ART LIBRARIES SOCIETY OF NORTH AMERICA
MID-YEAR EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING

August 26 & 27, 2003 University of the Arts 320 South Broad Street Philadelphia, PA

AGENDA

Tuesday, August 26

CBS Auditorium, Hamilton Hall

Present: Elizabeth Clarke, Executive Director; Allen Townsend, President, Daniel Starr, Past President; Jeanne Brown, Vice-President/President-Elect, Phil Heagy, Treasurer; Judith Herschman, Secretary; Suzy Frechette, Midwest Regional Representative.; Irene Puchalski, Canadian Representative.; Laura Schwartz, South Regional Representative; Kay Teel, West Regional Representative, Carol Graney, Northeast Regional Representative. Also attending: Vicky Roper, Association Administrator. Reporting attendees: Ted Goodman, Mary Wassermann.

1. Call to order (Townsend)

The meeting was called to order at 10 am.

2. Announcements

Robert’s Rules of Order (Herschman)

We are observing Robert’s Rules of Order.

Meal arrangements (Townsend)

Meals will be brought in to save time.

Agenda revisions (Townsend)

The committee discussions will be moved up because Clarke will be a little late. Missing committees will be added, e.g. Awards and Standards.

3. Approval of minutes (Townsend)
The Baltimore Post Conference Minutes approval was postponed because of the e-mail problems experienced weeks prior to the meeting.

Action; Baltimore post conference minutes will be revised by Herschman and sent out for approval. Deadline: September 15.

4. NYC 2004 Conference Planning Update

a. Local Arrangements (Goodman)

A packet of conference arrangements and materials was distributed. The dates for the NY conference has been successfully changed to April 15-22. Goodman reviewed the schedule including tours and workshops. The open plenary session with Okwui Enwezor is being worked on and may be cancelled in which case the schedule will be rearranged accordingly. No membership lunch is scheduled because of expense – but a business meeting will be held instead. Among the highlights will be an evening boat cruise with architectural historian. Organizers are attempting to get Christo to talk about the Central Park project but there are problems and negotiations are still underway. If successful, the session would be Monday at 4.

Tours, including Christie’s, NY Botanical Garden, Princeton, and the Grolier Club, look great and should appeal to locals as well. The tour of Phillip Johnson’s Glass House is particularly special since it is open so infrequently. The cost of the tours seems to be comparable to those of other conferences. The proposed workshops cover a variety of subjects which will interest members. One is off-site at the New York Public Library. Goodman will check into reason for scheduling a two-part workshop on the Western Middle Ages since the descriptions under each part are the same. Starr questioned the late scheduling of some of the afternoon workshops. Goodman said that this was because of conflicts and the length of time required for the workshops but that scheduling is still in flux and this may change.

The preliminary program schedule was reviewed. There are a lot of interesting sessions ranging from classical to digital art. Some highlights of the program: Documenting 9/11, Destruction and Reconstruction of Cultural Heritage Affected by Wars, New York Parks and Gardens, Queer Art, Establishing Core Competencies etc. Brown noted that some roundtables and discussion groups are missing, e.g. New Art Roundtable. Those groups have not yet been slotted but will be either slotted if requested or self-scheduled. Townsend reminded the Board that groups were required to formally request scheduling by a certain date, which may account for the omission of certain groups. Chapter groups have not yet been scheduled. Starr suggested an evening slot for them and Goodman proposed a possible lunchtime slot. The closing plenary session does not yet have anyone scheduled. Libeskind fell through. Strong support was expressed for a plenary session, although some felt NY was rich enough that we could do without one. Goodman will work through list of possible speakers.

b. Budget review (Goodman/Heagy)

The budget for the NY Conference seems in line with Baltimore’s. The $10,000 for the convocation has not yet been raised. Goodman had several prospects for generating support. While the Leadership Breakfast will be expensive, we may need to have it to meet hotel
expenditure requirements. Starr reiterated the need to generate more sponsorship for events. Graney raised the issue of fund raising. Goodman said that Most, Hughston, and he constitute the development committee for the conference and are planning to become more active in September. They are hoping to raise $10,000 more than Baltimore. The welcome party is budgeted for $24,945. Coffee for opening breakfast alone will be $18,000.

Starr indicated that the membership wants outside speakers. It was proposed that the Speakers Fund be used for this purpose. $1000 is not too high for someone like Christo. Stahl’s proposal to the Board, however, has suggested a ceiling. There is no business model for conferences and the planners’ desire to have a great conference results in the recurring issue of what to pay speakers. Planners want to get them for lowest amount, free if possible, but will usually have to negotiate. It was suggested that all expenditures including honoraria and AV costs be run through the program chair rather than leaving it up to individual session chairs. Goodman says that this is virtually what happens already. Townsend suggests that the conference planning manual needs to be revised to reflect this procedure or any honoraria policy changes. It was proposed that the previous and current CPAC’s meet for educational purposes. Honoraria for speakers will come out of Speaker’s Fund.

**Action:** Goodman will draft a proposed revision to the conference planning manual for honoraria for discussion by Board. Deadline: October 1,

b. Program Report (Townsend)

Margaret Webster sent a written report to the Board indicating that program proposal submissions had been received, discussed, and selected with substantive suggestions forwarded to the proposers. About 60% of those received were accepted. Those not accepted were encouraged to develop their ideas and submit proposals for Houston. The preliminary program draft is well underway. The NYC04 program will emphasize core competencies. Sessions and workshops will include the following topics: middle management, reference and instruction, cataloging, the fabric of NYC, women’s issues, librarian as scholar, digital image products, and art patronage. Offerings will include 9 workshops, 24 sessions, and 1 or 2 plenary sessions.

5. Administrative Documents Issues (Goodman/Townsend/Brown)

a. HANDBOOK and Online Member Directory

i. Schedule of updates

Roper said that she forwards updates roughly every month to Goodman. This year, the effort to get non-subscribers to renew delayed the update. This year also unless the home address was starred as primary mailing address, it was dropped. If the home address was the designated primary mailing address the phone number was dropped. Both decisions were taken for the reasons of privacy

ii. Membership database updates
It was mentioned that it is important to update online directory frequently to meet membership expectations. It was decided that it should be minimally updated monthly. Goodman monitors ARLIS-l for notices of e-mail, address changes and forwards the information to Roper. Starr wondered whether reformatting the directory would result in a smaller directory. Teel suggested that we are not ready to go completely online. It was decided that December 31 would remain deadline for renewals, but a production date of February 1 would be set for the publication of the directory to allow for a January reminder to non-renewers.

**Action:** Charge the Membership Committee Chairs with revising the membership form to give members an option to receive a printed directory or not.

### iii. Future of the printed Handbook

Goodman also questioned whether the Society should incur the expense of printing the Handbook/Bylaws. It was also noted that we had to continue to print at least some handbooks – for institutional members.

**b. Management Calendar (Brown/Roper/Townsend)**

**Action:** Roper will send monthly e-mail reminder to the Board of things that needs to be done that month. The documents editor will be responsible for editing and maintaining the management calendar. Any updates or changes should be sent to him.

**Action:** Goodman will revise the management calendar to reflect a December 31 renewal deadline, with a January 31 deadline for inclusion in the print directory; Goodman will also make changes in calendar reflecting the fact that this year we have an April conference instead of a March conference.

### 6. Organizational restructuring preliminary discussions – DSRT’s (Townsend/Brown/Starr)

Townsend distributed the Music Library Association’s definitions and requirements of Roundtables for the Board to read as a possible model for discussion. It was indicated that people may be interested in participating in roundtables but often have conflicts during conferences. It was noted that we do not now have concrete dissolution guidelines. [Note: the Bylaws say “The Executive Board shall authorize the dissolution of a Round Table when in the opinion of the Board its usefulness has ceased.”]. If the discussion groups apply for roundtable status, a more complex society will be created, which is not quite what we want. The Board was reminded that the Society is fluid and should have a mechanism for creating and dissolving and that the groups are an expression of diverse interests within the society. It was suggested that “Roundtables” be abolished in favor of “discussion groups.” However, the problems of getting moderators and monitoring the groups were raised. The opposite was then proposed, i.e. keep all “Roundtables” and abolish “discussion groups”. One possible definition of a roundtable is that it be able to find a moderator and have a quorum for two consecutive years. Discussion groups can self-schedule and informally meet before applying for Roundtable status.
7. Conference Reports

a. Baltimore 2003 (Heagy/Starr/Clarke)

The final figure is $32,000 under budget. Registration, tours, sponsorships were all under budget. $14,000 is still owed the Management Firm. The bottom line is, as of now, $60,000 in the black, but the final figure is expected to be $20-30,000 in black.

b. Houston 2005 (Clarke)

Jon Evans has the conference planning under control. The selected hotel, Hilton of the Americas in Houston, is almost complete and is expected to be complete for the Superbowl by January 1, 2004.

Action: Management will send dates for the Houston Conference to the Board.

c. 2006 Invitation(s)

Two invitations for the 2006 national conference have been submitted: from Southeast Chapter for Atlanta, and from the Northwest Chapter for Banff, Alberta, Canada. There have been some questions raised about the expense of getting to Banff but Clarke indicated that it would not be any greater than getting across country. Mid-May would be a preferable time to try to miss the snow, but prices go up about $20 at that time to the Canadian equivalent of $170. The suggestion was made that we might want to change one of the proposals to 2007. It was indicated that since we have had and expect to have a series of financially successful conferences, that we are in a position to risk a less successful one in Banff. Concern was expressed about making a significant change in the calendar and it was suggested that we check with the membership about whether that change would be acceptable. Snow might not be much of a negative in Banff so that it could be held earlier. Recent concerns about low Canadian member attendance at conferences, combined with the fact that Banff might be less expensive for the Canadian members, argues for Banff. Planning for a conference in Banff will depend more heavily on the work of Headquarters. Reservations were expressed by some. The assurance that the ARLIS members proposing the conference will still be around to actually plan can be problematic if the conference were postponed to a later year. It is not clear how important an enthusiastic local chapter is in putting together a successful conference given the changing communications/planning environment. The program might be able to focus on Professional Development since there may be fewer local diversions. Schwartz proposed going back to the Southeast Chapter to find out if 2007 would be an acceptable date. Brown proposed surveying the membership about whether people would be interested in going to Banff.

Action: Schwartz will contact the Southeast Chapter to determine whether they are amenable to changing its Conference proposal to 2007

Action: Puchalski and Townsend will request that the Northwest Chapter expand and enrich its written Conference proposal for 2006.

Action: As a result of the above actions, Board will discuss and approve 2006, 2007 Conference sites accordingly. Deadline: November 1.
8. Committees & Task Forces (board liaisons)-

a. Nominating (Townsend)

i. Slate for 2004

Margaret Webster, Vice-President, President-elect

Lynda White, Treasurer

Peggy Keenan West Regional Representative

Jonathan Franklin, Canadian Representative

b. Professional Development Committee (Graney)

i. Core competencies subcommittee

Graney passed out the committee report. Several Board members thought that there is a need to emphasize those things which are unique or especially important to art librarianship, e.g. copyright. There will be a session at ARLIS/NA for discussing competencies. The committee chair should publicize it in advance and perhaps send out discussion documents. The Board recognized the work being done by the committee in the development of core competencies.

c. Publications (Starr)

i. Reprint/Revision of Facility Standards

The committee is still looking for someone to edit and update the facilities standards. The committee is weighing the possibility of recruiting a library school student.

ii. ARLIS/NA Update

The committee is looking at indexing content and extracting bibliographies to post on a website.

iii. Art Documentation

The Ebsco licensing proposal and Scarecrow Press agreement, both of which were distributed before the board meeting, were discussed. The question of whether there would be any impact on the contracts the society now has with Library Literature was raised.

It is assumed that the agreement with Scarecrow Press will not affect the contract with Libraries Unlimited, and that the Ebsco proposal to electronically distribute the full-text of Art Documentation would not affect the contract with Library Literature to index the content of Art Documentation, but these assumptions have to be corroborated.
It was suggested that Institutional sponsorship might be affected as well by the Ebsco proposal. Individual members might want to keep subscribing to the print version.

**Action:** The Publications Committee will review the two proposals and respond to the Board.

**iv. Other issues**

The accreditation publication is in the process of being finalized.

Additional oral histories and remarks of Distinguished Service Awards recipients will be posted on the website.

**d. Awards Committee (Teel/Townsend)**

The deadline for getting materials has been delayed. Starr expressed concern about whether the Research and Travel awards have been funded and whether they are being funded at more than the amount of the award.

**Action:** Townsend will charge the Development Committee to contact sponsors for verification of the travel and research award fund, asking for 10% more than the award for an administrative fee. Deadline October 15

In response to a request, Townsend proposed that a special commendation/honorary award, separate from the Distinguished Service award, be considered for this year. An alternative possibility of naming an Internship award was discussed. Precedence might be a problem so needs to be made clear that this is an exception whatever is decided.

**e. International Relations (Puchalski)**

A plenary session proposal was accepted but ran into problems over size of the honoraria. Result may have been miscommunication between program chair and IRC chair about the possibility of negotiation. Goodman will try to resolve.

**Action:** Townsend will try to resolve the problem of the Plenary Session with the Margaret Webster.

**f. Development Committee (Townsend)**

The committee is drafting guidelines and identifying prospects for 2004. A question was raised about whether there should be a separate mailing for Society Circle membership or should it be included in packet. The current plan is to include it in the renewal package but maybe it should be separate. A pretty brochure is being developed, probably for separate mailing. Special renewal requests might be sent to current Society Circle members. A letter from a current member such as B.J. Irvine could be sent to solicit new members to the circle. The scheduled redesign of the membership form might include a variety of development options as well.

**g. Membership (Puchalski)**
The effort to contact non-renewers personally was successful as was the recruitment effort of
library school students. Townsend will use the Gerd Muehsam mailing list to write a cover letter
to library schools. The updated list of Library School contacts is now posted on the Web.

**Action:** Graney will ask the Professional Development Committee chair about the timing of
the mailing to library schools in order to coordinate the mailing with a cover letter by Townsend.

**h. ARLIS/NA-VRA Joint Education Task Force (Mary Wassermann, Co-Chair)**

Mary Wassermann, the co-chair of the task force, joined the meeting to report on the progress of
the planned summer institute. The location has been changed to Duke. Tuition has been reduced
to $575 for ARLIS/VRA members and $625 for non-ARLIS/VRA members. The program has
been condensed to four days from five. The task force is currently putting together the list of
instructors. Pre-registration will come out in December with final registration in March. May 15
will be the deadline for canceling. Since fundraising for the institute has been so successful thus
far, it was suggested that it should be discontinued because additional monies would go toward
profit and compete with other society fundraising efforts. It was agreed that the Development
Committee would have to monitor and control the competing fundraising interests. Wassermann
estimated that twenty registrants would probably be break even.

Approval of the Joint Agreement will be postponed until Headquarters and the Board has a
chance to review it further.

A start-up fund of $1500 has been requested from ARLIS/NA. If the Institute is cancelled do we
have to pay back donors? Need to clarify with the donor that the gift will not be returned. Can
the ARLIS budget line for the Institute be used both to pay for incurred expenses and to cover
reimbursements if pay back is required?

Clarke felt that the budget and income should be reconciled. Seed money up front means that the
two organizations might be contributing even if the budget is met. The recommendation is that
the profit be returned to the organizations and that the 2005 Institute, should it be held, start from
a zero budget.

In addition to core faculty, the planners intend to invite specialists for a day. Air fare
expenditures might be lower than anticipated because of proximity to the UNC Library School.

**Action:** Wasserman will give the Board a report of how much would be netted for each
additional registrant and what the maximum registration would yield.

**i. Diversity (Starr)**

The reestablishment of the Diversity Committee as a standing Committee with the current chairs
remaining in their positions was proposed. The committee would discuss suggestions from the
membership and prioritize and clarify the plans to implement diversity within the society. It was
asked why it should not just be a discussion group. The main reason posited is that this is an
ongoing issue which needs addressing over the long run. It was suggested that the establishment
is within the purview of the Board and does not require a change in the By-Laws. The Board
members generally felt that this was a visible sign of commitment to promoting diversity within
the society despite the observation that there had been a lack of commitment hitherto. Starr will draft a formal charge. The recommendations of the committee received by the Board are not necessarily being endorsed but should be resubmitted for discussion in NY.

**Motion #3: Starr moved that the Diversity Committee be reestablished as a standing committee. The motion was seconded and unanimously passed.**

**j. Public Policy Committee (Starr)**

It was recommended that the Public Policy Committee be congratulated for writing the response to the Iraqi National Museum looting and cultural properties issues in that country.

**k. Standards (Herschman)**

Clemson University will host the website for the Standards Committee. Members of the committee are reviewing ARLIS occasional papers to decide which ones are relevant to standards in order to write annotations and try to get them indexed in Library Literature and Art Index. The committee’s website will be used to build a "clearinghouse" for standards.

4:00 - Break

4:10

**9. Headquarters and management**

**Headquarters report (Clarke)**

Clarke would like to submit a general update report to the membership.

**New developments at Clarke & Associates Inc. (Clarke)**

McPherson Management has purchased Clarke & Associates. The two companies have had a long term relationship and share the same philosophy. Clarke expects that the relationship with ARLIS/NA will not change. Clarke will remain chief executive officer. The company name and e-mail address will probably change in the near future. A part-time human resources person has been hired for the Ottawa office.

The FCC has established new rules requiring the consent of members to receive FAXes. Clarke proposes that a line on the membership form ask for that consent.

**Action:** Clarke will announce the new FCC FAX privacy rule to the ARLIS membership and develop a FAX consent line on the Membership form.

**Action:** All Board Members will sign a permission form to enable them to receive FAXes.

**Legal relationship of ARLIS/NA to its Chapters – Baltimore follow-up (Clarke)**
Article VIII of the ARLIS/NA Bylaws states that the chapters are affiliates of the Society. The Chapter Bylaws are identical to ARLIS/NA’s but the legal relationship is still not clear. One expert Clarke consulted said that ARLIS/NA could incorporate the chapters on their behalf and secure a tax exemption for them. Chapter members would have to be members of ARLIS/NA, but not the other way around. Clarke has consulted a lawyer who is a specialist in non-profit associations who could do legal work for us. Starr asked whether the above process would include affiliate legal benefits. It is good that we publicly list our affiliates, however, as affiliates, the chapter officers are currently responsible for actions of the association. Formal incorporation would have the benefit of making them responsible only for their local chapter. All chapters could incorporate in one place or in different states. Presently ARLIS/NA is incorporated in Washington, D.C. Starr is expecting to receive some materials explicating the options.

The society Bylaws need to clarify explicitly the relationship between ARLIS/NA and the chapters. Appropriate forms will need to be filled out.

It was indicated that the potential new relationship might have implications for dues. It was suggested that an assigned task force examine a number of options/models for the relationship and send them to the membership for discussion.

**Action:** Task Force of the Board, consisting of Brown, Heagy, Starr, Teel and Townsend with Clarke taking the lead, will clarify the relationship of ARLIS/NA and the regional chapters, providing guidelines for the chapters and examining a variety of models/options and obtain legal advice as necessary to define this relationship and determine liability. It will provide a summary report to the Board for consideration. **Deadline:** April 14, 2004.

Permission was granted for Clarke to purchase a book on the issue.

**Corporate membership packages (Clarke)**

When forms, brochures, and fee structures are revised, Clarke will put package together for outreach to solicit additional members.

5:30 – The meeting was adjourned for the day

---

**Wednesday, August 27**

**Hunt Room, Hamilton Hall**

9:30

**10. Finances (Heagy)**

**2003 budget**
Heagy is projecting $320,000 total revenue and $264,000 total expenses for the year, which is $88,000 under the original prediction of expenses. The resulting net income is $54,000. Conference budgeting is quite unpredictable and therefore cannot be counted on to supplement the annual budget. The CPAC’s need to be conservative. Since there is a projected surplus this year Heagy is troubled by using budget outcomes to raise dues. Starr, however, thinks there ought to be a reserve fund of 100% of operating expenses and it is currently half that.

2004 budget

The total membership is projected to be the same next year as this year but may change if dues are restructured. The conference budget assumes tours will be completely full which has never happened before. There is some question about the Wilson revenue line which will be looked into. The Publication Committee income projections seem high. The question of whether to have them include Ebsco income was raised but it was agreed it couldn’t be done at this point. With updated conference projections, the total revenue goes from $379,000 to $410,000. There are no anticipated additional expenses. It was suggested that Update postage revenue be separated out since that is supposed to offset mailing costs. The need to be able to judge the budgetary impact of electronic access to publications was noted. An honorarium for the Art Document Editor was proposed. Budget corrections: ALA dues line cancelled and the Southern Regional travel allotment was reduced to $1300 from $1700. A question was raised about the Wittenborn Committee’s requested expense for shipping books. The committee has not yet been formed for 2004 and the 2003 committee has not yet spent anything so it was assumed that expense request is probably a misunderstanding. The budgeted amount was reduced to zero. It was asserted that the board should not approve a budget with a deficit unless it is prepared to absorb it, i.e. it should not be assumed that the deficit will turn around at the end of the year.

Special funding requests

Heagy drafted a letter to the Southeast Chapter indicating that its request for $500 for a regional conference had been denied, since according to the by-laws’ guidelines, chapter conference expenses are not eligible for special funding and regional conferences require more than one chapter involvement. However, $250 is available as honoraria for non-ARLIS speakers at the conference.

The Texas/Mexico Chapter has requested $500 to have the chapter website be translated into Spanish. The possibility of translating the membership form and the ARLIS/NA homepage as well, was raised. It was suggested that the chapter should negotiate the cost with the possibility of getting a lower price. The question of why this is being done at all and what we hope to accomplish by doing it was raised. Among the points expressed in the discussion were both the desire to present an image of an international, diverse organization and the attempt to attract additional members. It was emphasized that the business of the Society is transacted in English. It was proposed that just the chapter involved translate its site, but some felt that there was some public relations value as well as welcoming value in also doing a few of the national webpages. It was also suggested that we offer to put French or Spanish speakers in touch with members who might be able to help them at conferences. Concern was expressed both about appearing to be patronizing and the possible great expense involved in translating the pages. Some support was given to the idea of the local chapters doing what they want. It was suggested that colleagues from Mexico be asked their opinion about the translation.
The Board approved the request with the instruction to try and get it done for a lower cost.

**Action:** Clarke will look into the cost of the translation of the new membership form into French and Spanish.

The ARLIS/NA – VRA $1500 request will be put in 2004 budget line.

Clarke questioned whether credit card fee could be charged to the consumer. Starr thought that this was not a good idea.

Starr proposed that the sponsorship of the leadership breakfast should be changed to $5500 and that session sponsorship be raised to $9000.

The net income projection after all of the adjustments is $20,927

Heagy commended Roper for getting money from recalcitrant vendors.

The Policy Manual says any income overage in excess of $10,000 gets put into the Internship Fund. Right now the excess is in operating funds, which should be adjusted. Any investment income is spread among all the Equity Funds.

**Motion #4:** Starr moved that the 2004 Budget be approved as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

**Finance Committee**

Nothing to report.

**Advertising (Clarke)**

Most, Starr, Townsend, and Clarke were charged with putting together a plan for conference advertising. An all encompassing package has been put together by Clarke which she will send to the Board. There has been a decrease in advertising revenues since 1999 as well as a decrease in conference sponsorship except for 2001 (probably because of the Getty).

Clarke is proposing two sponsorship levels, Silver for $5000 and Gold for $10,000.

Travel awards and exhibit spaces are separated out. The packages would appeal more to larger vendors; smaller ones would still probably buy advertising separately. The packages should be sent out early so that the cost could be budgeted for by the companies. Tickets to social events could be sticky. While there are still some questions of offerings, it was felt that those could be ironed out later. Solicitation would be on an annual basis. Townsend said if implemented, coordination would have to be strict to avoid additional contacts with the vendors. Travel awards might want to be included. Business memberships will need to be included. Exhibit tables might also have to be added. We might have to possibly add smaller packages later if response requires it. Starr proposed creating a separate business form with check-off boxes about what they would want to schedule during the year, e.g. advertising, booth, etc. The vendor list is small so starting off slowly is a good idea.
Action: Clarke will send out package for further Board comment and discussion.

The Board approved moving forward on this.

Development and fundraising

The text for the Society Circle brochure needs editing. The Development Committee is creating a list of prospects for membership in the circle.

Speakers fund

Nothing to report

Use of funds designated as “restricted”

Nothing to report.

Noon

Box lunches will again be delivered midday. There will be no formal lunch break.

12:30

11. Membership

a. Membership statistics (Roper)

There was a question of when renewals apply to the following year: October 1 is on the form and is the official date, although, Jacoby said that it was August 1. The year of application is on the form. The mounting of the form on the website should be coordinated to reflect the year for which you are paying. October 1 was the agreed upon date. The membership form and the management calendar should be edited to reflect this date. Notification of new passwords upon renewal serves as renewal confirmation. Roper/Claire will explore trying to develop program for batch or automatic e-mails to renewed members giving new password.

Action: The administrative documents editor and the Membership Committee chair should put on the management calendar the date for the revision of the membership application form which reflects the new policy.

Clarke asked what the optimum membership maximum might be. Starr guessed 1300-1400 members. A discussion of declining membership ensued. Some people do not renew unless they go to the annual Conference. Sometimes lapsed members participate actively since renewals are not necessarily monitored. Also, chapter members are not always required to become members of ARLIS/NA. The decrease might be a reflection of the current economic/demographic situation. It was suggested that the successful special renewal drive by the Membership Committee be duplicated next year.
b. Membership issues (Heagy/Puchalski/Townsend)

i. Simplification of membership structure

A proposal to reduce the number of membership levels to seven. The Individual/Basic membership fee would not be geared to income but would be a flat fee of $85. Clarke thinks that gearing the fee to income as the society has been doing might be in violation of privacy laws. Heagy has done an analysis of implications based on losing no members as a result of the change. The consolidation would benefit 61% of the members and be a detriment to 39% mostly low income members. The total society income would be about the same as this year. Clarke thinks we should consider increasing fees on a possible three-year schedule to cover inflation. Heagy is concerned about a reaction related to the fact that the organization is in the black. It was suggested that the Sustaining member category be abolished. The retired/student/unemployed would pay the same fee of $45. Overseas members would be charged basic dues with an option to pay a surcharge for air mailing costs. Institution and Business Affiliate would be one level and would be kept at $145. The Subscriber level would be removed.

Membership category changes need to be approved by a two-thirds majority of the members while dues increases must be approved by a majority. Therefore there is a problem in having it in place when the fall membership renewal package goes out by mid-September. Townsend plans to present it at the Conference to the Membership Committee which should discuss it. The proposal needs to come from the Committee. The provision of institutional members naming individual representative to receive mailings needs to be reviewed.

The possibility of charging for DSRT participation was raised. Discussion of this issue was postponed and regional representatives asked to bring it up with their constituents discuss in advance.

**Action:** Townsend will send documentation regarding proposed membership structure to Board. Deadline: October 1.

ii. Form redesign

Action: Roper will modify the online electronic membership form to clarify the distinction between individual and institutional members and to select a preferred address for posting. She will send proposed changes to the Membership Committee and Townsend for review and approval. Deadline: September 30.

iii. Dues restructuring

See i. above.

iii. Bylaws revision

Action: Townsend will charge the Membership Committee to review articles II and III of the by-laws and draft amendments for discussion at conference. Deadline: January 1
12. ARLIS/NA web site (Clarke, Starr)

Townsend asked Clarke Associates to again review the site including content and design. Starr proposed that a subcommittee of the Publications Committee look at this issue.

**Action:** A task force will be established consisting of Brown, Herschman, Starr, and two members of the Publications Committee to be named to review the content and design of the website and develop a plan for revision.

13. Chapters issues (Graney/Frechette/Puchalski/Schwartz/Teel)

The ARLIS/NA Western Regional Conference held July 31 - Aug 3, 2003 in Portland was a great success. Sixty people attended and they realized a small profit which was distributed among chapters equally. Montana is not in any region and is applying for inclusion in the Mountain West chapter.

Frechette reported that Ohio Valley will meet Oct 3. and Central Plains Oct. 10.

**Action:** Regional representatives should send short reports on chapter meeting attendance to the Board list.

1:45 Break

14. Divisions, Sections, Roundtables issues (Brown)

The Visual Resources Division moderator has resigned and Susan Miller, the vice-moderator has stepped in to fill the position.

The GLIRT website will be maintained even though the webmaster is moving to another institution.

RISS wants to create a list of free web sites and wants to know whether it can be posted on the ARLIS/NA site. The issue should be taken up by the Webpages Task Force. The decision depends on the hosting ability of the group preparing the portal.

The ALA Arts Section Liaison has raised the issue of who should update the list of forthcoming conferences and ARLIS liaisons to be sent to ALA.

a. Public libraries (Frechette)

Frechette would like to create a Roundtable if the freeze on new ones has been lifted. Meetings could be scheduled at same time as Divisions meet. She would like to have it listed on the membership form.
Action: Townsend will propose a forum be scheduled at the NY Conference to explore the future of public librarians in the structure of ARLIS/NA.

15. Rethinking Roundtables (Townsend)

It was agreed that the DSRT structure will remain in place for the time being and that the moratorium on the establishment of new Roundtables decided at the pre-conference Board Meeting in Baltimore be lifted. Discussion groups should become roundtables if they want to be assured of scheduling during the conference. A statement of purpose should be required when a group submits a request for Roundtable status.

Action: Starr, Teel, and Brown will create guidelines for the creation and dissolution of Roundtables for the policy manual by Pre-Conference for Board review. Deadline: April 14.

16. Review open action items (Townsend)

The action items were reviewed.

17. New business

a. New Strategic Plan (Brown)

Brown will be appointing a chair for the Task Force for a New Strategic Plan soon so that the person can get feedback in New York and prepare a plan for approval by the Board before Houston. Various past models were discussed – there is no prescribed process. Clarke expressed surprise that it wasn’t a Board led activity with some key outsiders. Brown suggested a shorter time frame, i.e. a 3-year plan rather than a 5-year plan, be considered for implementation. Starr suggested that it might be a way to involve past board members. There is a forum scheduled in NY.

The next mid-year board meeting is tentatively scheduled for July 26, 27 in Calgary.

b. AWS & online surveys (Townsend/Brown)

i. NALSS (N. American Lantern Slide Survey)

Townsend was proposing to simplify the survey and the way information is extracted. Crosley said that the Rodda/Snow proposal was complex and would be costly. Townsend has been trying to mediate between the parties. However, there is a need for us to do surveys from time to time and we might want to set guidelines and determine costs for doing them. The question of whether or not there exists off-the-shelf software was raised again.
Action: Herschman will obtain information about possible useful survey packages.

c. Mid-year meeting

Brown proposed that the 2004 mid-year Board meeting be in Calgary July 26-27.

18. Adjourn (Townsend)

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 pm.