

**ARLIS/NA Mid-year Executive Board Meeting**  
**Minutes**  
**September 11<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup>, 2006**  
**Minneapolis, MN**

**Monday, September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

Attending: Heather Ball, Elizabeth Clarke (HQ), Carole Ann Fabian, Leigh Gates, Eumie Imm-Stroukoff, Sue Koskinen, Marilyn Nasserden, Fran Scott, Deborah Boudewyn Ultan, Margaret Webster, Ann Whiteside

1. Call to order (Whiteside): Ann Whiteside called the meeting called to order at 9:00 a.m.
2. Announcements
  - a. Robert's Rules of Order: A modified form of Robert's Rules of Order will be used to conduct the business meeting. The Executive Board was reminded of the confidential nature of board discussions.
  - b. Meal arrangements: Lunch and dinner arrangements were discussed.
  - c. Agenda revisions: The Executive Board did not have other topics to be added to the agenda.
  - d. Update on letter to McGill libraries: On behalf of ARLIS/NA, Ann Whiteside wrote a letter in support of maintaining subject specialty at McGill University libraries. She read aloud the response received from McGill's University's Director of Libraries, which discussed the complex nature of the decision that was made and the library's challenges to support the University's strategic plan. The Executive Board appreciated thoughtful nature of the Director's response.
3. Approval of minutes from Board meetings in Banff: The Executive Board reviewed the minutes from the Banff Pre- and Post-Conference Executive Board meetings and made minor editorial corrections.

**Motion 8: that the Executive Board accept the Banff Pre-Conference Executive Board minutes with revised corrections. Approved unanimously.**

**Motion 9: that the Executive Board accept the Banff Post-Conference Executive Board minutes with revised corrections. Approved unanimously.**

4. Ratification of e-mail votes between Banff and Minneapolis meetings: The Executive Board reviewed email motions 4-7 that were held since the Banff Conference Executive Board meetings.

**Motion 10: that the Executive Board ratify email motions 4-7 which were voted between the Banff Conference Executive Board meetings and the Mid-year Executive Board meeting in Minneapolis. Approved unanimously.**

5. Conference updates

- a. Banff (Nasserden/Scott): The Executive Board reviewed the evaluation results compiled by Marilyn Nasserden. Only 36 attendees of 480 attendees turned in their evaluation forms, causing concern that the evaluations do not accurately reflect feedback about the conference. The Executive Board discussed various methods to increase the number of evaluations that are turned in. Among the ideas discussed included sending out emails via ARLIS-L with link to the conference survey; encouraging attendees to turn in evaluations at the end of the conference by holding a raffle; and using Survey Monkey for evaluations. The comments about the Banff conference, according to the evaluation responses, were positive. Attendees praised the location, programming, and workshops. Some attendees questioned the costs of the full workshops and wondered why they could not be free like the mini workshops. The Executive Board discussed the concept of full workshops and the costs of covering speakers who are not members of ARLIS/NA. It might be less confusing if a different name could be used for mini workshops, such as “seminar.” The Executive Board also discussed the absentee attendance rates for the mini workshops and ways to prevent this, such as defining the goal of the mini workshop or charging a low fee for the mini workshop. A board member asked when the Banff conference report will be written, as it was due 6 weeks after the conference and would have been useful for the Atlanta CPAC to review. Nasserden doubted the report would be useful, as the responses are too general. The Banff Conference made about \$70,000 and was very successful. The Executive Board discussed the perception by the membership that Banff was more expensive than previous conferences. There was speculation about communication problems and mistrust of conference decision-making choices. Margaret Webster is currently reviewing the Conference Planning Manual and would be willing to facilitate a conference planning workshop at the Atlanta conference.

**Action 21: Marilyn Nasserden, Fran Scott, and Ann Whiteside will draft a general message explaining the conference decision-making process, relative profit or loss financial comparisons between last few conferences, and the process for choosing conference sites. Deadline: mid-October 2006.**

**Action 22: Margaret Webster will begin working on a conference planning workshop or session. Deadline: September 30, 2006.**

**Action 23: Marilyn Nasserden and Deborah Boudewyn Ultan will examine the conference workshop guidelines for the next conference proposal process. Deadline: April 1, 2007.**

- b. Atlanta 2007 (Whiteside/Ultan/Scott): Debbie Apfeld has thought of creative solutions in regard to the expensive cost of the Atlanta conference convocation site. The Executive Board discussed addressing the lack of communication among ARLIS/NA groups by having large meeting rooms with breakout groups at the Atlanta conference. The Executive Board discussed the conference schedule and reviewed the preliminary conference budget. A memorial area will be set up

in the registration area, instead of mentioning the deceased during the annual membership meeting; \$100 will be budgeted for flowers for the memorial display.

**Action 24: Fran Scott will allocate \$100 from the President's discretionary expense fund for a memorial display at the Atlanta conference. Deadline: mid-November 2006.**

- c. Denver 2008 (Whiteside): Confusion about the roles of the Denver CPAC and HQ was clarified. The Denver CPAC can work on ideas and the conference logo but cannot make commitments on the hotel and conference dates. HQ signs all of the contracts and deals with the financial aspects of the conference. The Denver CPAC was referred to the CPAC manual. Local Arrangements and Program Chairs have been chosen. The conference planning process will begin at the Atlanta conference. It was mentioned that conference planning, as well as the conference planning manual, are changing and undergoing revisions.
- d. Indianapolis 2009 (Whiteside/Ultan): Ursula Kolmstetter and B.J. Irvine are co-chairs for conference.
- e. 2010 – need an invitation: The Society does not have a venue for the 2010 conference. Various potential regions for the conference were discussed; it was speculated that the Southern California Chapter may not wish to hold a conference, that the Northwest Chapter might be interested but was just involved with the Banff conference, and that New Mexico was a desirable location but the Mountain West Chapter would have just held the conference in Denver. Buffalo, Toronto, and Ottawa in the Northeast region were suggested as possible sites. Elizabeth Clarke outlined a national conference planning committee model, in which a national program committee selects programs, a local program committee selects venues to showcase the conference city, and HQ handles the logistics of the conference hotel and site. It was suggested that a local chapter member be appointed on this national conference planning committee to maintain the local flavor of chapter that is hosting the conference. This model could be implemented by having the Atlanta, Denver, and Indianapolis conference program chairs as members of the National program committee, with rotational changes to maintain continuity. The Executive Board discussed methods to communicate this model with the general membership through dialogue. A national conference planning committee may be advantageous because some of the smaller chapter may not feel as if they have the proper support to plan a national conference. Other options for solving the problem of finding willing chapters to organize annual conference were discussed. This included: providing better guidelines, providing better training for CPAC members over a 2 year period, or having chapters responsible for local arrangements and national and HQ deal with programming and other issues. The Executive Board decided not to change the CPAC model dramatically and to instead add past and future program chairs to the CPAC for training and continuity.

**Action 25: Carole Ann Fabian, Margaret Webster, and Deborah Boudewyn Ultan will discuss a revised conference planning model and ask Ann Lindell**

**or Tom Caswell from the Atlanta CPAC, as well as the Indianapolis program chair, to be a part of the Denver CPAC in an advisory or training capacity. Deadline: December 31, 2006.**

- f. 2011 – possible joint conference with VRA (Whiteside): A contract is still being negotiated between VRA and McPherson Clarke; afterwards, a contract will be negotiated between VRA and ARLIS/NA. VRA will not move forward without a signed hotel contract. The current VRA Executive Board is very cautious about having a joint conference and has questions about the management firm and the benefits of having a joint conference with ARLIS/NA. However, a new VRA Executive Board will be in place in 2011, and the Twin Cities VRA chapter is very positive and enthusiastic about holding a joint conference. CAA was mentioned as a possible organization to hold joint conferences, but it was mentioned that CAA does not hold joint conferences.

*Break at 11:02-11:14 am*

6. Budget (Scott): Fran Scott reviewed the detailed draft of the 2007 budget with the Executive Board. The following supplements were also distributed: membership statistics from HQ, the Development Committee's budget, the Atlanta conference budget, the Publications Committee's budget, staff stipends, and special funding requests. Revenues: there was an increase in student memberships; money from investments and dividends increased; ARLIS/NA publication *Art Museum Libraries and Librarianship* may be published in time for the Atlanta conference, but Fran Scott has left it blank on the income line of the budget. Fran Scott has reviewed publications figures with Roger Lawson. They wanted clarification about the accounting line for web site advertising. This might be for web site advertising which has not yet been implemented. It could also be JobNet advertising. If this account line reflects JobNet advertising, it should be changed on the budget to JobNet, not web site advertising.

**Action 26: Fran Scott will seek further clarification about web site advertising income. Sue Koskinen will also inquire about this and speak to Roger Lawson. Deadline: by November 1, 2006.**

The SEI portion of budget, income of \$2800, will need to be increased because VRA and ARLIS/NA exchanged handling the budget ledgers; income and expenses will be reflected in next year's budget. Fran Scott needs to get the figures from SEI.

**Action 27: Fran Scott will discuss SEI budget figures with Trudy Jacoby. Deadline: by November 1, 2006.**

Fran Scott discussed expenditures on the 2007 budget. *Art Documentation* has increasing costs because of increasingly lengthy issues. *Art Documentation* editors have gone \$10,000.00 over budget and need be encouraged to stay on budget. The Executive Board discussed strategies to encourage the editors to stay within their

budget. Perhaps the submitted papers need to be more rigorously edited, the conference reporting briefs could be moved to the AWS, or editorial guidelines could be written up? The Executive Board decided not to approve an increase to line 5127 for a professional resources honorarium to Paul Glassman who is editing *Art Museum Libraries and Librarianship*. Lines 5131 and 5134 dealt with postage and production for *Update*; these accounting lines will be retained for historical documentation, but the budget for these lines will be \$0.00. Executive Board meeting expenses were increased to \$2000.00. Membership expenses have decreased, because NISO and LOEX memberships were discontinued. Special funding request lines will be revised when chapters submit their proposals on September 30, 2006. The line for HQ and administrative expenses reflects the new contract with management. HQ currently sends one person, instead of two, to the mid-year board meeting; the budget will need to reflect this change. Two HQ staff, including a financial person, is needed when there is a new Treasurer on the ARLIS/NA board. The Chapter listserv expense will need to be revised once the web site issue is resolved. Transportation fees for the conference will be lower in 2007 since the convocation site located at the hotel. *Art Documentation* publication costs need to be reviewed by the Publications Committee because it is \$10,000.00 over budget.

Five special funding requests were discussed. The Wittenborn Committee asked for \$350.00 to take the award winners to dinner. The Executive Board discussed that the Travel Awards Committee also used to take the awards winners to dinner, but discontinued this practice because of the cost. The Membership Committee asked for \$1750.00 to print the new membership brochure after restructuring the membership levels. The ARLIS/NA Student Affairs Discussion Group requested \$149.50 for an online communication blog. The Executive Board encouraged communication among student members, but discussion centered around the fact that this will be an ongoing yearly expense. The Publications Committee requested \$1298.00 for software to support the Artist Files database and full searching of *Art Documentation* reviews on the ARLIS/NA web site. Discussion centered around the fact that the Executive Board asked the Publications Committee to examine the infrastructure of the AWS. The final request was for partial support of ARLIS/NA representatives to attend meetings as deemed appropriate by the Executive Board on an ad hoc basis. Fran Scott will put a placeholder of \$1000.00 in the 2007 draft budget for this purpose. Discussion centered around finding volunteers in the local area to attend those meetings; and the fact that the Executive Board agreed to fund this on a case by case basis at the Banff conference meetings.

**Motion 11: that the Executive Board accept the Wittenborn Committee's request for \$350.00 to treat the award winners to dinner. Unanimously opposed.**

**Action 28: Carole Ann Fabian will communicate the results of the Wittenborn Committee's request to Daniel Starr. Deadline by: by November 1, 2006.**

**Motion 12: that the Executive Board accept the Membership Committee's request to fund the new membership brochure after the new membership models are completed. Unanimously approved.**

**Action 29: Marilyn Nasserden will contact the Membership Committee about the acceptance of the special request funding.**

The request from the Student Affairs Discussion Group for \$149.50 was tabled for discussion about the AWS infrastructure later in the agenda. The Executive Board reasoned if this vote is not approved, Ann Whiteside should carefully explain the reasoning behind the decision and encourage the students build a model critique, use it, and bring it back to the EB. The Student Affairs Discussion Group could investigate having the blog linked off the AWS.

The Publications Committee funding request for a relational database was tabled for discussion about the AWS infrastructure later in the agenda.

**Motion 13: that the Executive Board accept to place \$1000.00 as a placeholder in the 2007 draft budget for contingency funding for partial support of ARLIS/NA representatives to attend meetings as deemed appropriate by the Executive Board on an ad hoc basis. Unanimously approved.**

The Executive Board agreed to vote on the 2007 budget via email within a one month period once the figures have been clarified.

*Break at 12:45-2:08 for lunch*

7. Chapters: Ann Whiteside asked the Executive Board to focus on the next steps for this entire process.
  - a. Affiliation agreement process and discussion: Heather Ball stated that the DC/Maryland Chapter agreed overwhelmingly to sign the affiliation agreement. The Executive Board needs to fully explain to the chapters how to set up membership structures to retain and recruit members after signing the agreement and answer questions regarding chapter insurance. A summary of the conference call with attorney Michael Deese from August 22, 2006) was distributed. Each chapter should investigate obtaining DNO insurance so individual officers can protect their personal assets. Three chapter insurance options can be presented to the chapters: 1) continue to operate as before; 2) incorporate; or 3) or obtain DNO or general liability insurance. The Chapters can investigate these options according to their own timetables.

ARLIS/NA insurance will not cover Chapters' Board members; it only covers the ARLIS/NA's Executive Board and national activities. HQ explained that chapters are smaller with fewer activities and with a smaller geographic region, so the risk is smaller. If the chapters do not have much money in their budget and are not incorporated, the risk of being sued is very slim and so nothing really would change. Release forms and waivers protect members, but not the third party.

Events may also be covered by the institution hosting the event. HQ explained that it is easier to get DNO than to become incorporated. Incorporation is expensive because you need to hire an attorney. The chapters will hold their business meetings in October and November and need to discuss the affiliation agreement so they can sign the affiliation agreement in December. If a chapter does not sign the affiliation agreement, then they will not exist as a chapter of ARLIS/NA. Heather Ball stated that voting about the affiliation helped the chapter officers; they did not want to make the sole decision but wanted consensus with the membership. Bylaws change should not happen at the fall meetings because it would be too much on the agenda. Membership categories should not be put into bylaws because it often changes. The Executive Board agreed that it is acceptable to offer “Friend of the Chapter” or “Associate” categories if they are not listed in the bylaws. The Executive Board discussed responses to the New York City chapter’s questions regarding the signing of the affiliation agreement. The Executive Board discussed what would happen if chapter broke away from the Society by not signing the agreement. Can the Society trademark or copyright the ARLIS name? Perhaps the chapters should be called ARLIS/NA and then the chapter name.

**Action 30: Regional Representatives need to inform their Chapters that they need to sign the affiliation agreement by December 20, 2006. Deadline: by October 1, 2006.**

**Action 31: Chapters, with the assistance of their Regional Representatives, need to review, compare, and revise the Chapter bylaws to correspond with the ARLIS/NA bylaws. Deadline: by February 21, 2006.**

**Action 32: Executive Board will review and send back, as necessary, the revised bylaws to the Chapters for final approval vote at pre-conference Atlanta Executive Board meeting. Deadline: by March 1, 2006.**

**Action 33: Regional Representatives will encourage their Chapters Officers to contact their own local insurance agent about obtaining DNO liability insurance. Deadline: by November 1, 2006.**

**Action 34: Each time an affiliation agreement is signed and affiliation agreement meetings are held, Ann Whiteside will post the results on ARLIS-L. Regional representatives will send Ann Whiteside the meeting dates. Deadline: by September 21, 2006.**

- b. Canadian chapters and incorporation: This issue is about insurance, not incorporation.

## 8. Task Forces

- a. Awards Task Force (Fabian): Carole Ann Fabian distributed the task force's report. The task force is working on an awards handbook with consolidated calendars, financial information, and other information that will be available in Atlanta. This will eliminate confusion that occurs when chairs of the committees change. The committee expressed dissatisfaction with the new Awards Committee structure which has not solved previous problems. Communication and continuity problems still exist among awards committee sub-chairs operating under a Awards Committee chair. The Awards Umbrella Chair is seen as an ineffective position. The Awards Task Force recommended that a \$500.00 honorarium, complementary conference registration, and complementary lifetime membership for the Distinguished Service Award should be an ongoing budget line item, instead of a budget request each year. The Awards Task Force also recommended \$500.00 for Gerd Muehsam award with \$300.00 for travel.

**Motion 14: that the Executive Board approved the DSA award winner be given a \$500.00 honorarium, complimentary conference registration for the year of the award, and lifetime ARLIS/NA membership. Unanimously approved.**

**Action 35: Carole Ann Fabian will convey this DSA approval to the task force and will ask the Gerd Muehsam Committee for clarification regarding allocation of moneys so the board can vote via email.**

- b. Archives Task Force (Webster): Barbara Opar at Syracuse informed Margaret Webster that Syracuse University would be eliminating the ARLIS/NA archives. Margaret Webster met with Katherine Manwaring, who is a paraprofessional in charge of the archives, who was given a mandate to get eliminate certain archives and clear out space for the institution. Syracuse University has not been processing the ARLIS/NA archives and has only been maintaining container lists. Ann Whiteside and Margaret Webster have approached the University of Illinois about the ARLIS/NA archive. The Executive Board agreed that the University of Illinois might be ideal because they also have the ALA archives. Library schools with archival tracks, such as Simmons University, might also be approached. ARLIS/NA has about three years to deal with and resolve the issues surrounding electronic tapes, the processing of the archive, and oral history tapes. HQ does not have archival management papers.

**Action 36: Eumie Imm-Stroukoff and Margaret Webster will look to see if HQ's papers are included in archives container list.**

*3:53-4:05 – Break*

- c. Assessment Task Force [Webster, Whiteside]: The Assessment Task Force interim report of September 2006 was distributed. Affiliation, membership tiering, and assessment are all related issues. Affiliation should be addressed first, then membership issues will be addressed, with assessment issues addressed at a

later date. Ann Whiteside will encourage Lynda White to take time in gathering data. The task force should continue working, but should wait to present this assessment to the membership after the affiliation agreements have been signed. Elizabeth Clarke thought that the assessment had to do with assessing how to drive the strategic plan and assessing our performance. The Executive Board clarified that the idea was to assess the structure of ARLIS/NA.

**Action 37: The Assessment Task Force will ask for member feedback on the structure in February-March 2007 and will hold a forum in Atlanta to present their report to the general membership. Deadline: by February-March 2007.**

The Executive Board discussed getting software to search across multiple documents and to make the policy manual searchable. This is very expensive and will need to be addressed for long-term planning.

- d. SEI Long Term Planning Task Force [Webster]: The SEI Long Term Planning Task Force has not yet done any work nor written a report. The co-chairs of task force are also on the implementation team. Eileen Fry and Margaret Webster will hold a conference call to begin work.
- e. Membership Database Task Force [Webster]: The task force includes Sam Duncan, Nedda Ahmed, Craig Fleming, and Elizabeth Clarke. The task force examined the membership database report from last year to determine how to move forward. The previous committee recommended the software that was too expensive to purchase. The task force determined that *Memberclicks* would solve many membership management problems. Margaret Webster distributed a memo from Sam Duncan dated September 7, 2006 that discussed *Memberclicks*. It is reasonably priced; members can update their directory information online; members can register for conferences online; members can use Paypal or other credit cards; members can use a program to conduct surveys; and the Society can manage a listserv. This software will also be able to manage *Art Documentation* reviews on the AWS. Other advantages include that fact that Craig Fleming already is using *Memberclicks* for another organization, resulting in less training time, and that this software does not need a lot of customization. This was recommended as a low-end, but good solution by the task force and by HQ. The set up charge will be about \$1500.00 with a \$180.00 monthly charge. If it is desired, this software will allow the Society to close ARLIS-L to members only as part of a tiered membership list subscription and deal with the JobNet issue. The next step would be to negotiate with *Memberclicks* and make a list with what cannot be addressed by this software. The President's discretionary fund from Banff was set aside for a membership database.

**Motion 15: that the Executive Board approve that the Membership Database Task Force be authorized to continue exploration of Memberclicks**

**as a contracted service for ARLIS/NA membership database, including payment for the software.**

- f.** Education Task Force [Fabian]: The Education Task Force report was distributed. Younger members are needed on the task force since the issues are overarching and inclusive of many different groups. Carole Ann Fabian recommended quarterly reports until the structure is set up and will discuss this with task force members.

**5:22 pm – meeting adjourned for the day.**

**Tuesday, September 12<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

**9:00 a.m.: meeting called to order by Ann Whiteside.**

9. Committees

- a. Diversity Committee (Imm-Stroukoff): Eumie Imm-Stroukoff reported that at the Banff conference, the Diversity Committee was told that they need to act on issues instead of thinking that the Executive Board or the Society is not committed to diversity. The committee has been working proactively and positively on their charge and tasks. Laurel Bliss attended and reported on ALA's diversity meeting. Vanessa Kam submitted session proposals for the Atlanta conference. Members of the Atlanta CPAC clarified that although Vanessa Kam's proposals were not accepted, they can be presented at the Atlanta conference as poster session or resubmitted next year. The Executive Board was pleased with the Diversity Committee's actions and recommended that the committee act as a clearinghouse to disseminate information to rest of Society.
- b. International Relations Committee -- revised charge (action item 85 from Pre-Conference Banff) [Webster]: Hugh Wilburn and the committee was given a charge to determine the roles of liaisons since the Society is no longer an institutional members of IFLA. The committee has not acted on their charge or action item. The Executive Board thought of potential things this committee could be doing: 1) inform the membership of things that are happening in other countries; 2) act in a welcoming capacity for foreign and international attendees at the ARLIS/NA conferences; and 3) provide a list of multi-lingual members for foreign attendees at the ARLIS/NA conferences. The Executive Board discussed inviting international guests to the Society Circle reception. *Memberclicks* can identify services that members of ARLIS/NA can individually provide, such as language skills. Communication and service should be reflected in both the Diversity and IRT Committees' charges. The Executive Board commented that the International Relations and Diversity Committees are related; they focus on our membership and outside of our society to bring diversity into our conferences.

**Action 38: Eumie Imm-Stroukoff and Margaret Webster will ask the chairs of the Diversity and International Relations Committees to contact the News and Features editor to report on international conferences and ALA diversity meetings for the general membership and to investigate their charges to include providing service and communications of other meetings to the general membership. Deadline: by November 2006.**

- c. Membership Committee (Nasserden): Marilyn Nasserden distributed documents from the Membership Committee related to membership structure including a summary of membership structures and goals. Two models were examined by the Board. Model A was an a la carte membership structure and model B was a tiered membership structure. The a la carte membership model had a reduced basic membership with add-on benefit categories for an additional fee. The Executive Board discussed how Model A, as written, would not bring the Society additional

revenues. A modified model was suggested using: “Basic membership” – stripped membership; “Select membership” – voting and rights to serve on the Executive Board; and “Silver membership” – opportunity to attend Society Circle events. The Executive Board discussed changes to Model B, using tiered memberships: “Subscriber category” – the Executive Board recommended calling this “Listserv member” with access only to ARLIS-L; “Introductory category” – the Executive Board approved of the concept of this one year, one time category; “Virtual member category” – the Executive Board recommended removing this category since the Society is moving in this direction and virtual publications will cost the Society more money; “Full member category” -- the Executive Board recommended calling this a “Basic member” category. The Executive Board was in favor of a tiered membership model because it would be less confusing for the membership and easier for HQ to manage. The Membership Committee should revise the tiered membership model to include more detail using the aspects of Model A and bring it back to the Executive Board for review and a vote. The Executive Board examined the Membership Committee’s survey for ARLIS/NA members and wondered about the actual goal of the survey since the questionnaire is about value, not cost structure. The Executive Board recommended that the Membership Committee send a message via ARLIS-L and outline the tiered membership model for the membership with an invitation for comments rather than conducting the survey. This potentially could be aligned with the launching of *Memberclicks* as a benefit.

**Action 39: The Membership Committee should post a general message on the listserv stating that they are examining membership structures and asking for comments. Deadline by: November 2006.**

The Membership Committee wanted to know if business members can be included on the “What Members are Saying” portion of the AWS. Is it considered preferential treatment if a vendor is approached? The Executive Board suggested using the same guidelines and process to choose business affiliates. The Membership Committee should also send all vendors a direct invitation via email and clarify that vendors should state why ARLIS is important to them as individuals, not as business, members. Marilyn will pass this information along. The Membership Committee should also target new members, students, and retired members as well.

**Action 40: The Membership Committee will send vendors a blanket invitation via email for “What Members are Saying” on the AWS. Deadline: November 2006.**

The Canadian chapters asked if it is possible to have an institutional membership in ARLIS/NA and have more than one staff person attend chapter or national meetings. The chapter should consult Article 3, section 2 of the bylaws. It needs to be administered on the chapter level and is a chapter issue. The chapters’ bylaws cannot be in conflict with National’s bylaws.

*Break 11:02-11:20 am*

- d. Nominating Committee – process [Whiteside]: Terry Wilson has withdrawn from her candidacy because she did not wish to submit a statement and will be busy with her professional duties. This particular Nominating Committee has been troubled by communication and nominating processes. The Executive Board discussed problems that might have arisen regarding the guidelines and the nominating process. The Executive Board expressed concerns about lack of vision statements or incomplete vision statements from some of the candidates and the need for a fully committed and fully capable board at this juncture in ARLIS/NA. HQ noted that one of the candidates was not a current member of ARLIS/NA.

**Action 41: Ann Whiteside will speak with the Nominating Committee about the slate and process used in nominating candidates and will ask the committee to tell the candidates to provide missing documents and other criteria necessary. Deadline: by September 18, 2006.**

**Action 42: Ann Whiteside will convey to the Nominating Committee the need for another candidate for NE Regional Representative.**

- e. Publications Committee [Koskinen]: *Art Documentation* book reviews will go online this autumn. The book review list will be printed twice a year in *Art Documentation*. They will be posted on the AWS first and then on EBSCOhost. The Executive Board would like the book reviews to be posted continuously, not only twice a year. The EB discussed having the book reviews available as a benefit to members only. The addendum to EBSCO agreement needs the Executive Board and Elizabeth Clarke's approval.

**Action 43: Sue Koskinen will send the addendum to the EBSCO agreement to the Executive Board and Elizabeth Clarke via email for approval. Deadline: by October 2006.**

**Action 44: Sue Koskinen will inform the Publications Committee that book reviews should be on the members-only portion of the AWS and posted continuously.**

The handbook will be published in print, and it needs to be added to the budget. The Publications Committee and *Art Documentation* editors need to decrease publication costs. The Executive Board discussed at length possible solutions such as changing the matrix from the number of pages to the number of articles in *Art Documentation*; examining what makes an issue substantive; and editorial guidelines to edit articles that are submitted. The Executive Board would like to see breakdown of the costs to produce *Art Documentation*.

**Action 45: The Publications Committee should be told that they have gone over budget and need to review the parameters for the publication of *Art Documentation*. Deadline: by October 2006.**

**Action 46: The Publications Committee should examine and analyze guidelines set up for a peer review process. Deadline: at the discretion of the Publications Committee.**

The EB discussed conference proceeding materials, which include written recorded notes, power point, and handouts. The editors of *Art Documentation* want to publish conference papers in *Art Documentation* as an article. The Publications Committee should review online and *Art Documentation* conference proceedings and then make recommendations to the Executive Board.

The Publications Committee has much responsibility for *Art Documentation* and other publications, as well as AWS. Many of the editorial roles are appointments; perhaps these positions should be considered renewable term appointments.

A Japanese company would like rights to translate a copy of Joan Benedetti's *Art Documentation* article on managing the small art museum library. The company was referred to Scarecrow Press about her upcoming handbook for *Art Museum Libraries and Librarianship*, but the Executive Board pointed out that this request had to do with her *Art Documentation* article and needs to go to the *Art Documentation* editors.

The Archives Task Force and Publications Committee will need to review the need for conference web sites to be moved to AWS.

*Break for lunch from 1:00-2:00 pm*

10. Action items from Banff Conference meetings:

a. Pre-Conference:

- i. Action 85: Margaret Webster will work on the Conference Planning Manual with Marilyn Nasserden and Fran Scott to update the section on the Treasurer. Deadline: September 1, 2006.

Margaret Webster discussed this action item with Marilyn Nasserden, Laura Schwartz, and Elizabeth Schaub to determine what was successful or unsuccessful. She has compiled comments from Laura Schwartz, Elizabeth Schaub, the Atlanta CPAC, Debbie Apfeld, and Sue Rawlyck. She will get feedback from Fran Scott and Marilyn Nasserden next. She will incorporate an action timeline into the manual.

- ii. Action 88: Margaret Webster and Eumie Imm-Stroukoff will review the Policy Manual to ensure that it is current and propose any changes for the mid-year Executive Board meeting. Deadline: September 1, 2006.

This has not been accomplished. Margaret Webster and Eumie Imm-Stroukoff will work on this by the end of February 2007 for the pre-conference Atlanta agenda.

- iii. Action 76: Deborah Ultan Boudewyns will work with the Atlanta conference planning committee and Alba Fernandez-Keys, Mentor Program Coordinator, to encourage a personal approach towards finding conference mentors. Deadline: June 9, 2006.

Deborah Ultan Boudewyns has not spoken with Atlanta conference planning committee, but will contact them about implementing this.

- iv. Action 77: Heather Ball will speak with James Rout about the using raw files of the conference mentoring workshop recording for its potential posting on the AWS. Deadline: September 1, 2006.

This was an action item for Carole Ann Fabian, not Heather Ball. Carole Ann Fabian spoke with James Rout about this, who said that he would give the raw files to Marilyn Nasserden. Marilyn Nasserden should ask James Rout for the raw files. Heidi Haas with the Professional Development Committee should hold the raw files until the Executive Board makes a decision about what to do with them.

- v. Action 78: Heather Ball will speak with the Mentoring Task Force, the Professional Development Committee, and the Publications Committee to propose a method of organizing and disseminating the content of the mentoring workshop and to propose a plan for the distribution of a package of related materials to potential mentors and mentees for review at the mid-year Executive Board meeting. Deadline: September 1, 2006.

Heather Ball will speak with Heidi Haas. This is part of a Professional Development Committee initiative and corresponds into their vision, charge, and tasks.

b. Post-Conference:

- i. Action 11: Marilyn Nasserden will confirm with Peggy Keeran and Janine Henri that the draft membership recruitment and business affiliate letters have been written for review by the Executive Board at the mid-year Executive Board meeting. Deadline: September 1, 2006.

This task has not been completed. The Membership Committee informed Marilyn Nasserden that they drafted up a welcoming letter last year. This is not the same as a recruitment letter. The draft membership recruitment letter is for the purpose of recruiting lapsed members and getting new members. The welcome letter is for the purpose of welcoming new members. The draft

recruitment letter will be sent to potential members and to potential business affiliates. Elizabeth Clarke recalled that a membership campaign from three or four years ago had letters drafted for this purpose. This action will be tabled until the new membership categories have been established.

- ii. Action 12: Sue Koskinen will discuss with Maryly Snow and Jenni Rodda about the timing of keeping the paper format of the lantern slide survey online. Deadline: July 10, 2006.

Sue Koskinen had discussed this with Maryly Snow and Jenni Rodda, but it is still online. She will follow up and make sure that it has been taken down.

- iii. Action 3: Deborah Ultan Boudewyns will inform all group leaders that their successors should be chosen and identified prior to each conference.

Deborah Ultan Boudewyns should do this by end of October 2007. She will inform DSRTs, and the Regional Representatives will inform the chapters. The DSRT leaders should inform Deborah Ultan Boudewyns by March 1, 2007.

- iv. Action 6: Deborah Utlan Boudewyns will send an email to DSRTs inquiring about current and future projects and convey this information to the Atlanta CPAC so that it can be written into the conference program.

Deborah Ultan Boudewyns has collected about half of this information.

- v. Action 7: Liaisons will inform committee chairs that their meetings are open to all members, with the exception of the Awards Committee. Every committee will submit a brief one-sentence description about the committee for the conference program.

**Action 47: Ann Whiteside will communicate this action item to the Atlanta program conference chairs, Ann Lindell and Tom Caswell. They will ask the committee chairs to submit the brief statement for the conference program. Deadline: September 30, 2006.**

#### 11. Marketing, Advertising: How can the Board support this for ARLIS/NA?

HQ and Publications Committee marketing and advertising duties are not clarified. Elizabeth Clarke outlined the history for advertising within ARLIS/NA. An ARLIS/NA member used to solicit advertising for ARLIS/NA publications and charge a fee for this service. She was taking 25% before the Society receiving the advertising, which led to potential problems because she was making commissions from sales that were not completed. HQ began tracking these sales and commissions and recommended that the Society does not continue with this procedure. Instead, HQ would work with existing advertisers and send packets to exhibitors. Advertising

revenues have declined with online, not print, publications increasing and the development of tiered sponsorships for exhibitors. The Development Committee does not want HQ to participate in advertising sales and the sponsorship process and wants to administer this package themselves.

The Executive Board wanted to know if the Development Committee submits a report about these sponsorships. They should reflect the number of sponsorships and the monetary value of those sponsorships in their annual report. This committee needs to have clear guidelines with a continuity of information between succeeding Development Chairs.

Bill Gates Foundation and Warren Buffet grant offer letter was received by HQ. Who writes the grant proposal and who deals with this type of issue? The Executive Board suggested that the Development Committee should be involved in this process and determine what types of projects the Foundation has been funding. The Executive Board agreed that it would be a good idea to get grants for the Society. The Executive Director was suggested as someone who could act as a principal investigator to do research and write the grant proposals.

**Action 48: The Development Committee should review the Bill Gates Foundation grant proposal and report back to Ann Whiteside and Elizabeth Clarke.**

Roger Lawson asked if the advertising budget could be used to support the increasing costs of *Art Documentation*. The packages are advantageous because they provide benefits to our elite sponsors for a one-time fee. Advertising is solicited once a year. The package will be attractive once advertising is posted on the AWS. The Society needs to have someone function in an advertising role. The line item for web site advertising in the budget is for JobNet. The money for advertising used to go the Publications Committee and is now applied to conferences through a sponsorship package.

**Action 49: Ann Whiteside will discuss with the Development Committee the need to obtain funds for the entire Society, not just for the conference and will ask the Development Committee to discuss methods to accomplish this. Sue Koskinen will explain to Publications Committee that this advertising revenue has shifted to another area and that the Development Committee has been asked to check into this to solve this problem.**

Development and chapters: Worldwide Books volunteered to sponsor lunch for the ARLIS/WNY chapter meeting. The Development Committee told ARLIS/WNY that they could not accept the donation. This is in error. If a vendor offers a donation that is not solicited, the chapter is allowed to accept it. The difference is between an offer from a vendor and not a solicitation by the chapter.

**Action 50: The Development Committee needs to be informed that if a sponsor offers a donation, it is acceptable for a chapter to take the offer.**

12. Headquarters Report (Clarke): The membership has been asking what HQ does for the Society and why it is so costly? Elizabeth Clarke discussed the benefits and staffing of HQ. It offers a PT Executive Director, PT association coordinator, PT conference planner, PT financial manager, and the services of other people in the firm at times of the year as necessary. Benefits include personnel and HR duties. This equals about two full-time medium managers at \$60,000 CD per year with benefits. Office space, equipment, insurance, and supplies are all provided by the management firm. Elizabeth Clarke mentioned that she makes about \$20,000 from ARLIS/NA; Executive Directors in Canada usually make about \$150,000.

The Executive Board agreed that HQ should inform the membership about its duties and roles. Some ideas included: introducing HQ staff, a quarterly report on the AWS and to the chapters, and updates of HQ reports in the News and Events portions of the AWS.

**Action 51: Elizabeth Clarke will send an email to ARLIS-L with a link to the HQ page on the AWS to highlight activities of HQ and introduce Sue Singer who replaced Bonnie James. The AWS will also include a profile of each of the HQ staff on the home page.**

Elizabeth Clarke encouraged Executive Board members to approach her with any problems, questions, or clarification.

13. Board communication: The Executive Board discussed efficient board communication. It was agreed that a conference call might be more efficient than an email discussion. It was also suggested to have summarized minutes of conference call. It was also suggested that a single email for each discussion thread would be less confusing.

**Action 52: The Executive Board agreed to hold email discussion with a single email for each discussion thread three weeks per month and a conference call one time per month on Wednesdays from 4-5:30 ET (2-3:30 MT).**

**Motion 16: to adjourn. Unanimously passed.**

**The meeting adjourned at 4:15 pm.**

Submitted by Eumie Imm-Stroukoff, ARLIS/NA Secretary  
Approved by the ARLIS/NA Executive Board 2/6/07

