Pre-Conference Executive Board Meeting
February 4, 2017, 9:00am – 4:30pm EST
Newberry Room, Hilton New Orleans Riverside

AGENDA

Attending: Jamie Lausch Vander Broek, Rebecca Friedman, Heather Gendron, Jennifer Garland, Matthew Gengler, Carol Graney, Robert Kopchinski, Ann Roll, Kristen Regina, Eumie Imm Stroukoff, Shalimar Fojas White

Call to order (Heather Gendron)

Consent Agenda (Heather Gendron)

- January 2017 Past-President’s report
- November 2016 Treasurer’s report
- Ratification of email motion

Annual Reports:

- President’s Annual Report
- Vice President’s Annual Report
- Advancement Liaison’s Annual Report
- Secretary’s Annual Report
- Education Liaison’s Annual Report
- Chapters Liaison’s Annual Report
- Canadian Liaison’s Annual Report
- Editorial Director’s Annual Report
- Treasurer’s Annual Report

Motion #83 Eumie Imm Stroukoff moves that the Board approve the consent agenda. Seconded by Carol Graney. Carried unanimously.

Annual Financial Report (Matthew Gengler)

- Thank you to the board for working overtime to make the recent adjustments to member dues
- There are some coming changes to Federal regulations that we need to prepare for
- We’re going to start “laddering” our investments so that we always reap returns on our investments
- The current market situation is quite good for our investments
- Deficit budgets
  - We’re looking at $10,000 budget deficit this year
  - Long term concern: going into New York we might have to create a budget deficit
  - Want to set up the person to follow to not have to create deficit budgets
We should look carefully at our financial situation—we’ve already raised membership dues, so we can’t do that for a while. Find ways to be more economical

- Individual donations are currently at $19,720 for the year
- Goal of making our finances more transparent and inclusive – recruit future treasurers, etc.

**New Orleans conference update (Robert Kopchinski)**

- Good numbers, but a smaller conference – possibly contributing factors include New York and ACRL
- Fundraising
  - We exceeded our original goal for fundraising – a little short of the projected target goal
  - Contributing factors include ACRL, Codex, Midwinter, and recent library industry mergers
- Exhibitors
  - We are down numbers-wise but we’ve met our goal revenue-wise
  - A few vendors have purchased larger spaces this year
- Program
  - New this year: Sched app
  - Small run of print program, fixed missing content issue from Seattle
  - Long term goal of eliminating the printed program
  - Sizable group of people who are still interested in the printed programs
    - We are going to ask a question in the post-conference survey about the programs
    - We could make the question branch so that we can collect data from those who do and those who don’t
    - “If you picked up a printed program at the conference, please tell us the reasons you picked up a program.”
  - We should continue to investigate other products, balancing the investment the members have in having learned Sched
    - Guidebook
    - Sched
- Recorded Sessions/Accessibility
  - Four sessions recorded
  - Will be providing remote closed captioning for one member who requested at a cost to the conference, per ADA
  - Request for wheelchair accommodations for a speaker on the New Voices panel
- Carol Graney: Can the conference photographs be made available immediately after the conference for marketing and publicity?

**Census Report (Ann Roll w/ Stacy Brinkman)**

- Short update, mostly want feedback and discussion from the board
- Our numbers of midcareer professionals are low by comparison to earlier and later career professionals
One likely situation is that members who are students intend to become art librarians and go on to other careers. Mid-career professionals are often promoted to more general administrative positions and might leave for that reason also.

A slightly higher percentage of the early career members are non-white.

One clarification: people took the survey who are not members
  ○ Could run numbers with the sets of current and former members

Which questions do we really want to track over time?

It’s a pain to take long surveys and a pain to tabulate complicated surveys, so we should be intentional

How often should we do this? Task force is recommending every five years

Made at least one error in tabulating the data – needs further editing

Shalimar Fojas White: Comments in the free text about the census as a snapshot of where they are now, but doesn’t reflect. Maybe we could have some open forums to follow – focus groups, presentations

Roger Lawson: Is there data from other comparable organizations?

Jamie Lausch Vander Broek: 5 years could mean that we lose people when they face pressure to quit ARLIS/NA after working outside art librarianship for the first part of their careers

Heather Gendron: We could crosstab students so that we can create targeted programming. We could also take a look at how we can make more use of the data collected during membership renewal. We should do benchmarking with similar societies and related fields. There might be an opportunity here for advocacy with other organizations for salary increases.

Catherine Essinger: At our institution, people hit the 6-year mark and once they make the next rank are able to scale back their organizational involvement

Matthew Gengler: Is there a thought about making a membership category for affiliated members so that people can remain involved with their cohorts

Stacy Brinkler: We could have a SIG for people outside art librarianship

Rebecca Friedman: Some members complain about generic content

Ann Roll: The generic content helps me justify my involvement to my employer. So much of the variation in income and salary could have to do with geographic distribution.

Rebecca Friedman: Should we look at our related fields for demographics to see if we match?

Kristen Regina: How often do other organizations survey their membership? I wonder if we should look into hiring a consultant to help us with this data and to create a plan for the next census?

Carol Graney: We should also think about the location and format of presenting this data to a wider audience. I would vote for transparency.

**Action Item #49:** Stacy Brinkman will draft a charge for two task forces: one task force to give more analysis to the current data to create a report with some recommendations for next steps, which may include some benchmarking with other organizations, focus groups, etc. A second task force to examine the report and perhaps work with a consulting firm to operationalize it going forward with an eye toward the collection of longitudinal data.

**Motion #84:** Kristen Regina moves that the Board approve the January minutes. Seconded by Jennifer Garland. Carried unanimously.

**NDSR/Art progress report & future directions (Kristen Regina & Shalimar Fojas White)**

- Background
- The initial idea was to follow a medical post-doc. Solid training to start a career path. Similar to CLIR
- Location selected, then sites selected, and then a call for residents
- The focus of the projects is designed to be complementary – two sites with born digital preservation, etc., so that students can learn from each other’s experiences.
- Idea to focus on art, geographically dispersing the cohort but with a related subject or focus
- Chapters were key in this idea for providing support to the residents across the country
- Initial projects were not supported by the organization, sent back to committee to re-open the call.
  - 4 apps the first time, 11 apps the second time, stronger pool
- Planning group learned to ask a lot of questions to prepare for the cohort’s successful experience (where will this person work? How will they be embedded in the organization? Etc.)

- **Curriculum-development**
  - Did a survey to determine what should be included in the curriculum
  - Revealed some gaps of knowledge among the ARLIS/NA community – lead to a series of webinars by former residents to share their knowledge
  - We have an opportunity here to drive the conversation
  - A lot of requests for image management, which is already supported by SEI

- **Current status**
  - Board member traveled from site to site in January (in one week!) to evaluate the sites.
  - Gave a good sense of the big picture experience for the cohort. Critical.
    - Would be good to build this evaluation into the budget going forward
  - Cross-education happening among the board members -- some of them have more experience in digital preservation and less in art, etc.
  - Press release has officially gone out announcing the sites and the application process
  - Intentionally paired the institutions so that there is overlap for the cohort
    - Born digital works of art
    - Managing electronic records for a museum
  - The process of selecting a cohort was challenging
  - Timeline was crunched and there was a large amount of work to do
  - After the conference the team can really begin fleshing things out

- **Next steps – future for the program**
  - Moving forward – recommending a task force within the Professional Development Committee?
    - Including members from Cataloging Advisory, Web Archiving, Chapters, other relevant groups
    - There’s an opportunity to partner with Preservation and Archiving Special Interest Group (PASIG) – A liaison to this group would be a good idea. Could be the chair of the task force
    - There should be a slot built into the next several ARLIS/NA conferences
  - Carol Graney: This reminds me that ARLIS/NA publications are not currently strategically preserved – ARLIS/NA could host a resident? Documentation Committee, perhaps?
  - Jennifer Garland: Currently the residencies are not open to non-US institutions. We could look to CLIR, which offers partnership grants to bridge this gap.
Jamie Lausch Vander Broek: The Cataloging Advisory Committee would be a good fit to add to these conversations going forward

Kim Collins: How long is ARLIS/NA built into the process? Is there tracking for job attainment post-program? How much are the residents paid?
  - Kristen Regina: There’s a very high placement rate – basically 100%. The residents will be paid approximately $40,000/year. Some differences because of differing travel issues, site contributions, etc.

Shalimar Fojas White: We’re hoping that going forward this program will help the sites create a network for themselves when approaching projects in the future

**Action Item #50:** Kristen Regina will draft a task force charge for an NDSR/Art group.

**Vote on motion #82 started via e-mail**
- Some further edits required – will happen before the statement goes out.
- Using numbers reported in a number of places, including a Connecticut state representative’s communications
- We may have further work to do going forward regarding government relations. Our messaging will be critical in order to create a welcoming environment for our members
  - We had one person decide not to attend the conference this year and request a refund because of the actions of the US president
- Kristen Regina: The Washington Post has some good numbers indicating how little the agencies cost. Also referenced the Reagan administration. Possibly useful language and talking points.
- Eumie Imm Stroukoff: Is there a policy in place for reimbursements?
- Ann Roll: We have a cancelation policy that involves contacting the treasurer after a certain date:
  - Cancellation requests submitted less than 30 days prior to the start of the conference must be for reasons of personal or family emergency only. Refund requests must be made in writing to Matthew Gengler, ARLIS/NA Treasurer, (mgengler@clevelandart.org), stating the specific reasons and circumstances for the refund request. The $75.00 administrative cancellation fee and the no refunds for tours or workshops policy will apply in these cases as well.
- Stacy Brinkman: Asking someone else to shoulder the financial burden of a protest doesn’t seem appropriate to me. We could make an effort to accommodate remote participation.
- Heather Gendron: We can remind them about the remote participation options that already exist.
- Shalimar Fojas White: Part of a larger movement of international scholars boycotting events in the US

**Motion #85:** Ann Roll moves that the Board enter executive session. Seconded by Matthew Gengler. Carried unanimously.

**Motion #86:** Kristen Regina moves that the Board exit executive session. Seconded by Matthew Gengler. Carried unanimously.

**Statements opposing Trump administration policies**
- Heather Gendron: It’s important that we make a statement as an ARLIS/NA body
- Rebecca Friedman: Maybe there’s something specifically related to art that we can say
- Eumie Imm Stroukoff: We can say that as stewards of culture and art we believe in the open exchange of knowledge – all voices, all perspectives, a commitment to our rights.
• Carol Graney: We could think about what rises to the level of a press release – some things can go on ARLIS-L.
• Heather Gendron: It’s important to me to be straight about it. My advice is to make these statements press releases so that other affiliate organizations know how we feel on the issue

Motion #82: Jennifer Garland moves that the Board release a statement opposing proposed government spending cuts to the NEA, NEH, and IMLS. Seconded by Matthew Gengler. Carried unanimously.
Motion #87: That the Board release a statement opposing recent Trump administration policies including the ban on travel from seven Muslim-majority countries and the proposed construction of a border wall between the United States and Mexico, and reaffirming ARLIS/NA’s mission, shared values and goals. Seconded by Ann Roll. Carried unanimously.

Editorial Board annual report highlights (Carol Graney)
• Working on the style guide and communications plan
  ○ Will share documents after the meeting
• Currently revising our publication agreement with University of Chicago Press
• A reminder that we changed the name of “conference proceedings” to “conference materials”
• The editors are doing such a fabulous job. Things are stable and will hopefully stay that way going forward.
• Rebecca Friedman: Is there inconsistency in how often groups are submitting conference meeting minutes?
• Carol Graney: There’s been a request to allow groups to include meeting minutes on their pages on the AWS. This could be a place for including conference meeting minutes. We could also have groups focus on action items when crafting minutes.
• Jamie Lausch Vander Broek: Documentation Committee should discuss how to capture these minutes on a long-term basis. Only the link structure will be preserved.
• Kristen Regina: Maybe we should ask the groups to focus on actions and have them just submit to the Action Scorecard.
• Shalimar Fojas White: A past action item that I have is to fold the speaker publication agreement with the publication consent form. I will follow up on this now.

Action Item #51: Jamie Lausch Vander Broek, Samantha Deutch, and Roger Lawson will discuss the long-term storage of committee, division, and SIG minutes and action items.

• Art Documentation
  ○ Royalties are going up, which will make open access decisions more difficult.
  ○ Unlicensed distributors, such as Academia.edu – distributing published research without paying distribution fees.
  ○ This seems like a similar activity to depositing into a repository.
  ○ Heather Gendron: Our Green Open Access status allows authors to deposit into these at their institutions. Not allowed to deposit into subject-based repositories. Unclear whether this activity is a violation. Social media is allowed; commercial repositories are not. Not an issue for us to solve.

Seattle conference debrief (Kristen Regina)
• Final conference report posted a few months ago, available for all to read
• It could be advantageous to commit to revising the Joint Conference Implementation Plan well in advance of the next joint conference planning time
• The next joint-conference planning board and CPAC should bear in mind that we have a renegotiated contract with AEG which no longer includes unlimited support for conference planning
• Rebecca Friedman: The chapters are looking for information about joint conference planning and how to incorporate the idea of a joint conference into a formal proposal

Motion #88: Kristen Regina moves that the Board enter executive session. Seconded by Eumie Imm Stroukoff. Carried unanimously.
Motion #89: Matthew Gengler moves that the Board exit executive session. Seconded by Carol Graney. Carried unanimously.

Gordon Rudy, University of Chicago Press
Art Documentation (continued)
• Journal revenue has been going up, despite a slight loss in subscribers – this is due to a slight increase in the cost of the journal to subscribers from year to year
• Number for rights and permissions went up by almost $10,000
• New arrangement with Accucoms – leading to increases abroad, and in particular we are seeing a rise in consortial agreements
• The news in the US is different:
  ○ Market saturation
  ○ Cuts or budget reductions – University of Chicago Press works hard to make counter offers, careful not to overly discount the product
• Usage
  ○ EBSCOHOST usage is down across the board -- no explanation for this
  ○ JSTOR possibly looks more inflated than it should – lots of people think to click on JSTOR first when presented with options, there could have been some issues in the way the usage was counted in 2015 resulting in what looks like a spike and a fall
  ○ Art Documentation doesn’t have an impact factor, but there is comparable information in this report
    ▪ New competition in the impact factor territory
    ▪ Web of Science now owned by a private equity firm
    ▪ Art Documentation should be included in Scopus soon
    ▪ Google Scholar
      • Currently Art Doc is included in the visual and performing arts – a broad selection of things that are not very easy to compare
      • Working with a university in Spain to address the issue of overseas journals and this may include more art journals soon
    ▪ Web of Knowledge
      • Counts a total of three cited articles from 2015 total for Art Doc’s entire history
• Marketing and Promotion
  ○ Art Doc is included in a group of art and art history journals made freely available to interest potential subscribers
• Unlicensed redistributors
- Messes with the model that contributes to paying the costs that University of Chicago Press incurs
- It’s always been permitted for authors to post their own articles on their personal websites – University of Chicago Press is now asking authors not to post articles on Academia.edu
- The world is changing and adaptation is a current issue – there is intense pressure to post articles on Academia.edu
- The publication agreement won’t have to be changed – instead the change is to the authors’ rights statements
- No immediate reason to panic – could be contributing to the decline in our usage, but this will take a few years to determine
- Status is an important element here that’s not yet replicated by any unlicensed competitor and would be a difficult challenge for us if we consider taking over the production of our journal

### Open Access

- An anthropology society has done something similar – they’ve looked at their portfolio and made some things purely open access, other things, such as their primary journal, they’ve kept subscription. They’ve also added some open access supplements to their journal and University of Chicago has been contracted to distribute these.
- University of Chicago has a contract to distribute an open access journal out of Hankook University in Korea.
- Some universities also ask their faculty to use alternative publication agreements granting rights back to the university. These are denied by University of Chicago Press and authors have to get a waiver.
- Presses haven’t done a good job explaining the costs of presenting and distributing information to rights holders and others.
- Heather Gendron: We’re very pleased with the services we’re receiving from University of Chicago Press. Our Open Access Task Force is charged not with flipping *Art Doc* to open access, but at examining our publications program holistically. There may be opportunities for partnership, especially to promote building competencies among our membership in the area of publishing and publication agreements. There are also competitors popping up offering distribution services for open access, like BePress. Grant requirements are contributing to these issues as well.

### Open Access Task Force II report (Heather Gendron)

- Second iteration of the task force, again chaired by Daniel Payne
- Tied the report into our mission and vision
- Demonstrated what we’ve done in the recent past to become more open access
- Also lays out what might be possible going forward with our online publications as well as *Art Documentation*
  - Lays out scenarios for flipping to open access
- Makes clear the AWS is probably not the most appropriate location for making all of our content accessible and discoverable and for preserving it long term
  - Explores the idea of creating an institutional repository for ARLIS/NA
- How do we create an infrastructure for our publications going forward that is robust and insures both access and preservation.
• We don’t necessarily have a publication model for the society. It might be time now that we have the Editorial Board in place to have this discussion. Leading to missed opportunities. We want to continue to be relevant to our members. We also have an opportunity to think about where we want to go next, holistically.

• Needed from the Board:
  o Help prioritizing our initiatives going forward
  o There could be a webinar or presentation for the board by Daniel Payne, the chair of the task force
  o Should anything be redacted from a public version?

• Selected task force recommendations and Board commentary on the ideas:
  o **Specifically earmarks profits for OA initiatives (for example, using funds to pay for DOIs for existing ARLIS/NA OA publications or make improvements to the AWS to allow for greater discoverability)**
    ▪ Ann Roll: Do we have additional funds for this? Aren’t we running a deficit budget?
    ▪ Heather Gendron: This idea doesn’t match our budgeting model
    ▪ Kristen Regina: We could say that we already invest in Open Access. The money that we spend on the Learning Portal could be targeted instead
    ▪ Carol Graney: How much are we paying for the Learning Portal?
    ▪ Robert Kopchinski: We pay about $5,000 annually. It does have features that we aren’t using, which reduces our cost. It stemmed out of an interest in doing a virtual conference. There are other costs associated with distributing content the society produces as well – GotoMeeting, etc.

  o **Revive and rejuvenate the Research & Reports publication arm of ARLIS/NA, particularly the Occasional Papers, then use the initial goals in founding the Research & Reports arm of ARLIS/NA to inform expansion in OA.**
    ▪ Carol Graney: Maybe part of the Editorial Director’s job is to solicit publications and make clear that there are opportunities available to membership to share ideas
    ▪ Heather Gendron: Once Roger Lawson is settled, we could think about whether Occasional Papers is the best format for this type of publication. Used to convey prestige when put on CV.
    ▪ Stacy Brinkman: It may be the case that tenure committees wouldn’t consider the publication of an Occasional Paper as prestigious as *Art Documentation*
    ▪ Ann Roll: Maybe it’s just not on people’s radar
    ▪ Rebecca Friedman: The idea for Occasional Papers comes from a print world
    ▪ Kristen Regina: I have a photo of the results of a historical discussion that created the current structure of the Editorial Board
    ▪ Roger Lawson: Could there be a peer-reviewed process for this type of publication?

• Carol Graney: There is an honorarium for publishing *New and Events* (AWS Content Editor does this and receives an honorarium), and *What our Members are Saying* is also missing from the task force’s list. The Professional Resources Editor (solicited reports, research, monographs) was discontinued in the recent past, which changed the scope for the Editorial Board. Could be revived. The point about adding tags to content should be shown to the content editors. We have an offer from RISD to host our publications, including *Art Doc*. We could return to them
regarding the offer for all content except Art Doc. I see this group looking at making everything open access going forward, and I’m not sure if that’s their job. The question should be sent to the Editorial Board for further discussion.

- Shalimar Fojas White: The Professional Development Committee and the Public Policy Committee are going to look at the Career Resources section to bring everything together and make the content more discoverable and accessible. There’s definitely a need to look at content holistically and optimize across the board and there is interest among committees who publish content. There could be an executive summary that explicitly states that we’ve looked at open access and have decided against going down that road.

- Samantha Deutch: These monographs (which are currently posted on the AWS) could be added to OCLC which is crawled by Google, which could help make them more discoverable. We could also look at new models like crowdsourcing and see these publications as potential opportunities for sponsorship.

- Matthew Gengler: I think we need to hear “what we want to do costs this much”

- Jamie Lausch Vander Broek: The document could be edited for tone before it’s posted

- Ann Roll: If the document is supposed to make clear that we’ve examined the idea of Open Access and decided against it, I don’t think that point is quite clear. We should go through the recommendations and determine which to do. I could see the Development Committee potentially getting behind the idea of crowdsourcing releasing something Open Access. We’re going to have to think about how to market things in a creative way because of the way our donor organization landscape is changing.

- Robert Kopchinski: The platform of the website is Joomla, an open source CMS. There is a template overlaying the CMS.

- Eumie Imm Stroukoff: We could ask the Editorial Board to use this information to start creating a long-term plan, acknowledging that this is going to cost money.

**Action Item #52:** Carol Graney, Roger Lawson, and Robert Kopchinski will work with the Editorial Board to make sure that the Open Access Report’s action items for the content editors are carried out if possible.

**Action Item #53:** Heather Gendron will thank the task force and ask them to edit the Open Access report for public distribution and add an executive summary highlighting its main conclusions.

**Action Item #54:** Carol Graney and Roger Lawson will ask the Editorial Board to take up the recommendation: “Formalize and harmonize ARLIS/NA publication policy documents to reflect more open terms, such as encouraging Creative Commons licensing for re-use”

**Strategic Directions (Kristen Regina)**

- Parts of the issue:
  - Strategic Directions Committee (meets four times a year with an emphasis on the two in-person board meeting times, job is to react and be the Board’s conscience – keeping an eye out for missed issues, etc., and also need to keep their eyes out for broader issues for the society to be aware of)
  - Strategic Directions (need to be re-evaluated in two years)
  - Action Scorecard (represents all the activity of the society)

- Liaisons have already tied the Strategic Directions into their Annual Reports

- We can easily create a structure where the Secretary looks at the reports and adds items to the Action Scorecard
The committee could meet during the conference and look at the current version of the Action Scorecard.

Robert Kopchinski: This means that we need to figure out a structure for dealing with the forecast trends brought up by the committee.

Jamie Lausch Vander Broek: Twice a year matches the workflow for annual and midyear reports. Monthly seems like a lot.

Heather Gendron: We need to build in time to talk about it and calibrate. Maybe over time our Strategic Directions will become more timely and strategic.

Eumie Imm Stroukoff: I would touch base with my groups on a monthly basis. This would just be something they’d add to that monthly check in, but only as necessary.

Rebecca Friedman: For Chapters, there are a lot of reports to look through to prepare this information.

**Action Item #55:** Jamie Lausch Vander Broek, Samantha Deutch, Eumie Imm Stroukoff, and Heather Gendron will meet to determine a workflow for the Action Scorecard.

**Special Funding Requests and Project and Service Charters**

- Matthew Gengler will roll out new process shortly.

**Motion to Adjourn**

Motion #90: Matthew Gengler moves that the Board adjourn. Seconded by Shalimar Fojas White. Carried unanimously.

**Summary of Motions**

- Motion #82: Jennifer Garland moves that the Board release a statement opposing proposed government spending cuts to the NEA, NEH, and IMLS. Seconded by Matthew Gengler. Carried unanimously.
- Motion #83: Eumie Imm Stroukoff moves that the Board approve the consent agenda. Seconded by Carol Graney. Carried unanimously.
- Motion #84: Kristen Regina moves that the Board approve the January minutes. Seconded by Jennifer Garland. Carried unanimously.
- Motion #85: Ann Roll moves that the Board enter executive session. Seconded by Matthew Gengler. Carried unanimously.
- Motion #86: Kristen Regina moves that the Board exit executive session. Seconded by Matthew Gengler. Carried unanimously.
- Motion #87: That the Board release a statement opposing recent Trump administration policies including the ban on travel from seven Muslim-majority countries and the proposed construction of a border wall between the United States and Mexico, and reaffirming ARLIS/NA’s mission, shared values and goals. Seconded by Ann Roll. Carried unanimously.
- Motion #88: Kristen Regina moves that the Board enter executive session. Seconded by Eumie Imm Stroukoff. Carried unanimously.
- Motion #89: Matthew Gengler moves that the Board exit executive session. Seconded by Carol Graney. Carried unanimously.
- Motion #90: Matthew Gengler moves that the Board adjourn. Seconded by Shalimar Fojas White. Carried unanimously.

**Summary of Action Items**
• Action Item #49: Stacy Brinkman will draft a charge for two task forces: one task force to give more analysis to the current data to create a report with some recommendations for next steps, which may include some benchmarking with other organizations, focus groups, etc. A second task force to examine the report and perhaps work with a consulting firm to operationalize it going forward with an eye toward the collection of longitudinal data.
• Action Item #50: Kristen Regina will draft a task force charge for an NDSR/Art group.
• Action Item #51: Jamie Lausch Vander Broek, Samantha Deutch, and Roger Lawson will discuss the long-term storage of committee, division, and SIG minutes and action items.
• Action Item #52: Carol Graney, Roger Lawson, and Robert Kopchinski will work with the Editorial Board to make sure that the Open Access Report’s action items for the content editors are carried out if possible.
• Action Item #53: Heather Gendron will thank the task force and ask them to edit the Open Access report for public distribution and add an executive summary highlighting its main conclusions.
• Action Item #54: Carol Graney and Roger Lawson will ask the Editorial Board to take up the recommendation: “Formalize and harmonize ARLIS/NA publication policy documents to reflect more open terms, such as encouraging Creative Commons licensing for re-use”
• Action Item #55: Jamie Lausch Vander Broek, Samantha Deutch, Eumie Imm Stroukoff, and Heather Gendron will meet to determine a workflow for the Action Scorecard.