The meeting was called to order by Jonathan Franklin at 5 p.m.

Present were: Nedda Ahmed, Sandy Brooke, Judy Dyki, Jonathan Franklin, Ted Goodman (attending on behalf of ARLIS/NA incoming Treasurer Tom Riedel), Carol Graney, Jennifer Hehman, Roger Lawson, Douglas Litts, Eileen Markson, Barbara Rominski, Lee Viverette, and Terrie Wilson.

Unable to attend: Kraig Binkowski and John Taormina.

Old Business:
The minutes of the 2009 business meeting in Indianapolis were approved as posted, with no corrections. The 2009 annual report was likewise approved with no corrections.

New Business:
Art Documentation:
Judy Dyki reported that the peer review process is proving to be very successful and has engaged a lot of people. Many more articles are being submitted. Many volunteers have come forth asking to be peer reviewers. Readers are given the information that the journal is peer-reviewed. Jonathan thanked Judy for taking on this extra burden.

The recent competition for the cover design of Art Documentation was in the long run not productive. From among the nine designs submitted, a short list of three was developed and presented to a jury. The jury felt that none of the short-listed designs was appropriate or specifically relevant to the mission of the journal. We will live with the present cover design a while longer. We all need to understand what the future format of Art Documentation (print + online; online only?) will be before pursuing a new cover design, considering branding of all ARLIS/NA publications, and redesigning the Web site. In any case, at this time there is no money available to pursue these projects.

The current AD cover-color selections have been projected for the next two years/volumes. Corporate redesign may be discussed eventually. We also need to learn more about TEI’s ability to do such a design. We have already experienced a few bumps along the road with TEI’s capabilities in design (layout of AD articles that needed redoing, advertisement in AD that was not particularly attractive).

Roger Lawson will find out from EBSCO if Art Documentation issues prior to 2009 are designated as peer-reviewed.

Future developments:
Barbara Rominski reported that the Executive Board has asked Jonathan to form a task
force, including representation from the Membership Committee. We may want to consider having both print and online versions of our publications for a time, then eliminating the print format eventually. How do people access *Art Documentation*? Should we be trying to expand the readers’ possibilities? Barbara suggested that Jonathan investigate possibilities of effecting changes, based on the three models that he outlined in his presentation of the topic for this meeting. Having a good electronic version of our publications is important in itself, independent of the print- version question. In regard to receiving *AD* as a benefit of membership, Ted Goodman raised the question of whether we should do away with certain membership categories, and just have subscriptions to *AD* (that is why the membership committee is being asked to be involved in these discussions). Jennifer spoke about how the Music Library Association handles the print vs. online version of its journal, *Notes*.

All of us on the Communications and Publications Committee should read Jonathan’s report prepared for this meeting, send our thoughts via e-mail to the entire committee, and discuss the issues online. We can all contribute to the ongoing discussion.

Nedda mentioned as a warning that Taylor and Francis (one possible partner in marketing *AD* online) imposes an embargo on access to journal contents, something we would want to evaluate no matter which firm we partner with. For instance, we would want members to have full access; hosting companies and aggregators may offer subscribers only current access plus “x” number of preceding years.

Institutional access is set up through IP addresses. Some hosting companies would put up anything we provided, but others may not do so (for example, some may omit advertisements). Chris Roper at TEI (the new ARLIS/NA administrator taking Nancy Short’s position) will be helpful in negotiating these decisions, since he has long experience in this area. There are lots of potential business partners.

**ARLIS/NA Web site future developments:**
A content management system (CMS) under consideration by TEI, called ‘Community Server’ from Telligent, would improve the functionality of the Web site. With further development of a CMS, for instance, editors of Web site sections could manipulate their files, committee chairs could edit their own contributions, rather than burdening Nedda with this work. Nedda should share her information on such systems with TEI, compiling a list of what we are looking for as TEI looks for a product. We on the committee can compile a list of questions for Nedda to offer to TEI. Other Web sites of associations managed by TEI seem to be fairly traditional, although Jonathan has only been able to look at each association’s public sections, not the members’ sections.

**Indexing reviews online:** TEI is building a page for indexing back issues of *AD* reviews.

**Wikis, tiki-wikis** (Barbara):
TEI’s software is not compatible with wiki software used by the Artist’s Files Working Group in which Barbara participates, so she has not been able to explore this matter. Nedda has had good communication with TEI (she almost always goes directly to Scott Sherer, who has experience with technology).

Barbara explained that TEI’s service to ARLIS/NA is being assessed (it has been eleven months that we have been with them); any useful comments and suggestions (both positive and negative) from committee members should go to Sandy Brooke, incoming Board liaison to our committee.
Doug Litts asked whether the AWS is in a holding pattern waiting for software investigation; the response was, not necessarily. But any input from us would be helpful.

Shifting our Web site from one CMS to another is a complicated effort.

**ARLIS Reviews:** The new co-editors (Terrie Wilson and Doug Litts) have assumed that their new schedule for posting reviews is successful, but the editors do not necessarily hear pro or con from members. The citation format has changed (people were unhappy with the previous format). The co-editors are reaching out to additional publishers; the Spring postings will show a wider range of publishers. Publishers are contacting Terrie and Doug directly.

Doug explained that we have set up a policy for comments on reviews, and have spelled out the policy in guidelines for reviewers on the AWS. Comments and suggestions are welcome.

**AD back file:** 1982 onwards is in PDF format, six years only are on the AWS. Judy Dyki has volunteered to compile the article-level PDF files into issue-level PDF files to be able to assemble them for an eventual electronic version.

Are reviews on the AWS retrospective all the way back? No; they are embedded in the PDF versions of AD and are not searchable all the way back. But how useful is it having decades of reviews available at this time?

Do we want to start having advertisements on the AWS, and if so, where and how much? Nedda has ethical reservations, it would take a lot of time, and, more specifically, it would take a lot of Nedda’s time. Having advertisements on the AWS should not challenge our nonprofit status, since we already have them in our conference programs, *AD*, etc. What kind of advertisements are appropriate: mostly from businesses offering products or services related to what ARLIS/NA does, rather than car rentals, etc.?

**Professional resources Web pages:** can pages be rendered more usable? Could we have links to online papers, advertisements about other publications, etc. on the AWS? Can one click right to a title? We might make a list of existing titles, and a one- or two-line blurb on newer resources; categorize the other online resources so readers can see about professional standards, others, etc.; and check linking. We can continue to work on this via e-mail. What about older occasional papers? Should we delete mention of them? Should we put them in the members-only section as hard copies that people can buy through TEI? What about POD service, with our goal being to eliminate the remaining paper copies?

**Membership directory (print version?):** ion (design firm used when ARLIS/NA was managed by McPherson-Clarke) had a template, from which we produced a 2009 directory. We did not purchase that template for TEI. We can print a directory based on the online membership directory, but without indexes. Do we still need a printed directory? Scott Sherer is open to working on this and will work on the idea with Jonathan. We can sort the online directory by state/country, so we can get a “picture” of the membership’s geographical locations.

Ebsco/Scarecrow: Roger reported that our contact with Ebsco has a long-term open-ended provision, so does not need a review by a specific deadline. *Art Documentation* has been carried by Ebsco in PDF format for four years. Reviews is another feature we have added. We have not received any royalties, so Ted Goodman should investigate. The Scarecrow
contract expired in March 2010, and the person who recruited us has left. Roger met with the person now in charge. The contract needs to be looked at again. Roger will be willing to work on this, but the new ARLIS/NA administrator has experience in this kind of work. The updated edition of *Museum Libraries* is not noted on the Scarecrow Web site. Roger can provide details about offering the entire new version of *Museum Libraries* on the AWS. Ebsco royalties: the incoming ARLIS/NA treasurer Tom Riedel should investigate this via TEI. Ted Goodman will look at the matter with him. They should ask Chris Roper for his help and advice.

*arlis-l*:
The University of Kentucky is still hosting arlis-l on its server. TEI purchased the necessary software to transfer management of arlis-l to its own server, but the software is not working on their system. It crashes. University of Kentucky is being very generous about our lingering on while the problem is being solved. The archive of arlis-l will come with the changeover once the processing problem has been solved.

TEI can set up listservs for smaller groups, and for sub-general list discussions which take up too much space on the general arlis-l.

Jonathan thanked Barbara for her work as liaison from Board. She was offered a round of applause from the committee members.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 pm.

Submitted by Eileen Markson, Member of the Committee