

ARLIS/NA Board Meeting (conducted via email)
Wed., 11//28/07, 3 pm CT - 11/29/07, 3 pm CT

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

Agenda

1. CAA and marketing of caa.reviews to ARLIS/NA members
2. Wittenborn Committee
3. MemberClicks -- proposal from Wayne Amundson
4. Mentorship Sub-committee
5. Education Task Force
6. Upcoming meeting schedule

1.) CAA would like to market their caa.reviews product to ARLIS/NA members and wondered if, as affiliate members, we'd help them by allowing an e-mailing and a print mailing for one fee. The standard fee is \$200 (for each).

The board discussed the pros and cons of allowing CAA to post to our listserv and have access to our membership list for one fee. The pro side expressed the value of collegiality and potential for reciprocal treatment at some point in the future. Others expressed the view that CAA should pay the going rate. We should not be giving information away and there's no reason they should not pay the going rate. It was unclear whether they (or some representative from CAA) could post something to our listserv anyway and reach the membership that way.

It was agreed that if we charge for one group we need to charge for all groups, so for consistency's sake we should charge them. Earlier this year we did allow them to announce their survey via our listserv, so this time, especially since they are marketing a product, they should pay the fee. It was pointed out that \$200 is not a particularly high charge.

2.) Wittenborn - The Executive Committee reviewed our discussion on this and decided that it makes sense for the Board to vote on whether we want to see this moved to a chapter rotating committee or to keep as an appointed committee.

A few Board members were not ready to vote and requested a review of the earlier discussion.

Cate provided a recap of her responses from the Chapters regarding this issue:

"I only got a few responses to this question (5 out of 18 chapters...), but the reaction was positive. All respondents said they would support responsibility for the Wittenborn award to rotate through the chapters. Some excellent points were made:

1. on the subject of whether chapters with lots of members should be given the opportunity to host the award more often than those with small memberships: one respondent thought there could be a weighting system so that big chapters turned up in rotation more often. Another respondent pointed out that with 18 chapters, it doesn't make a lot of sense to have a weighted system - it could be 18 years before the rotation even comes to your chapter!! Some of us may have retired or moved by then (That's my editorializing, not the chapter leaders.) Another respondent mentioned that neighboring chapters could work on the award together. Finally, there are going to be years when the chapter that comes up in rotation can't take the responsibility (they are hosting the conference, for instance) so we will need to skip to the next in line.
2. on the subject of how to start the rotation, two ideas were put forth: ask for volunteers; look at who had it in the past couple of years, and choose a different chapter."

Rebecca provided summaries from our two previous discussions on the issue (9/26/2007 and 10/3/2007)

9/26/2007 minutes (excerpt)

"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 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."

10/3/2007 Minutes (excerpt)

We were still divided on the idea of rotating the Wittenborn Award Committee through the chapters and/or regions. (see minutes of 9/26/07 meeting) The pros to a chapter rotation are: it gets the chapters more involved, makes sure that committee members can easily access the nominated books and that the committee can meet in person.

The cons to a chapter rotation are: chairing the committee no longer becomes an honor that is granted by the ARLIS president, the chapter head might not be the best choice for the committee, the board is removed from the process; and was the system broken to begin with?

If we move forward with the idea of a geographical rotation

as suggested by the Task Force, we need to determine how to do it.

Cate points out that one of the issues or "cons" of moving the award to the chapters is that it takes this away from the president. Instead of having the committee report to the Chapters Coordinator, couldn't the Wittenborn committee rotate through the chapters, but report to the president? That way the president still gets to select the committee chair, and the award maintains its cachet of being a "presidential" award. The Chapters Coordinator has plenty to do without the Wittenborn award!

It is suggested that the Board could vote on whether the committee rotates among the chapters or remains an appointed committee and if the rotation idea is voted on, then work out the details and logistics of that rotation.

Cate moves that we vote on whether we want to see this moved to a chapter rotating committee or to keep as an appointed committee. The specifics of rotation or appointment of chair, etc. to be determined after voting.

The motion is seconded.

The motion is rescinded due to some confusion over whether we are moving that the Wittenborn award process be managed by a chapter rotating committee or simply moving to go ahead with a vote (which needs to be more clearly defined).

Motion 17: It is moved that we vote to transfer the administration of the Wittenborn Award to the chapters. The administration of the award will be rotated through the chapters. (Ann Whiteside)

The motion is seconded. The vote passes 6-3.

Several members express the desire that as this process is worked out there be an emphasis on maintaining a close connection of the committee with the president. This is an important award that carries much prestige and the president should be able to maintain some influence over the committee composition, even as it cycles through the various chapters.

3.) MemberClicks

Wayne Amundson, suggested by McPhersonClarke to help us get MemberClicks up and running, has sent a proposal for the work he can do for us. He suggests also that we form a group for him to work with and who will develop the site based on our needs and expectations.

It is agreed that his proposal is logical and seems to address the initial needs to get the tool up and running. We question the need for a large group (he suggests 12 members) and we propose that 4-6 will be sufficient and probably more nimble. We note that he is intending to do the work in December and early January, when many are out on break. He is hoping to have the site up and running by mid January.

There was a question about Wayne's role. In his proposal he states, "I see my prospective role as bridging the gap between the technology and the potential beneficiaries above to achieve that result while avoiding problems and bad decisions." Isn't that the role of our proposed Technology Advisor?

Deborah clarifies that Wayne's role is that of a bridge connecting MemberClicks setup/technology/interface with our needs. This is different (much more focused and specific) than our proposed Tech Advisor. (As an aside: we had asked Jonathan Franklin to take on this role. He does not feel qualified to do it, so we are seeing if any other at-large members of the Publications Committee will take it on.)

Wayne does not offer a cost for his services at this point. We have allocated \$2600 to MemberClicks for next year to cover our subscription fee. This does not cover Wayne's fee. We agree that we need to see the quote for his work and then we can compare it with the fees posted on the MemberClicks site for their standard set-up and maintenance.

4.) Mentorship Sub-Committee

It is proposed that we establish a Mentorship Sub-Committee that would be under the PDC's purview. There is a question about whether that comes from the Executive board or if the PDC can create a sub-committee on its own.

The Bylaws indicate that the Board creates committees, but nothing is written about sub-committees. It makes sense that this could come from the committee initially and then be approved by the Board.

5.) Education Task Force

Deborah reports that Tony White, Jeanne Brown & Betsy Peck Learned are the only three engaged at this point. They want us to agree to dissolve the Task Force. However, they do want to see ARLIS/NA go ahead with the survey of the membership. This could effectively be done by a standing committee, though not one that subsumes the Professional Development Committee. They can't continue with only three people willing to do the work, so they are suggesting a newly formed committee be appointed by the Board

and that their first task would be to conduct the survey of the membership to determine what educational initiatives are desired by the membership. Betsy is willing to serve on the committee but prefers not as the chair.

The Board discusses how a standing committee for Education would be different from or work with the Professional Development Committee. Through discussion the Board comes to the conclusion that it makes more sense for an Education Committee to be a subcommittee of the PDC. As discussed above regarding the Mentorship Sub-Committee (item 4), the establishment of a subcommittee should come from the committee, not from the Board. The Board decides that it would be best at this point for Deborah to talk with the chair of the PDC about both of these subcommittees and ask if PDC agrees that it makes sense for the to handle both issues. A Board vote is not needed at this time.

6.) Schedule:

Deborah proposes that we hold Board meetings every other week for the next five months and Executive Committee meetings as needed. The proposed dates are:

Dec 12, Jan 9; 16, Feb 6; 20, Mar 5; 19, Apr 9; 23

Submitted: Rebecca Price, ARLIS/NA Secretary