



**Association of College and Research Libraries**  
***Fall Executive Committee Meeting***

Friday, October 19, 2007  
8:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.  
Conference Call with Board – 10:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.  
ALA Headquarters – 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room  
Chicago

Saturday, October 20, 2007  
8:00 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.  
Holiday Inn Chicago Mart Plaza

**Fall Executive Committee Meeting Minutes**

**Attendees:**

*Executive Committee Members:* Julie Todaro, Erika Linke, Pam Snelson, Theresa Byrd, Locke Morrissey, and Mary Ellen Davis.

*Visitors:* Deborah Gilchrist (by phone).

*Staff:* David Connolly, Margot Conahan (by phone for part of the meeting) and Mary Jane Petrowski (for part of the meeting).

**1.0 Call to Order**

President Julie Todaro called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m.

**2.0 Opening Remarks**

Todaro thanked everyone for attending the meeting and noted the difficult travel conditions the previous day.

**3.0 Adoption of the Agenda**

Executive Director Mary Ellen Davis asked that two additional items be added to the agenda under New Business: an information literacy-related proposal from UNESCO and a discussion of the Chinese American Library Association's (CALA) interest in partnership opportunities with ACRL.

An additional bit of new business was discussed at this time, regarding whether it was appropriate to add ACRL's ALA Board liaison to the ACRL Board's electronic discussion list. ALA Governance Office staff recently sent an email to Division executive directors requesting that the new ALA Board liaisons to be added to their Board's email discussion lists. Davis was then approached at the ALA Finance and Audit Committee meeting the day before this meeting by ACRL's ALA Board liaison, Larry Romans, who asked Mary Ellen to add him to the list. Davis responded that the list is closed, as is the ALA Executive Board list, and it wouldn't be appropriate to add Romans. At Romans' request, Davis is bringing it to the Board for their consideration.

When Davis asked the ALA Governance Office staff for some background on this request, she was informed that the staff member who sent the email with the request regrets it and did not intend for the ALA Board liaisons to be added to Division Board lists, but rather for them to be kept up to date through Division leadership lists. It was noted that ACRL staff has already added Romans to the ACRLLeads list in response to this request.

The Executive Committee members agreed that they would not be comfortable adding anyone to the list beyond Board members, noting that the list is not used to circumvent open meeting policies, but is instead often used to develop half-formed ideas and is sometimes used to discuss confidential issues, such as real estate and personnel

matters. It was noted that even ACRL Program Officer David Connolly and other ACRL staff members who communicate with the Board have not been subscribed to the list.

Davis will write to Romans to notify him of the Board's decision and share the many other ways he can stay informed, such as subscribing to the ACRL Update list and the upcoming staff-driven blog, and will invite him to attend ACRL Board meetings whenever he can. A copy of the letter will be shared with the Board. (Note: A subsequent discussion by the ALA Executive Board removed the need for the letter as the ALA Executive Board discussed staying in touch with Divisions without participating in Board electronic discussion lists.)

*Action:* The Executive Committee adopted the agenda as revised.

## **Strategic Area: The Association**

### **4.0 Reports**

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

Todaro referred the Executive Committee to her written report for an update of her activities and noted one small change: that the Colorado chapter is changing its dates and now conflicts with the spring Association of Research Libraries (ARL) membership meeting that she's planning to attend. Todaro sought feedback about which meeting she should miss. The point was made that the ARL meeting might include a goodbye for retiring ARL Executive Director Duane Webster and a welcome to a new executive director. If Todaro has to miss the Colorado meeting, the vice-president or past-president might attend instead.

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

Vice-President/President-Elect Erika Linke shared that her local ACRL chapter asked her to speak at their meeting and verified with Davis that she only needed to coordinate chapter visits through ACRL if ACRL is funding the visit.

Linke noted that she had made her first committee appointments and was preparing for the major appointment effort to come in the spring. Todaro shared that when she had been asked to provide names for ALA appointments it could have been helpful to have ACRL volunteer reports to know who was interested in service. There might be some discussion later in the meeting about how to follow up with volunteers who were not appointed to an ACRL Division-level committee the previous year.

#### **4.3 Councilor's Report**

Division Councilor Locke Morrissey noted that most of the Council's electronic discussion list topics have been around the new bundling price structure for ALA conferences and the costs of pre-conferences. Morrissey met informally with the other Division Councilors earlier in the day and plans to meet with them at future meetings.

Davis commented that according to other ALA units, only ACRL members seem to be raising issues with the ALA conference registration bundling practice.

#### **4.4 Executive Director's Strategic Plan Activities Report (Document 1.3)**

Davis highlighted some of the entries in the fall Strategic Plan Activities Report (SPAR) and noted the change in the name of the report from the "Operations Report" to more accurately reflect its current purpose. Major points included:

- Consultants and ACRL staff are finishing a report on June's scholarly communication community discussion.
- ACRL has published its first "open access" monograph, which is available on the Web as a full download and in printed form for a fee.
- *Resources for College Libraries* has been successful and is looking at the possibility of publishing a vo-tech edition.

- ACRL Associate Director Mary Jane Petrowski helped EDUCAUSE plan an information literacy meeting in Colorado. It was an interesting partnership, but ACRL should monitor EDUCAUSE's information literacy programming and make sure that ACRL keeps its own visibility on that issue. It was suggested that Davis could use information literacy as an opportunity to reach out to incoming EDUCAUSE President and CEO Diana Oblinger and push for ACRL-EDUCAUSE partnership ideas.
- The ACRL College Student Surveys Project Group (CSSPG) (including CJCLS members) is working to have library-related questions added to the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). Questions have been developed and submitted. Executive Committee members found this particularly interesting, noting that CCSSE and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) are very protective of their longitudinal integrity and are resistant to adding the questions. Getting information literacy questions added may be one of the most important things ACRL could ever do. The CSSPG should be followed up with and ACRL should help push them forward. Davis noted that this is the kind of big information literacy issue that needs to go forward with consistency; ACRL needs to identify a clear person or group to assign to move this forward. Petrowski noted that this entry in the SPAR was based on an item she saw in the CJCLS newsletter and offered to get more information and report back to Davis. It was also mentioned that the Oberlin Group had found that as many as 25 schools may be adding the ACRL info lit questions to their own NSSE surveys.
- ACRL has partnered with Harvard for an advanced leadership institute. The original institute always sells out and results in a lot of good feedback.
- ACRL was partnering with LAMA on a spring virtual institute, due to mutual interest in the topic of issues and challenges facing middle managers and leaders.
- There have been several ACRL staff changes since the Annual Conference. Manager of Web Services Stephanie Orphan resigned to take a new position out east, Classified Advertising Coordinator and Editorial Assistant Olivia Hodges is leaving for another position in Chicago shortly, and *C&RL News* Editor-in-Chief and Marketing and Communications Specialist David Free started in mid-August. Searches are ongoing for the Web Services Manager and the new Program Coordinator position, while a temp will fill in as the Classified Ads Coordinator while a search gets underway for that position. Davis also thanked Connolly for his hard work preparing for Board meetings and noted that some of his responsibilities will be reassigned to the new Program Coordinator position.
- Other ALA Division executive directors have been hearing ALA Treasurer Rod Hersberger praise ACRL for managing to gain members in a year with a dues increase.
- ACRL planned to launch a staff-driven blog this fall to share announcements about what's going on and serve as an outlet for thoughts from the Executive Director or Board members about the reasoning behind Board decisions and policy or structure changes. This blog will be distinct from the *ACRLog*, which is still content-focused and member-driven and would only refer to items posted in the staff-driven blog if they chose to.
- The first ever negative feedback about ACRL announcements on a Section electronic discussion list recently came in. After discussing it with Davis, the Section's executive committee asked staff to refrain from posting on the list while the Executive Committee looked for other communication venues. The staff-driven blog referred to above could help relieve some of the need for these announcements on Section lists. An Executive Committee member noted that the only feedback heard about ACRL's email announcements regarded event announcements that were repeated, as in a "register now" message, then a "space still available" notice, followed by "Deadline extended!" and "last chance." Staff will keep this in mind to avoid causing announcement fatigue, while still working to get the word out about new events and opportunities.

## **5.0 2007 ACRL Annual Conference Board Minutes (Document 2.0)**

The draft 2007 ACRL Annual Conference Board minutes were not completed in time for this meeting, but will be shared with the Board prior to the Midwinter Meeting. There were no other comments or discussion.

## **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 Spring Executive Committee Meeting Minutes ( Document 3.1)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the 2007 spring meeting minutes.

#### **6.2 Redesignate National Conference Executive Committee as a Coordinating Committee (Document 3.6)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Executive Committee approve a request to rename the National Conference Executive Committee the "National Conference Coordinating Committee." The current National Conference subcommittees will become component committees of the National Conference Coordinating Committee.

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

#### **6.3 Establish Copyright Discussion Group (Document 3.2)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the establishment of a Copyright Discussion Group. The statement of purpose and responsibility of the proposed Discussion Group is as follows:

To provide a forum to discuss copyright issues that confront those working in academic and research libraries.

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

#### **6.4 Dissolve Academic Library Outreach Discussion Group (Document 3.3)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the dissolution of the Academic Library Outreach Discussion Group.

#### **6.5 Establish Continuing Education/Professional Development Discussion Group (Document 3.4)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the establishment a Continuing Education/Professional Development discussion group in ACRL. The statement of purpose and responsibility of the proposed Discussion Group is as follows:

The purpose of the discussion group is to provide a forum for issues of current interest for librarians and others about continuing education for librarians and library staff. Discussions will share information and experiences, and discuss strategies to address common problems in the development of skills and knowledge needed in the fast changing library environment.

Discussions of topics of current of interest to the group are held at ALA Midwinter and Annual Conferences. Topics are determined by general agreement at the conference preceding discussion and may change during the 6-month period before the next conference.

**6.6 RBMS 2009 Preconference Date Change (Document 3.5)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Executive Committee approve a date change for the 50th Anniversary RBMS Preconference from July 7-10, 2009, to June 17-20, 2009.

*Discussion:* At the request of Executive Committee members, agenda items 6.5 and 6.6 were removed from the consent agenda for further discussion.

*Action:* The ACRL Executive Committee approved the consent agenda as amended.

**6.5 Establish Continuing Education/Professional Development Discussion Group (Document 3.4)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the establishment a Continuing Education/Professional Development discussion group in ACRL. The statement of purpose and responsibility of the proposed Discussion Group is as follows:

The purpose of the discussion group is to provide a forum for issues of current interest for librarians and others about continuing education for librarians and library staff. Discussions will share information and experiences, and discuss strategies to address common problems in the development of skills and knowledge needed in the fast changing library environment.

Discussions of topics of current of interest to the group are held at ALA Midwinter and Annual Conferences. Topics are determined by general agreement at the conference preceding discussion and may change during the 6-month period before the next conference.

*Discussion:* The Executive Committee noted that there were 2 new discussion groups being established at this meeting and expressed concern that especially as the effort to create the proposed Communities of Practice structure moves forward the Board will have to find a way to manage the potential for overlap or at least keeping related groups connected. The discussion touched on topics including: the Board might need to come up with a standard document with criteria for approval or disapproval of proposed new units and explicit requirements that they coordinate with related units of other types, such as a discussion group working with an existing committee.

It was suggested that the overlap might lie with existing Division-level committees in content areas that could be better served by a discussion group or the proposed Interest Group unit-type. The recent trend in associations has been to have fewer standing committees and establish ad hoc groups when needed for specific projects, rather than to have committees in every possible area on standby in case the Board needs them for something unexpected, developing the occasional program in the meantime. A comprehensive review of current committees and their charges was called for on a cyclical basis in the original strategic planning process, but the Board had been busy with its other structure changes and hadn't set aside time for that yet.

In the meantime, a small working group could be charged to review all standing committee charges with an eye toward their length, specificity, short-term and long-term purposes, and identification of anywhere else in the association that the committee's topic area might be covered. If such a group is established, it might be a good idea to appoint it with primarily non-Board members, as Board members are already quite busy with other various working groups. Staff has also been discussing the possible usefulness of a Committees Council or an electronic discussion list for committee chairs to communicate with each other.

There was also a general sense that the Board needs to be more proactive with committees about its expectations and should assign more specific projects to committees, rather than waiting for committees to come to the Board with an idea.

*Action:* The ACRL Executive Committee approved the establishment a Continuing Education/Professional Development discussion group in ACRL. The statement of purpose and responsibility of the proposed Discussion Group is as follows:

The purpose of the discussion group is to provide a forum for issues of current interest for librarians and others about continuing education for librarians and library staff. Discussions will share information and experiences, and discuss strategies to address common problems in the development of skills and knowledge needed in the fast changing library environment.

Discussions of topics of current of interest to the group are held at ALA Midwinter and Annual Conferences. Topics are determined by general agreement at the conference preceding discussion and may change during the 6-month period before the next conference.

#### **6.6 RBMS 2009 Preconference Date Change (Document 3.5)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Executive Committee approve a date change for the 50th Anniversary RBMS Preconference from July 7-10, 2009, to June 17-20, 2009.

*Discussion:* Executive Committee members expressed concern that the timing of the RBMS Preconference was moving even further away from the dates of the ALA Annual Conference than usual, making the use of the "Preconference" name less accurate. While they did not want to see it branded as a distinct "conference" in its own right, a different name might be more appropriate. An estimated 50% of attendees to the RBMS Preconference don't go on to attend that ALA Annual Conference that follows. The Executive Committee decided not to address the issue at this time, but plans to keep it in mind when reviewing future RBMS Preconference planning requests.

*Motion:* The ACRL Executive Committee approved the date change for the 50th Anniversary RBMS Preconference from July 7-10, 2009, to June 17-20, 2009.

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

#### **7.0 ACRL Trends and Statistics Working Group (Document 4.0)**

Davis and ACRL Associate Director Mary Jane Petrowski updated the Executive Committee regarding the discussions at the ACRL Trends and Statistics Working Group's meeting in Chicago in September. This working group was charged to meet this fall based on a document the Statistics Committee submitted to the Board at the 2007 Annual Conference suggesting a change in ACRL's approach to collecting statistics.

The Working Group had suggested trying to get the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to survey every year rather than biannually, but that may not happen. If NCES were to conduct an annual survey, that could replace ACRL's statistics collection. 2007 is an off year for NCES, so ACRL will definitely move forward with collecting statistics this year, but in the future ACRL may do so only on NCES' off years. While the working group had discussed using just the NCES data collected every other year, there was too much concern that important longitudinal trends could be missed, so ACRL will ensure that the information is collected annually one way or the other. Other ideas discussed at the working group's meeting included enhanced education efforts about how to use ACRL's statistics.

The working group decided that for ACRL's data gathering efforts in 2007, the survey instrument that was used in 2006 (that is to say, the old ARL Survey, not the new one) will be sent out and the new ARL Supplemental

Survey will be added as an optional set of questions. The Executive Committee was pleased with this decision. The working group will have a conference call in the spring to develop an updated recommendation to send forward at ACRL's Spring Executive Committee Meeting.

The Executive Committee expressed an interest in having ACRL collect data that would help the profession and are very interested in working with the Statistics Committee to see what the most important data are to collect and the best instrument to collect them. Major points raised during the discussion included:

- Even those libraries receiving data from regional groups, such as the Oberlin Group, need to compare themselves to institutions outside the group.
- ACRL's collection of statistics serves as a membership service that has a unique value for some users.
- Libraries are asked to complete too many different surveys.
- ACRL could be doing much more trend analysis with the data it collects rather than presenting it as a "data dump," but it's difficult to identify accurate longitudinal trends when the same institutions don't necessarily participate in the survey each year.
- ACRL has tried a number of different strategies to make survey completion easier, including using the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) form that users are already familiar with, the current use of the ARL form (including allowing ARL members to check a box to allow ARL to share their responses with ACRL, rather than completing the form again), and allowing schools to opt out of some sections of the survey altogether if they are irrelevant to that school.
- ACRL is able to provide data in a much timelier manner than some of the other collectors. For example, IPEDS just released its 2004 report, whereas the 2006 edition of ACRL's *Academic Libraries Trends & Statistics* has already been published.

The Executive Committee decided that it was important to gather input from the target audience for the statistics, namely library directors and vice-provosts who need the statistics to defend library budget requests or prepare for accreditation processes, about whether the statistics were useful and how the information was used before making any long-term decisions about the survey or the program. It was noted that the people completing the statistics surveys were not necessarily the same people using the resulting statistics. Asking rank and file ACRL members would likely result in an overly negative response, as no one enjoys completing statistics surveys, so the end-users must be reached. An external researcher, a statistics expert with knowledge about the profession, might also be needed to fully assess what information is gathered about academic and research libraries, how often, and how it's used.

To ensure that the Working Group and the Statistics Committee have the information they need to make thoughtful recommendations about the future of this program, the Executive Committee decided that a small group made up of ACRL Statistics Committee Chair Shawn Calhoun (with help from the committee members), Petrowski, ACRL Past-President Pamela Snelson, and ACRL Division Councilor Locke Morrissey will develop a short set of survey questions (no more than 8, but the idea is to keep the survey short enough to encourage completion) to address the following areas:

- What data is needed (by library directors, vice-provosts, department directors, etc.)?
- How is the data used/for what specific purposes (accreditation, budget justifications, strategic planning, annual reports, grant applications, etc.)?
- When is the data needed, i.e., how important is the timeliness factor (e.g., the Academic Library Survey (formerly known as IPEDS) is every other year with the lag time sometimes making the report 3 years after the data being reported on.
- What surveys do they currently rely on?

This survey will first be sent to those attending the ACRL Leadership Council and ACRL Fellows Luncheon at the 2008 Midwinter Meeting. A discussion will be held with both groups at the respective meetings. The survey will be refined based on the Midwinter experience, and then sent in the spring of 2008 to the full list of contacts

for the Academic Trends and Statistics annual data gathering request. The email requesting participation in the survey could also be used to make the point that ACRL's statistics collection differs from many of the statistics surveys out there that are collected every other year, rather than annually, and the importance of timely data, which ACRL's program is able to provide.

The Executive Committee was grateful that the Statistics Committee and the working group started this important discussion and looked forward to continuing to get additional information about the data needs of the profession for more discussion at the Spring Executive Committee Meeting.

### **8.0 ACRL-driven Applied Research (Document 16.0)**

The Executive Committee reviewed the draft business plan for an ACRL Research Subscription Service. The Executive Committee was very supportive of the idea and would like to see a revised business plan presented to the full Board for the 2008 Midwinter Meeting.

The revised plan should take the following comments into consideration:

- The revised business plan should emphasize the variety of products to be delivered (not just survey research).
- The next revision should show more support for staff, as additional staff will be needed to ensure the project's success (i.e., working with the member advisory group and interfacing with the organization conducting the research to be sure that scope of project is clearly understood).
- The pricing model should allow for subscriptions as well as individual purchases since an annual subscription may not be affordable for all institutions. "Inaugural" subscribers might be offered a discount. The next iteration of the business plan needs to consider consortial pricing, as well. Some Executive Committee members thought that the proposal's model of a \$500 annual subscription price was a good value while others were concerned that it might be too expensive for small schools. Discounts for institutional members of ACRL should be included in the pricing model.
- Data gathered for ACRL's Academic Library Trends and Statistics might be re-purposed and used as a source of analysis. The NSSE/CSSE data model might be considered (their data is available on the Website. For a fee, an institution can pay for customized analysis and reporting.).
- The Executive Committee noted that the new product could raise concerns about "open access" issues and emphasized the need to frame communications about this project carefully with those concerns in mind.
- The Executive Committee suggested that the advisory board be carefully constructed as a "blue ribbon" panel to lend credibility to project. Subscribers should be invited to contribute ideas for future research topics for the advisory group's consideration.

### **9.0 IIL Immersion Assessment Program (Document 13.0)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve a proposal for an ACRL Immersion Assessment Program.

*Discussion:* The possibility of an assessment program offering has been discussed with the Immersion faculty members on and off for 5 years. This proposal was brought to the Board rather unexpectedly just a couple of weeks prior to this meeting. The Executive Committee had a number of questions about the proposal and brought Immersion Dean of Faculty Deb Gilchrist and ACRL Manager of Professional Development Margot Conahan in on speaker phone to participate in the discussion. Major points of discussion included:

- ACRL has been looking for some way to offer its members training in assessment, particularly as it relates to student information literacy skills. This program could address that need. Assessment is a critical issue in higher education and the profession and the Executive Committee was very excited to see this idea brought to fruition. The Immersion faculty hears from participants regularly about the need for content in this area.

- The curriculum has already been developed for the most part by the Immersion faculty members. It will be owned by the faculty members under the same model that ACRL currently uses for the Immersion information literacy program curriculum.
- The proposed date of May 2008 for the first offering of the program was of concern, as a call for applications would have to be developed and released very quickly, potential attendees' institutions would already have their professional development budgets set for the year, and ACRL's professional development staff already have their plates full planning offerings already in progress. The Immersion faculty is flexible about the offering date, but saw that as the soonest they would be able to pull everything together. The non-academic year timing allowed for the use of a campus as the host site, which would be the cheapest option. The Executive Committee asked that the faculty work with ACRL staff to consider the implications of the timing and come to agreement on a date that would not compromise the quality of any of ACRL's professional development (including this program). The Executive Committee was willing to allow the program to be held in May, because of the small number of people expected to attend, if staff felt that this was the best time to hold it given the other ACRL programs already in development.
- The Executive Committee had serious concerns about the selection process for attendees, described by Gilchrist as an open call with no prerequisites (such as attendance at an earlier ACRL Immersion program), unless the applicant did not look ready for the program. The selection process was described as not being as rigorous as that for the other Immersion programs. The Executive Committee discussed this and decided to require that the program use either a first-come/first-served registration model, or a full-fledged rigorous selection process that is used for the other Immersion programs, not the described hybrid selection model. Either individuals must be told in advance clear criteria that must be met for acceptance or registration should be first-come/first-served. The hybrid process could leave the association open to potential legal issues and would only serve to confuse and frustrate potential applicants. Ideally, the Executive Committee noted that it would like to see the full Immersion model carried through each program consistently (ownership of curriculum, similar program lengths, similar target audience, and same selection process).
- The poor initial reception to the recently developed third Immersion track, The Intentional Teacher, was discussed in relation to this program. Gilchrist stated that the faculty's executive team was currently surveying Immersion alum to see what obstacles they face in implementing the models that they learned at the institute and finding that it is assessment. They are hearing that the track 3 curriculum was great, but is not needed like assessment skills are.
- Gilchrist noted that the faculty developed this assessment curriculum on its own time, but that the people asking for it know the faculty members because of ACRL's Immersion program, so they hope to fold it back into ACRL's offerings to fulfill a sense of return obligation for ACRL's support launching the original Immersion program. When an Executive Committee member floated the idea of breaking up the curriculum into smaller chunks for people who could not attend or afford the full program, like a preconference or other single-day workshop, Gilchrist worried that they could not maintain the integrity of the curriculum and keep interest alive for the full program. She stated that she didn't think it could be branded as an Immersion product, but probably wouldn't have any objection otherwise.

*Action:* The ACRL Executive Committee approved the proposal for an Immersion Assessment Program. The Executive Committee, however, is requiring that the program use either a first-come/first-served registration model, or a full-fledged rigorous selection process that is used for the other Immersion programs, not a hybrid selection model described by the proposers. Either individuals must be told in advance clear criteria that must be met for acceptance or registration should be first-come/first-served.

The Executive Committee also requested that staff work with the Immersion faculty to set an appropriate date for the assessment program given the rest of ACRL's professional development program offerings.

## **10.0 Strategic Planning and Structure**

### **10.1 Review of Strategic Plan Progress and Gaps in Progress (Documents 1.3, 5.1, 5.2, & 10.2)**

The Executive Committee did not have time to begin this discussion at its Friday session and postponed it until Saturday morning (see agenda item #14.0).

### **11.0 Conference Call with Board of Directors**

The Executive Committee participated in a conference call with the full Board of Directors, including Directors-at-Large Mary Carr, Beth Dupuis, Lori Goetsch, Lynne King, Michael LaCroix, Debbie Malone, and Karen Williams. Director-at-Large Janis Bandelin was unable to participate.

Todaro welcomed everyone to the call at 10:35 a.m.

### **11.1 Bylaws Language for Structure Change (Documents 6.1 – 6.3)**

Davis updated the Board on some feedback that staff has received from a Section about the proposed language in the bylaws revisions concerning the implementation of a Communities of Practice structure. The Section interprets the language under Section 3, Governing Procedures, calling for Communities of Practice units, including Sections, to establish written procedures related to its function and governance to be adopted by the membership of the group as meaning that the Section should put any changes to its written procedures up to a membership vote on the annual ballot. The Board intended this adoption to take place at a membership meeting of the group and discussed whether that should be made more explicit in the proposed bylaws. Any change to the proposed bylaws language would have to be approved by the Board at this meeting for there to be time for the Board to take its second vote in time to include the proposal on the 2008 ballot.

The Board decided to leave the language as currently proposed and define the practices it intends units to use for their written procedures through policies that the Board will have to craft and approve for the implementation of the new structure, if it's approved on the 2008 ballot. The Board group working on the communication plan for the proposed bylaws revisions will clarify this as part of its efforts and might prepare some draft policy language before the Midwinter Meeting to share with members.

### **11.2 Communications Plan for Bylaws changes**

A small group of Board members will focus on the communications plan for the proposed bylaws revisions, chaired by Linke. Document 6.1 was suggested as a starting place for identifying issues that the plan will need to address; Board members were asked to look at the document and send any suggestions they have for the plan to Linke. Linke will notify the Board when the group starts working. A small group of Board members attending the upcoming EDUCAUSE meeting might also get together to work on this.

### **11.3 Board Update**

#### **11.3.1 Draft "Job Description"**

Todaro is working on a draft "job description" for Board members' roles as liaisons to Sections and will send it to the Board for discussion before the Midwinter Meeting.

#### **11.3.2 Coordinating Committee Survey**

The Board discussed a timeline and process for reviewing the efficacy of ACRL's coordinating committee structure, implemented in 2005. Surveys will be sent to the current and former coordinating committee chairs, component committee chairs, coordinating committee appointed members, and staff liaisons to coordinating or component committees, seeking feedback on issues such as:

- What works with the structure?
- How does it work?
- Are there any issues with the timing of the coordinating committee meeting structure?

- What improvements could be made to the structure?

Board members were asked to send comments about what should be asked on the surveys, which will go out in the first half of November. Results will be shared with the coordinating committee chairs and the Board by mid-December.

### **11.3.3 Experts**

Todaro and Davis sought the Board's feedback regarding the development of an expert consultants program for the association. In 2007, staff offered this sort of service by facilitating a self-study assessment as a pilot for the University of Puerto Rico. Staff is interested in expanding the program by moving forward with the cultivation of a few select "experts" to offer their consultation skills to institutions in such areas as "self study" assessments or as external reviewers for libraries conducting a periodic program review.

Staff regularly fields calls from libraries looking for assistance with their periodic reviews. Callers assume that ACRL either offers a service to provide them with reviewers or can refer them to a list of potential reviewers. The demand for this kind of service seems strong and consistent. If successful and self-supporting, in the future this could potentially expand to include topical experts to offer consultation and training at an institution around topics like digitization, copyright, or student engagement. The Board believes that it is important that the service start narrowly defined, that the service be established, the business model proven, and a pool of appropriate consultants developed before expanding into other areas.

The consultants service was compared to the old ARL/OMLS self-study program and it was noted that external services, such as LSSI, make money off similar programs. It seems like a worthy effort to put ACRL's name, reputation, and efforts behind, but ACRL must maintain control and consistency over what goes out.

A related issue is the development of a resident expert call list, having a list of someone who can be called when an immediate expert answer is needed on an issue. It was noted that several divisions within ALA do some version of a "resident experts"/speakers bureau hybrid. A number of issues would have to be considered in setting up such a list, such as whether people are included on the list through self-identification or through some sort of vetting process. Both the experts list and the consultants program relate to the knowledge-based Board concept that has been discussed in recent years.

Board members asked what liability ACRL would be exposed to if a consultant gave advice that had unfortunate results, to which Davis responded that ALA's legal counsel was consulted during preparations for the pilot program at the University of Puerto Rico and that indemnifying language was included in the contract.

The Board was very supportive of the consultants program as a concept and asked staff to develop a business plan and draft policies for such a program. Staff should share these drafts with the ACRL Not-for-Profit Entrepreneurial Best Practices Task Force for review, as it fits with the sort of ideas that task force should be developing, as well. It was suggested that a Board member work with staff and the task force on this. Director-at-Large Mary Carr expressed particular interest in working on it.

## **11.4 Next Steps for:**

**11.4.1 Diversity White Paper – Next Steps for Dissemination  
Action/Outcomes/Recommendations (Document 6.4)**

The Board discussed next steps to be taken to implement the recommendations included in the 2007 ACRL white paper on Diversity. Directors-at-Large Janis Bandelin and Karen Williams were asked to take a fresh look at the recommendations and prepare some suggestions for concrete action for the Board to consider at the 2008 Midwinter Meeting.

The suggestions should be presented in a grid format in order of descending priority, and should include recommended implementation deadlines and process owners, such as the ACRL Racial and Ethnic Diversity Committee, the ACRL Dr. E.J. Josey Spectrum Scholar Mentor Program Committee, a new task force, or staff. Minutes from previous Board discussions of the paper and ACRL President Julie Todaro's companion piece should be considered when preparing the suggested actions.

The white paper's suggestions of a *discovernursing.com* type of publicity campaign garnered some media attention when the paper was released, so it is particularly important that the Board decide what action, if any, it is interested in taking in that direction.

**11.4.2 Stepping Through the Open Door: A Forum on New Modes of Information  
Delivery in Higher Education – Next Steps (Document 6.5)**

The Board discussed next steps to be taken to advance the work begun at the summit ACRL hosted jointly with the National Association of College Stores (NACS) and EDUCAUSE earlier in the year, "Stepping Through the Open Door: A Forum on New Modes of Information Delivery in Higher Education." At the conclusion of the summit, next steps were left very open-ended, that any of the associations involved could do what they liked with the report and its recommendations.

After discussing the importance of finding a way to drive discussion among libraries, bookstores, and IT departments at the campus level, the Board was interested in pursuing two of the recommendations included in the forum's report on page 6.

To identify demonstration projects and best practices that showcase collaboration, ACRL will issue a call for members to submit their experiences opening successful dialogues with other units at their institutions, such as the book store or IT department. A task force could be formed at a later date to use these submissions to create some form of guidelines, tipsheets, or templates for others to work from on their own campuses. This call could come in the form of oral announcements at ACRL leadership meetings, such as Leadership Council or the Fellows Luncheon, by email, or in *C&RL News*. While the task force could work with ACRL's Copyright Committee, it was felt that the issues involved were too broad to give the work to the Copyright Committee itself.

Todaro and ACRL Past-President Pamela Snelson volunteered to draft a "blurb" that could be used in *C&RL News* or posted to an electronic discussion list to spark discussion.

The Board asked Davis to approach NACS and EDUCAUSE to gauge their interest in pursuing the report's recommendation that a joint task force among the associations be created to continue moving the discussion forward.

**11.4.3 Roundtable on Technology and Change in Academic Libraries – Next Steps  
(Document 6.6)**

The Board discussed next steps to be taken to advance the work begun at the Roundtable on Technology and Change in Academic Libraries and described in the essay that came out of the roundtable, "Changing Roles of Academic and Research Libraries," and Todaro's response to that essay.

Several Board members pointed out that this work seemed related to the charge for the ACRL Task Force on Positioning the 21st Century Library in the Competitive Academy: Why We Can't Wait. Todaro offered to share the essay and response with the task force in the context of their work, particularly since at least 3 members of that task force were in attendance at the Roundtable. As the task force's interim report is also due for the 2008 Midwinter Meeting, the Board decided that the report and the original essay and response will serve as the basis of the Board's mega-issue discussion at that meeting.

The Board adjourned its conference call and the Executive Committee recessed for the day at 11:35 a.m. The Executive Committee reconvened at 8:13 a.m. Saturday morning.

**Strategic Area: The Association**

**12.0 7 Measures of Success Debrief**

Executive Committee members discussed the book and discussion from the previous afternoon's meeting with all of the Division Executive Committees and the ALA Executive Board. While there was some appreciation for the meeting's structure and the forethought that went into planning the topic, there was a sense that the facilitator was not particularly effective and disappointment that there was no evaluation to provide feedback.

**13.0 2007 Environmental Scan Editing Guidance (Documents 7.0-7.2)**

The Executive Committee reviewed the progress that members of the Research Committee have made editing the draft of the Environmental Scan submitted to the Board of Directors at the 2007 Annual Conference, noting that the first 27 pages had been completed. The Executive Committee members were pleased with the progress made so far and encouraged the committee to complete editing the remainder of the document.

The Executive Committee added that a 2-page executive summary should be added to the start of the scan. The completed scan should be submitted to ACRL staff for a final review and then it will be posted to the ACRL Website. The Executive Committee hopes to see this done before the 2008 Midwinter Meeting.

**14.0 Strategic Planning and Structure *continued from Friday***

**14.1 Review/Update the Strategic Plan (Documents 1.3, 5.1, 5.2, 8.1, & 10.2)**

*Discussion:* The Board's suggested revisions to the ACRL Strategic Plan from its recent 2007 fall Strategic Planning and Orientation Session (SPOS) were shared with the Executive Committee in document 8.1. Executive Committee members were supportive of the revisions, noting they had been carefully considered and refined at the SPOS.

The Executive Committee was reminded that, although no specific language was developed around it, there was some discussion at the ACRL Board of Directors 2007 Strategic Planning and Orientation Session regarding the addition of a new goal area regarding space and place under the Higher Education and Research strategic area. Physical space is currently addressed in objective 3 under the goal area: Learning. Notes from the meeting included the following suggestions as a starting place:

**Goal Area: Space and Place**

Design manifests culture.

**Strategic Objectives:**

1. Move objective 3 from Goal Area: Learning - ACRL increases member abilities to create and manage physical and virtual spaces and services as environments for discovery.
2. LEED (Leadership for Energy Efficient Design)
3. Partner with other higher education associations/other professions, e.g., architects, etc.
4. Sustainability
5. Value of Place
6. Collaboration
7. Information Commons

The Executive Committee supported this idea, noting that the recently completed ACRL and LAMA task force highlighted the ongoing need to recognize and support the fight for actual space on campus. It was noted that space was covered briefly in objective 3 under Goal Area: Learning, but the weak consensus of the Executive Committee was that the issue should be raised to its own goal area. It was suggested that, as president, Todaro send the revised Strategic Plan to all of the Board members announcing the approved revisions, while at the same time calling for volunteers to look at the potential Space and Place goal area and develop language to propose for the Board's consideration at the Midwinter Meeting.

Other issues raised in the discussion and review of approved action plan proposals from the last few years and the fall Strategic Plan Activities Report included:

- The Strategic Plan could use a strong statement supporting ACRL collaboration with others, especially with other divisions.
- It is difficult to assess whether the many activities recorded add up to something significant and really advance the strategic plan, or if they just show that the association is carrying out many activities. Efforts to introduce more formal assessment of activities have begun using the presidents' priority areas of the plan and their initiatives, but have not really been successful yet. Proper assessment of activities in relation to the Strategic Plan suggests a huge, expensive effort.
- There is a lot of duplication of similar activities.
- There hasn't been much work done in the area of influencing accrediting agencies, as no ACRL units are charged in that area. Technology and IT continue to be top issues of concern for the membership; continued emphasis on development of professional development offerings in this area is critical. There is no specific unit charged in these areas.
- Committees need greater encouragement to submit action plan proposals, as most of them are currently coming from Sections. Todaro will draft a letter to reach out to committee chairs and encourage them to do so. She will send the letter to the Executive Committee first for feedback.
- Todaro will speak with ACRL Council of Liaisons Chair Frances Maloy about ways to coordinate the many action plans with liaison components better and consider other models to streamline this work and improve proposals in this area.
- Todaro, Linke, and Snelson will work together to present something at the 2008 Midwinter Leadership Council to help units understand the Board's hopes for Action Plan proposals. Part of that effort also needs to be education for Sections to change their culture to look at action plan proposals as responsibility of the unit, and not just of the newly elected vice-chair.

*Action:* The ACRL Executive Committee, at its October 20, 2007, meeting in Chicago, revised "Charting Our Future: ACRL Strategic Plan 2020" as shown below:

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

#### **Goal Area: Learning**

ACRL and its members are recognized as collaborative leaders and partners in teaching ensuring that students graduate with lifelong learning skills, improving techniques for assessing learning outcomes, and in creating environments for discovery.

#### **Strategic Objectives:**

1. ACRL expands adoption, use and development of information literacy standards.
2. ACRL increases members' ability to collaborate and partner with faculty and other campus professionals to integrate lifelong learning skills into the curriculum; teach and to evaluate programs and assess individuals' lifelong learning skills.
3. ACRL increases member abilities to create and manage physical and virtual spaces and services as environments for discovery.

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

#### **Goal Area: Leadership**

ACRL members achieve recognition as leaders and advocates for academic and research libraries.

#### **Strategic Objectives:**

1. Empower members to communicate the value of their contributions to learning and scholarship.
2. Increase recognition of the value of libraries and librarians by leaders in higher education, information technology, funding agencies, and campus decision-making.
3. Increase ACRL's efforts to support recruitment of new and diverse talent to academic and research librarianship.
4. Increase ACRL's activities in support of succession planning and leadership development at every level in academic and research libraries. Support and encourage research and programming on the changing workforce in academic libraries and the implications for library education and training, leadership and middle management development, and staff recruitment and retention.

#### **Goal Area: Information Technology**

Academic and research librarians are leaders in using information and academic technologies to create and manage information resources and to deliver library and information services.

#### **Strategic Objectives:**

1. Support the development and recognition of academic and research librarians as leaders and experts and campus leaders in information technology applications in libraries.
2. Build ACRL's capacity to partner with other technology-oriented higher education organizations to develop standards and best practices for managing digital libraries and digital library services.
3. Support members in their exploration and implementation of new and emerging information technologies and their application for library services in educational environments.

### **14.2 Establishment of Research Coordinating Committee and Component Committees (Document 8.2)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the creation of the Research Coordinating Committee (and component committees, as defined below) with the following charges.

### **Research Coordinating Committee**

The Research Coordinating Committee is responsible for coordinating a broadly defined range of research initiatives and programs throughout ACRL, including those designed to support one or more identified research agendas. The committee regularly scans the Association and the profession for research initiatives that support the Association's strategic objectives. The committee enables communication with the Board of Directors on research strategies and issues at all levels of the Association and will make recommendations to the Board regarding the most effective and efficient committee structure to achieve these ends.

The Assessment, Research Planning and Review, Research Forum, Research Program, and Trends in Academic Librarianship Committees are component committees of the Research Coordinating Committee. The Research Coordinating Committee may also charge Task Forces, as needed, to accomplish well-defined initiatives in support of its charge to coordinate and support research initiatives and programs across the Association.

### **Assessment Committee**

The Assessment Committee is responsible for designing and implementing outcomes-based evaluation and other assessment programs in support of the ACRL Strategic Plan. The committee will stay informed about outcomes-based evaluation design and implementation and will manage ongoing evaluation projects designed to assess effectiveness of ACRL programs supporting highlighted, high priority areas of the strategic plan. The committee will focus on assessment priorities as established by the Board of Directors. The committee will coordinate its assessment research with other research activities through the Research Coordinating Committee. The Chair of the Research Coordinating Committee will keep the Board informed about assessment activities and results, so that assessment results can be used by the Board to improve the effectiveness of the Association.

### **Research Planning and Review Committee**

The Research Planning and Review Committee is responsible for the design and development of documents to be regularly provided to the Board of Directors as part of ongoing planning activities, e.g., the "Annual Assumptions" and the "Environmental Scan." The "Annual Assumptions" document is compiled annually based on member feedback during the Spring and Summer, and provided to the Board as background to the Fall meeting of the Executive Committee. The "Environmental Scan" is compiled by committee members, and through input from ACRL Committees and Sections, and provided to the Board biennially for presentation at the National Conference. The committee will collaborate, as appropriate, with research committees and planning committees across the Association at the Division and Section level in the development of these documents.

### **Research Forum Committee**

The Research Forum Committee is responsible for the development of programs for presentation at meetings of the American Library Association and the Association of College & Research Libraries that provide a venue for discussion of peer-reviewed, research-based presentations. The committee will coordinate with research committees across the Association at the Division and Section level to design, deliver, and assess the impact of Research Forum programs.

### **Research Program Committee**

The Research Program Committee is responsible for the development of programming for presentation at meetings of the American Library Association and the Association of College & Research Libraries aimed at the development and improvement of research skills among academic librarians. Research programs may be presented in face-to-face or virtual learning environments, may take the form of presentations, workshops, or pre-conference programs, and may be presented at the national, regional, or state level. The committee will coordinate with the Professional Development Coordinating Committee to design, deliver, and assess the impact of research program presentations, and may

collaborate with Chapters Council on the development of programming appropriate for delivery through Chapter programs.

### **Trends in Academic Librarianship Committee**

The Trends in Academic Librarianship Committee is responsible for the design and development of a document noting emergent trends in academic librarianship that will be provided to the Board of Directors each Spring (beginning Spring 2009).

*Discussion:* As promised at the 2007 Annual Conference, the ACRL Research Committee's new Chair, Scott Walter, looked at the structure of the Research Committee and its ability to accomplish its assignments and prepared this proposal to expand the committee. Generally, the Executive Committee was impressed and very appreciative of the great thought and work put into creating a structure to carry out the tasks the Board has added to the Research Committee's work over recent years. There had also been feedback from some members of the Assessment Subcommittee that, as a committee that requires active, hard work from its members, they felt they lacked certain status recognition that they would have as members of a full-fledged standing committee.

The following major points of discussion were raised:

- To be consistent with the ACRL Bylaws and practice with other established Coordinating Committees, it should be emphasized that these are Committees of the Association and are responsible to the Board of Directors. Some of the proposed language at the end of the Assessment Committee's charge was stricken to make that clearer and because the language reflected the coordinating role played by the Research Coordinating Committee and already included in the charge for that committee.
- The proposed ACRL Research Forum Committee was not approved. The phrase in its proposed charge regarding discussion of peer-reviewed, research-based presentations was integrated into the charge for the ACRL Research Program Committee. Language was also added to that committee's charge clarifying that the Research Program Committee must work through the existing processes for planning and proposing programming with the Professional Development Coordinating Committee (PDCC) and National Conference Coordinating Committee (NCCC). The Executive Committee wanted to ensure that all programming was being reviewed by the PDCC or NCCC rather than setting up another venue for developing and offering programs.
- The proposed ACRL Trends in Academic Librarianship Committee was not approved. The Executive Committee understands that this committee was intended to create a structure to carry out the Board's desire to see an annual list of emergent trends in academic librarianship, but felt that the trends work was so closely tied to the Research Planning and Review work that it was important not to separate the groups. The Executive Committee suggested that the trends work could be carried out either by a subcommittee of the ACRL Research Coordinating Committee, or as part of the work of the ACRL Research Planning and Review Committee, perhaps renamed the ACRL Research Planning, Review, and Trends Committee. The Executive Committee left this decision to the Research Coordinating Committee's discretion and looks forward to seeing a proposal reflecting the committee's decision.
- The Executive Committee also expressed some concern about the use of co-chairs. While this may work this year with the individuals Walter has identified to lead the committees initially, they should be encouraged to consider a chair/vice-chair structure to ensure continuity for carrying out the work.
- An Executive Committee member strongly advocated hiring a consultant to take a comprehensive look at all of ACRL's research, data gathering, and assessment processes and should work with staff, the Research Committee, and the Statistics Committee. Staff members involved in this work should outline the specific outcomes expected from the consultant.

- It was noted that ACRL keeps establishing new committees, but seriously needs to review existing committees and consider dissolving those that are not needed as standing committees.
- A joint call with Todaro, Davis and Walter might be needed before Midwinter to make sure that all are clear on these decisions and their ramifications.

*Action:* The ACRL Executive Committee approved the conversion of the ACRL Research Committee to the ACRL Research Coordinating Committee and the establishment of the ACRL Assessment Committee, ACRL Research Planning and Review Committee, and ACRL Research Program Committee, with the following charges as amended:

### **Research Coordinating Committee**

The Research Coordinating Committee is responsible for coordinating a broadly defined range of research initiatives and programs throughout ACRL, including those designed to support one or more identified research agendas. The committee regularly scans the Association and the profession for research initiatives that support the Association's strategic objectives. The committee enables communication with the Board of Directors on research strategies and issues at all levels of the Association and will make recommendations to the Board regarding the most effective and efficient committee structure to achieve these ends.

The Assessment, Research Planning and Review, and Research Program, Committees are component committees of the Research Coordinating Committee. The Research Coordinating Committee may also charge Task Forces, as needed, to accomplish well-defined initiatives in support of its charge to coordinate and support research initiatives and programs across the Association.

### **Assessment Committee**

The Assessment Committee is responsible for designing and implementing outcomes-based evaluation and other assessment programs in support of the ACRL Strategic Plan. The committee will stay informed about outcomes-based evaluation design and implementation and will manage ongoing evaluation projects designed to assess effectiveness of ACRL programs supporting highlighted, high priority areas of the strategic plan. The committee will focus on assessment priorities as established by the Board of Directors.

### **Research Planning and Review Committee**

The Research Planning and Review Committee is responsible for the design and development of documents to be regularly provided to the Board of Directors as part of ongoing planning activities, e.g., the "Annual Assumptions" and the "Environmental Scan." The "Annual Assumptions" document is compiled annually based on member feedback during the Spring and Summer, and provided to the Board as background to the Fall meeting of the Executive Committee. The "Environmental Scan" is compiled by committee members, and through input from ACRL Committees and Sections, and provided to the Board biennially for presentation at the National Conference. The committee will collaborate, as appropriate, with research committees and planning committees across the Association at the Division and Section level in the development of these documents.

### **Research Program Committee**

The Research Program Committee is responsible for the development of programming for presentation at meetings of the American Library Association and the Association of College & Research Libraries aimed at the development and improvement of research skills among academic librarians, and discussion of peer-reviewed, research-based presentations. Research programs may be presented in face-to-face or virtual learning environments, may take the form of presentations, workshops, or pre-conference programs, and may be presented at the national, regional, or state level. The committee will work through the Professional Development Coordinating Committee and National Conference Coordinating Committee to design, deliver, and assess the impact of research program presentations,

and may collaborate with Chapters Council on the development of programming appropriate for delivery through Chapter programs.

#### **14.3 Establishment of Research Agenda for Academic Librarianship Task Force (Document 8.3)**

*Proposed motion:* That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the creation of the Research Agenda for Academic Librarianship Task Force with the charge, membership, and timeline listed below.

**Charge:** The Research Agenda for Academic Librarianship Task Force is responsible for developing a broad-based research agenda for academic librarianship. The Task Force should develop an approach to data gathering that will foster engagement across the Division, and should present a document informed by the recent work of the Scholarly Communications Committee and the Instruction Section.

**Specific tasks:** A draft of the Research Agenda should be prepared for review by the Board of Directors at Midwinter 2009 in order to be presented as a draft for public comment at the National Meeting in Seattle.

**Specific Requirements of Membership Composition:** Members should demonstrate a broad knowledge of academic librarianship as well as experience in the design and conduct of research in the field.

**Date interim report is due:** Spring 2009

**Date final report is due:** Fall 2009

*Discussion:* The Executive Committee decided not to take action on the proposal for the establishment of a Research Agenda for Academic Librarianship Task Force at this time. The Board is currently considering other ways of looking at this very issue in the near future, and expects that the project will be carried out in consultation with the Research Coordinating Committee, once the project and desired outcomes have been more fully defined. The Executive Committee is glad the Research Committee is thinking along those lines but at this time felt it was premature to establish this group.

#### **14.4 Committee Appointments Process/Structure**

Connolly apologized that the planned document compiling research of appointment practices in other associations was not completed in time for this meeting. He explained that a brainstorming session of ACRL's managers turned to enhancing committee effectiveness and resulted in the idea that the Board's act of decentralizing Division-level committee appointments by granting coordinating committee chairs the authority and responsibility to appoint members of their component committees could be taken a step further by having committee chairs appoint the members of their own committees. Appointment of the committee chairs themselves would remain the responsibility of the vice-president or coordinating committee chairs and would leave them time to focus on selecting the best qualified chairs, rather than applying their efforts to appointing dozens of committee members, as well. The committee chairs could be better positioned to appoint committee members knowledgeable about the committee's content area and lends itself to the knowledge-based Board concept that has been considered over the last few years.

The Executive Committee was interested in seeing additional research done and considering a fuller proposal in the future. In the meantime, it was suggested that Linke and Connolly might want to hold a conference call with the various appointing authorities prior to Midwinter and that a more rigorous application process should be considered for potential committee chairs to ensure more deliberative chair appointments in the future.

#### **14.5 Virtual ACRL Membership Meeting Costs & Format (Document 8.6)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Board of Directors approve the development of the ACRL Virtual Membership Meeting/Professional Development Webcast to be offered in April 2008, free of charge to ACRL members.

*Discussion:* The Executive Committee reviewed the proposal, developed based on discussions at the poorly attended ACRL Membership Meeting at the 2007 Annual Conference, and decided that it would like this to go forward branded as a free Webcast as a member service, rather than as a virtual Membership Meeting. The Executive Committee did, however, wish to use the opportunity to reach current and prospective ACRL members with a brief message at the start of the program.

Rather than a "talking heads" introduction to the Webcast, the Executive Committee had several suggestions for alternative content for staff to consider using some introductory time preceding the Webcast, including having people submit questions with their registration, from which questions could be selected for a "Q & A with a few members of the Board" or "5 questions you've always wanted to ask the Executive Director." It was also suggested that one of last year's ACRL members from the Emerging Leaders program could talk about what ACRL membership means to them, as an Emerging Leader might be a better match to the Webcast audience than a Board member would.

Staff should continue its development of the program and keep the Board informed as the content comes together. The Executive Committee feels that this free Webcast is an excellent way to offer ACRL members a tangible benefit.

*Action:* The Executive Committee approved the development of the ACRL Virtual Membership Meeting/Professional Development Webcast to be offered in April 2008, free of charge to ACRL members.

#### **14.6 Planning for 2008 Midwinter**

##### **14.6.1 Leadership Council (Document 9.0)**

- Action Plan Decisions Communication
- Action Plan Development
- Communication Plan for Bylaws Structure Changes (2nd Board vote planned at MW)
- Data Gathering for Environmental Scan?
- Academic Libraries Trends and Statistics

The Executive Committee discussed the agenda for the Leadership Council to be held at the 2008 Midwinter Meeting. The rough agenda will be as follows:

##### **Action plan decisions communication and action plan development – 30 minutes**

This portion of the meeting will be targeted toward newer leaders, which should be made upfront for attendees in advance to address complaints from long-time leaders about repetition at Leadership Councils. The Board's refined criteria for action plan proposals would be discussed, as well as the need for clear outcomes in the proposals tying them to the Strategic Plan. Sections would be encouraged to view the proposals as the responsibility of the whole unit, not just the vice-chair. Committees would be encouraged to submit proposals in greater numbers.

##### **Communication Plan for Bylaws Structure Changes – 15 minutes**

Linke will present an overview of the proposed bylaws revisions that would establish Communities of Practice, which the Board will be voting on for the second time at the Midwinter Meeting in anticipation of their placement on the 2008 spring ballot. Board members should sit at each table to answer questions.

### **Academic Libraries Trends and Statistics and data gathering**

Plans to discuss the statistics survey (agenda item #7.0) were confirmed. Small group work at each table should involve some kind of interactive component. ACRL Content Strategist Kathryn Deiss should be brought in to facilitate the discussion about the different uses of data for library directors, institutions, and library faculty and staff, emphasizing that such data is an important part of every professional's life and benefits the profession. Flipcharts should be used to brainstorm the different areas in libraries that data is gathered from, such as information literacy, electronic resources, and collections, and the different uses of data, such as for annual reports, grant applications, budget justification, and government reports.

### **14.6.2 Fellows Luncheon (content?) or Reception**

The Executive Committee decided that a working luncheon was best for Midwinter. ACRL's Fellows could be a good resource for the discussion of statistics and data usage and represents more of the end-users for statistics and trends than those at the Leadership Council. The responses of the 2 groups could be compared. Deiss might again be used to facilitate.

Todaro noted that she would like to see a handout table at the back of the Fellows Luncheon and pretty much any type of membership meeting.

## **15.0 Budget & Finance**

### **15.1 FY 2007 Financial Report Unaudited (Documents 10.1 & 10.1a)**

ACRL Budget and Finance Committee Chair Theresa Byrd reviewed the FY 2007 financial report for the Executive Committee, noting that the figures were based on a preliminary close and were not final, as ALA's Accounting and Finance department was still working on finishing the year. Key points of discussion included:

- ACRL's very successful National Conference helped the year end on a strong note, with net revenue of over \$800,000.
- Friends of ACRL donations were down for the year, as staff did not solicit as actively as in the past while the Board considered changes to the program based on the Friends of ACRL Review Task Force's report during the year.
- Periodical subscriptions continue to fall.
- Non-periodical publications showed a deficit for the year, caused partly by a change in staffing and strategy. As ACRL pursue new authors and titles more aggressively, the production pipeline for future years should be enhanced. Approximately a dozen works are currently commissioned for release over the next two years. It was noted that the cost of order fulfillment will always be high for a small publisher like ACRL. In FY 2008, ACRL expects to begin writing off older inventory in the warehouse, which will further reduce the ability to generate net revenues for the year. The good publicity from the recent release of ACRL's free electronic version of the new *Studying Students* book was mentioned. Staff will consider this dual-publication option on a title by title basis.
- ACRL's statistics program had a very strong year.
- Web CE's budgeted revenue was a little over-ambitious for the year, but still very strong. Davis noted that since Orphan's departure, Conahan will be managing the program on an interim basis while the search for a new Manager of Web Services is underway. On a related note, Davis mentioned that ALA has decided not to renew its license with Web CT and is moving to Moodle to host Web CE programming. An Executive Committee member commented that they were not comfortable with that move, as members are much more familiar with Web CT. It was also suggested that a couple of good past presenters be approached to write a quick piece for *C&RL News* or the Website on how to put together an online course, or even a podcast, to try encouraging new course development.

- *C&RL* had a good year, largely due to the efficiency of ACRL Production Editor Dawn Mueller, resulting in lower staff time costs.

### **15.2 2008-2009 Budget Assumptions (Document 10.2)**

*Discussion:* The Executive Committee reviewed Davis' draft Budget Assumptions for FY 2009, noting that these serve as the marching orders to staff for preliminary budget development. The Executive Committee made a number of minor changes, including:

- Add \$5,000 to support for another free virtual event.
- Add a \$10,000 placeholder amount to support activities stemming from the Diversity white paper.
- Add a \$5,000 placeholder amount to support activities stemming from the Roundtable on Technology and Change in Academic Libraries.
- Instructed staff to research costs for a Web usability study once ALA's study is complete and the extent to which that can inform ACRL's Website redesign decisions is clear.

Davis also noted that ALA's auditors were strongly encouraging ACRL to change its budgeting practices for professional development to recognize 90% of the expected registration revenue in the budget. Historically, ACRL has budgeted at a more conservative 80%. Davis suggested that this change be referred to the Budget and Finance Committee to consider and recommend to the Board at the Midwinter Meeting, but the Executive Committee was comfortable approving it at this meeting. Davis noted that she will continue to encourage staff to budget conservatively for registration numbers, particularly for newer programs.

The Executive Committee also recommended that Davis talk with EDUCAUSE about partnering on a series of "everyman's" information technology Webcasts. The Board would consider subsidizing these Webcasts so that they would not have to be budgeted with registration fees for full cost-recovery, as long as that subsidization was well-publicized to prevent de-valuing the costs of providing Web CE opportunities.

*Action:* The ACRL Executive Committee approved the FY09 Budget Assumptions, with a few minor changes as described above. The preliminary budget prepared for the Midwinter Meeting should reflect these assumptions.

Additionally, the Executive Committee approved a change in ACRL budgeting practices for conferences to recognize 90% of the total planned revenue in the budget, rather than the 80% practice used in the past. This should be reflected in sections 6.13.3 and 10.6 of the *ACRL Guide to Policies and Procedures*, as well as anywhere else this practice is noted.

### **15.3 CHOICE Property Update (Document 10.3)**

Davis referred the Executive Committee members to document 10.3 for an update on the status of CHOICE's property purchase efforts and noted that earlier in the week ALA's Finance and Audit Committee approved recommendation of the purchase to the ALA Executive Board.

### **15.4 Major Gifts Recommendation Status**

Davis and Byrd updated the Executive Committee on several Budget and Finance Committee assignments from the 2007 Annual Conference. Byrd, a new chair this year, had not had time to get the committee working on recommendations for a major gifts program yet, but noted that progress had been made on appointments to the Friends Fund Subcommittee and the new Friends Fund Disbursement Subcommittee.

Davis noted that she had contacted the consultants currently managing ALA's Development Office and they have no expertise with major gifts programs, so an external consultant might be necessary. Byrd

asked for help finding people to develop a plan for the major gifts program. Executive Committee members suggested that staff review the membership of LAMA's fundraising group and see if any of them are ACRL members. It was also suggested that Byrd see who is active on the ALADIN Research Commons electronic discussion list. Linke noted that a former development officer of hers, who now works at a library in Chicago, belongs to ALADIN and could be a resource.

The Executive Committee instructed Davis to add funds to be budgeted for a consultant to develop a major gifts program for ACRL to the FY 2009 Budget Assumptions (agenda item #15.2).

### **15.5 Annual Fundraising Goals and Objectives**

Byrd noted that, given the age of those in the profession and the giving habits of that demographic, a strong revitalization of the Friends of ACRL program was achievable. Another Executive Committee member suggested that the American Society of Association Executives (ASAE) might have a publication with information about other associations' annual fundraising practices.

### **16.0 Digitization Issues and ACRL (Document 11.0)**

The Executive Committee did not have time to discuss this item and asked that it be carried over to the Midwinter Meeting agenda.

### **17.0 Assessment Task Force Charge (Document 12.0)**

Todaro is currently working on the development of this task force's charge, and will incorporate any of the discussions regarding assessment from this meeting, including in the agenda items regarding the new Immersion program proposal, the new charge to ACRL's Assessment Committee, and ACRL's data-gathering and statistics efforts.

### **18.0 Executive Director Review Timeline (Document 14.0)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the revised timeline for the performance evaluation of the ACRL Executive Director.

*Discussion:* This revision is an effort to make the reality of the Board's current treatment of the executive director's goals, which are generally to demonstrate progress in advancing ACRL's strategic plan, and ALA's current performance appraisal timeline. It was noted that Davis should provide the executive director's performance appraisal form to Linke soon so she knows what to be thinking about throughout the year.

## **Strategic Area: The Profession**

### **19.0 Academic/Research Librarian of the Year Award Presentation Plan (Document 15.0)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the plan described below regarding the presentation of the ACRL Academic/Research Librarian of the Year Award in non-National Conference years:

The winner receives the \$5,000 award check (and \$400 award plaque) at the ACRL President's Program and the sponsor treats winner to lunch or dinner with family, friends, ACRL President, Executive Director, award committee, etc. The sponsor will continue to pay the ACRL administrative fee (\$600).

The 2008 award winner will be notified during the ALA Midwinter Meeting in Philadelphia regarding the details of the award presentation.

*Discussion:* Davis updated the Executive Committee of supporting vendor YBP Library Services' latest feedback, noting that they liked last year's changes to the award presentation, with the awardee recognized at the ACRL National Conference. Unfortunately, YBP cut their budget for the award in the coming year to \$5,000 plus the administrative fee, so YBP was not planning to fund a social activity for the winner.

The Executive Committee did not believe that most winners were very concerned with the venue for their recognition and that it would not be a problem if the winner in a non-National Conference year were not recognized at the following year's National Conference. Conversely, it was noted that some members thought that although this year's winner was recognized at the National Conference, that there would still be some sort of reception at the ALA Annual Conference.

*Action:* The Executive Committee approved the plan described below regarding the presentation of the ACRL Academic/Research Librarian of the Year Award:

**1) Non-National Conference years:** The ACRL President and YBP present the award at the beginning of the ACRL President's Program, as other division awards are presented. (If the sponsor is willing the winner will also be treated to a lunch or dinner with family, friends, ACRL President, Executive Director, award committee, etc.).

**2) National Conference years:** The award will be presented at a keynote session during the National Conference. (If the sponsor is willing the winner will also be treated to a lunch or dinner with family, friends, ACRL President, Executive Director, award committee, etc. either during the national Conference or at the following ALA Annual Conference.) The winner will also be introduced at the ALA Annual Conference at the beginning of the ACRL President's Program and announcement of the award will be made in other appropriate venues, e.g., ACRL membership meeting, ACRL Leadership Council, etc.

*Staff note:* Regrettably, an earlier draft of the discussion document was mistakenly distributed to the Board with its documents for the Fall Executive Committee Meeting. The intended final document included additional background information and a revised recommended action, which has been amended above to reflect the action taken by the Executive Committee. Staff believes that this amended language accurately reflects the action the Executive Committee took and notified the Board of the document error and amended action. The Board was given 1 week to notify staff if there was any objection, otherwise the action would stand as written above and the final revised document would stand as the document of record.

## **20.0 Second Life Task Force Interim Report (Documents 17.0 & 17.1)**

The Executive Committee reviewed the Second Life Task Force's Interim Report and found its work to date thoughtful and liked the ideas offered so far for ACRL to make use of this environment. The Executive Committee asked that Davis resend the recent updates from Jenny Levine of ALA's ITTS department and remind the task force to work with her to remain updated about ALA's Second Life activity as it works on a final report with recommendations for the Board of Directors to consider at the Midwinter Meeting. Additionally, Todaro intends to touch base with the task force this fall.

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

### **21.0 Living the Future 7 Sponsorship Request (Document 18.0)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Executive Committee approve ACRL's co-sponsorship of the Living the Future 7 conference. Co-sponsorship would provide an opportunity for officers to speak about the importance of ACRL membership and the collaborative nature of the organization. ACRL will provide one free ad in *C&RL* to announce the conference and column space in *C&RL News* to encourage attendance at the conference to discuss consortial development, faculty and librarian partnerships, and the leveraging of assets with community organizations and museums.

*Discussion:* While direct benefits to the association aside from name recognition are not clear, this small amount of publicity is a service that ACRL has granted the conference for a number of years. The conference has a solid reputation and the cost to provide one free ad is affordable.

The action notification letter should be sure to include a note thanking the organizers for their welcoming offer for the attendance of ACRL executive officers for the opportunity for them to speak about the importance of ACRL membership and the collaborative nature of the organization, in case ACRL chooses to take them up on their offer.

*Action:* The ACRL Executive Committee approved co-sponsorship of the Living the Future 7 Conference, to be held from April 30 to May 3, 2008, in Tucson, AZ. ACRL will provide one free ad in *C&RL* to announce the conference and, with approval of the Editor-in-Chief, a small space in *C&RL News* to encourage attendance at the conference to discuss consortial development, faculty and librarian partnerships, and the leveraging of assets with community organizations and museums.

If the conference organizers would prefer, the free ad could be placed in *C&RL News* instead, as that seems to fit the target audience of the conference better.

## **22.0 Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education Review Task Force Final Report (Document 19.0)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the following recommendations of the Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education Review Task Force:

1. Do not revise the standards at this time but leave open the possibility pending the results of the actions recommended below.
2. Clarify and affirm the original purpose of the standards.
3. Conduct a study during the next 12-18 months to investigate how the standards are serving higher education.

Regarding the last recommendation, the task force proposes that this study be conducted by an independent researcher/research group, possibly in partnership with a library school and with the close involvement of an ACRL staff and/or board liaison. Funding might come from within the Association, through a grant, (possibly an IMLS National Leadership Grant), or a combination of sources.

There are several possible aspects to this study:

- To conduct a content analysis, of sorts, to determine how various institutions have applied the standards and measured their impact--can they be found on the college/university's web site? Have they been recrafted or customized for local application? Is information literacy (or its myriad variations) referenced in mission statements, strategic planning documents, general education requirements and/or other curriculum requirements, or accreditation self-studies?
- In examining what works and does not work with the current standards, it is also critical that the study engage the non-library community to assess the need for and effectiveness of the standards (and perhaps, more broadly, information literacy efforts). Therefore, it would be useful to obtain support and input from relevant higher education institutions or organizations such as Educause, AAC&U, American Association of Community Colleges and/or the League for Innovation in the Community Colleges, and accrediting agencies.
- Furthermore, the study could consider the role, purpose, and relationship of the existing and developing disciplinary standards documents prepared by ACRL sections.

The study should be conducted with the working assumption of multiple possible outcomes; however, the results should show a clear path of action that can be taken by the Association. Based on the outcomes of the study, the ACRL Board of Directors would have better evidence upon which to make decisions regarding the future of the standards document.

*Discussion:* The Executive Committee reviewed the task force's report and noted that, despite its best efforts in the short timeframe, the task force did not receive much formal input. In light of that, the report can be viewed as input from an expert panel more than as member feedback.

Regarding the recommended actions, the Executive Committee supported the first recommendation, while noting that a suggested timeframe for revisiting the standards would be helpful.

Executive Committee members were supportive of the second recommendation, recalling that the standards were originally envisioned as a framework more than as standards, but the full intent of the recommendation was unclear. The Executive Committee decided to affirm the recommendation, but ask the task force for clarification of the intent.

While pursuing the recommended study would be a worthwhile endeavor, the Executive Committee decided to pursue only the aspect of the study described in the first bullet. The Executive Committee referred the study to ACRL's Information Literacy Advisory Committee to recommend by the 2008 Spring Executive Committee Meeting a process for implementation. It was suggested that if a survey were developed, it could be paired with ACRL's statistics collection survey as special set of additional questions.

*Action:* The ACRL Executive Committee received the final report of the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education Review Task Force and approved the following selected recommendations from the report:

1. Do not revise the standards at this time but leave open the possibility pending the results of the actions recommended below. The Executive Committee would like the task force's suggestion of an appropriate timeframe in which to next revisit the standards.
3. Conduct a study during the next 12-18 months to investigate how the standards are serving higher education. Of the possible aspects to the study suggested in your report, the Executive Committee would like to see the first pursued. This study would be a content analysis, of sorts, to determine how various institutions have applied the standards and measured their impact--can they be found on the college/university's web site? Have they been recrafted or customized for local application? Is information literacy (or its myriad variations) referenced in mission statements, strategic planning documents, general education requirements and/or other curriculum requirements, or accreditation self-studies?

The Executive Committee requests that ILAC put this study on its agenda and recommend a process for carrying it out to the Board by the 2008 Spring Executive Committee Meeting. In its report, the task force recommended that this study be conducted by an independent researcher/research group, possibly in partnership with a library school and with the close involvement of an ACRL staff and/or board liaison. Funding might come from within the Association, through a grant, (possibly an IMLS National Leadership Grant), or a combination of sources. The study should be conducted with the working assumption of multiple possible outcomes; however, the results should show a clear path of action that can be taken by the Association. Based on the outcomes of the study, the ACRL Board of Directors would have better evidence upon which to make decisions regarding the future of the standards document.

The Executive Committee was supportive of recommendation #2, as well, to clarify and affirm the original purpose of the standards, but it was uncertain about what the task force was specifically suggesting. The task force should be consulted to determine what message it would suggest best captures this idea and how the task force recommends that it be communicated.

### **23.0 ACRL/LAMA Designing Higher Ed Library and Learning Spaces Guide Task Force Final Report (Document 20.0)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the following recommendations of the ACRL/LAMA Designing Spaces for Higher Education Task Force:

1. that the Guide developed by the Task Force be either a wiki or a web page with links on both the ACRL and LAMA pages. The task force is divided on the best format for the guide, but the architects in our focus group all favored the wiki.
2. that the ACRL Board ascertain a mechanism for monitoring and updating the Guide. The Task Force believes that the LAMA College and University Libraries Committee (chaired now by Laverna Saunders) is the best group to do this, if they are willing.
3. that the best places and ways to promote the *\_Guide\_* are:
  - link in AIA Knowledge Communities (We have contact to do this.)
  - link in APPA, Association of Physical Plant Administrators  
<http://www.appa.org/>
  - link in Society for College and University Planners  
<http://www.scup.org/>
  - post announcements on all appropriate ACRL and LAMA listservs
4. that ACRL investigate ways to work with LAMA to finish and maintain the LAMA/LJ buildings database as soon as possible.

*Discussion:* The Executive Committee discussed the final report of the task force, noting that while the original plan to distribute information about the guide at the American Institute of Architects (AIA) meeting did not work out, staff is following up on a more promising lead with SCUP staff on an even better venue.

The Executive Committee agreed that it was not comfortable handing off the maintenance of the wiki entirely to LAMA, as this task force's work was first proposed by ACRL because it is important to ACRL members. Continuing the spirit of collaboration in which this task force was conceived, the executive director of LAMA should be copied on the action notification letter, with a suggestion that a standing joint ACRL/LAMA committee be established to handle the wiki maintenance and work on the longer-term standards piece of the project that was envisioned when this task force was established to develop this guide as a short-term stopgap. Perhaps the LAMA Buildings and Equipment Section's Buildings for College and University Libraries Committee could be converted to such a joint committee. ACRL is interested in hearing LAMA's thoughts on this suggestion.

In the letter notifying the task force of the Executive Committee's actions, the task force should be asked about the contact they mentioned for the link to AIA, as well as for plans to approach APPA and SCUP for their links, as well.

The Executive Committee had only a cursory familiarity with the database referred to in the fourth recommendation and withheld action on it until it is provided with additional information. If the task force or LAMA could provide ACRL with additional information and background in time for the Midwinter Meeting, it could be included on the Board of Directors' Midwinter agenda.

The Executive Committee was grateful for the task force's quick and thorough work on this project. The need for a reference like this has only become clearer in the year since it was proposed.

*Action:* The ACRL Executive Committee received the final report of the ACRL/LAMA Designing Higher Ed Library and Learning Spaces Guide Task Force and approved the following selected recommendations from the report:

1. That the Guide developed by the Task Force be a wiki with links on both the ACRL and LAMA pages.
2. That the ACRL Board ascertain a mechanism for monitoring and updating the Guide. The ACRL Executive Committee suggests that the best way to maintain the collaborative spirit in which this guide

was developed is to establish a joint, interdivisional committee to maintain the guide and address future issues of mutual concern to both Divisions.

3. That the best places and ways to promote the *\_Guide\_* are:
  - link in AIA Knowledge Communities
  - link in APPA, Association of Physical Plant Administrators  
<http://www.appa.org/>
  - link in Society for College and University Planners  
<http://www.scup.org/>
  - post announcements on all appropriate ACRL and LAMA listservs

#### **24.0 Council of Liaisons Proposed Organization – Association for the Study of African American Life & History (ASALH) (Document 21.0)**

*Motion:* That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the establishment of a liaison relationship with the Association for the Study of African American Life & History, Inc. (ASALH).

*Discussion:* The Executive Committee was thrilled that a good diversity organization with the potential for a liaison relationship had been identified. While it is also nice that the organization was proposed by a Section, it was also cautioned that Sections need to be better educated to understand that they do not select the liaison, as liaisons are appointed through a Board-mandated open call process and not by the Section.

*Action:* The ACRL Executive Committee approved the establishment of a liaison relationship with the Association for the Study of African American Life & History, Inc. (ASALH).

#### **25.0 New Business**

##### **Collaborative Opportunities with CALA**

Davis informed the Executive Committee about a conversation she and former ACRL president Camila Alire recently had with the Chinese American Library Association (CALA). CALA has informally been working with counterparts in China to provide assistance, such as training help. The Chinese institution covers the local costs, while their US counterparts pay for travel. CALA would like to find a way to tap ACRL's knowledge for their efforts. CALA doesn't seem to have a good handle on what they're looking for from ACRL, but if ACRL is interested in working with them, they plan to work on a formal proposal to bring to the Board.

Davis asked the Executive Committee for ideas of ways to help China and to tap the Chinese market. She stated that she told CALA that ACRL is very interested in having more of its standards and guidelines translated into Chinese during their conversation and sees that as a critical step to begin opening relationships with Chinese librarians. The only immediate connection that came to mind during the conversation was to encourage potential sister library partnerships with Chinese libraries.

There was some speculation that CALA could view this as an initial inroad with ACRL that could eventually lead to them being able to get ACRL funding for some of their work.

It was pointed out that although international efforts fit into ACRL's Strategic Plan in the big picture, they are not included in any of the more targeted objectives and strategies that determine the association's immediate focus.

The Executive Committee suggested that Davis write to CALA and let them know that they did not have an immediate suggestion for a project for the two associations to work on, but to ask that if CALA has any specific ideas that they be submitted in writing for a future Board of Directors or Executive Committee meeting.

#### **UNESCO Information Literacy Proposal (Document 22.0)**

Davis was recently approached by Dr. Forest Woody Horton, Jr., author of a proposal for an international train-the-trainer proposal to offer regional workshops on information literacy in 2008 and 2009, which UNESCO has now approved. Horton would like ACRL to consider sharing some part of its materials that have been developed for the ACRL Information Literacy Immersion program for a North American regional workshop that would be held as a preconference before the August 2008 IFLA meeting in Quebec and/or serving as host for the workshop, which includes site selection and all the logistics associated with holding a program.

The Executive Committee discussed the proposal, noting that it would essentially be a contribution on ACRL's part to support the program. ACRL would need to organize 2-5 day meeting for 50 people and identify a local co-facilitator, so it would largely be a meeting planning effort on the part of ACRL's professional development staff.

The Executive Committee did not see a role for ACRL in this program. After discussion, it concluded that Davis should write Horton with the following feedback:

- Regarding ACRL's IL Immersion program materials, ACRL does not own the Immersion curriculum and cannot legally provide the curriculum to third parties. The Immersion faculty owns all rights and grants ACRL a license to use their content as part of the Immersion program curriculum. Horton can be directed to contact Gilchrist if he would like to discuss the proposal with her. If the faculty were interested, they can then bring a proposal to the ACRL Board of Directors, asking them for permission to "recreate" an Immersion program for this purpose. While the Executive Committee was not ready to approve of this idea, it did not want to rule it out without feedback from the faculty and a concrete proposal to consider.
- ACRL will not consider serving as a host for the workshop at this time, as its timing interferes with the development of ACRL's current professional development offerings and it would not be possible to come up with the needed staff time in the foreseeable future. Staff resources for professional development are already committed for the next two years.
- Suggest that Horton consider encouraging the potential audience to attend ACRL's existing Immersion program to learn more about teaching information literacy and provide dates for the upcoming National Immersion program and offer to keep Horton updated on dates and locations as future Immersion programs are planned.

#### **NSSE/CSSE**

Todaro mentioned some NSSE/CSSE issues that she would like to see discussed at the Midwinter Meeting and asked that it be added to the agenda. She might organize a conference call to discuss the issues prior to Midwinter.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.