

ARLIS/NA Board Meeting (conducted via email)

Wed., 9/26/07, 3:00 p.m. CT - Thurs., 9/27/07, 3:00 p.m. CT.

Attending: Cate Cooney, Sue Koskinen, Marilyn Nasserden, Rebecca Price, Elizabeth Schaub, Fran Scott, Ken Soehner, Amy Trendler, Deborah Ultan Boudewyns, Ann Whiteside

1.) Review of Action Items sent out on 9/24 (Action Items resulting from our Midyear meeting 9/17-9/18).

RE: Action Item 27: There was a request for clarification of Action Item 27, which requested board members to write up brief descriptions of their positions, especially given the new responsibilities in this transitional year. It was described in the action item as a job description but we had also discussed that it might serve as an introduction to the membership of the board members' duties. It was also discussed that it would be something for the website to keep the membership informed of changes and transitions.

2.) Membership Dues Increase: (Fran Scott and Marilyn Nasserden)
Fran's email of 9/26 Shared the proposals for dues increases that she prepared with Marilyn.

Fran and Marilyn prepared various dues increase scenarios for the board to evaluate. This was in response to the need for a consistent and solid rationale for the increase. The entire membership of the board believes that we need to have a dues increase, but also feels the need to be clear in our justifications to the membership.

The board was impressed by the scenario based on the CPI, in which 1998 figures were compared to their 2007 equivalents. It was suggested that the proposed dues schedule be shared with the Membership Committee for their support as we bring this to the membership. Perhaps the Membership Committee could propose a timeline for moving ahead with these changes. A vote could be taken at the membership meeting in Denver.

It was also suggested that we could increase various categories by different proportions. While the equivalent dollars rationale makes sense for individual members, our fees for corporate and institutional memberships are not keeping pace with comparable societies. Music Lib. Assoc., VRA, Spec. Lib. Assoc. all charge fees in the \$400-\$500 per year range. We could consider increasing institutional and corporate members fees at a greater rate than fees for individual members. It was also noted that our conferences are not bringing in a lot of revenue, which means that we need to rely more on membership dues.

The issue of timing was raised. We are instituting changes to membership categories and it may not be the best time to throw in a dues increase as well. Both changes will require a vote by the membership. We will not be able to get a dues increase in place before this year's (2007-2008) renewal cycle. We need time to develop PR for the increase and explain carefully to the membership the need for the increase. It was suggested that we move forward on proposing changes to membership categories, and have that prepared for a membership vote, but wait until next year to propose a dues increase as of the 2008-2009 renewal cycle. All agreed that the timing and laying a foundation for the process is critical to the success of these changes.

It was also noted that MemberClicks needs to be in place and working before we suggest raising dues.

A plea was also made not to lose momentum on these changes, so that another year does not slip by.

3.) Chapter guidelines for membership status: (Cate Cooney) The proposed guidelines are attached for review.

There was a motion to approve the chapter guidelines for membership status, but this was not followed by an official vote. The matter of the vote is put forward to our 10/4/07 meeting.

4.) Code of Ethics

ARLIS/NA POLICY NO.: N-4. SUBJECT: ETHICS

ARLIS/NA endorses the following documents: the Canadian Library Association's Statement of Intellectual Freedom and Code of Ethics; and the American Library Association's Library Bill of Rights, Statement of Professional Ethics, and the Freedom to Read document. [issued 2/9/90]
The ARLIS/NA Executive Board shall address the ethical concerns of the Society in a timely manner.

Elizabeth Clarke brought this issue to the board's attention in response to a question posed to her by a student who was evaluating ARLIS/NA as a case study. She suggested that this might be an opportune time for the board to review the current statement and consider if we want to revise it or develop something more complete.

The board wondered if this Code of Ethics was geared for the individual members or the society as a whole. It was decided that it should be read for both members and the society. It was

decided that Deborah will decide if the society wants to devote time and energy to this at this point.

5.) Finance Committee policy request change (Fran Scott)

The Finance Committee asks that the board approve a change to the wording of the **ARLIS/NA POLICY NO.: G-11. FINANCE COMMITTEE (STANDING); section e.**

Currently the past Treasurer becomes the chair of the finance committee. The Policy states, "If the Past Treasurer can not serve as Finance Committee Chair following their term on the Executive Board, an exception can be made in appointing an alternate Chair of the Finance Committee. The Chair of the Finance Committee should be someone who has served on the Executive Board and has knowledge of the financial operations of ARLIS/NA."

The committee proposes changing the wording to: "If the Past Treasurer chooses not to serve..."

The board discusses the merits of the wording change suggesting that "chooses" or "elects" would work in place of the current wording. The issue of what to do if the past Treasurer 'should not' be asked to be chair of the Finance Committee was raised. It was noted that there are means already in place (Policy C-8: Procedures for replacing an executive board member) if that situation should arise. After discussion the board agreed with the proposed change suggested by the Finance Committee.

6.) ARLIS/NA History:

Addressing Action Item 29 from our midyear meeting in which board members are asked to investigate and create a list of members who preceded them in their board positions, Deborah suggested that we coordinate a message to ARLIS-L or a few members asking for those who have saved Handbooks over the years to help us in this endeavor.

Elizabeth Schaub noted that Janine Henri who recently left UT-Austin gifted Elizabeth with her ARLIS/NA files and the files include lists of the East, Midwest, West and Canadian regional representatives from 1976-87. She has created a list of the South representatives since 1993.

2007-2009: Elizabeth Schaub
2005-2007: Heather Ball
2002-2005: Laura Schwartz
2001-2002: Paula Hardin

1999-2001: Pat Lynagh
1997-1999: Lee Sorensen
1995-1997: Janine Henri
1995: Jeannette Dixon
1993-1995: Joan Stahl
1993: Philip Rees

It was suggested that a targeted inquiry would be better than a blanket posting to the listserv.

Cate was able to compile a list of Northeast representatives since 1997.

2005-2007 Carole Ann Fabian
2003-2005 Carol Graney
2001-2003 Laurie Whitehill-Chong
1999-2001 Debbie Kemp
1997-1999 Margaret Webster.

It was pointed out that each board officer is supposed to turn over his or her files to the incoming officer, so there is a mechanism to capture this information. Also there should be information in the archives. Theoretically we can get at this information, but perhaps we need a clearer path or a means to access it more easily. The question to answer is whether the process of gathering and keeping the information is flawed or simply not transparent enough. This does raise the issue of the state of the ARLIS/NA Archives, which is something we need to address.

7.) Wittenborn Responses: (Cate) See attached. Review and comment.

Cate shared the responses she received from the Chapters regarding the Wittenborn Award Committee. They were responding to an initial suggestion of the Awards Task Force (April '07 Progress Report, no. 5) that the Wittenborn Committee rotate through the chapters on a set schedule.

Awards Task Force Progress Report, April 2007

"5. Pending the approval of the Assessment Task Force recommendation for an Executive Board level Chapter Council, the George Wittenborn Award Committee should rotate through and be managed by ARLIS/NA Chapters in a proscribed sequence alternating geographically across all regions and chaired by the respective Chapter President or his/her designee. The Wittenborn Committee Chair should report to the Chapter Council Coordinator."

The response showed that the chapters appreciate being involved in the Wittenborn Award process and decision. Although not all chapters responded, all that did respond supported the idea of

the committee rotating through the chapters. To address the issue of the disparity of the size of chapters, it was suggested that there could be a weighting systems so that chapters with more members appeared on the schedule more frequently. Another option would be for neighboring chapters to work together - this is particularly relevant when the chapters have fewer members. There may also be years when a chapter comes up on the rotation, but cannot take on the responsibility that year and passes it to the next chapter on the schedule.

The board discussed the pros and cons of a rotation schedule. It was proposed that someone (perhaps the Awards Committee Chair with the Chapters Coordinator) needs to review the geographic layout of the most recent Wittenborn committees, put together a rotation and approach a chapter to begin the process. Smaller, neighboring chapters could be combined in the schedule. Another suggestion is to create a schedule by region and allow the membership of the committee to be drawn from various chapters within the region. The selection of committee members could be transparent. Also by rotating on a regional level (rather than chapter), the committee will rotate through and involve chapters more frequently.

The point was also made that geographical distribution may not be the best way to determine participation in the Wittenborn Committee. It was suggested that by delegating the award to local chapters, the board is relinquishing its role in the committee. It may be better to have a board member appoint the chair of the committee each year to ensure that both the chair and the committee have the background and expertise to effectively serve and make an informed judgment. It was emphasized that the Wittenborn Award is the single most important expression of the society to the many constituencies outside the ARLIS/NA community and therefore should not be released from board involvement.

Submitted: Rebecca Price, Secretary