

YALSA Board of Directors Meeting
ALA Annual Conference, Chicago
June 23 – 27, 2017

Topic: Evaluation of 2016 Jury Format Pilot

Background: With the passage of the Confirmation of Jury Appointment document #16 at ALA Annual 2016, the length of juries was changed from 1-year to 3-months, and the chairs became the only appointed member, with other members functioning on an opt in basis. Document #16 also included a recommendation to evaluate the process after 1-year. This document was submitted by Leading the Transformation of Teen Services Standing Board Committee: Crystle Martin, Trixie Dantis, Melissa McBride, Candice Mack, Jessica Snow, Mega Subramaniam.

Action Required: Discussion

Proposal: We recommend that the jury structure remain essentially as is, based on very positive feedback from members, with some minor process changes, as outlined later in this document.

Rationale:

- Feedback was positive from members, based on a survey administered by the Leading the Transformation of Teen Services Standing Board Committee.

Data:

20 of the 30 jury members responded to the survey, with an even split between those who had previously served on a jury and those who had not.

- Those who had served on a jury previously felt the concentrated time was effective:
 - “In some ways it was significantly better - there was less down time and it was easier to keep on task. ... Also, about a month of it was getting everyone set up and it might be nice to have some extra time before review starts”
- 95% felt that 3 months was enough time
- 90% said they liked the pacing of the short-term committee
 - One member said, “I served on the Frances Henne Award Jury, and 3 months was perfect. Everything was fresh in my head throughout the process, and I found it very easy to manage my time. I think having a year would have been more daunting, and I would likely have procrastinated on some of the tasks. I can't speak to other juries, but for the Frances Henne Award I think 3 months is great.
- 100% said they would volunteer again and/or suggest a colleague participate on a jury
- The chairs were supportive of the shorter time line, helping to keep the juries on task

- “I’ve chaired the jury both on the 1 year and 3 month terms. On the whole, I liked the 3-month term better. It would be nice if the chair reviews matched the 3-month term - they seemed a little pointless after the term was over. Also, some help on how to run the transition from year to year would've been nice. With such a big gap in service, it would be nice to have a designated way to share information with the incoming chair? A Dropbox or something? (This might be solved by whatever new platform ALA decides to adopt)”
- “There wasn't enough time for them to apply to be on a jury, for me to get the roster, and then to promote the grant. We had a bit less applicants, if we had an extra month to promote, I think we maybe would have had more.”
- “I felt that I didn't get my roster until very late.”
- Suggestion for improvement from jury members and chairs:
 - “It would be nice for chairs to have one extra month on the beginning, but other than a few minor things, it was much nicer to have the 3-month term!”
 - “Encourage communication. I had no idea what was going on. Still don't. Someone dropped out of our jury because she didn't know what was expected either.”
 - “Can we have them fill out the volunteer form one more month earlier? Or push back the grant deadline by a few weeks (not too close to holidays, though)”.
 - “Have the opt-in deadline a little earlier, so that rosters are ready a full month before the grant application deadline.”

Feedback from Appointment Process:

- Chairs could be recruited first, possibly from the opt-in members. Then the chairs would have time to prepare for leading the group.
- Some of the juries were not fully appointed by Nov. 1, because getting invites sent and accepted took longer than expected, so perhaps the call for volunteers should come earlier, and the invitation process should be streamlined.

Analysis:

- Overall members like the new structure, finding it efficient and easier to keep on task.
- The problem of appointments not being finalized by Nov. 1 should be solved this year with the jury call going out in June instead of October.

Suggested Process Changes:

- Appoint chairs one month earlier than the rest of the group, so that they have time to prepare for leading their committee.
- Have the President-Elect select chairs from those who volunteer for the jury.

- Do away with the formal invitation process that requires formal acceptance by the member by completing a form. Instead, simply ask for an email conformation from the member that they are still willing to serve on the jury.
- Make sure chairs understand that they are not responsible for promoting the awards, and that frequent communication from the chairs to their jury members is essential for success.
- Have jury chairs fill out their chair report as soon as their jury's work is done.
- Move forward with assembling a short-term group to create a manual for jury chairs.

Fiscal Impacts: No fiscal implications.

Evaluation: No further formal evaluation needed.

Proposed Board Action:

The Board approved the continuation of juries in the new structure with the additional changes outlined above, and directs the 2017 – 2018 President to appoint a short-term taskforce to create a manual for jury chairs, to be completed no later than Oct. 1, 2017.

Additional Resources:

- Document #16 : http://www.ala.org/yalsa/sites/ala.org.yalsa/files/content/Juries_AN16.pdf