender much further discussion. It is important to the Board that this paper be used as a starting point for ongoing action and discussion, so the Executive Committee considered what next steps it would like to see.

It was noted that you generally hear more comments when people disagree than when they agree, which may have had something to do with the lack of online discussion, and there does seem to be general agreement with the recommendations included in the paper. The Board needs to determine which recommendations to begin implementing.

One upcoming action has already been approved. The white paper’s authors had requested permission to present the paper at a meeting of the Black Caucus of the American Library Association (BCALA) in August 2007. Permission was granted, contingent on the inclusion of an ACRL Board member in the presentation, which Todaro has agreed to do.

The Executive Committee, and the full Board, when discussing the paper at the Midwinter Meeting, are particularly interested in the idea of creating a recruitment Website like discovernursing.com, but recognize that the cost of such a polished site and an accompanying media campaign could be prohibitive. Ideas for funding assistance included finding a corporate sponsor to underwrite the campaign or applying for a leadership grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS).

It was also again suggested that ACRL partner with ALA’s Office for Human Resource Development and Recruitment (HRDR). It is believed that HRDR would welcome additional assistance and content from divisions focused on recruiting to their specific type of librarian. HRDR might also be a good partner to work with on a grant application to IMLS.

Regarding dissemination of the paper, the Executive Committee agreed that the paper needs editing, as suggested by the authors when they presented the paper to the Board at the Midwinter Meeting. The recommendations scattered throughout the paper also need to be pulled together in a single, consolidated list. While the paper itself is much too long to include in *C&RL News*, a summary of the paper or a note announcing its release and directing readers to the full version of the paper on the Web site would be a good idea. The authors should be offered the first right of refusal to write the summary for *C&RL News* and to create the consolidated list of recommendations. They should also be asked to review the paper before it is disseminated once it has been copyedited. There is some confusion about exactly what type of editing the authors intended when suggesting it to the Board, whether focused on the content or strictly the structure. Once that’s determined, someone extremely sensitive to the content of the document should be selected as the editor.

The following next steps were settled on:

- 1) Approach the paper's authors about writing a summary suitable for publication and consolidated list of recommendations. The summary should be published in *C&RL News* before the BCALA meeting in August.
- 2) Find out specifically what the authors intended with their suggestion that the paper be edited, then have the paper copyedited.
- 3) Todaro and one other Board member will work with the ACRL Racial and Ethnic Diversity Committee, meeting with them at the Annual Conference and helping them draft strategic initiative action plan proposals that will suggest to the Board a strategy for carrying out the paper's recommendations. Ideas for action statements included creating a marketing piece for recruitment and retention and directing committees to develop conference programs directed to underrepresented librarians. Partnerships should be considered where feasible.

12.0 Assessment Skills Development for Librarians

Several signs indicate that ACRL members could benefit from some sort of education about assessment to help them assess their own institutions, including comments during the panel on the Top Ten Assumptions at the recent National Conference and large turnouts by academic librarians at outcomes workshops Todaro teaches.

It was noted that the agenda for the ACRL Leadership Council at the upcoming Annual Conference included an assessment education component and would be discussed later at this meeting. Beyond that, it was agreed that ACRL might need to consider developing a business model to teach its members more advanced assessment skills, to be used in such areas as information literacy assessment and advocacy, to clearly demonstrate the library's value on campus. This could also help libraries define their role on campus as the U.S. Department of Education's so-called 'Spellings report,' "A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education," begins to have an impact.

Todaro, Davis, and ACRL Board Director-at-Large and assessment expert Nancy Allen will have a phone call to further develop ideas for ACRL's role. It was noted that the association should be willing to go beyond librarianship when looking for experts to develop assessment education, as there are many people on the faculty of ACRL members' institutions who have served on accreditation teams and have valuable experience to share. It was also suggested that very basic assistance could be provided through the development of a pathfinder for the ALA Website, to help people self-direct an assessment using relevant standards and tools throughout ALA's units.

13.0 13th National Conference Debrief (Document 12.0)

The Executive Committee shared some of the many great compliments they had heard about the successful National Conference in Baltimore, and noted that there were a number of particularly effective innovations introduced at the conference, such as the Cyber Zed Shed presentations.

Actions: The ACRL Executive Committee, at its May 3, 2007, meeting in Washington, DC, approved the following resolutions:

On behalf of the ACRL Board of Directors, the Executive Committee sends a special thanks:

- 1) to Mary Reichel, chair of the 13th ACRL National Conference Baltimore for her leadership in breaking all conference records; and
- 2) to all the ACRL members involved in the planning of this conference.

AND

On behalf of the ACRL Board of Directors, the Executive Committee acknowledges and extends a special thanks:

- 1) to the entire ACRL staff involved in the planning of the 13th ACRL National Conference Baltimore; and
- 2) to Margot Conahan and Tory Ondrla for their special leadership of this effort.

14.0 Conference Call with Board of Directors

The Executive Committee participated in a conference call with the full Board of Directors, including Directors-at-Large Nancy Allen, Janis Bandelin, Mary Carr, Lynne King, Debbie Malone, and Karen Williams. Director-at-Large Lori Goetsch attended the meeting in person. Director-at-Large Dorothy Ann Washington was unable to participate.

Snelson welcomed everyone to the call at 11:05 a.m. She noted that the Board would not be taking action at this meeting, but planned to discuss elements of the proposed bylaws changes that would be voted on at the Annual Conference meeting in Washington, D.C. the following month.

14.1 ACRL Bylaws Revisions Overview (Documents 10.1a-10.1c)

Document 10.1c contains small changes that clean up various bylaws, and would not change things in a significant structural way. The Board had no questions about these changes, thought they made sense, and will use this document for its vote on the proposed Bylaws revisions at the 2007 ALA Annual Conference.

14.2 Dues (Document 10.2)

The Board discussed the 3 options that had been selected as possible bylaws revisions that would allow the Board to adjust dues without necessarily always having to go to the ACRL membership for approval. The Board began considering this change after the experience with the dues increase approved in 2005. It had been over a decade and half since the previous increase and there was a feeling that it would be better to avoid such a long stretch between increases in the future for the sake of the association's sustainability, and because it required so much education of the membership to increase dues after such a long time.

Option 1 would give the Board unlimited responsibility to set personal dues without qualification. There is precedent within ALA for a Board to have that kind of authority, such as the Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS) has, but it is recognized that this idea might not be popular with ACRL's membership.

The second option limits the size of personal dues increases that could be set by the Board without a membership vote to the level of inflation since the last dues increase, based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI). This would be the minimum increase needed to keep pace with inflation in the larger economy. Any increase above that amount for programmatic reasons would still go to the membership for approval and would need careful justification.

The third option takes a different approach by requiring a larger vote (2/3) of the Board to increase dues without qualification. Given the importance and impact of dues, a stricter vote requirement might be appropriate.

It was also suggested that there could be a fourth option, using the inflation cap on the amount of any increase from the second option combined with the stricter supermajority vote requirement of the third option.

The Board agreed that option 2 was preferred. There was some discussion about whether it was better to identify a specific index, such as the CPI, in option 2 or if it should simply say that any change in the

dues would be data-driven using some index, with whatever index made the most sense identified as needed. It was agreed that members would understand the widely used CPI and that by not identifying a specific index the Board risked clouding the issue. Saying only that the Board would use data or some unidentified metrics to base its decision on could be seen cynically by those who would assume that the Board would seek out the data most favorable to whatever increase it wanted to implement. Should the Board see the need for an increase beyond the CPI-based cap, it could include whatever data it liked in the supporting documentation with the ballot.

It was clarified that option 2 would not be an automatic increase each year, but only when the Board does look at dues increases at some fairly regular interval.

The Board agreed that option 2 is its preferred option, with some slight revisions as follows:

1. The final line, regarding organizational dues, should be broken out into its own entry to avoid confusion. I.e., a) Personal Member Dues..., b) Organizational Dues...
2. The end of the Organizational Dues section should be revised to say “of the members of the Board,” rather than simply “of its members.” This is to remove any confusion by even the most casual reader about whether it is members of the Board or members of the association that are being referred to, and also makes the language consistent with the proposed personal dues section.

14.3 Interest Group Structure (Documents 10.3a-10.3c)

The Board was supportive of the revisions proposed in document 10.3a. There was concern, however, that use of the umbrella term Common Interest Groups both lent itself to confusion with the specific group-type descriptor Interest Group and was also a confusing set of words, as some Board members suggested it was not clear whether common modified interest or groups. The Board brainstormed to come up with alternatives to use for the umbrella term, with suggestions including “groups of common interest” and “communities of practice.” The Board and staff would come up with more suggestions following the meeting and a decision on a new term would be made for the final language the Board would consider at the Annual Conference for its first vote on the bylaws change.

The Board discussed the requirement in the proposed policies, which would not be part of the bylaws language, requiring a petition with the signatures of 10 members to propose the establishment of a new group to the Board. There was general agreement that, given the growth in ACRL’s membership, 25 signatures seems more reasonable as an initial gauge of interest in a new unit. Some Board members felt that even that was too low and would like to see more restrictive language, fearing that too many new units will be requested and the Board will be unwilling to decline any of them. It was also suggested that the funding descriptions on document 10.3 could create expectations for conference program funding that could be at odds with the Board’s efforts to improve the programs process.

It was clear that this change would require a great deal of education before the members vote on it. Existing groups will want to know how they fit in to the new structure. When the time comes, a small group will work on the narrative to accompany the ballot.

14.4 Leadership Recruitment and Nomination Process Revisions (Documents 10.4a-10.4b)

Davis informed that Board that in her consultations with ALA Parliamentarian Eli Mina about the bylaws revisions, he had advised that changes to the current nominating process might be made within the present bylaws structure that could potentially accomplish the Board’s goals. The Board wished to consolidate the disparate nominating committees that have been difficult to educate well about the expectations and responsibilities of being a Board member when those committees search for candidates to put forward. The changes under consideration would still ensure the involvement of each unit involved in nominating Board members, while centralizing the process and ensuring a deliberative, educated search for candidates.

The Board agreed not to move forward with any further changes to the nomination bylaws at this time and felt that it would be more productive to discuss the structure proposed in document 10.4a with the units involved, including Sections Council, Chapters Council, the Leadership Recruitment and Nomination Committee, and the three type-of-library Sections: the University Libraries Section (ULS), College Libraries Section (CLS), and Community and Junior College Libraries Section (CJCLS). This new nominating structure and process could be framed as a pilot, but the importance of laying out a clear start and end to the pilot and plan for assessment was emphasized. The assumed outcomes listed on document 10.4b could be used as a basis for assessment benchmarks.

There was some concern that if the proposed Interest Group unit were introduced, as described in the previous agenda item, they would not be included in this process. Given the effort to equate them with Sections, that could be a problem.

Additionally, there is some editorial work that needs to be done to the existing bylaws in Articles IX and XI, e.g., to change Nominating Committee to Leadership, Recruitment, and Nominations committee. The Bylaws Committee will be asked to include those housekeeping changes with the other minor revisions in document 10.1c.

Grasping all of the structural changes under consideration now and those implemented over the last few years, such as the establishment of coordinating committees, was challenging for some of the newer Board members, given the complexity and long history of some of the discussions. It was agreed that staff should share all major reports that have come out of the Board's strategic planning sessions over the last few years with those Board members who were not present at the time to help give them a sense of the history of the discussions, particularly where the Interest Groups and Board composition are concerned.

14.5 Annual Conference Programs Working Group Recommendations (Document 10.5)

The Board discussed the latest update and set of recommendations from the Board's Annual Conference Programs Working Group. This working group was reviewing all aspects of ACRL's Annual Conference programs, particularly taking what had been a minor role for the Board in program approval and making it an active responsibility for a member group. There has been a disconnect and belief among members that the Board is putting much more effort into vetting programs than it ever really has.

The Board was supportive of the recommendations. Major points of the discussion included:

- There was some concern about the amount of staff support required. If there was an open call for program proposals it would add to the staff's workload, but as framed in this document it would just shift the group that staff worked with, adding no additional work. Changes to the process made in recent year have already improved the amount of staff time required and everyone seems comfortable with it.
- It was noted that staff had already implemented recommendation #9, to add institutional pricing for online education.
- While recommendation #3, to investigate ways to bring forward program proposals from sources other than the traditional Sections or committees, is meant to allow for individuals to propose programs, that intention might need to be made more explicit.
- Recommendation #10's call to explore options for allowing Sections to front the cost of an online program for all interested members of the Section could get very expensive and needs some mechanism for cost containment. Perhaps it is intended to apply to asynchronous programming, which would be more affordable. There was also question about whether Interest Groups would be included if they are approved. Director-at-Large Karen Williams, chair of this working group, was supportive of this as a move that many members need when they can't afford to attend face-

to-face conferences, but agreed to ask working group member Beth Dupuis how that recommendation's implementation was envisioned.

These recommendations will be shared with the Professional Development Coordinating Committee. The committee will be notified that this will be on the Board's agenda at the Annual Conference and it should be asked whether it has any questions about what the committee's role will be.

The Board adjourned its conference call at 12:20 p.m. and the Executive Committee reconvened.

15.0 Stepping Through the Open Door: A Forum on New Modes of Information Delivery in Higher Education – Next Steps (Document 11.0)

The Executive Committee did not have time to discuss this item. It will be postponed until the Board's Annual Conference meeting.

16.0 ALA Draft Principles for Digitized Content (Document 7.0)

The Executive Committee reviewed the draft ALA Principles for Digitized Content and was very pleased with the direction the draft has taken. It was noted that ACRL was approached for representation on this task force. Comments included that the principles were well written and structured for others to build on, the bold-faced words are well selected and make it easy to identify key concepts, and the principles are ordered in a very logical fashion.

17.0 Digitization Issues and ACRL (Document 19.0)

The Executive Committee did not have time to discuss this item. It will be postponed until the Board's Annual Conference meeting.

Strategic Area: The Association

18.0 2nd Quarter Budget Report (Documents 13.0 & 13.0a)

Susan Kroll, Chair of the ACRL Budget and Finance Committee, highlighted a few items from the 2nd quarter budget report, including:

- Membership revenue was much stronger than expected.
- The National Conference looks like it will exceed all expectations when the final numbers are in.
- The non-serial publications and Academic Trends and Statistics projects continue to wrestle with inventory adjustment and cost of sales problems, which staff continues to work with ALA's Accounting department to sort out.
- ACRL Content Strategist Kathryn Deiss is working on branding to better distinguish ACRL from ALA publishing.
- CHOICE is doing well overall. Its recent product launches have been successful.

19.0 CHOICE Property Update (Document 20.0)

The Executive Committee had no questions about the written update.

20.0 ALA Emerging Leaders Initiative (Document 4.0)

Motion: To support the Emerging Leaders '08 initiative with a \$1,000 stipend in FY08 for one new librarian as requested in the message from Connie Paul included with the Board document.

Discussion: The Executive Committee agreed that the goal of the Emerging Leaders initiative is excellent, to connect future leaders to the structure and programs of ALA. The initiative was much more time consuming for participating units than they had originally been informed, however. As Davis noted in the Operations Report, ACRL was assigned 12 emerging leaders to work on projects for it during the year. Fortunately, Todaro had two concrete projects for them to work on this year and was very generous with her time as she worked with the groups. At the Annual Conference, Todaro expects to bring the Board recommendations and an assessment

regarding the two projects she coordinated. Recommendations will include how many projects ACRL could reasonably manage, who should manage them, and what kind of oversight the emerging leaders will need.

The Executive Committee supported continuing its support of the Emerging Leaders initiative in FY08 with cautious enthusiasm. It decided to increase its support to \$2,000, with the caveat that ACRL intends to evaluate its experience with the current emerging leaders and, based on that assessment, structure ACRL's participation in the program to best serve ACRL's needs. It was also noted that three ACRL Sections are also interested in supporting Emerging Leaders in FY08.

There was some question about whether it would be possible for ACRL to sponsor 5 different emerging leaders, should ACRL sections follow through on their initial interest, and, if so, does FY08's revised system have a mechanism where the sponsored Emerging Leader is assured that it will work with the sponsoring unit.

Todaro also updated the Executive Committee regarding her correspondence with the University of Michigan about its support for two interns. The U of M has funding to support two library school interns to work virtually on projects for ACRL. Todaro has come up with projects related to the work that this year's Emerging Leaders groups did and intends to add recommendations from the diversity white paper to their work. She is excited about the applications submitted. Details for the arrangement are still being sorted out.

Action: The ACRL Executive Committee voted to support the Emerging Leaders '08 initiative with a \$1,000 stipend each in FY08 for TWO new librarians to attend the ALA Midwinter Meeting and ALA Annual Conference. Further, ACRL intends to evaluate its experience with the current emerging leaders and, based on that assessment, structure ACRL's participation in the program to best serve ACRL's needs, particularly related to the oversight of Emerging Leaders projects and the selection process.

21.0 Task Forces

21.1 Friends of ACRL Review Task Force Interim Report (Document 14.1)

Friends of ACRL Review Task Force chair Lisa Browar had indicated that the report fell a little short of the assigned tasks, but that the task force's members were still working. The final report for the Annual Conference meeting will be complete.

While Executive Committee members could appreciate the report's note that the Colleagues Committee charge on paper, to coordinate all corporate fundraising for projects throughout the association, is not the work that in practice the Colleagues Committee carries out, they were uncomfortable separating the current National Conference-based Colleagues Committee from the conference subcommittee structure, given the committee's track record of success for the last few conferences. The Executive Committee would rather have the Colleagues Committee's charge revised to reflect its limited focus on the National Conference. This committee has been very successful and should continue to be appointed by the National Conference Chair and function as a part of the National Conference team.

However, a separate fundraising subcommittee of the Budget and Finance Committee could be established to fulfill the other recommendations the report outlines, including fulfilling the original charge to the Colleagues Committee, and would coordinate the association's overall fundraising plan with the National Conference Colleagues Committee.

21.2 ACRL Second Life Task Force Establishment (Document 14.2)

Motion: That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the establishment of the Second Life Task Force with a charge, membership, and timeline as follows:

Charge: The ACRL Second Life Task Force will explore the Second Life (SL) environment, determine what kind of presence ACRL should have in SL, recommend programs and services ACRL should offer in SL, and determine the resources needed to sustain ACRL's presence, programs, and services. In

addition the Task Force is charged with setting up the ACRL and Choice floor in the ALA building, furnishing and decorating it, and developing promotional materials related to ACRL's presence in Second Life.

Specific tasks:

- Determine scope of ACRL presence in SL
- Describe initial programs and services
- Furnish and decorate the third floor
- Recommend future activities for ACRL in SL

Specific Requirements of Membership Composition: The ACRL Second Life Task Force should have at least two ACRL members on it who are already active in Second Life in addition to people who are interested in helping to explore the potential of Second Life for ACRL.

TIMELINE FOR COMPLETION OF WORK:

- Date interim report is due: Fall 2007
- Date final report is due: Midwinter 2008

Discussion: Mark Bard, Information Technology Specialist at ALA's Office for Information Technology Policy (OITP), presented an overview of Second Life and the work that librarians and ALA have been doing there. He noted that several other ALA units, such as RUSA, had been working in Second Life. Bard then answered any questions the Executive Committee had about Second Life.

Action: The ACRL Executive Committee approved the establishment of the Second Life Task Force with a charge, membership, and timeline as follows:

Charge: The ACRL Second Life Task Force will explore the Second Life environment, determine what kind of presence ACRL should have in SL, recommend programs and services ACRL should offer in SL, and determine the resources needed to sustain ACRL's presence, programs, and services. In addition the Task Force is charged with setting up the ACRL and Choice floor in the ALA building, furnishing and decorating it, and developing promotional materials related to ACRL's presence in Second Life.

Specific tasks:

- Determine scope of ACRL presence in SL
- Describe initial programs and services
- Furnish and decorate the third floor
- Recommend future activities for ACRL in SL

Specific Requirements of Membership Composition: The ACRL Second Life Task Force should have at least two ACRL members on it who are already active in Second Life in addition to people who are interested in helping to explore the potential of Second Life for ACRL.

TIMELINE FOR COMPLETION OF WORK:

- Date interim report is due: Fall 2007
- Date final report is due: Midwinter 2008

22.0 Tech Services/AUL Outreach Meeting Report (Document 15.0)

Snelson, Todaro, and Davis hosted a group of 22 technical services and Assistant University Librarian-level attendees at a breakfast on the closing day of ACRL's National Conference. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the views and desires of academic librarians who don't see a good home unit for themselves within

ACRL. The breakfast went well and found the attendees very engaged in the discussion. However, it also made clear the ongoing need to educate the membership about how much control they have over the association. The breakfast attendees were stunned to learn that it only required 10 signatures to submit a petition to establish a new discussion group to the Board, which is stated in the *ACRL Guide to Policies and Procedures* and on the petition itself, both of which are openly available on the ACRL Website. The Senior Administrators Discussion Group established earlier at this meeting was one of the outcomes from the breakfast.

The Executive Committee discussed the need to continue considering new association structures that could provide homes for different niches. It was also suggested that an op ed piece in *C&RL News* written by one of the proactive members who spearheaded the establishment of new discussion groups in recent years could serve as a useful tool for educating the membership.

23.0 National Conference Focus Group Reports (Document 16.0)

The Executive Committee discussed the reports from the various focus groups held during the National Conference in Baltimore. Major points of discussion included:

- Members expect the association to offer content directly relevant to their specific job.
- Executive Committee members were still surprised at the number of activities that ACRL undertakes that members are unaware of. A number of suggestions that focus group participants had for ACRL programs and services they'd like to see have already been offered for some time, such as toolkits for advocacy, institutes, and a blog.
- The focus group reports have been forwarded to the Emerging Leaders group working with Julie on recruitment.
- Many of the focus group participants saw ACRL as a conduit for furthering their careers or tenure status.
- More focus on programming for members in senior management might be needed.
- There seems to be some interest in credentialing in academic librarianship and offering continuing education units for participating in ACRL professional development programs. ALA has not really been involved in these areas, outside the credentialing program ALA-APA has established for public librarians. Before making any moves in this area, further probing should be done to determine what members really want and need, as offering anything beyond a participation certificate for attending a preconference, for example, would involve a hefty commitment to an in depth approval process with the International Association of Continuing Education & Training (IACET).

The Executive Committee discussed the next steps for review of these reports and decided to route the Trends and Statistics Users report to the ACRL Statistics Committee for its use. The other reports would be sent to the ACRL Membership Advisory Committee for review. The Membership Advisory Committee should identify the key implications statements and priority strategies for recommended future action and report back to the Board of Directors by late August so the Board can consider the report in its discussions at the Board Strategic Planning and Orientation Session in the fall. The report should address the question, "What does this mean for recruiting and retaining ACRL members?"

24.0 MW Board Meeting Effectiveness Assessment (Document 17.0)

The Board's self-assessments have shown repeatedly that the Board doesn't believe that it does a good job communicating with the membership. Suggested possible solutions included revisiting the responsibilities and expectations of Board members as liaisons to specific Sections and providing Board members with training focused on developing skills specifically for communicating with members.

If there is time, this assessment will be discussed further at the Board's Annual Conference meeting.

25.0 Expected Outcomes of Annual Conference

25.1 Leadership Council (Documents 18.1a-18.1d)

After reviewing the introduction to assessment presentation in the next agenda item and expanding the time allotted to it, the Executive Committee settled on the following agenda for the Leadership Council at the 2007 Annual Conference:

Introductions and connections – 10 minutes

Have new Section and committee chairs stand and introduce themselves by name and Section/committee. Snelson would use a wireless microphone to move among the members. A fun icebreaker question could be asked on the RSVP, with answers worked into Snelson and Todaro's exchanges with the new chairs or a few moments for the chairs to introduce themselves around their tables.

Response to Feedback Solicited from Members/Update on Planned Board Actions regarding Bylaws and Policy Revisions– 30 minutes

- Dues Bylaws Revisions
- Interest Group Structure Bylaws Revisions
- Leadership Recruitment and Nomination Policy Revisions

This will be followed by reminders for upcoming Strategic Initiative Action Plan proposal and environmental scanning deadlines, leading directly into...

Introduction to Outcomes Assessment – 70 minutes

- PowerPoint Presentation
- Examples/Step-by-Step Walk-through
- Questions
- Practice Activity

Copies of the President's Program, President and Vice-President Reports, and Bylaws revision documents from the Board I meeting will be available on the tables or at the back of the room.

25.1.1 Introduction to Assessment Presentation (Document 18.1.1)

The Executive Committee reviewed the draft presentation created by the Assessment Subcommittee for the Leadership Council and agreed that it provides a good, broad overview of assessment and does a great job fulfilling the Board's original request. After reviewing the presentation, the Executive Committee came to the conclusion that more time is needed than originally planned to ensure that the topic is covered in sufficient depth, as even more is needed to truly help educate an incoming section or committee chair about how to develop an assessment component for his/her unit's Strategic Initiative Action Plan proposal.

The Executive Committee decided to expand the amount of time spent on assessment training at the Leadership Council from the 15 minutes originally planned to 70 minutes. The focus needs to be on the creation of outcome statements. The Executive Committee will ask one of ACRL's Sections to volunteer to work with the Assessment Subcommittee so that the subcommittee could help the Section develop a step-by-step outline showing how to get from an initial idea for an action plan to a proposal with fully fleshed-out outcome statements. Because the Executive Committee had just given CJCLS conditional approval on an action plan proposal contingent on submitting an improved assessment plan earlier in this meeting, they agreed that CJCLS should be offered the first right of refusal to be the volunteer Section.

There should also be a workshop component of the training, providing opportunities for those in attendance to practice writing outcomes statements and developing an assessment plan. One

possibility is to ask participants to come to the meeting with 4 sample goals that they will use to create outcome statements at the Leadership Council itself. This also responds to feedback from previous Leadership Council attendees seeking more leadership development from the meeting.

25.2 Fellows Luncheon (Documents 18.2a & 18.2b)

The Executive Committee briefly reviewed the history and purpose of the Fellows Luncheon. After discussing a number of different focuses for this year's luncheon, the Executive Committee decided to have the Fellows help ACRL craft a response to the Spellings report. Links to the report and a few relevant articles about it will be included in the email invitation for them to read beforehand. An icebreaker and a little time for networking would also be provided at the beginning of the luncheon.

Other focuses considered that could be used for future events included:

- Asking the Fellows to promote self-nominations for the Board throughout the membership to expand the pool of potential nominees beyond who the members of the Leadership Recruitment and Nomination Committee know,
- Asking their input on ACRL's next steps or role should be regarding the diversity white paper, the essay from ACRL's Summit on Technology and Change in Academic Libraries, or other current issues,
- Asking the Fellows, "If you were incoming ACRL president today, what would your initiative be?"
- Asking how ACRL should help fill its members' assessment education needs, or
- Repurposing popular programs that could be of universal interest, such as the program on dealing with a toxic work environment from the 2007 ACRL National Conference.

26.0 New Business

There was no new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:59