

ARLIS/NA

Mid-year Board Meeting (September 17-18, 2007)
Minneapolis. MN

Monday, Sept. 17, 2007

Deborah Ultan Boudewyns called the meeting to order at 8:50 am.

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

1. Executive Board Composition

The meeting began with an evaluation of the hybrid model of the executive board.

All felt that the functional roles were working and that it was a good decision. The board discussed whether we want to continue in a hybrid mode next year, with the regional representatives taking on both regional rep. roles and functional roles; or whether we wanted to make the transition to purely functional roles. This decision is important because it affects the work of the Nominating Committee, particularly affecting how they describe the roles to potential nominees. Inasmuch as it affects the bylaws, further changes to the board member roles will need to be voted on by the membership. The issue at this point is to determine exactly what we need to do administratively to cast these roles.

The board discussion moves to a discussion of each board role individually.

A. Chapters Coordinator

Cate Cooney notes that the position is becoming more clearly defined as tasks and issues arise. One aspect that needs better definition is how the members of the board will visit chapters that the Chapters Coordinator is unable to visit. Setting up a schedule or simply being able to know who can attend what meeting will take considerable communication between the Chapters Coordinator and HQ and other members of the board.

It is important that some member of the board attends chapter meetings. It needs to be emphasized that the Chapters Coordinator is the person for chapter chairs to contact even when a different member of the board is able to attend their meeting. The chapter chair meeting at the annual conference is also a crucial piece of communication with the chapters. The Chapters Coordinator should emphasize to the chapters that if the chapter chair can't attend, there should be another delegate.

B. Communications Officer / Tech Advisor

Sue Koskinen proposed that we change the name of the Publications Committee to Communications Committee to better reflect the scope of work that the committee now addresses. A Communications Officer would continue to oversee the publications efforts of the Society, but would also take on the role of Technology Advisor. There is concern that the role is too large for one person to take on - particularly given the skill set required. It was decided to name the position Communications and Publications Officer, citing the importance of having the word publications in the title.

Because of the special skills required and the dire present need we have to address our technology needs, it was proposed that we appoint a Technology Task Force (at times called Geek Squad). Others felt that we know what we need technologically, and don't need a task force to evaluate the landscape any further. Instead of a task force, we need to put a person in the position to begin the work. It was suggested that the Technology Advisor position not be a board position, but have an adjunct relationship, reporting to the Communications and Publications Officer.

The suggestion was made that the Technology Advisor role be for a limited time: a six or twelve month charge to evaluate our technology needs and propose strategies to meet those needs. The issue of cost was raised and how we would pay for someone. Fran noted that we have some funds in our web fund.

The discussion turned back to the role of the Communications and Publications board position. Some expressed concern that will be a considerable amount of liaison work. It was pointed out that at present the Publications Committee runs very well and does not need a lot of hand-holding. Elizabeth Clarke reminds us that the board positions should be at the strategy and policy level. Board members should not be involving themselves in the day-to-day work of the committees.

C. Conference coordinator - Amy

It was noted that this position provides continuity from year to year, yet even then it changes hands every two years. One issue that has come to the fore is that with this position, CPAC has become board heavy with the vice president, president and past president all attending. And there is continuity in their presence in the process. As we discussed this position, it became clear that it wasn't a necessary position for the board. The idea of continuity is good, but a two-year board position doesn't bring a lot to that - and the other CPAC members bring some continuity to the process. It was noted that part of the problem at this moment is that Headquarters staff is relatively new and still learning about the role of conference planner. Headquarters should (and it is expected will) be picking up much more of the year-to-year coordination

of the conference. In regard to the high number of board members at the CPAC meeting, it was suggested that perhaps the past president also doesn't need to be there.

The board discussed the necessity of this position and reached the conclusion that the society may be better served by an at-large position on the board. It was decided that after the Denver conference, The current position of Conference coordinator would become an at-large position, with duties and focus to be determined.

D. Education Liaison

Elizabeth Schaub, who has been working with the Professional Development Committee, noted that feels the role is clear but that she has questions about communications. She asks for clarification on her role to provide communication between the SEI task force and the PDC. She suggests that an important role of the Education Officer would be to provide communication between these groups.

Membership Liaison - Marilyn and Rebecca

Currently both Marilyn and Rebecca are working with the Membership Committee. In the coming year, the role will shift more completely to the Secretary. It was discussed whether this was too much for the secretary to handle. Rebecca suggested that her philosophy of these roles is that they are advisory roles and not hands-on roles. She sees her role with the Membership Committee to be one of listening and advising, more than doing the actual work of the committee. This brought us to a larger discussion of the functional positions - should they be called "officers" or "liaisons" or some other title and how deeply should the board members be involved in the work of the committees? Elizabeth Clarke advised against being too involved in the nitty-gritty of the committee work, but advised instead that the board should be focusing on policy and strategy and vision.

Conversation moves to the issue of a Canadian representative on the board. The current Canadian representative advocates strongly for the need for this representation at the board level. She emphasizes that the position is not just a tangential post, but should be a voting member of the board. She explained the need is not for geographic issues, but for national (legal) issues; such as, copyright, insurance, etc. The board arrives at the idea of a Canadian ambassador who would serve as an 'at-large' member of the board (to be called: Canadian Member-at-large). [Note: currently the Canadian representative chairs the Canadian chapter and the Melva Dwyer Award Committee.] The board discussed the logistics of electing a Canadian board member. The suggestion was made that the Canadian chapters or members could elect their representative to the board.

Development/Marketing Liaison - Marilyn

The board agreed that this position was important and only becoming more important as our need to raise external funding grows. It is appropriate that a board member be devoted fully to it, rather than assigned this liaison work to the treasurer, who already has a full plate.

**It was noted that we need a new org chart for the web to reflect the new board roles.

II. Nominations put forward by the Nominations Committee

The Nominations Committee reported that they had talked to twenty-eight people for the four board positions to be filled this coming year (Western Regional Rep., Canadian Rep., Treasurer, Vice president).

There is concern about the number of people who turn positions down - not because of the hybrid model, but because of timing in their professional and personal lives. Does this also reflect a poor perception of the board? We need to emphasize the accomplishments of the board and opportunities of serving on the board. The board discussed the idea of promoting board service. Information about what each board member does could be added to the website - esp. addressing the emerging roles with the new organization. It would also be good to have a list of all who have served in the board positions up on the web.

ACTION ITEM 27:

Board members will summarize his or her own experiences and goals as a board member these past few months, particularly in regard to the hybrid model. Each will outline what their roles have become and what tasks now fall to their new role. The report can be on the model of a bulleted list for a job description.

Deadline October 31, 2007

Canadian Member-at-large (Marilyn - outgoing: to be filled in 2008)

Communications Liaison (Sue - outgoing: to be filled in 2008)

Development/Marketing Liaison (Amy)

Chapters' Liaison (Cate)

Education Liaison (Elizabeth S.)

Membership Liaison (Marilyn outgoing: Rebecca)

ACTION ITEM 28:

Board members will investigate those who came ahead of them in their board roles (back to 1970s, if possible) and prepare a list to put online. (See Past Presidents list and Past Treasurers list as examples)

Deadline: March 31, 2008 (before Denver conference)

The board discussed the impact of the transitional time on the incoming board members. There are candidates in line for the Canadian Rep position and the Vice President position. The candidate for the Western Regional Representative position has requested that she be Chapters Coordinator. Because that role is being filled (and developed still) by Cate Cooney, whose term does not end until 2009, the board makes the recommendation that it hopes the person running for the Western Region representative position, will consider serving in another capacity. Because our earlier conversation led us to decide not to continue with a functional role for Conference coordination, Amy Trendler will take on the role of Development Coordinator. It is still closely related to the conference, but takes on the broader role for helping the Development Committee and working on the broader tasks of public relations and promotion of the society. This leaves the position of Communications Liaison open for the Western Regional representative candidate. Because the current Western Regional rep is now liaison to Publications, this could be a smooth transition.

Motion 6:

It was moved to approve the slate put forward by the Nominations Committee.

Passed unanimously

III. Nominations Task Force

Deborah Ultan Boudewyns read the Nominations Task Force report. The board discussed the idea of having an open call for nominations at the start of the nominations process as recommended by the Task Force, instead of midway through the process. The process for this year cannot be changed midstream, but we could suggest change to next year's process. The ARLIS/NA Bylaws do not stipulate when an open call for nominations can be made (there is an implied chronology because section 1 is the slate developed by the committee, whereas section 4 includes the open call). We can revise the bylaws to provide for an open call earlier in the process.

The board discussed the misunderstanding with the Nominations Task Force earlier this year. Their request for an open call for nominations before the committee solicitation of nominees was misinterpreted by the board as a request for nomination by petition early in the process rather than later. It was suggested that the board send a letter to the Task Force explaining our misunderstanding and responding to their suggestions.

IV. Publications Report (Sue)

Sue Koskinen reported on the activities and questions of the Publications Committee. They have suggested several changes to the Policy Manual, which she will go over in our meeting tomorrow (Tuesday).

a) Bulk purchase of the most recent Occasional paper. Roger worked out an agreement with Scarecrow that would allow us to sell copies of the Occasional Paper to ARLIS/NA members at a discount. If we purchased 250 copies, we could get a 25% discount from Scarecrow. We could pass along some of that discount, but not enough that we would make a profit. The board decided against the bulk purchase of the recent occasional paper due to lack of potential for profit. In the future it may be something to negotiate up front with the publisher. The next occasional paper will be a revised edition of BJ Irvine's *Facilities Standards for Art Libraries*.

b) With the directory moving to MemberClicks, the issue of providing a printed version of the Handbook was raised. It was pointed out that many members like having a printed handbook - it contributes to a sense of community and continuity. The board discussed the idea of being able to print the Handbook on demand (a PDF file from AWS). The possibility of tapping into self-publishing services such as lulu.com was also discussed. ARLIS/NA would still have control over the appearance of the handbook.

c) The Publications Committee has suggested several changes to *Art Documentation* to save money. One of these is to use thinner cover stock. Another is to use a US publisher to reduce postage costs. It was pointed out that we have a long-standing and very good relationship with our current Canadian publisher, but that we might want to investigate using a US distributor. It was suggested also that our Canadian publisher could perhaps distribute from the US, to reduce postage costs.

d) Last year's survey of the membership regarding peer review for *Art Documentation* did not show a strong preference for having it become peer reviewed or not. Nonetheless there seemed to be interest in moving toward some sort of peer review model. In light of this, the Publications Committee will develop a procedure for peer review (probably on model of including a few peer reviewed articles each issue). The committee is eager to work with Headquarters to find ways to increase revenue; for instance with advertising. Advertising in *Art Documentation* became an issue when it was taken out of the sponsorship package offered by Development. There was no measure to add it in or to encourage our Institutional or Corporate Members to advertise. Either it needs to be added back to the sponsorship package or Headquarters needs to begin selling advertising. It was decided that it would be

appropriate for someone on the Publications Committee to be designated to work with Headquarters on advertising.

Elizabeth Clarke brought up the possibility of working with a trade journal publisher (e.g., www.mediaedge.ca/) to increase visibility and create sense of community by creating an annual report type document. Such an initiative would need to involve the Membership Committee and the Development Committee.

ACTION ITEM 29:

Elizabeth Clarke will talk to Media Edge to inquire about creating a magazine / annual report for us.

Deadline: October 1, 2007

V. Student Internship Name Change Request

Deborah reports that the Internship Committee has requested that the Student Internship Award be called the BJ Irvine Student Award to recognize her contributions and history in the area student mentoring. While all agreed in the worthiness of BJ Irvine's contributions, it was thought that we would need to consider other names as well. Also it was suggested that a 'named' award should reflect a sizable monetary contribution to the Society. It was noted that the award is currently \$2500 and comes from restricted funds. It was suggested that an appeal could be made to the membership to increase that fund, particularly if it were named in someone's honor.

Ultan Boudewyns adjourned the meeting at 5:25 pm.

Tuesday morning, Sept. 18, 2007

Deborah Ultan Boudewyns called the meeting to order at 8:40 am.

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

VI. Approval of Minutes

Motion 7

It was moved to approve Executive Board minutes from May - September 5.

Passed unanimously

VII. Publications Committee Changes to Policy Manual (see IV above)

Sue Koskinen read through all the Policy Manual changes requested by the Publications Committee. Generally the changes have to do with correcting and clarifying putting the Reviews

online as opposed to print and correcting current copyright practices. The board agreed with all changes except that proposed for R-26. Sue will take that back to the Publications Committee.

Motion 8

**It was moved to approve changes to the Policy Manual put forward by the Publications Committee, with the exception of the change to policy No. R-26 (in regard to the Membership Directory).
Passed unanimously**

VIII. Round Tables

The board discussed the need to decide what to do with Round Tables, based on the Assessment Task Force recommendations. The advantage of moving to Special Interest Groups is that there is no official reporting to the board required. There will still be a board liaison (Vice President) so that information can be passed back and forth. Aside from a more fluid structure, an advantage of having SIGs is that we will not have to provide meeting space at the conference. SIGs will be encouraged to arrange to meet at mealtimes or offsite.

The board realizes that there may be some opposition to this change, but recognizes also that it was a strong recommendation from the Assessment Task Force. There are advantages to this change that we can emphasize to the membership. We will need to make changes to the wording in the Policy Manual and Bylaws and those changes will be brought to the membership for a vote. The board agrees to change the designation of Round Tables to Special Interest Groups and to change the policy so that the only requirement of the group is that they provide a contact name to AWS, so that interested members can find a way to join them. No other official reporting is required.

Motion 9: It was moved to accept the Assessment Task Force recommendation to dissolve Round Tables from the ARLIS/NA structure. Passed unanimously

ACTION ITEM 31: Ken Soehner will look through the policy manual and suggest revisions to reflect the dissolution of Round Tables in favor of Special Interest Groups.

IX. Vote to change board from including regional representatives to including functional roles plus a Canadian Member-at-large.

Motion 10: It was moved to accept the Assessment Task Force recommendation to change regional representatives to functional roles as of the 2008 annual conference. The board will move to functional roles including Communications Liaison, Development Liaison, Chapters' Coordinator, and Education Liaison. In

addition, there will be a Canadian member-at large- on the board who will take on one of the functional roles.

Passed unanimously

The board voted on the change from the existing board structure to one in which there are four functional liaison roles (Education, Development, Communications, Chapters' Coordinator) and one at-large member, who will have a focus and duties assigned according to the needs of the society, instead of regional representatives. Recognizing the importance of the Canadian perspective at the board level, the board would like to keep a Canadian member-at-large position on the board. The Canadian member of the board may take on any of the functional liaison roles. Their at-large status is not to be confused with the at-large functional member of the board. In other words, any of the non-executive board positions can be filled by any of the liaison board members. The board discussed the transition from one model to the other and how best to make that transition. Can the board members most closely affected by the change work within both models for a period of time? It was acknowledged that the transition may be messy, but that it should not be postponed. It is important to move forward toward the model proposed by the Assessment Task Force. The changes, which will be reflected in changes to the bylaws, will come to the membership for a vote.

X. Nominations Committee; changes to G-14, Policy Manual

Deborah brought forward changes, as suggested by the Nominations Committee, that need to be made to the Policy Manual regarding nominations and voting.

a) The board agreed to strike the request for a photograph at the start of the selection process (G-14, e). That should be requested later and cannot be part of the initial selection procedure.

b) The Nominations Committee suggested changes to Policy Manual with the addition of a section (f) with procedural guidelines for the nominations process. In f.1.A. strike the beginning of sentence two so that f.1.A reads, "The committee may use summary reports from previous committees to identify potential candidates. In addition, the committee may identify potential candidates through discussions with members." Section f.1.B. will read: "The committee chair will issue a general call to the membership by February 1, with a deadline for response 60 calendar days from the date of the announcement. The call will invite nominations for each of the offices to be elected and set forth the procedures for nomination consistent with the bylaws Article IX." The board agreed with proposed changes to f.1.A and f.1.B.

c) The Nominations Committee asked that we review the nominations timeline particularly as it regards the introduction of a ballot. The board discussed the issue of when a ballot is needed and when in the timeline it would occur, if needed. The board sent the question back to the committee for further clarification about the introduction of a ballot (F.3).

The board discussed further revisions to the timeline: 1) change the August 15 date to Mid-year Board Meeting. This change will push back the August 30th and September 30th dates. 2) change the July 1 date of getting the slate to the board to "one week before the Mid-year Board Meeting." It was agreed that this should be a 'recommended' timeline, and should not be set in stone. Once these changes to the timeline are approved, they will need to be incorporated into the Management Calendar.

d) The Nominations Committee proposed revisions to the ByLaws, Article IX: Nominations and elections - Section 5, nos. 2 and 3. Their suggestions were unclear given the Board's understanding of this section, so the board asked Deborah to take these revisions back to the committee for clarification.

The Final issue brought in relation to the Nominations Committee was the question of whether we have determined if we can vote on bylaws electronically or if we have to do it by traditional print mail. It was recommended that we put the desire to be able to vote electronically on the list of things for the Technology Advisor to investigate.

XI. MemberClicks (Ann Whiteside)

a) Ann sent an update about MemberClicks. Rebecca and Deborah are working with the Membership Committee to get letter up for the renewal process.

ACTION ITEM 31:

Rebecca Price will work with Deborah Ultan Boudewyns and Craig Fleming to have the Membership letter placed in MemberClicks so that it goes out automatically to our membership.

Deadline: Sept. 26, 2007

b) We can have up to 3 forms set up with the initial setup. In addition to our membership form, we would like to have the conference registration form online via MemberClicks. The question was raised: can we do this before Denver registration?

c) We can offer the option to host Chapter websites to our chapters. There will be some limitations because of the shared template. It remains to be seen how much is permitted in the way of customization.

d) In the future, we will want our conference website to be hosted on MemberClicks. It was noted that we have a 500 page limit. We'll need to clarify what that means as far as the content that we hope to host on our main site and on chapter sites.

e) We agreed to move our listserv to MemberClicks. It is only \$25/year.

We also agreed that it made sense to roll out MemberClicks incrementally (first the membership database and then the other services (forms, web hosting, etc.)).

XII. Budget (Fran Scott)

a) Fran Scott summarized the budget documents. She notes that the figures will change slightly over the next few months, so we will not be taking a vote on anything at this point. Our investments have been doing quite well and the society has a reserve fund of approx. \$134,000, ideally we should have a full year's operating budget in reserve (approx. \$270,000).

b) The board talked about our restricted funds and the need to have more fluidity (fewer dollars tied up on restricted funds) so that we have more freedom to spend where needed. Elizabeth Clarke noted that our auditor has recommended that we reduce the number of restricted funds. Over the past couple of years, two funds have been removed so that now there are three restricted funds: Speaker's Fund, Internship Fund, and Travel Grant funds. We were encouraged to think more about how we spend our money - do we need as much in each of these funds? We draw 10% or less now from these funds - but they do not gain, since the growth does not exceed that. Should we investigate setting up an endowment for Speakers? One can only draw 5%/year, so it would need to be sizable.

Another issue has developed around the limits on how these restricted funds can be used. When a sponsor or other member wants to support a speaker (with travel or other funding) they should not give to the Speaker's Fund, which is purely for honoraria. Donors are not aware of this, therefore the society must do a better job of communicating how various funds are used. We could do a better job of letting people know how to direct their funds depending on what they hope we accomplish with those funds.

Elizabeth Clarke recommended talking with a financial manager familiar with non-profits to get a better understanding of how to set up and use a reserve fund and how to use restricted funds. In her discussions with Andrew Lang, he suggested that a reserve fund should have from 40 - 100% of the amount of the annual operating expenses.

The board spoke for some time about the Speakers' Fund and the desire both to increase the current honorarium (\$75 for local non-ARLIS/NA members and \$150 for traveling non-ARLIS/NA members) and to attract top-notch plenary speakers for our conferences. Generally plenary speakers are sponsored by special donations (usually our corporate sponsors), but it would be good to supplement that with some sort of endowed funds or other long-term, substantial funding source.

c) Scott advises that the society's revenue is not high, so needs to be very careful as spending lines are increased. Scott encourages us to have a plan on how we spend. For instance, we could think about how to put the savings from not printing the Handbook into something worthwhile.

d) Funding Requests

1) Membership committee for new brochure for new members. The board had questions about how valuable this would be, since it will be targeted only at new members. The board approves the request.

2) Wittenborn Award Committee: Request for dinner with honorees - The board declined this request citing both the possibility of it being very high and the issue of other award committees requesting similar benefits.

3) Distinguished Service Award (\$750): already in the budget

4) Muehsam Award (\$300 travel + \$500 honorarium): already in budget

5) ArLISNAP: Request for \$250 for promotional materials (buttons, etc.). We approved the request with the proviso that they work with the Membership Committee to coordinate with the new members' brochure.

6) Ontario Chapter: Request for \$1000 for Ontario Chapter brochure (500 count) and posters and postcards. We wondered if it should encompass all Canadian chapters. Decided to postpone/decline because of other PR efforts - we need to coordinate all these promotional efforts.

7) Delaware Valley Chapter: Request for financial support of an unspecified amount for regional conference programming support. Board postponed a decision since no dollar amount was requested..

8) Texas-Mexico Chapter: Request for \$500 to support a 2008 meeting in Mexico. It is expected the funds will provide supplemental travel assistance. According to our guidelines, we could help with registration, but not with food or travel expenses. The request was generally viewed favorably, but the board has asked that the chapter resubmit the request according to Guidelines for Chapter Funding.

9) Western NY Chapter: Request for \$75 for speaker at joint meeting with regional VRA chapter. The board approves the request.

ACTION ITEM 32:

**Marilyn Nasserden will sketch out a strategy for outreach and marketing, in an effort to consolidate some of the chapter requests to promote their individual chapters.
Deadline: Dec. 1, 2007**

XIII. Membership Dues

ARLIS/NA membership dues have not increased in 10 years: the conference fee went up two years ago, so we held steady on membership dues at that time. Materials, labor and overhead have all gone up requiring a dues increase (or some sort of revenue increase) in the near future. A few models of increases were presented by Scott, each increasing revenues by varying degrees. The board discussed how it needed to be able to present the logic behind whatever model that is selected and presented to the membership. There is agreement that we need an increase to support our current and near future needs, but the board did not feel that any of the models could be sufficiently justified. While we're doing this, do we need to put in place a predictable increase (every three years, every five years)? Scott and Nasserden will work on a new model to present within the next week and we will plan on voting on it at our next online meeting. This decision is urgent because of the impending renewal period.

ACTION ITEM 33:

**Using the scenarios already presented as a starting point, Marilyn Nasserden and Fran Scott will work on a new scenario for Society dues increases and the guiding logic or rationale behind the increases.
Deadline: Sept. 26, 2007**

XIV. Travel Stipends for Board Members

The board discussed the need to revise how travel monies are dispersed to board members as we move to the functional liaison model. The Chapters' Liaison cannot attend all chapter meetings, so the rest of the board will need to attend as many local meetings as possible. Is there a way to reallocate funding so that some of that is covered? The options seem to be either to have one pot of money that traveling board members dip into or an increased travel stipend for all. It was suggested that we have to pick an option, try it and see how it goes. Fran will look at the budget to see how best to tweak this. One place to look is CPAC travel; since we're decreasing the number of board members who attend by one, we may have some leftover funds there.

ACTION ITEM 34:

Fran Scott will develop a model for funding board member travel to chapter meetings (given the new directive for members to attend meetings when the Chapters' Coordinator cannot).

Deadline: Oct. 31, 2007

XV. Technology Funding

The board discussed how to fund and how much to fund the Technology Advisor position (see I.B. above). The society needs someone with expertise. We cannot pay market rate, but could offer a decent honorarium: \$800-\$1000 range was suggested. There are questions about how we would find, select, and appoint a technology advisor. The board discussed whether a general call to the membership or a select list of names would be best. In the case of a general call, how would we select the person from the group? It was noted that we recently had a task force investigating some technological aspects (concentrating on our move to MemberClicks). It would make sense to look at their findings before launching on a new search. After much discussion, the board decided to wait on the Technology Advisor and create a small task force that will look at our relationship with McPherson-Clarke and the technology support they provide and will determine which needs are not addressed by McPherson-Clarke and ways that we can meet them.

ACTION ITEM 35:

Sue Koskinen and Deborah Ultan Boudewyns will develop the charge for a Technology Task Force. All board members will be providing input to them.

Deadline: Oct. 15, 2007

XVI. Honoraria for Conference Speakers

The need to address the low amount of our conference session and workshop speaker honoraria was brought forward for discussion. This is in reference to the non-ARLIS/NA member honoraria of \$75 for local speakers and \$150-\$200 for traveling speakers. (The amount is actually at the discretion of the local planners, but generally falls within this range.) For workshops and other events that charge a fee, a higher honorarium may be offered. The money comes first from funds brought in by the Development Committee and then from our restricted Speakers' Fund. We have not had to use all of the Speakers' Fund money (10% of the total amount in the fund) in recent years. [Note the 10% limit is written up in the Treasurer's Manual, it is not in the Policy Manual.]

While considering an increase, we must also consider that workshops are expensive to run with costs associated with AV equipment, room rental, etc.

A secondary issue is that of keynote speakers. They are usually funded from Development funds. It was suggested it is important to work harder on getting notable and interesting

speakers. In the end it will draw more members to the conference - and therefore will be worth the investment.

The board considered raising the amount to take from the Speaker's Fund to up to 15% from the current 10%. The board decided after much discussion that for one year we would do this (Denver conference only). It may help provide for a much better speaker - but it does deplete our funding beyond our incoming money (interest and contributions). Also it raises the issue of how we raise and spend our funds generally. We need to take a thorough look at how we spend our funds overall. Could there be a greater push to membership to garner contributions to put toward better speakers, etc.?

Motion 11

It was moved that the Treasurer be able to draw up to 15% from the Speakers' Fund to give to the Denver 2008 CPAC to be used for speakers' honoraria as needed.

Passed unanimously

Deborah Ultan Boudewyns adjourned the meeting at 4:30 pm.

Submitted: Nov. 26, 2007
Rebecca Price, Secretary