



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

Friday, October 24, 2008

8:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

Conference Call with Board from 10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

**ALA Headquarters – 1st Floor Conference Room
Chicago**

Saturday, October 25, 2008

8:00 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.

**ALA Headquarters – 1st Floor Conference Room
Chicago**

Fall Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Executive Committee Members: Erika Linke, Lori Goetsch, Locke Morrissey, Mary Ellen Davis, and Julie Todaro (participating by phone for part of the meeting on Saturday).

Visitors: Karen Strege and Dave Dowell (both by phone) as well as Bob Daugherty (in-person) for agenda item 23.0 (on Saturday).

Staff: Katie Coombes, Margot Conahan (by phone for part of the meeting on Friday), Mary Jane Petrowski (in-person for part of the meeting on Friday), Kara Malenfant (in-person for part of the meeting on Friday), and Tory Ondrla (in-person for part of the meeting on Friday).

1.0 Call to Order

President, Erika Linke called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m.

2.0 Opening Remarks

Linke noted that with a smaller group the normal rules of order may not be as necessary, but she encouraged the group to be aware of the rules and consider time management as the agenda is quite full.

3.0 Adoption of the Agenda

Linke noted that agenda items 7.0, Task Force on Positioning 21st Century Libraries: Why We Can't Wait, and 8.0, Diversity Initiatives Discussion Forum, do not have documents to support them. Executive Director Davis pointed out that Document 1.3 contains information relevant to these points and the agenda was amended to list Document 1.3 for agenda items 7.0 and 8.0. Agenda item 8.0 was added to item 19.0, Interest Groups, as it related to the interest group discussion. Agenda item 10, Review of Government Relations Content Experts, was moved to later on the agenda to permit discussion to include staff liaison Kara Malenfant. Finally, it was decided that agenda items 16.0, Committees, and 14.0, Strategic Plan Revisions, be addressed together in discussion as appropriate.

Action: The Executive Committee adopted the agenda as revised.

Strategic Area: The Association

4.0 Reports

President's Report (Document 1.1)

President Linke referred to her written report and added that she had been trying to contact Barbara Preece, the chair of the President's program committee and that she will get it back on track. She also noted that she was late setting up the Assessment Task Force, but she is in contact with CJCLS to involve the appropriate members and finds them enthusiastic. Linke also reported that she was invited to by a librarian in Greece to participate in an activity as ACRL President. She will find out the details.

Linke concluded her remarks by that noting reading through the documents submitted as follow-up to the Strategic Planning and Orientation Session meeting in September was interesting and praised the Board's enthusiasm. She cautioned the Board to balance the enthusiasm with time and opportunities for including members and noted that the Board's actions might seem abrupt to members if this balance is not maintained. It was suggested that these concerns be addressed in the Leadership Council discussion. It was noted that ACRL is using a combination of models of change including top down and bottom up as part of the committee restructuring process. Linke concluded by stressing that it is up to the Board to determine its role in relation to committees and create a framework for committees to contribute their ideas.

Vice-President's Report (Document 1.2)

Vice-President/President-Elect Lori Goetsch added an update to her written report from her recent discussions about a joint President's program with ACRL, LLAMA, and ASCLA. It was reported that ASCLA had a lot of interest in what can be done electronically and possibilities to make money keeping in mind the costs associated with new endeavors. Goetsch pointed out that ACRL has a lot more capacity than other Divisions and will take the lead as a result of that. She concluded that the next step is to establish a planning committee and determine if ASCLA really wants to be part of a joint President's program. It was noted that this proposal fits well with the seven measures model. It was also noted that the program's emphasis on recruitment and retention to middle managers and senior administrators will be interesting in light of the current economic focus as there is a trend for middle management to be cut. It was suggested that the economic focus is a great addition as well as a mentoring component. Goetsch concluded her update noting that she was invited to present at ACRL's North Dakota Chapter.

Past President's Report (Document 1.3)

As Todaro was not present at the meeting to add to her written report, Linke noted that we will return to the Past President's Report at agenda items 7.0 and 8.0.

Councilor's Report

Division Councilor Locke Morrisey noted that ALA recommendations from the task force on electronic member participation regarding electronic participation in Task Forces have been issued and he anticipates a lot of motions in the council about the recommendations. The recommendations are included as Board FYI Document 25. He pointed out that the recommendations include a need for balancing virtual and in-person participation as well as a concern about the revenue stream. Specifically, will these virtual participants pay a fee as conference attendees have? The Executive Committee raised questions regarding the mechanics of instituting these recommendations and Morrisey explained that the recommendations do not address these details, rather the report concludes that ALA explore how to make this happen. Another area of potential debate is compliance with ALA's open meetings policy. Morrisey explained that the goal will be maintaining the spirit of the open meetings policy while not constricting the productivity of electronic communication of sensitive discussions. Current debate brought forth a suggestion to provide live video streaming for Council meetings. The Executive Committee inquired if the video streaming concept suggested for Council was also applied to Board meetings and Morrisey noted that it had not been. Linke suggested that they consider bloggers as a means to push the information out more quickly and attempt to achieve the goals of the live streaming suggestion. Morrisey

agreed to suggest this idea and mentioned that he anticipated that there would be a concern that the blogger would be a filter. Morrisey also noted there are many issues yet to be resolved regarding access to Board email lists. There is the option to create a closed list not run by ALA, which would render a policy unenforceable. He concluded his report by noting that the ALA Executive Board recommendations include adding the capability for electronic signatures and that he perceived this aspect of the recommendations will pass through without any trouble.

Executive Director's Strategic Plan Activities Report (Document 1.4)

Davis highlighted some of the entries in the fall Strategic Plan Activities Report (SPAR). Major points included:

- Summer is an opportunity for staff to do a lot of administrative work e.g., ALA handbook preparation, ACRL file archiving.
- The Immersion program was successfully held in August.
- A new collaboration with SCUP and AASCU to develop a webcast was very well attended and sold some CDs. They reported that they usually do not have presenters of the caliber ACRL provided. Davis noted that she will explore future collaborations.
- Kathryn Deiss has continued to work with the University of Puerto Rico and there is one more site visit this fall. Davis was invited for a closing ceremony in November.
- ACRL welcomed a new staff member, Katie Coombes, who will serve as Program Officer for governance as well as a new student intern, Patrycja Pietrzak, who has been sending out donation thank you letters and will research the impact of ACRL's conference scholarships by reviewing the activity level of scholarship recipients as recorded in the ALA iMIS database records.
- The purchase of an office condominium has taken a lot of time and October 29 had been set as the target closing date, but there are some outstanding issues that need to be resolved and it may not be possible to meet the target date. The building is going well and will be a good work environment with features like windows for every staffer except those in mail room and environmentally friendly office furnishings. There has been a consultant involved with the interior green certification application. However, there have been a lot of problems with the exterior LEED certification and because of the need to have a consultant involved throughout the process it may no longer be possible to achieve the external certification. The exterior LEED certification was the responsibility of the developer.

Goetsch asked if the opening of National Conference registration resulted in an increase in membership numbers. Davis replied that they have gone up, but have not gone up 4% to completely account for the August drop. She explained that the numbers ALA reports include a 5 month grace period and as a result the drop in August membership numbers covers a period of several months. Davis expressed concern that with the unstable economy some members might not renew.

Davis concluded her report with an update on the National Conference. Registration opened 21 weeks out and as of this meeting ACRL now has five hundred and twenty one registrations which is slightly ahead of the last National Conference. Davis cautioned that PLA recently had a successful early registration and then had a drop off and did not meet their registration goal. However, ACRL has retained a marketing firm which is employing a new idea of personalized URLs to reach out to people in specialized ways. Goetsch encouraged ACRL staff to look for regional participants to help meet the goal. Davis noted that this is part of the marketing plan. Davis concluded her report by noting that the number of paid registrants for the last National Conference totaled three thousand and sixty nine.

5.0 2008 ACRL Annual Conference Board Minutes (Document 2.0)

The draft 2008 ACRL Annual Conference Board minutes was reviewed. There were no 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.

Strategic Area: The Profession

6.2 Dissolution of ACRL Fiscal Discussion Group (Document 3.2)

Motion: That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the ACRL Fiscal Discussion Group's request for dissolution.

6.3 Dissolution of ACRL Team Based Organizations Discussion Group (Document 3.3)

Motion: That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the ACRL Team Based Organizations Discussion Group's request for dissolution.

6.4 Approval of RBMS 2011 Preconference Proposal (Document 3.4)

Motion: That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the RBMS 2011 preconference request to hold the 52nd Annual RBMS Preconference in Baton Rouge, Louisiana on June 21-24, 2011.

6.5 Approval of revised budget for Immersion 2009 program (Document 3.5)

Motion: That the ACRL Executive Committee accept the revised Immersion 2009 Program budget which reflects the decision to restructure the Immersion program by coupling Intentional Teacher with the Immersion Assessment track, the revenues and expenses associated with Intentional Teacher will be folded into the FY2010 budget. As a result of the structure change registration fees were lowered and kept at the 2008 level.

Action: The ACRL Executive Board approved the consent agenda as presented.

Strategic Area: Higher Education and Research

7.0 Task Force on Positioning 21st Century Libraries: Why We Can't Wait (Todaro) Action

Discussion: As the Executive Committee reviewed Document 1.3, Davis provided background information noting that Elizabeth Henry is retired and the final Task Force on Positioning 21st Century Libraries: Why We Can't Wait report was due at this meeting. Todaro had offered to finish the Task Force's report. Todaro's report indicates that the report will be posted on the wiki. The Executive Committee noted that a direct release of a report to the public without an opportunity for the Board to review the report first deviates from the Board's normal process. The Executive Committee agreed that the Board would like a chance to review the report and needs to receive it before it is publically disseminated.

Next Steps: The Executive Committee recommends that Julie submit the final report to the Board for review either virtually or at the 2009 Midwinter Meeting in Denver and then the appropriate next steps will be taken to publically release the final report.

8.0 Diversity Initiatives Discussion Forum at MW09 (Todaro) *Information*

The Board Working Group on Diversity will report progress on the planned invitational Midwinter Meeting that will involve constituencies beyond ACRL in the diversity discussion.

Discussion: As Todaro was not able to be present to provide a report, the Executive Committee did not know whether invitations had been extended yet to the discussion forum scheduled at the 2009 Midwinter Meeting. The Executive Committee reviewed the intended outcomes of the event, which include an opportunity for ACRL members to engage in discussion about the report as this opportunity was not provided prior to the report's release. Some concern was expressed about the initiative's sustainability given that Todaro and Byrd's terms on the Board will end at Annual Conference 2009. The Executive Committee agreed that Todaro and Byrd should include sustainability of this initiative in future strategizing to help the Board manage expectations and gain a full understanding of expected outcomes. Goetsch and Linke asked to be included in the Diversity Forum to aid in any transition. The Executive Committee's discussion concluded by noting that this topic is sensitive and ACRL needs to have a clear actions and outcomes.

Next Steps: The Executive Committee requested that Todaro and Byrd add Goetsch and Linke to the discussion forum invitation list for the purpose of aiding in any transition and supporting sustainability. The Executive Committee also requested Todaro and Byrd share the following information with the Board:

- Invitation list and status of invitations.
- Anticipated outcomes for this meeting.
- Minutes/notes from the planning meeting held with ACRL members at the 2008 Annual Conference to provide context for the 2009 Midwinter Meeting activity.
- Finally, the Executive Committee asked that Todaro and Byrd share their vision of their roles in this initiative as their terms on the Board end at the 2009 ALA Annual Conference.

Strategic Area: The Association

9.0 REAL Research Project update (Davis/Petrowski) #6.0, *Information*

ACRL Associate Director Mary Jane Petrowski reported that the REAL Advisory Board now represents librarians from all Carnegie classifications. Everyone who participated in the first planning session was given the right of first refusal, but not everyone could make the commitment to serving on this Board. A document that specifies the roles of the REAL team was developed and was shared with the REAL Board as part of their orientation. The contractor that ACRL had expected to develop the website withdrew from the project at the last minute. As a result, an RPF was developed and distributed with a deadline for proposals of October 31, 2008. Petrowski anticipates receiving three proposals and that there will be a preference for a proposal that encompasses both the website needs as well as the subscription filling service. Current indications led her to report that January will be the soonest that we can expect to have a functional website. One company quoted an entire year before a website would be functional.

Petrowski noted that the Student Success report is in the final stages of editing. The first report released will be the Trends report which will be the first, free promotional report released in January of 2009, then followed by Student Success report in March and then the next report will be in May. Petrowski indicated that the REAL Advisory Board would like to see a Trends report every December. As a result, she is working with the Research Committee to make sure that they understand this is an annual commitment. It was recommended that the costs of providing the Trends report for free should be weighed against the benefits to building the ACRL brand and achieving strategic goals. The Executive Committee determined that the estimated \$25,000 expense of providing the Trends issue at no cost be added to the FY2010 budget assumptions.

Petrowski concluded by noting that a logo has been selected and a few additional aesthetic conditions need to be worked out. She pointed out that the project is currently behind schedule as September 2008 was the original goal for the REAL Reports launch and this has been revised to January 2009. Petrowski added that subscription management is a very complicated process and expressed her preference for a proposal that encompasses the website and subscription management components of the project.

Discussion: The Executive Committee inquired about the price of the product. Petrowski explained that several levels of pricing have been determined based on categories such as members and non-members. In determining these prices, the annual costs were considered. The overall production cost for the website is higher than anticipated and one time start-up costs need to be balanced with the annual maintenance expenses to determine if the subscription prices are still appropriate or need to be modified. It was suggested that as the REAL reports subscriptions are marketed the materials include messages such as: when things are tighter you need more information to make decisions, so REAL is a worthwhile investment. The Executive Committee thanked Petrowski for her report.

Next Steps: The Executive Committee requested that the expense of providing the Trends issue at no cost be added to the FY2010 budget assumptions.

10.0 Review of Government Relations Content Experts (Malenfant/Linke) Discussion

Davis opened the discussion asking the Executive Committee if there is more direction to give ACRL staff member Kara Malenfant in relation to the process of identifying government relations content experts.

Locke Morrisey offered to serve as Board Liaison to this process, but President Linke noted that Linda Kopecky has already been invited to fill this role. Morrisey expressed willingness to work with Kopecky to develop a list of content experts.

The Executive Committee's discussion returned to the goal of identifying content experts and the need to develop criteria for selecting individuals. It was noted that the Executive Committee may be broadening the charge to include content experts in a broad range of areas. The process of identifying government relations content experts may be laying a foundation to build a broader process. It was agreed that Malenfant, working with Linda Kopecky, should develop process for identifying experts in different content areas. These experts will be invited based on the criteria Malenfant and Kopecky determine through the Government Relations content expert process. Davis noted that the Government Relations content expert process might be a chicken and egg situation. She clarified – identifying good candidates and evaluating what qualities make them good may help to develop the criteria. The Executive Committee thanked Malenfant for her work to date.

Next Steps: The Executive Committee requested that ACRL staff member Kara Malenfant together with Linda Kopecky develop a process for identifying experts in different content areas and that these experts will be invited based on the criteria Malenfant and Kopecky determine through Government Relations content expert process.

Conference Call with Board of Directors

The Executive Board participated in a conference call with members of the Board of Directors including Directors-at-Large Michael LaCroix, John Lehner, Linda Kopecky, Debbie Malone, Mary Carr, Janis Bandelin, Elizabeth Dupuis, as well as Past President, Julie Todaro and ACRL staff members Margot Sutton Conahan and Tory Ondrla.

Linke welcomed everyone to the call at 10:00 a.m. Central Standard Time noting the chimes sounding outside the ALA office building. She reviewed the conference call agenda items noting that it was a lot to accomplish

in one hour and therefore directed the Board members to turn their attention to Document 16.0, the Choice Loan materials.

Strategic Area: The Association

11.0 Approval of loan for Choice property (Davis) #16.0, Action

Motion: That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the two million dollar loan from Bank of America for the purchase of the office space for Choice in the Liberty Square condominium.

Discussion: Davis opened the discussion by noting that ACRL received these documents from the lawyer yesterday. The developer wants to close on October 29, 2008, but there are several issues to work out before we will agree to close. The lack of certainty with the parking situation is a deal breaker; if there is not parking available ACRL does not want the building. We have yet to determine if city will lease the parking spaces for 20 years to ACRL or the developer. The developer's preference is for the city to lease directly to ACRL. There were also problems with the sealant on the windows and as a result we negotiated a five year warranty on the windows. Due to a lack of action on the developer's part, we will most likely not be able to get a LEED certification on the exterior of the office space. The developer turned down opportunity to hire a consultant in February 2008. We did not discover this failure until June and this loss cannot be undone after the fact. Although a number of good environmentally sound materials and practices probably were used, we anticipate not being able to achieve the LEED certification as the consultant needs to be involved in the entire building process as opposed to being hired at the completion of the process. As a result of this lost opportunity, we asked the developer for a \$50,000 credit. ACRL continues to pursue an interior LEED certification. Part of the requested credit would be used for the interior certification costs (\$20,000) and the rest would be compensation for the failure to begin the LEED application process in a timely manner.

Davis noted that the ALA lawyers and Finance and Audit Committee have endorsed the Choice loan documents currently under consideration and indicated that she depends on the ALA real estate lawyers to review these and offer sound legal advice. Davis noted one error on page 10- LIBOR would be based on the monthly not a daily rate. The interest rate for the loan agreement is not a fixed rate and with the current economic situation this is a concern although we anticipate an interest rate of about 6%. However, these factors lend themselves to encouraging an accelerated repayment in a seven year timeline especially because of the volatility in the current financial market. Davis made it clear that approving the loan documents under consideration in no way obligates the Board to close and noted that we will not close unless the parking issue is resolved.

Action: The Board endorsed ALA Executive Board Document EBD #3.5 2008-09 and requested that their approval of proceeding with the loan be conveyed to the ALA Executive Board.

12.0 WESS 3rd International Conference, 2010 (Griego/Linke) #8.1a-d, #8.2a-e, #8.3a-d, #8.4 Action

Motion: That the ACRL Executive Committee approve holding the WESS 3rd International Conference in Madrid in March, 2010.

Discussion: Linke opened the discussion by reminding the Board that the purpose of the discussion is to clarify the progress of the WESS conference to date and the goal is to determine if we will hold this conference in Madrid 2010 as proposed.

The Board had an extended discussion about the feasibility of the WESS 3rd international conference proposal considering the current financial climate and amount of work yet to be done. The materials that the Board received raised concerns that must be addressed in order for the Board to continue to support this proposal. The Board expressed concern that since the June Board meeting there was not a regular flow of information between

WESS section planners and their appointed liaisons, ACRL Director-at-Large, Mary Carr, and Budget and Finance Committee member, Joan Roca, or ACRL staff members Margot Conahan and Tory Ondrila. The Board acknowledged that communication began shortly before the documents were due for the Fall Executive Committee Meeting. The documents submitted did not deliver the specificity that the Board expected. The Board recognizes that perhaps there was a misunderstanding of the June 2008 action but did expect the plans to be further along at this point. The Board was concerned that a conference hotel had not been selected, that the promise of free meeting space had not been delivered beyond the first day at the National Library of Spain, that the conference budget was based on more estimates than actual costs, and the nature of the marketing plan (i.e., it is not clear how the lists and audiences will be identified to reach specific individuals), was too general.

The Board discussed the feasibility of international conferences and their own experiences attending successful international conferences including the second WESS conference in Paris and believe it is possible to plan an international conference while maintaining a specific timeline and budget. While ACRL has expert meeting planners on staff, their time is currently consumed with preparations for the 2009 National Conference in Seattle. The Board regrets that the experience and expertise of ACRL staff was not engaged by the WESS international conference planning committee over the 2008 summer when staff workload would have permitted them time to support WESS section members in their proposal.

After noting these concerns, the Board also noted the enthusiasm of WESS section members and affirmed the Board's desire to support members' ideas and proposals. The ACRL Board and staff strive to provide as much support and guidance to members as possible, but must balance the amount of Board and staff time and association funds required by every proposal. As a result, the Board approved continued planning for the WESS 3rd International Conference, provided a meeting planner consultant is hired to support the WESS section planners in drafting a timeline and revised budget that addresses the concerns raised in the Board's discussion. The Board set a deadline for receiving the timeline and revised materials as roughly one month from the request being made to WESS section members. The Board charged the Executive Committee with determining the exact deadline date and specific materials and content that will be requested as requirements for the Board to be able to approve the 2010 WESS 3rd International Conference at the Midwinter 2009 meeting.

The Board's discussion acknowledged that, while some institutions may be exempt, the current global economic downturn will result in increased financial challenges for most ACRL members and their institutions. To mitigate this risk as much as possible, the Board noted that critical marketing efforts should be started now to encourage WESS members to save and dedicate their travel funds to this opportunity. The Board expressed hope that by permitting the WESS 3rd international conference planning to continue, the date can be advertised to allow members to include the conference costs in their travel budgets and for WESS planners to achieve their fundraising goals.

The Board noted that the free meeting space and free translation service were compelling aspects of the original proposal and encouraged WESS to make every attempt to build relationships and engage existing ones to access resources creatively and capture existing momentum and enthusiasm.

Next Steps: The Board charged the Executive Committee with determining the details such as deadlines for a final budget, project timeline, hotel and conference space contracts as well as the services of a meeting planning consultant with international conference planning experience. The Board requested that these details be compiled in the form of a letter to WESS 2010 conference proposal submitters and shared with the full Board for review before the letter is sent.

Strategic Area: The Association

13.0 Action Plans, Action

- **Revised Action Plan Criteria/Form (Dupuis/Carr/Williams) #9.0, #9.1**

Motion: That the Board discuss and adopt revised Action Plan policies and procedures.

Discussion: Davis inquired if Document 9.0 will be a cover document or will it eventually be combined with Document 9.1 in the future. It was clarified that these documents are a work in progress and need input to resolve some key questions Dupuis, Carr, and Williams faced. Key questions include, should committees and sections both use the same form? Did this task originally include the intention to create an umbrella document? Do communities of practice involve sections and discussion groups but not committees?

It was clarified that in the ACRL bylaws, communities of practice and committees are two distinct groups. Therefore the documents under consideration need to sort out committees and communities of practice, unless in this case as both entities can access Action Plans, we could rename the document to address this issue. The Board agreed to change the title to make the form inclusive of both committees and communities of practice.

It was noted that clarifying what activities are out of scope of the Action Plan process is helpful. A concern was raised that the Board refrain from revising the Action Plan form based on the most recent proposals.

It was further noted that now is the time to see if there is anything missing from the form. Two topics that appear to be omitted include recruitment and retention and pilot-funding versus ongoing funding. The Board has expressed interest in establishing a division-wide recruitment and retention effort. The question was raised how the coordination of recruitment and retention activities should be addressed in the Action Plan revisions. The Board also discussed the intention of Action Plan funding to be prioritized for pilot funding over providing ongoing funding. By making funding priorities and considerations as accessible as possible, the Board intends to encourage members who are considering submitting repeated proposals to take this information into account and plan accordingly.

The discussion continued by noting that joint initiatives and relationships in the Action Plan process are not clearly integrated with the Board's approved process of going through the Council of Liaisons. While the Action Plan proposals that the Board has received have not been full blown relationships but rather discrete actions like presenting a paper or collaborating on standards there may be opportunities for building deeper relationships that are lost. It was suggested that the difference between attending a one-time conference on information literacy standards is different than attending a conference one time to hold a career fair. This nuance needs to be clear in the language included in the umbrella document. It was suggested that the final bullet point on the third page of the Action Plan form be revised to better reflect the Board's goal of establishing deeper, long-term relationships. It was pointed out that this bullet point is also listed on the cover sheet.

Davis also noted that in conversations with Susan Kroll, Chair of the Council of Liaisons Committee, she learned Kroll would like the Board to extend their liaison terms to allow time for fresh eyes to review the strategic plan and not renew or appoint new liaisons until the role of the Council has been clarified. The Board also noted that the Coordinating Committee for Advocacy Initiatives, (of which the Council of Liaisons is a component), has to be considered. The Board asked that this issue be placed on the "parking lot."

One Board member suggested that "one-shot" meetings not be funded through the Action Plan process.

Next Steps: The Board requested that Dupuis, Carr, and Williams revise the documents to include the changes discussed for the full Board to review. The deadline was November 10, 2008.

At 11:40 a.m. as the conference had extended beyond the scheduled time before the entire conference call agenda could be addressed, Davis did a straw poll on the revised Action Plan approval process described in Document 4.0. Comments included that the sub-group of Board members reviewing the Action Plan proposals needed to include a representative of the section viewpoint. It was noted that the Director-at-Large position

could fulfill this role. The Board also discussed adding the check box to the form asking if the applicants had discussed the proposals with their Board and staff liaison. Concerns were raised that all Board members still need to be well informed and feel that they own the Board's decision when it comes time to inform people that proposals have or have not been funded. It was noted that distributing all documents prior to the sub-group meeting and allowing time for Board comment as well as a report on the decisions made are actions intended to address these concerns.

The Board adjourned its conference call and the Executive Committee recessed for the day at 11:50 a.m. The Executive Committee members including Erika Linke, Lori Goetsch, Locke Morrisey, Mary Ellen Davis, and Julie Todaro (participating by phone for part of the meeting) reconvened at 8:05 a.m. Saturday morning.

The Executive Committee reordered the agenda to address as many agenda items as possible in the time remaining.

Strategic Area: The Association

12.0 WESS 3rd International Conference, 2010

Discussion: The Executive Committee took up the WESS work charged by the Board in Friday's conference call. The Executive Committee reviewed the previous day's discussion noting that one of the terms of the approval was a requirement to hire a meeting planner with international experience as a consultant. The Executive Committee determined that WESS be required to use their basic services funding to pay for a portion of the meeting planner and that the cost of the meeting planner (taking into account a subsequent reduction in staff expense) needs to be recovered in the fundraising and registration fees in the revenue portion of the budget.

The Executive Committee also noted that it needs to be clearly communicated to WESS that they must work with the conference planning consultant, their Board liaison Mary Carr, their Budget and Finance Committee Liaison, Joan Roca, and their ACRL Staff Liaisons, Tory Ondrla and Margot Conahan. The Executive Committee discussion then moved to the project timeline and how to communicate to WESS that they are required to regularly report to the Board and should be checking in with staff more often. It was noted that in the past when planning an international conference WESS attended every Board and Budget and Finance Committee meeting.

The Executive Committee stressed that the requirements for continued support include providing the Board with the final budget, revised timeline, contracts from the hotels and meeting facilities WESS intends to use for the conference, and copies of the letters from institutions, business, and vendors offering support to the conference by December 19, 2008, conference in order for the Board to approve the conference at Midwinter 2009.

The Executive Committee determined that the proposal had been adequately reviewed and taken enough time on the agenda. Concern was raised that a disproportionate amount of Executive Committee time was spent on this proposal as there are many items that still need to be addressed. It was suggested that one outcome for this experience be a process for risk management assessment for international meeting planning. This process would include developing international conference proposal policies and developing criteria such as the use of an international meeting planner.

Action: The Executive Committee requested ACRL staff draft a letter to WESS that communicates in detail the requirements discussed that WESS must agree to in order for the Board's continued support and that the full Board be given the opportunity to review the letter before it is sent.

The Executive Committee returned to agenda item 13.0 Action Plans as time did not permit the Executive Committee to address items 13.0-16.0 during Friday's session as originally planned.

13.0 Action Plans, Action

- **Process for selecting Action Plans (Linke) #4.0**

Motion: That the ACRL Executive Committee discuss this Action Plan proposal, consider the options, and select a new review model that could be announced at Midwinter. This Action Plan proposes that Action Plans are sent to the full Board and comments sought in advance of the Strategic Planning and Orientation Session (SPOS). A subgroup of the Board convenes before the Strategic Planning and Orientation Session, either in person or by conference call, to review and select the Action Plans to include in the Budget. This subgroup has the final decision-making authority for what is funded. The results are reported back to the full Board at the SPOS.

Discussion: The Executive Committee revisited the proposal to designate a small group to review the Action Plans and make decisions regarding funding. Operationalizing this would impact the orientation process. It was pointed out that the Annual Conference is optional for the incoming Board and therefore adding the orientation could be problematic. Additionally, it was noted that for Annual Conference 2010, ACRL needs to come up with a whole new schedule for the conference. Concerns about the impact of the economic strain in coming years were also raised.

An item of new business was addressed as Morrisey and Goetsch volunteered to participate in developing the 2010 Midwinter and Annual Conference schedules.

Action: Morrisey and Goetsch will advise staff in reallocating the Midwinter and Annual Conference 2010 schedules.

Davis noted that ACRL could pay for the additional hotel room night and that airfare costs are not generally covered. She also suggested that Tuesday morning could be a possibility for the orientation if there are not a lot of new documents that require the Board use this time to review them. It was noted that the Tuesday morning time period would work well as it imposes a limit to the length of the meeting. This was suggested to be especially important this round in avoiding information overload as there are two candidates for President/President-Elect without previous Board experience. It was also noted that this schedule allows time before the Fall Executive Committee meeting for new Board members to receive additional individualized orientation.

The Executive Committee suggested holding the orientation to the Action Plan Review Process on Tuesday morning at the 2010 Annual Conference.

Action: The ACRL Executive Committee approved revising the Action Plan Review schedule as follows – submitted Action Plans will be sent to the full Board for review and sent to a sub-group comprised of the Vice-President, President, Past-President, a Director-at-Large, and the Executive Director (participating in an advisory capacity) to convene either in person or virtually to review and select Action Plans to include in the Budget. The sub-group has final decision making authority for what is funded. The results are to be reported at the annual Strategic Planning and Orientation Session meeting.

14.0 Strategic Plan Revisions (Todaro/Goetsch) #10.0 - #10.4 Action

Discussion: Todaro invited Executive Committee to review a draft of her revisions to the strategic plan compiled in a grid format that included the revisions drafted by other ACRL Board members. She explained that she began by incorporating the work done by other Board members and noted that highlighting the issues of sustainability and diversity were two major goals in the revision process.

After the Executive Committee members reviewed the document, Todaro posed several questions including:

- Should the sustainability section be renamed to better reflect the focus on organizational sustainability?
- Should the new sustainability items proposed be added as a new separate section or integrated?
- Should new diversity items be added as a separate section or integrated?

The Executive Committee discussed the placement of the sustainability and diversity additions to the strategic plan and decided to integrate these additions throughout the plan.

The Executive Committee turned their attention to the topic of research, noting that it is currently integrated and somewhat problematic because it is not clearly stipulated that we need research to cover three broad areas: supporting association business, aiding membership, and teaching members how to use research data from ACRL and other sources. The Executive Committee considered if research should be a separate section or should it remain as currently stated. A recommendation was made to add research to the scholarship section and add research after knowledge management in the introductory sentence. It was also suggested that research be integrated as part of the organization's work into the Organizational Vitality section as, "data driven decision-making to drive entrepreneurial activities."

The Executive Committee agreed that Todaro will insert the research language into this section now that the title has been changed to include research. The use of research will be added to this section as well.

The Executive Committee turned their discussion to the Organizational Sustainability section: staff expertise, financial security, etc. It was agreed that this section needs to be renamed to be more inclusive and should include an explicit desire for entrepreneurial practices. The Executive Committee decided to rename this section Organizational Vitality and leave the goal area as it is, and add the strategic direction: Create and maintain a culture of entrepreneurship.

The Executive Committee noted several areas of the strategic plan contained redundancies, but decided to focus on making the needed additions before removing any redundancies.

The Executive Committee turned their attention to the technology section next noting that they need to reword "new and emerging technology." As a new and emerging technology committee has been proposed, the Executive Committee questioned whether the new committee has the language it needs in the strategic plan. It was discovered that the new language proposed was absent from Todaro's compilation; Todaro will add it to the revised version. It was noted that including monitoring responsibilities within a committee charge does not provide a clear set of outcomes, i.e., monitor for what purpose, who will get the information and how will it be used?

It was noted that there is a section in the strategic plan dedicated to working with other organizations that develop standards in information technology. For four years there has not been work in this area. The question was raised, should we remove this area? As other organizations have begun working in this area and developed some expertise the Executive Committee noted that there may not be value in duplicating these efforts. A suggestion was made to organize and rate the existing standards.

The Executive Committee's discussion then shifted to the area of Advocacy and the question was raised, do we need to add anything about the state-by-state advocacy initiative? It was suggested that this initiative is adequately covered in existing sections. The Executive Committee requested that ACRL staff member Kara Malenfant review this section of the strategic plan and respond to the Executive Committee's following concerns:

- Should the advocacy wording be broadened to include ACRL's role in government relations?

- And are our expected outcomes included in the current wording?

A suggestion was made to include the ALA ethics document updated for 2008 as an underpinning document and add it after the Library Bill of Rights. The Executive Committee agreed to this suggestion.

The Executive Committee then considered how to streamline the plan and noted that the Big Audacious Goal might need some editing. While some Executive Committee members did not see a need for any changes, in the future it could be addressed.

The Executive Committee recalled that the ALA meeting yesterday encouraged ALA divisions to work together to improve how ALA functions. ACRL's strategic plan already includes an explicit goal about this, but it was suggested that putting something at the beginning of the document would be a symbolic message.

It was noted that the strategic plan may eventually be updated to include the committee areas. This can only be done once the strategic plan has been revised. The small working group will virtually make their recommendations for the committees to charge with carrying out specific aspects of the strategic plan. This small working group is tasked with getting their additions and revisions completed by November 15, 2008.

It was noted that a new committee has been proposed—the Information Literacy Coordinating Committee—and that the scholarly communication section of the strategic plan could serve as a potential model for integrating the issue of information literacy. It was also noted that information literacy was seen as supporting the goal area of Learning in the original drafting of the strategic plan and that the Executive Committee did not want to have to break out every issue within the strategic plan. Todaro requested that any changes to committees or Executive Committee decisions that impact her strategic plan revisions be communicated to her as soon as possible. It was suggested that the questions that we are focusing on in a given year or two be set in bold type. The Board could add to them mid-year and be flexible. Adding an annual focus will help the Board to be more explicit about expected outcomes when it reports back to members.

Next Steps: The Executive Committee will communicate any additional information regarding revisions to the strategic plan that is discussed while Todaro is not participating in the conversation.

Next Steps: Todaro will revise the strategic plan as discussed and distribute a revised document for the full Board to review by November 10, 2009 for a virtual vote later.

Next Steps: The Executive Committee requested that ACRL staff member Kara Malenfant review this section of the Strategic Plan and respond to the Executive Committee's following concerns:

- Should the advocacy wording be broadened to include ACRL's role in government relations?
- And are our expected outcomes included in the current wording?

15.0 New Committees Discussion

- Recruitment and Retention (Todaro/Goetsch) #11.0
- Sustainability (Carr/Morrissey) #11.1
- Technology (Morrissey/Malone) #11.2

Discussion: The Executive Committee's discussion opened by addressing the first question on the document – should the committee address recruitment and retention to the profession and the organization? The Executive Committee considered the challenges of a dual focus for the committee and had an extended discussion which revisited the decisions made during the Strategic Planning and Orientation Session held in September 2008.

At the Strategic Planning and Orientation Session the Board determined that recruitment and retention efforts for building ACRL membership should be carried out as broadly as possible and that the Board does not wish to receive Action Plan proposals with recruitment and retention efforts limited to an ACRL section or specialty. The main message should be focused on ACRL membership broadly and then as a means of helping recruits find their niche within ACRL, the full range of participation options should be presented.

Goetsch noted that she initially thought that the charge of the recruitment and retention committee was to focus on the profession. The current charge of the Membership Advisory Committee was discussed and the possibility of adding a focused, one year emphasis on membership recruitment and retention added to their existing charge.

The Executive Committee decided to divide the recruitment and retention task into two distinct parts by assigning the Membership Advisory Committee specific tasks and establishing a task force charged with recruitment to profession. It was noted that Goetsch will appoint the chair of the Membership Advisory Committee and can therefore help ensure that the Membership Advisory Committee addresses this issue. It was also noted that the committee staff liaison, Mary Jane Petrowski, should be consulted in implementing this plan.

Goetsch mentioned she was exploring the possibility of a joint President's Program with LLAMA and ASCLA, an example of collaboration.

It was noted that the management of the recruitment and retention wiki is currently handled by the emerging leaders program and that this may not be sustainable. The Executive Committee agreed to revisit the issue of Wiki sustainability at a later date.

The Executive Committee agreed that the specific task they would like to charge a Recruitment and Retention Task Force with is to develop a plan with specific means to recruit people and students into the profession. The Executive Committee stressed the need to avoid leaving too much to interpretation to avoid confusion and promote timely results. In addition the Executive Committee stressed the need to establish open and ongoing communication with committees and task forces.

Action: Goetsch will revise Doc 11.0 based on the Executive Committee's conversation in consultation with Todaro and present a revised document for the Board to review by Friday, November 21, 2008.

The Executive Committee's discussion moved to the proposed Sustainability Committee detailed in Document 11.1.

The Executive Committee noted the challenge of writing effective committee charges that foster big initiatives and avoid the possibility of committee work focusing primarily on developing programs for the ALA Annual Conference. It was noted that proposed Sustainability Committee has a two-fold purpose: one is internal to the organization and one is external. It was noted that at the Strategic Planning and Orientation Session discussion the Board stressed the mission as well as outcomes and focused on determining what will success look like when developing committee charges. A suggestion was made that priorities be given to committees.

As sustainability is a broad term, it was suggested that clarification of the scope may be required to distinguish among concepts of environmental stewardship, smart planning, and cost saving. The Executive Committee agreed that the Sustainability section should not only be focused only on issues of environmental concern but also be inclusive of fiscal strength and other sustainability issues.

The Executive Committee considered whether economic sustainability is within the scope of this committee. After an extended discussion, the Executive Committee agreed to add a frame to help narrow the focus to

membership and the association and ensure that the committee charge captures the Executive Committee's intention that the committee's work will be to implement the new sustainability language that has been infused throughout the strategic plan. A process by which the committee will work annually with the Board to develop an Action Plan will also be added. The Action Plan is intended to help focus on outcomes and be framed along the lines of, "in the first year the Sustainability Committee will do 'A' and 'B' with an eye toward laying the foundation to accomplish additional goals included in the charge in the upcoming years."

The Executive Committee noted that it will be challenging to appoint the committee and then keep this process going. It was suggested that the Board consider adding vice-chairs to committees for sustainability. The question was raised, "Should the Board develop a template for committee charges and Board committee work?" The planning document from the Strategic Planning and Orientation Session meeting was suggested as a template moving forward for creating new committees.

It was noted that the last bullet point in Document 11.1 regarding sustainability literacy is very interesting and the suggestion was made that ACRL could achieve it by partnering with sustainability organizations.

It was suggested that Mary Carr serve as liaison to this new committee. It was also suggested that as the Board reviews the revised committee charges, if changes are anticipated that perhaps the Board should not fill these committee positions right away. It was noted that the next round of revisions to these documents could inform the whole Board and decisions about appointments could be made then.

Next Steps: Morrisey and Carr will revise Document 11.1 to include a framing statement to the committee charge and leave all the bullets but also add a clear role for the Board in the committee through the Action Plan process and identify some initial priorities. The deadline for submitting the revised document is Friday, November 21, 2008.

The Executive Committee's discussion shifted to Document 11.2 which proposed establishing a new and emerging technology committee. It was noted that regarding the second bullet point that the intention was not for ACRL members to be creating standards, but rather that ACRL members could help people identify, assess, and apply them. The Executive Committee briefly discussed the challenges of disseminating this information.

The Executive Committee revisited the original intention for establishing a new and emerging technology committee noting that pulling in new members and providing a niche for technology savvy members were major goals. It was suggested that a committee may not be the most appropriate means for achieving these outcomes and that an interest group could pull together and engage technology savvy members more effectively. Similarly, it was suggested that a task force would be a more appropriate means of organizing members to identify standards and issue a report and then revise as it becomes dated. It was noted that ACRL is trying to build credibility in this area. Davis noted in the budget assumptions that we are not allocating money to this area. While the Board hoped that a committee could tackle many of the broad goals such as establishing more credibility, the Executive Committee questioned if compiling a list of standards is enough to achieve that desired outcome.

The Executive Committee discussed several alternatives to establishing a committee that would result in progress toward the Board's desired outcomes. An interest group was proposed as a viable option and it was mentioned that Linke knows people who could develop an interest group on technology but that the information about how to establish one is not easily accessible enough on the ACRL website. The Executive Committee agreed that there should be an intentional effort made by ACRL staff members and Board to promote and market the new interest group structure as an opportunity to get likeminded people together. Specific suggestions included: Board members blogging about interest groups, including interest group information in Linke and Davis' OnPoint chat, "Finding your Niche in ACRL," and updating the ACRL website to more prominently display information about ACRL interest groups.

Thinking ahead to the National Conference in Seattle, it was noted that at the Leadership Council meeting held at ALA Annual Conferences and Midwinter Meetings, ACRL is addressing people who are already active members. It was suggested that the Board task the Membership Advisory Committee with making sure that all first time Seattle conference attendees know about interest groups. The Executive Committee also decided that interest groups be added to ACRL 101 and that ACRL booth workers be given talking points about interest groups and other ways to be involved in ACRL and encouraged to actively market themselves.

Next Steps: The Executive Committee requested that Davis work with ACRL staff members to implement the interest group promotion activities discussed.

Morrissey and Linke noted that in their experience at the chapter level, the most innovative work comes from technology-oriented things. The discussion concluded by noting that the Board needs to be aware of the electronic signature policy as it relates to the formation of interest groups because this would streamline the process and would require that updates be made to related policies etc.

Next Steps: The Executive Committee decided not to establish a new and emerging technology committee at this time.

16.0 Committees Discussion

- Review Committee responsibility areas recommended in Strategic Plan (Todaro/Goetsch/Malone/Carr) #10.0 - #10.4
- Roles for Research Coordinating Committee/Environmental Scan (Linke/Davis)
- Committee engagement ideas and Board's role communicating with committees (Malone/Carr/Linke) #12.0, #12.1

The Executive Committee determined that much of this section had been addressed in previous discussion and in the interest of time moved to the next item on the agenda.

Strategic Area: The Association

17.0 Committees continued, Discussion

- Changes to existing committees (Linke) #7.0, #10.0 - #10.4

The Executive Committee determined that much of this section had been addressed in previous discussion and in the interest of time moved to the next item on the agenda.

Strategic Area: The Association

19.0 Interest Groups

- Proposal to Establish Residency Interest Group (Linke) #14.0, **Action**
- Communicating about Interest Groups (Linke) #15.0, **Discussion**

Motion: That the Executive Committee establish a residency interest group.

Discussion: The Executive Committee noted positively that many of the members involved with this proposal are younger and it was suggested that the interest group be invited to get involved with recruitment and retention issues.

Action: Pending the verification of signatures on the petition, the Executive Committee accepts the petition to establish the Residency Interest Group.

Due to time constraints, the Executive Committee did not address the second bullet point or Document 15.0 and moved to Agenda item 22.0.

Strategic Area: The Association

22.0 Budget & finance

- **Friends Fund disbursement proposal Doc #3.6**

Motion: That the Executive Committee approve the Friends Friend Disbursement Criteria and Process.

Discussion: Linke began the discussion by asking if the Friends Fund has dispersed any money recently. Davis could not speak for the Friends Fund Disbursement Committee, but noted that they have high hopes that if their proposal is approved today they could put out a call and be ready for the 2009 Midwinter Meeting. It was noted that both the disbursement and fundraising aspects of the work have generally been on hold since the Friends Committee began the restructuring process. The Executive Committee agreed that the proposal included the appropriate checks and balances.

Action: The Executive Committee approved the Friends Friend Disbursement Criteria and Process.

Due to time constraints, the Executive Committee moved to the first bullet point of agenda item 24.0 Budget & Finance.

Strategic Area: The Association

24.0 Budget & finance

- FY 2008 Financial Report Unaudited (Byrd) # 20.1 & 20.1a, **Information**

Davis reviewed the budget noting that the documents are based on the August second close financial performance reports. She mentioned that the report has not allocated for staff time and miscellaneous administrative expenses to the individual projects. She further reported that since the second close approximately \$56,000 in interest from the Long-Term Investment was allocated to strategic planning initiatives such as the e-journal project, Action Plans, and the SPOS meeting.

Davis commented that the revenue weak spots include WebCE projected revenue because there was a period where the project was not fully staffed and the project was incorrectly budgeted at 100% of projected revenue versus the ACRL standard of 90%. The online classified ad sales are doing well, but we don't know how long that will continue with increased competition from free sites. Classified ads are experiencing a decline similar to the one in 2001. Membership is starting to tick back up and we already have six hundred and eleven registrants for the national conference. Davis concluded her report by noting that ACRL expenses are often under budget because not all budgeted items are carried out e.g. reimbursements for sections and committees, \$50,000 for new initiatives, etc.

The Executive Committee recessed for lunch with the other ALA Division Executive Committees and reconvened at 1:15 p.m. to address a new item of business

Motion: That the ACRL Board of Directors review the proposed partnership with APA and if it approves of this relationship direct staff to execute a memorandum of understanding outlining these terms with the APA.

Discussion: The question was raised as to the process that ACRL could use to ask member for input and Davis noted that it would be sent to the ACRL leads email list. Because the request includes the use of the ACRL name, Davis wanted the Board's input. ACRL's name will be included in a list that we don't have control or ability to review. It was noted that noted that ACRL members may find it helpful to participate even without the ACRL name being attached. Davis pointed out that this is new for them and what they really wanted help with

is getting the word out and that it may not be necessary for the Board to do something as formal as this proposed.

Next Steps: President Linke informally directed Director Davis to approve APA's request.

Strategic Area: The Profession

23.0 Library Support Staff Certification Proposal (Strager/Dowell) #19.0, Action

Motion: That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the nine competency sets for library support staff and provide input on the preliminary description of LSSCP so that any academic library-related or ACRL-specific issues can be addressed as we move forward.

Bob Daugherty joined the meeting as a guest and at 1:30 p.m. Davis dialed Karen Strege and Dave Dowell to join the meeting by phone

Discussion: Linke welcomed Daugherty to the meeting and invited him to address the Executive Committee. Daugherty provided background information and a brief overview of the proposal. He noted that PLA and ACRL are particularly important to the project as these two associations account for the vast majority of library support staff and include representation across support staff functions. With more than 150,000 library support staff in the United States, they are eager to develop standards. From 2002-2003 this work began with surveys to support staff to determine their needs. After compiling the results of these surveys, it was decided to develop a formal library support staff certification proposal which secured a large amount of grant funding.

The planning started in 2006-2007 with interest from the library support staff planning council. Draft competencies were sent out as a survey to over 35,000 people who helped them to refine the competencies. The refined competencies were brought to the conference at Anaheim and presented to various divisions seeking approval and inviting suggestions to improve the competencies. Consequently, there have been additional recommendations. The current set of competencies incorporate all feedback. A number of regional organizations have also demonstrated their support. The current endorsers are listed in the materials provided. Daugherty concluded his introduction noting that in addition the formal organizational feedback, field testers will help to further refine the competencies.

The Executive Committee asked for more information about the field-testing process. It was explained that field-testing will start in the Spring of 2009 in five different libraries representing different types of organizations. Field test sites enroll candidates into the competencies program to develop procedures and perhaps courses to try out all the things that they plan to include in the program.

The Executive Committee asked for additional clarification to determine if candidates will be enrolled and then tested after instruction or would the proposed testing be closer to that of an ACT type exam. It was explained that an assessment model has not yet been decided upon, but a portfolio model and course model are under consideration. In the portfolio system, the support staff would prepare a portfolio and then have it judged. In the other method, candidates take approved courses to achieve the certificate. In the field test they will have the portfolio system up and running and will test it. They also hope to have the courses tested as well. They propose that the courses will go through the APA certification process. It was noted that ACRL could develop courses, apply to get them certified with APA, and then sell them. It is then up to individuals to take the courses to earn the certification.

Daugherty clarified that at this point they are just asking ACRL to approve the competencies not to begin developing courses, though ACRL could in the future through APA. Daugherty said that if ACRL decides to support the proposal, they offer their courses. RUSA and ACCTS are divisions that are starting to develop

courses and the LLAMA Board is particularly interested in developing courses in management and teamwork. ACRL is not being asked to develop courses at this time, but it may come up in the future.

The Executive Committee asked for clarification on the status of the nine competency sets: are they finished or evolving? Daughtery explained that they are evolving, but this is the draft that they are ready to go with for the field testing. He noted that one particular area, administration and management, was a concern in the survey results, but that it depends on the scale of the library in which a person works, and therefore there may be some skills that need to be adjusted. As the profession changes there will need to be adjustments. Daughtery noted that of the 3,000 people who looked at the competencies, about half were from academic libraries and half from public libraries. However, because they have not been through the field test, yet, he cannot say that these are the final competencies.

It was pointed out that the support staff technology competencies seem to be passive rather than active. The Executive Committee asked if support staff would be posting content to the Internet and tagging items. It was explained that the technology competencies are a base that everyone needs to have, not the specializations.

The Executive Committee asked for clarification: are the competencies entry level basic/gate-keeping competencies or are these aspirational competencies for support staff to go above and beyond their basic functions? It was explained that the three required competencies are basic competencies that the project leaders feel every support staff should know, while the other competencies are intended to be more advanced. The Executive Committee had expected them to be career path options to seek to advance professionally, not gatekeeper competencies for potential hires. It was clarified that these are basics that will comprise a first round of competencies and that the LSSCP project members have talked about having more aspirational competencies as a next step. The project leaders wanted to start off with something that they knew they could accomplish. The Executive Committee noted that many of their institutions base hiring standards on state level classification systems and the competencies proposed are equivalent to the very basic level of such classification systems noting that this category is rarely used anymore because all support staff need more advanced skills to perform their job functions. The Executive Committee inquired if other classification systems and skill sets have been consulted. The LSSCP members are familiar with the civil service structure and noted that it worked well in some cases, but noted that one of the things that they would like to establish is national standards. Ohio and Illinois are pretty far along in establishing standards, but most other places do not have standards beyond their institution and it is a goal to establish national standards.

The Executive Committee expressed a strong preference that achieving certification represent an achievement, rather than a baseline. It was noted that many library support staff who have gone through local programs might not want to participate in these certifications because it is so much less advanced than their local programs. Members of LSSCP replied that in public libraries in many places across the country the library support staff do not have any specialized training at all and noted that there is no way that the existing local programs could train all the library support staff in the country. This certification proposal is intended to work together with the existing programs, not replace existing programs.

The concern was raised that if the certification process is for baseline competencies there will not be an incentive for libraries to pay their staff to go through the process. The challenge of developing training for technology skills that are often institution specific was also raised. It was noted that basic computer courses exist and could be replicated. It was noted that there are multiple ways to achieve the certification through the portfolio process, basic courses, or something else. Members of the Executive Committee felt that their institutional experience suggested strongly to them that these competencies are too basic and that library support staff need to have more advanced skills. It was noted that this might come out in the field test and if that is the case they will then have to readjust their competencies. This is why they included a one year field test. It was noted the LSSCP project team felt that most library directors support staff development.

The Executive Committee was particularly interested in support staff gaining certification for the presented competencies without courses and that the portfolio option would be a good way to encourage support staff who have these skills to quickly gain a certification and recognition of their existing skills.

It was noted that the competencies seem heavily tilted to public library services, but it was also noted that after a basic level of skills it is the on-the-job experience that prepares support staff the next level position. Linke noted that there is a lot of transferability in her geographic area between the public institution and her academic library. The Executive Committee agreed that they did not see an entire category of competencies that are missing; rather it would be degrees of competency within each category. In addition, it was noted that in the academic library setting and the definitions for assess services, cataloguing, etc. is shifting and there are trends within academic libraries that do not fit with these competencies, but it would be possible to make it work.

The Executive Committee concluded their discussion with the LSSCP guests by noting that often customer service skills are favored over technology skills because the technology skills can be trained, but customer service skills may be more challenging to train. Daughtery noted that the competencies all are designed to support the improvement of user services. In conclusion the LSSCP project leaders asked for time on the Board's agenda in Denver. The Executive Committee invited them to submit documents by the December 12, 2008, deadline to be included.

The Executive Committee continued their discussion in private noting that these competencies are a work in progress. The Executive Committee continued to discuss whether the competencies should be baseline or aspirational. There was some feeling that as written the competencies were very minimal, and might not be enough to even guarantee an individual getting an interview for a position. The Executive Committee had expected that the competencies would be ones that people already in their positions would aspire to and take extra classes to obtain some type of certification/credential. Because of these questions, the Executive Committee will encourage the Library Support Staff Certification Program Advisory Committee to differentiate between baseline and aspirational competencies.

The ACRL Executive Committee noted that they appreciate the scale of the undertaking and admire the work done to date, and noted that David Dowell has requested time on the ACRL Board's Midwinter agenda to share next steps.

Action: The Executive Committee voted to support the development of competency sets for library support staff and thank the LSSCP for the work done to date, and encourages LSSCP to differentiate between baseline and aspirational competencies.

Due to time constraints, the Executive Committee returned to agenda item 18.0.

Strategic Area: Higher Education and Research

18.0 Proposal to Establish Information Literacy Coordinating Committee (Dorner/Linke) #13.0, *Action*

Discussion: The Executive Committee started by noting that ACRL set-up the Information Literacy Task Force to build on the work done by Beth Dupuis to help make information literacy work in ACRL more coherent and better managed. It was acknowledged that the Task Force felt there is some urgency to get this done before the Midwinter Meeting to help people get acquainted with the change.

The Executive Committee reviewed the proposal in detail to identify how the proposal differs from the current structure and how the interconnection with the Instruction Section would be addressed. One difference that was noted is who would participate from the Instruction Section and that Coordinating Committee representation for the Instruction Section would be open to any member of the Instruction Section Executive Committee. The

Executive Committee noted that overall the proposal does not differ significantly from the current structure. Linke noted that ACRL Board had previously received multiple small requests for summits.

The Executive Committee considered how the proposal would impact the strategic plan and if revisions would be necessary. It was noted that the proposal indicates that they would propose changes to the strategic plan if approved.

The Executive Committee identified several issues that needed to be clarified in order to make a decision including:

- The timing of the request to change the structure. It was not clear why the proposal includes an immediate request to create a structure only to have structure the subject of a summit in July 2009. The Executive Committee would like more information on the rationale for changing the structure first, then asking people, and then potentially changing the structure again.
- The Executive Committee needs additional information about how a Professional Development Information Literacy Coordinating Committee would interact with the existing ACRL Professional Development Coordinating Committee.
- The Executive Committee needs additional information about how would an Information Literacy Outreach Committee work with the ACRL Council of Liaisons.
- The Executive Committee needs more information about how IS and sections with information literacy committees will be impacted.
- Should the proposed structure consider its potential relationship with LIRT?
- What is the Immersion Program versus the Professional Development?

The Executive Committee noted that they are sensitive to creating new groups whose work might already be tasked in another group. It was also noted that this coordinating committee is different from the existing coordinating committees as it would be heavily involved in work of the sections. The Executive Committee wondered about how this structure would function as committee charges come from the Board and section work comes directly from the members. The Executive Committee noted that as the Board is evolving its role with committees it may be a challenge to determine what hand the Board will take in shaping the work.

It was noted that the proposal does not include a Board member liaison, but that in similar situations in the past there has been a Board member liaison and it was very helpful. In addition, all other coordinating committees have Board liaison. As Linda Kopecky is Board liaison with ILAC, it was suggested that her role be shifted to liaison to the Information Literacy Coordinating Committee if it is approved.

The Executive Committee continued to discuss what would the role of the Board be in the proposed coordinating committee and noted that the Board would need to develop the charge and appoint a chair. If the proposal is approved, it was suggested that the Board ask Section Council to select its own representative, that Mary Jane Petrowski serve as staff liaison, and that an Instruction Section representative be included as a coordinating committee member.

The discussion briefly shifted to coordinating committees in general and it was noted that overall the Board has not clarified if the coordinating committees are intended to function as gatekeepers to the Board and that this is not an intentional result of coordinating committees. It was noted that a coordinating committee does not have authority to disband committees, but can make recommendations to the Board. As the proposal currently under consideration includes establishing new committees, the Executive Committee affirmed that coordinating committees do have the authority to create sub-committees or task forces as a way to get work done.

Returning to this specific proposal under consideration, it was noted that there is a clear connection to the Council of Liaisons charge – collaboration and cooperation efforts with other professional library associations and that professional development and outreach component committees seem to duplicate some existing structures. The Executive Committee discussed the potential consequences of implementing the proposed structure and it was suggested that the Board consider appointing a liaison to the Council of Liaisons and outreach component committee. It was also suggested that the Instruction Section might function like the training ground to learn about information literacy and all the different modalities as well as function as a leadership training group where section members could move up into the component committees and coordinating committee roles. It was also noted that there may be unintentional consequences to such a suggestion.

It was noted that the Executive Committee has dedicated a significant amount of time to structure and that the Executive Committee is making every effort to anticipate the consequences of their actions on all ACRL members and the association. The original problem that the Board sought to address was the fragmentation across information literacy. After years of research and without Board action, it was noted that work has continued. The Executive Committee decided that more information is needed to determine what the outcome of approving this proposal would be and noted that the comments of Board members Beth Dupuis and Karen Williams are desired as they have been particularly involved in the Instruction Section.

Because only three voting members of the Executive Committee were present they determined that the discussion was not as rich without the benefit of the full Board's insights. The Executive Committee decided to make this proposal a topic for a future Board conference call to take place before the Midwinter 2009 conference.

Next Steps: The Executive Committee requests that ACRL staff contact Jennifer Dorner to get more information to allow them to better understand the intent of the proposal.

The Board will address this topic further in a conference call the week before Thanksgiving and may consider a virtual vote in order to allow the structure to be in place by Midwinter if approved.

The Executive Committee is generally supportive of the proposal and appreciates the leadership that the proposal demonstrates.

Due to time constraints, the Executive Committee skipped ahead to the second bullet point on agenda item 24.0, 2010-2011 Budget Assumptions.

Strategic Area: The Association

24.0 Budget & finance

- FY 2008 Financial Report Unaudited (Byrd) # 20.1 & 20.1a, **Information**
- 2010-2011 Budget Assumptions (Byrd/Davis) #20.2, **Action**

Davis called the Executive Committee's attention to Document 20.2 and noted that most of the assumptions are continuing projects. She pointed out that one new item the Executive Committee approved earlier in this meeting is the \$25,000 expense of providing the Trends issue of REAL for free annually. The other new expense is adding about \$75,000 to manage the online access to journals *RBM*, *C&RL* and *C&RL News*.

Discussion: Linke asked if the proposed online management of ACRL journals would change the agreement with the journals being available to Proquest as she was concerned that there might be a risk that institutions will cancel their subscriptions once the journals are available online. Davis replied that the agreement would not change and noted a significant decrease in subscriptions was not expected.

Davis pointed out that the new expenses do not have a revenue stream associated with them and that these are new ongoing, long-term expenses. As there is not an existing business plan in place to generate a new revenue stream these funds will come out of existing revenues.

An inquiry was made about the profitability of the ACRL Harvard Leadership Institute, but it was explained that this is Harvard's project and ACRL does not generate any revenue from it. ACRL spends money supporting marketing and reunion activities although it is a minimal investment for the cachet of being involved with a prestigious institution like Harvard.

Davis noted that FY2010 is a non-conference year and will be a deficit year, though ACRL has a \$1.3 million asset balance.

Davis explained that part of the reason that the FY08 budget came in better than expected is because \$50,000 that had been budgeted for new projects was not needed. She also pointed out that next year Choice is supposed to transfer \$100,000, but that the Budget and Finance Committee will need to evaluate Choice's financial status before a transfer is made as the new building puts it in a period of financial transition.

It was also suggested that the Board review the use of the Choice Long-Term Investment as the current policy requires that all funds accessed must be paid back. The question was raised, will the Board be able to use the funds strategically with this restriction. It was suggested that the Board revisit the topic of the Choice Long-Term Investment as the options for paying back the new mortgage loan are considered. It was also suggested that the purpose of the interest needs to be defined and that the Board may want to consider ceasing to contribute to the Choice Long-Term Investment in favor depositing funds into the operating funds account.

Davis pointed out that the budget assumptions as presented do not include adding funds to the Council of Liaisons or any additional travel funds. She noted that additional expenses can be added to the budget up through June 2009.

It was noted that in light of the current financial situation, the Board should plan to have much less interest to spend and may even lose principle. Davis confirmed that principle has been lost in the past.

Action: The Executive Committee accepted the budget assumptions as revised to include the addition of a \$25,000 expense for providing the Trends issue of the REAL Report at no cost.

Due to time constraints, the Executive Committee moved to agenda item 21.0.

21.0 Planning for 2009 Midwinter Discussion

- Leadership Council (Linke) #5.0
 - Action Plan Decisions Communication
 - Action Plan Development
 - Data Gathering for Environmental Scan
 - Committees
- Fellows Luncheon or Reception (Linke)

Discussion: Davis noted that Kara Malenfant suggested that the Leadership Council meeting is an opportunity to talk to the committees and see what they want and what will work for them. The Executive Committee considered this suggestion noting that it would need to be made clear well in advance if a significant amount of the Leadership Council agenda would be focused on strictly on committees. It was recalled that there has been a lot of member feedback on dialogue and interaction being preferable to an oral report format for the Leadership Council Meeting. As the Executive Committee considered how Leadership Council can be a more meaningful

experience involving the sections and the whole membership in an interactive activity that addresses the committee structure was considered.

Another topic considered for the Leadership Council agenda was reporting updates on changes to the ACRL Strategic Plan. It was suggested that the theme of the Leadership Council meeting be change as the strategic plan is a dynamic document and the Board is now looking at the committee structure. Interest groups, Annual Conference schedule changes, the Action Plan process, and electronic member participation were all suggested as agenda items.

Morrisey volunteered to lead a discussion on electronic member participation as there are a lot of fuzzy areas and opportunities for clarification. The outcomes of the interactive discussion will be used to inform ACRL's reaction to ALA's Electronic Member Participation Recommendations. He will prepare a few questions for the small group discussion. It was also suggested that revising the Annual Conference schedule could be addressed in a small group activity to address how to respond to the loss of face-to-face contact between Board liaisons and sections and committees. It was noted that the compressed schedule really impacts the time available for work and productivity at the conference. Questions for further consideration include: on what is this limited time best spent, what outside work needs to be done to prepare, and what are the resulting implications. It was also suggested this portion of the agenda communicate to members that they should anticipate a reduction in the number of programs and the potential for the necessity of combining programs.

The Executive Committee agreed on a tentative agenda for the Council of Liaisons meeting as follows:

15 minutes- The President and Vice-President will do short reports on their year plans. President's report can include the updates on the strategic plan.

30 minutes- Locke Morrisey will do interactive small group exercise on the electronic member participation.

30 minutes- conference schedule

30 minutes – committee work

15 minute – break/transition time The break would also be another time for building community or potentially an icebreaker that includes a leadership building component. It was noted that because Leadership Council participants RSVP, there is potential to create seating assignments or other program ideas using this information.

The Executive Committee decided not to hold the Fellows Lunch at the 2009 Midwinter Meeting as there already is a Candidates Lunch scheduled. The Executive Committee decided to hold the Fellows Lunch at the National Conference in Seattle and invite current and past leaders.

25.0 New business

Immersion faculty recognition draft proposal (Linke) #17.0, *Action*

Motion: That the ACRL Executive Committee approve the awarding of a Special President Award to the 1999 Immersion Faculty and Steering Committee at the 2009 ACRL National Conference in Seattle and award them with a certificate acknowledging their contribution.

Discussion: The Executive Committee supported this idea and noted that the Immersion Program has continued to grow over the years and has made a lasting contribution to the Association, ACRL members, and the profession. To promote the celebratory tone of the event, it was decided that the recognition will be planned for the Seattle 2009 National Conference.

Next Steps: The Executive Committee directed ACRL staff members to draft an email message to notify award recipients as soon as possible to increase their ability to attend in-person. In addition, ACRL staff was tasked with implementing the logistics of the certificate and in-person recognition and celebration at the 2009 Seattle National Conference.

Action: The Executive Committee approved the proposal to recognize all Immersion Faculty (founding, past, and present) as well as the members of the 1999 Immersion Program steering committee in honor of the program's ten year anniversary.

As the Executive Committee meeting already continued an hour over the scheduled time of adjournment, the Executive Committee decided to address the remaining agenda items either by adding them to the conference call agenda for discussion but not action or by adding them to the Midwinter Meeting agenda.

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.