MINUTES

ARLIS/NA Mid-year Executive Board Meeting Calgary, Canada July 26-27, 2004

Present: Elizabeth Clarke, Executive Director; Jeanne Brown, President; Allen Townsend, Past President; Margaret Webster, Vice-President/President-Elect; Lynda White, Treasurer; Judith Herschman, Secretary; Suzy Frechette, Midwest Reg. Rep.; Jonathan Franklin, Canadian Rep.; Laura Schwartz, Southwest Reg. Rep.; Carol Graney, Northeast Reg. Rep.; Peggy Keeran, West Reg. Rep. Also attending: Vicky Roper, Association Administrator.

Monday July 26

1. The meeting was called to order by Brown. Robert’s Rules of Order will be followed.
4. Announcements

a. Thanks to Elizabeth for hosting the lovely party on Sunday evening.

b. Robert’s Rules of Order – Follow modified Rules of Order. Keep track of discussion in order to document thought behind decisions and be able to record exploration of issues. Names will not be included in order to encourage free expression. Please raise hand to be recognized.

c. Meal arrangements

Lunch will be served in the meeting room and we will meet 6:45 in lobby for dinner.

d. Agenda revisions

5. Approval of minutes

Motion 1: That the NY Pre-conference minutes be approved as amended. Approved unanimously.

Motion 2: That the NY Post-conference minutes be approved as amended. Approved unanimously
6. Conferences/Meetings

a. New York (Webster)

We did not meet room block, although we had expected to, perhaps because of no shows and people sharing rooms. We opted not to buy rooms but pay the $5000 penalty which was the cheaper option. A report has been posted on the Board Only portion of the website.

b. Houston 2005 (Schwartz)

CPAC has met and reviewed program proposals which consist of 24 sessions, 12 tours, and 6 workshops Dr. Fred Heath, Vice Provost and Director of University of Texas Libraries will be a plenary speaker and address issues of interest to Art Librarians. We might want to ask him in advance about publishing his talk in Art Documentation. Discussion of when to schedule Board meetings occurred and it was agreed to make it a day later, i.e. Friday rather than Thursday. Future conferences might do the same and make contracts for six rather than seven days. Concern was expressed about the possible impact this change might have on the ability to meet room block requirements. Conference scheduling problems and considerations were discussed.

Exhibits are scheduled for different days than in the past. The Convocation will be held at Rice and the reception at the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston.

c. Banff 2006 (Webster, Franklin)

Webster had extensive discussions with the three of the four co-chairs. A planning website will be put up. It was proposed that, because of the location, this might be a different kind of conference - almost like a symposium format. Perhaps we should concentrate on basics, e.g. core competencies, strategic planning.

A question arose about the room block and it seems that room-nights up to three days before and three days after the conference will count towards the room block. The room block has been reduced to 1000 because of an expected lower attendance. We must meet 81% of the rooms. There will be a shuttle from the airport to Banff.

A personal planning document is being created to help people understand the
costs and logistics.

d. 2008 proposal from the Midstates Chapter, proposing Indianapolis

A good proposal was submitted revealing the commitment of the local ARLIS/NA members and describing many exciting possibilities in Indianapolis.

Motion 3: That the Indianapolis Conference Proposal for 2008 from the Midstates Chapter be accepted. 8 approved, 1 absent

Preliminary planning for the Indianapolis hotel and site needs to be done by Headquarters as soon as possible to determine the feasibility of holding a conference here.

e. Midyear 2005 (Webster)

Webster is investigating the logistics involved in having the Board meeting in Ithaca, possibly at the Statler Hotel on campus. While somewhat difficult to get to, there is a limousine service from Syracuse and other points. July 22-23 was proposed as potential dates. Ithaca is a beautiful place in summer.


The issue of whether ARLIS/NA conferences need to have a continuing education focus in order for librarians to justify attendance to their institutions was raised. Fees are charged for workshops but could there be free sessions which fulfill these objectives. Perhaps different models and different levels of addressing issues could be investigated in order to provide the kind of substantive information that one can take back to work. Addressing current concerns of their governing institutions, such as assessment, would be important and these could be in the form of both paid workshops and general sessions. Ask ARLIS/NA sessions in the beginning were often good sharing sessions, but they ultimately became indistinguishable from regular panel discussions and so have not been held recently. We might also look at bringing people/experts from outside of ARLIS/NA. The consensus was that we must address the interests of the stakeholders, i.e. institutions.

Common Ground sessions in St. Louis consisted of a panel session, a seminar, and a workshop which addressed the theme from different
perspectives and in different formats. They were useful for people at different levels.

Need to get a better idea of what people need to know, i.e. to better identify topics and professional development not offered by our institutions, particularly smaller ones. Different levels of need have to be met.

Conference programming for professional development should be informed by the core competencies document when completed. Program proposals should include an explanation of how sessions relate to the core competencies and the strategic plan. This discussion led to the question of whether ARLIS should establish a certification program or not. Such programming could be a part of a certification program. Certification would be a logical extension of the establishment of core competencies and the Professional Development Committee is the appropriate group to address it.

1. Action: Clarke will look into 501c3 issue and what kinds of certification such as CEU’s might impact ARLIS/NA non-profit status. Deadline Pre-conference

2. Action: Graney will ask PDC to investigate the issue of certification. Deadline September 30.

Management Issues Roundtable might also be interested in the certification issues.

3. Action: Schwartz and Webster will look at revising the Conference Planning Manual to provide guidance for program planning incorporating the suggestions made by the Board. Deadline Pre-Conference

7. Chapters

a. Chapter relations models (Clarke)

Clarke distributed a draft document which outlines a chapter affiliation agreement and puts forth recommendations. It was suggested that the Board needed a draft which explained each option and its cost-effectiveness.

4. Action: Webster will chair a task force consisting of Clarke, the Canadian and regional representatives to create a document which presents the costs and benefits of the chapter affiliation options/models. Deadline October 15.

5. Action: Clarke will provide the task force on chapter relations the cost of liabilities insurance and incorporation. Deadline September 15.

d. ARLIS/NA/Canada Bylaws revisions (Franklin)

The change allows for the nomination of local chapter members as
representatives to ARLIS/Canada.

Motion 4: That the recommended changes to the Canadian Bylaws be approved. Approved unanimously.

c. Chapter Officers’ breakout at Leadership Breakfast

This will be an opportunity to share information, issues, and problems across chapters. Since many of the chapter chairs will not make it to the conference, minutes will have to be taken and sent to the absentees. Representatives might want to provide models of reports, etc. Ask officers to send in agenda items in advance in order to identify experts who may address the issues of concern.

6. Action: Keeran and Franklin will create an agenda for the chapter officers’ breakout meeting at the conference. Deadline February 1.

Will evaluate after the conference and add dates to management calendar.

7. Brown will add planning dates for Chapter officer’s breakout to the Management Calendar.

d. Chapter Issues

Discussion of additional matters were tabled until after the Chapter affiliations issue is resolved.

Denver will be hosting the 2004 MW chapter conference from September 30-October 2.

6. Administrative Documents Editor (Brown)

The Board discussed the proposal from the current Administrative Documents Editor that the position be abolished. Conference Proceedings need to be edited but it is possible to have someone added to the conference planning team to do the editing. Perhaps the Conference Planning Manual can be edited after the Conference by the CPAC or an assigned member, as well. A regular review cycle might be set up to review entire document for consistency. Policy Manual changes need to be made by
the Board and can be submitted directly to the web editor.

The Conference Proceedings and Society Handbook and Directory of Members are the chief documents that need editors. A person with that responsibility and the title of Conference Documents Editor needs to be added to Conference Planning teams.

Motion 5: That the position of Administrative Documents Editor be abolished as of July 1, 2004, as recommended by the current editor, Ted Goodman. Approved 8 for, 1 against.

Motion 6: That the Executive Board officially commend the work of the former Administrative Documents Editor, Ted Goodman, and thank him for his assistance and expertise. Approved unanimously.

Action 8: Brown will submit for Board approval the revision of the Policy Manual to reflect the abolition of the Administrative Documents position. Deadline September 15.

Action 9: Schwartz will follow up on appointing a person responsible for editing the conference documents and will revise the Conference Planning Manual to incorporate the position into future Conference Planning. Deadlines September 1 and Pre-conference.

It was agreed that the past president will annually review the Policy Manual for consistency.

Discussion of editing responsibility of the Handbook and Membership Directory was postponed until after the Membership Database Task Force presents its report. Franklin volunteered in the event that an editor is needed.

8. By-laws changes vote (Herschman)

The total number of ballots submitted was 226. Proposals I, II, III all passed unanimously. Proposal IV had 214 votes for and 12 against.

Action 10: Herschman will submit Bylaw changes to the Web Editor. Deadline August 1.

Action 11: Brown will draft e-mail to announce the results of the Bylaw vote. Deadline August 5.

Action 12: Brown will write an article on the Bylaw changes for Update.
8. Committees and Task Forces

g. Committee composition (Brown)

The suggestion was made to remove Board Liaison as counted member of a committee so that an extra person could be appointed. There used to be a provision that two new members would be appointed each year and the enforcement of that guideline might be renewed. Recruitment needs to be active. New ARLIS/NA members need to be encouraged to join committees, perhaps some as interns. The rule of term limits for committee members was removed from Policy Manual some time ago and perhaps should be reconsidered.

Motion 7: That Board Liaisons are no longer counted as part of the maximum number of committee members. Approved unanimously.

Action 13: Brown will revise the Policy Manual to reflect the change in membership composition. Deadline September 15.

Action 14: The vice president will develop agenda item for leadership breakfast breakout to present a proposal for committee membership possibilities for discussion at the Post Conference Board meeting. Deadline February 1.

h. Awards Committee (Frechette)

The chair of the umbrella Awards Committee reports that everything is working all right in his opinion. It was suggested the subcommittee chairs be surveyed for their opinions. There are some inconsistencies in the reporting structure which need fixing. Some subcommittees expressed the need to have separately scheduled meetings which was the original intention.

Action 15: Frechette will survey subcommittee chairs to determine whether they think the new structure is working and produce a document with pros and cons. Deadline Pre-conference.

Webster will inquire at the Leadership Breakfast about the desire for self-scheduling of meetings

i. Travel Awards
Requests for new travel awards were made from the Diversity Committee and Visual Resources Division. ARLIS/NA currently offers two $500 travel awards to individual members who serve as committee moderators or chapter officers in order to encourage conference participation. In lieu of accepting the Committee’s request for a $1000 ARLIS/NA-funded award, it was recommended that one of the current $500 awards be repurposed to subsidize an underrepresented minority student from the region or chapter hosting the annual conference, based on the DC/MD/VA Chapter diversity attendance model introduced at the Baltimore Conference. If appropriate applicants for this award do not present themselves to the Travel Award Subcommittee, the award would revert back to its original purpose. It was also proposed that the Diversity Committee will participate in the publicity. The VRD request was not accepted based on the Board’s reluctance to limit awards to specific divisions, sections, or roundtables as a matter of policy.

Action 16: Townsend will notify the Diversity Committee of the rejection of their travel award request. Deadline August 5

Action 17: Webster will notify the VRD of the rejection of their travel award request. Deadline August 5.

Action 18: Frechette will ask the Awards Committee chair and Travel Awards subcommittee co-chairs to examine the number of ARLIS/NA travel awards and the amounts attached to them, (2 awards of $500 each) to determine whether they are still realistic and whether there are other options such as one award at $1000, and to make recommendations to the Board. She will also let Travel Awards committee know that the Board approved the proposed changes concerning the Karno award. Deadline September 30.

Motion 8: That, in consideration of the Diversity Committee’s Conference Attendance Award request, one of the ARLIS/NA-funded $500 Travel Awards be offered to a student from an underrepresented group from the region of the conference host chapter in 2005. If there are no qualified applicants, the ARLIS/NA Award will revert back to the current guidelines for the awards. The Board will review this decision at the Houston post-conference meeting. Approved unanimously.
The Karnos put forth the following proposals: that the management calendar reflect a change in the application timetable, that the criteria for the award be expanded to include Latin American Librarians from any country, and that ads for the award be written in both Spanish and English.

Action 19: Townsend will inform Karnos of the Board acceptance of their proposals. Deadline August 15

d. Development Committee

i. Issues (White)

The committee has been working to update the list of prospects, guidelines, and other tools used by its members. Their goal is to have those ready and assignments communicated by mid to late September.

ii. Report on Corporate Sponsorship (Townsend)

The Development Committee response to the report was that there may be few candidates for Sponsorship at the suggested levels and perhaps the amounts should be lower. Townsend asked permission to approach historically big supporters of ARLIS/NA and offer them this year some extras not received before like website presence.

Action 20: Clarke will prepare a document which details the value of features offered at different levels of sponsorship. Deadline August 27

Action: 21: Clarke will prepare a list of institutions which we invoice more than $1000 a year with the amounts they spend and send it to Townsend and Brown. Deadline mid-August.

iii. Fundraising and Development Goals (White and Townsend)

The total development goal for this year is $46,500, including a goal for Conference Sponsorship of $23,000. Townsend is spearheading the drive for goods and services as reflected in the new corporate sponsorship packages. There is a need to make more efficient the wonderful support we get and to promote further support. In addition, we need to increase visibility and do some marketing at affiliated societies conferences. For example, the Canadian Library Association is meeting in Calgary in July, 2005 and we might try to approach vendors there.

e. Diversity (Townsend)
Townsend announced the recent diversity-related award to the American Library Association’s Office for Diversity by the Institute of Museum and Libraries Services, which will offer library students and library professionals from underrepresented groups funding for educational and professional development training options. The Diversity Committee is hopeful that ARLIS/NA might somehow be the recipient of some portion of this funding initiative.

f. Finance Committee (White)

i. Policy Manual Section J (Finance)

The committee met in NY and decided to move our bank money market funds to Schwab. White and Webster were charged with investigating other investment options. White recommended investing in index funds such as those run by Vanguard. Although the Treasurer will implement these changes, she will consult with the chair of the Finance Committee first.

Action 22: White will set up an index fund investment with the funds now in the Money Market. Deadline August 15.

Section J 3 of the Policy Manual was revised to increase the endowment in order to realize adequate returns.

Motion 9: That Section J (Finance) of the ARLIS/NA Policy Manual be revised as recommended by the Finance Committee. Approved unanimously.

Action 23: White will send the revised section J to the website Deadline August 15.

g. International Relations Committee (Herschman)

There was an e-mail exchange between the treasurer and the IR Committee Chair about not paying the $300 needed to be an institutional member of IFLA.

Action 24: Herschman will request a written report from IRC documenting the rational for discontinuing membership in IFLA. Deadline September 15.

h. Membership Committee (Keeran)
The new membership form was reviewed. The Board recommended the following change of wording: “Please check this box if you would like to conserve resources by not receiving a printed copy of the directory.”

Action 25: Keeran will inform the Membership Committee of the recommended wording change for the membership form and to thank Janine Henri for her work. August 15.

Action 26: Henri will send to Roper the wording changes on the Membership Form and Roper will post changes to the online form. September 15.

i. Nominating Committee (Brown)

The proposed slate for next year was discussed. In particular, the issue of having two nominees and therefore, three people from one institution on the Board at the same time might be perceived as problematic to the membership. It was suggested that the amount of experience should not necessarily be the most important criterion for all Board positions. The Nominating Committee did solicit recommendations and narrowed the slate to one person per office.

The issue of whether a single name slate is still desirable was raised. The committee wants to send out solicitation requests before conferences so that prospective nominees can be interviewed during conference. The Bylaws require a petition of 10 names for a write-in nomination. The committee may have to alert people not selected so that they can decide about whether to mount a write-in petition. It was suggested that at some point the nominating process should be reviewed.

Action 27: Brown will go back to the Nominating Committee and convey the Board reservations about having three people from the same institution on the Board. Deadline July 30.

j. Professional Development Committee

The committee was contacted by the Standards Committee regarding standards related projects. The PDC informed the Standards Committee of the work on core competencies and also asked if a Standards Committee member would like to sit on the core competencies sub-committee to fill a recent vacancy. The Core Competencies report with revisions is expected to be ready for approval at midyear 2005. The thoughtful comments received from the survey confirm that the committee is on the right track. The mentoring sub-committee is doing a literature search and investigating programs in place in other organizations. They are planning to submit a report recommending a year-long program by mid-March 2005.

k. Public Policy (Schwartz)
The committee has kept the membership informed of developments with respect to the Digital Millennium Copyright Act.

1. Publications Committee (Franklin)

   i. Task force on AWS progress report

   Two proposals for redesign, from Ion and Q Ltd., were presented. Ion's had more detail for later phases and was structured around a Content Management System. Q Ltd's proposal was priced higher. It had more research as part of development and had better sample sites. A Content Management System may not be as important as was thought previously. The Board would like a recommendation from the Task Force concerning which redesign proposal is preferable.

   Action 28: Task Force needs to review the two proposals and make a recommendation to the Board. Deadline August 20.

   The question of using the existing Logo came up. We recommend that the Task Force retain the basic design but have the discretion to change the colors.


   The question of who reviewed the proposed papers for publication was raised. The Board would like to receive evaluations with the names of the reviewers and have the reviewers be authorities in the fields. Outside experts can be consulted as needed. We have certain requirements from the submitters, but the requirements for reviewers should be separate. The Board members would like to see more thorough and critical evaluations by the reviewers. The Publications Committee should be the gatekeeper for the Board and should not forward substandard publication proposals.

   Action 29: Franklin will request that the review committee for each occasional paper include in the documentation going to the Board the names and qualifications of reviewers and that a publication timeline be included when submitting proposals to the Board. Deadline August 15.
The Board proceeded to approve the following Occasional Paper proposals for publication:

Core Competencies and Core Curricula for Art Library and Visual Resources.

Handbook of Museum Librarianship

Action 30: Roper will investigate differences in cost based on publication size. Deadline August 15.

The proposed Salary Survey was approved for Electronic Publication.

A discussion of distribution costs of electronic format publications ensued. Shouldn’t we be sharing electronic publications with the scholarly community. We could put the Salary Survey in the Members’ Only area of the website with a summary on general page area. The Board voted 5 to 4 to make the survey freely available on the website.

It was additionally noted that the Website would be a good place to announce upcoming publications.

Action 31: Franklin will ask the Publications Committee to come up with ways of publicizing and communicating AWS initiative. Deadline August 15.

iii. EBSCO Agreement

It was acknowledged that the EBSCO agreement would provide greater visibility for Art Documentation. The need to compare the EBSCO and H.W. Wilson contract was noted.

Motion 10: that the Board approve a non-exclusive contract with EBSCO for licensing of full-text Art Documentation content contingent on review of the contract with H.W. Wilson. Approved unanimously.

Action 32: Franklin and Brown will investigate copyright issues related to electronic full-text provisions and contracts for Art Documentation contributors by looking at comparable contracts issued by similar societies. Deadline October 31.

m. Standards (Schwartz)
The committee wants to develop a core list of periodicals for Art Libraries and will need to consult with Serials Roundtable and Collection Development Discussion Group. It is working on the revamping of the Facilities Standards. Staffing standards need to be distinguished from staffing practices. The committee will need to work collaboratively with VRA to concerning standards for VR professionals.

Guidelines for products and services may emerge from some of the Houston programs. An option is for the Board or the Standards Committee to set up a task force to address the issues and establish standards.

Action 33: Brown will contact Ann Whiteside to establish a task force to address issues of product standards. Deadline August 20.

It would be useful to approach other groups to find out about other standards that have been or are being developed.

Schwartz will investigate the discussions between the Standards Committee and H.W. Wilson regarding the indexing Art Documentation and Occasional Papers. She will work with Franklin to transfer this task to the Publications Committee.

9. Summer Education Institute (Graney, Webster)

a. Report on 2004 SEI

It was reported that the first SEI was a huge success both financially and programmatically.

Motion 11: That the co-chairs, Mary Wasserman and John Taormina, and implementation team of the SEI be commended for a very successful first institute. Approved unanimously.

b. SEI 2005 and future options

Questions and suggestions regarding future SEIs were brought forward from the implementation team. A new ARLIS/NA co-chair will be appointed in the fall by Webster to fill the vacancy created by Wasserman who has served for two years already but has agreed to continue in an advisory capacity until the 2005 ARLIS/NA conference. The current co-chairs have suggested that co-chairs be appointed for 18 months to allow for overlap with new co-chairs. It was decided that the ARLIS/NA-VRA Joint Educational Task Force be dissolved as suggested by the co-chairs as their work resulting in the SEI has been completed. The SEI implementation team will continue to plan and oversee SEIs and will report directly to the ARLIS/NA Board. The site and dates of future SEIs will be decided by the implementation teams. Co-chairs will be appointed by ARLIS/NA and VRA, one from each organization, and implementation team members will be
selected and appointed by the co-chairs. The 2005 SEI will again be held at Duke University with Taormina handling local arrangements. The SEI implementation team will submit a funding request to ARLIS/NA each year.

Motion 12: That the ARLIS/NA –VRA Joint Educational Task Force be dissolved as recommended by the Task Force. Approved unanimously.

Action 34: Webster and Townsend will submit a contract for the SEI for approval by the Board. Deadline September 1.

Action 35: Webster and Townsend will draft language for the Policy Manual relating to the SEI Implementation Team after the contract for SEI is signed. Deadline within a month after contract is signed.

10. Membership Database Task Force (White)

The Task Force will meet tomorrow to discuss how the database works and what we want out of it. They are shooting for an October 1 deadline. They will need to coordinate with other relevant committees.

11. RISS (Webster)

Webster reported that the Section recommends adding the concept of instruction to its charge.

Motion 13: That the wording of the RISS charge be changed as recommended by the Committee. Approved unanimously.

12. HQ report (Clarke)

a. Membership Statistics

There is a perception that membership is down when it isn’t; we are actually in pretty good shape. There have been 30 new members since May, so the increase is not necessarily due to the New York conference, although conference attendance often impacts new memberships. Accurate membership data prior to 2002 is not available because of the condition of the database when it was transferred to Clarke.

b. Advertising
The Sponsorship packages may boost advertising. There is a general downturn in advertising revenue across the board, not just in ARLIS/NA. How do we approach potential advertisers? Headquarters phones previous advertisers to solicit new ads. We both need to review lists and try to identify new vendors not now on the list.

Action 36: Keeran will send names of potential new advertisers to Roper. Deadline August 15.

The Board meeting was adjourned for the day.

July 27, Tuesday

The Board meeting reconvened.

13. Ties with Affiliate Organizations (Brown)

a. Report on ALA affiliates lunch

Brown reported on the lunch she attended in Orlando along with about 20 other people including MLA (Music) and MLA (Medical). The Canadian Librarian Association has been working on a Strategic Plan which focuses on three areas: advocacy, professional development, and networking. Some examples of collaborations are Scarecrow Press partnering with the Music Library Association to publish, and Medical Library Association partnering with ALA to identify diverse populations to promote going into the profession.

How can we affiliate more closely with ALA? One possibility mentioned was renting an affiliate booth, which would require staffing. It was recommended that someone from management (Clarke) attend one of the ALA meetings. Local members could staff the booth with her. This would be a way to get more sponsors, advertisements, members, etc. We would need to set up a table and set aside money for it. It would be useful to collect data to evaluate/assess the activity and the return.

Action 37: White will put together a budget estimate to send Clarke to either ALA Midwinter in Boston or ALA annual meeting in Chicago and bring appropriate materials for display and distribution. Deadline September 1.

Action 38: Townsend will contact Sherman Clarke to ask if he could organize the booth volunteers for this year’s annual ALA
conference. Deadline September 15.

Should there be liaisons to ALA, specifically to connect with the sections on Arts, Cataloging, Diversity, Collections, and Technical Services or should there be a single general liaison? We probably need to make a formal appointment other than the president to explore joint projects and activities, e.g. marketing. A distinction needs to be made between liaisons concerned with professional practice and the organizational level liaison. Perhaps a past Board member would be good.

Motion 14: that ARLIS/NA create a position of liaison to ALA for a 3-year term. Approved unanimously.

Action 39: Brown in conjunction with Townsend and Webster will identify someone to be the ALA liaison for three years. Deadline October 1.

b. ARLIS/NA Affiliates (Brown)

There are no liaisons with our ARLIS/NA affiliates. Should we consider enhancing the charge of IRC to emphasize collaborative projects and activities with these affiliates? It was suggested that we need a definition of a liaison which would embrace an active component. It might be appropriate to charge the Past President with being liaison to IRC and developing collaborating projects with affiliate organizations.

Motion 15: To revise the Past President’s duties in the Policy Manual to include working with overseas ARLIS/NA groups to develop collaborative projects. The Past President will serve as the Board liaison to the International Relations Committee. Approved unanimously

Action 40: Brown will develop the wording in the Policy Manual indicating the new duties of the past president (liaison to other ARLIS/NA groups and to IRC). Deadline November 1.

c. VRA Collaboration (Brown)

Collaboration with VRA is an important activity for us. Publishing, standards, statistics, collection development are areas ripe for collaboration. This kind of collaboration is emerging as one of the main goals of the Strategic Plan.

14. Financial (White)

a. Chart of accounts revision

White will work with James to develop code definitions so that there can be more consistency and to simplify the structure of the Chart of Accounts. This will make it easier for Roper as well.
b. Treasurer’s duties: proposed policy manual revision

White distributed a revision of the Treasurer’s duties.

Motion 16: That the Treasurer’s duties section of the Policy Manual be revised as proposed by Lynda White. Approved unanimously.

Action 41: White will forward the revised language for the Treasurer’s duties to the web editor for the Policy Manual. Deadline August 6.

c. Unanticipated requests for 2004 funding

The main request is for the Website cost.

Motion 17: That the Board approve taking money from the reserve fund to fund the website redesign. Approved unanimously.

White explained some adjustments to the line accounting. Gifts and contributions are up from last year. There was an accounting question about where to put income from the Fundraising Party. It goes into the Internship Fund at the end of the fiscal year.

d. 2005 budget

The budget was reviewed, explained and corrected. We can remove balloting costs because we will be doing electronic voting. Committee expenses should be separate from special funding requests and are sometimes confused because there are two different calls with the same deadline. Committee expenses are considered part of the process of prioritizing expenditures. There were requests for brochures from ARLIS/MOQ and Professional Development which suggests that the groups should talk to each other so that they can coordinate efforts. A recruitment brochure which might be used by both the Diversity and Membership Committees might be different from a general one. The request from the Professional Development Committee was approved.

Action 42: Graney will get back to the Professional Development to have them consult with the Membership and Diversity committees to create a recruitment/career brochure. Deadline August 3.

Action 43: Roper will inform the Membership Committee about the number of General brochures still in print and discuss revision when more are needed. Deadline August 3.
Franklin suggested putting a pdf version of the brochure on the website for instant printing capability.

i. Special funding requests

The $1500 funding for SEI will be moved to the committees section of the budget. The funding was approved.

The Strategic Planning Committee request of $500 for FY04 was also approved. When the brochure is revised it will need to reflect the new mission statement and other changes.

Action 44: Keeran will alert the Membership Committee to revise the brochure incorporating new mission, website for strategic plan, and other changes. Deadline August 15.

Double requests were made for two regional meetings, indicating that there is a need for guideline review. Regional meetings should be self sustaining. Any honoraria, requested should be consistent with ARLIS/NA policy. It was reiterated that travel is not supported Special funding request guidelines will be on the agenda for the Chapter chairs meeting in Houston.

Action 45: White and Frechette will revise and expand the guidelines for Special Funding Requests for divisions, chapters, committees and roundtables and incorporate a model application. Deadline January 15

$500 for each of the 2 regional meeting requests was approved, to be paid to the hosting chapter (Mountain West and Ontario).

The ARLIS/SC request for $500 for an Artists’ Book Symposium was approved.

The Southeast Chapter request for $250 for its conference in St. Petersburg was approved. The Southwest chapter’s request for $250 toward covering expenses of the LoPresti Award was approved with the proviso that the chapter be told that this is a one-time award in acknowledgement of the thirtieth anniversary presentation of the award.

The New Art Roundtable funding request denied because it was a retrospective request.

All approved special funding requests should require a report within a month of the event about the usefulness and appropriateness for exportation to a national and/or regional event. This requirement will be reiterated in the guidelines.

The approved awards and the reports should be publicized and it was suggested that they be posted to ARLIS-L.
Action 46: Treasurer will post on ARLIS/NA-L which special funding requests have been approved after the requestors have been informed. Deadline August 15.

ii. Policy concerning deficit budget

There was a question about whether we should ever approve a deficit budget. It was agreed that as long as there is a reserve, it should be left up to each Board depending on the circumstances using the possible options of cutting expenses, tapping the reserve, or increasing revenue. There is an assumption that the Budget is fairly conservative.

iii. Houston conference budget

There was a question of whether the expectation for income from tours in Houston is too high. It was noted that the silent auction revenue estimate may be too high as well.

i. Internet room

There was a question about providing an Internet Room in Houston because there is no offsetting income. While there have been complaints in the past when it has not been provided there remains the question of who should bear the expense, the user or ARLIS/NA. Should the CPAC look for a sponsor, perhaps from a Techie firm? It was agreed to recommend to the Conference organizers that it should be contingent on funding.

ii. Speakers Fund - Endowment status and use.

The Fund is not really an endowment fund since it has only half of the amount required by Section J of the policies. There is not enough in the fund to be able to use the interest. We do get extra money from time to time but not on a regular basis. We can and have taken money out to subsidize speakers, but if we continue to use it, it will never reach the amount needed to generate sufficient interest.

Action 47: White will ask Development Committee to remove from Society Circle literature and wherever else it appears any reference to the Speaker’s Fund being an
endowment fund. Deadline August 6.

It was necessary to put payment for speakers into the conference income line to offset the expense. The bottom line cost for conference speakers was reduced to $5000.

iii. Convocation

Again, there is no offsetting income which results in a discrepancy between expected costs and income. At the reception, food and drink would have to be provided by us. It could be included in registration rather than as a separate cost but this action is too late for this year. A discussion ensued about what the priorities are for funding, e.g. workshops vs. reception. We discussed collapsing the welcome party and reception and combining the convocation and membership lunch. We were reminded that we need a certain number of functions in order to meet the hotel requirements. We possibly could provide a partial subsidy.

For this year, Houston CPAC needs to scale back.

Action 48: Schwartz will ask the Houston CPAC to scale back on food and drink and indicate that sponsorship is needed if we are to have an Internet room. Deadline August 6.

Motion 18: That the Board approve the ARLIS/NA 2005 budget as amended. Approved unanimously.

e. Dues increase 2006

Since we just restructured the membership categories and dues it might not be a good year to raise dues. Also, if we are anticipating raising the conference rates, it might be problematic. We may have to try to limit activities, like advertising or publications, or make other marketing initiatives, if we do not increase dues. The Strategic Plan might reveal other things requiring funding, as well, so we might want to reconsider this in Houston. The Board was reminded that the management company raised their fees based on inflation and we might need to do the same thing. A caveat was that such action may result in a loss in membership, especially since students dues are already considered high.

15. Strategic Plan Task Force (Brown)
The Strategic Plan Task Force reported that the preliminary survey had a total of 34 responses and, while there were no surprises, some issues were touched on enough that they seem to emerge as ideas which are coming into their own. Although 34 is not a high number, those who did respond are likely to be a very engaged 34. They will be doing another survey based on the first and will also be doing an Environmental Scan.

16. Strategic issues discussion

The strategic planning framework can be broken down to mission, goals, objectives, and action items. In order to integrate the work of the committees and DSRT’s with the plan, they will be required to submit action items annually referencing the Strategic Plan. Hopefully, this will result in keeping the Strategic Plan fresh. The issue was discussed of who will develop goals and objectives, the committees or the Strategic Planning Task Force. It was agreed that the goals and objectives would be developed by the Task Force and the action items would be determined by groups, including the Board, which would have the responsibility of realizing the goals and objectives. This will take place in Houston. Webster will need to convey the responsibility of determining action items relating to the Strategic Plan to the new chair appointments. Continual monitoring of the implementation of action items will be necessary. How to monitor and track changes and accomplishments needs to be determined but it seems reasonable that Board liaisons may be the monitors for the committees. The Strategic Plan will naturally influence budgetary planning as well.

It was noted that while the President has to address the plan in the annual report, it is after the fact. In other societies, the Board agenda always addresses the Strategic Plan. This idea was received positively for future meetings.

How should chapters relate to the planning process? If chapters have goals which feed into the Society’s plan, it could be incorporated into it. This, however, feeds into the whole chapter/national relationship issue.

Action 49: Brown will convey the sense of the Board discussion to the Strategic Plan Task Force. Deadline August 5.

a. Role of the Board

The Board discussed how the Society might deal with changes that are either perceived as needed by the membership or by the Board itself. The strategic planning may hopefully address some of these issues, but other proposals were made:

- Highlighting our members.
- Publishing a special issue of *Art Documentation* which addresses the value of Art Librarianship.
- Board identifying issues for the Society to address.
· Developing a mechanism for responding appropriately to issues which develop on ARLIS/NA-L.
· Asking existing committees to change action items to address issues in a timely fashion.
· Encouraging the partnering with other organizations and internal collaborations between different divisions and committees.
· Addressing the needs of those who are not able to attend conferences, perhaps through distance programs.
· Use new electronic communication technology to extend conference programming, e.g. videotaping sessions, providing live video teleconferencing throughout the year, etc.

The sense is that members long for substance at the Conferences, either through an ASK ARLIS/NA format or through regular sessions. Any problems Board members hear about should be passed on to the Strategic Planning Task Force to address and develop solutions. We want to encourage openness and trust within the organization.

Action 50: Roper will send the Board information on teleconferencing educational sessions from other organizations. Deadline August 3.

We will need to start budgeting for continuing education and distance learning commitments. We may encounter legal and logistical difficulties such as permissions, etc. Programs like these should be incorporated into conference planning at the point of making session proposals.

Action 51: Schwartz will consult Rawlyk about the possibility and costs of videotaping sessions at Houston. Deadline September 1.

Should we be concerned about licensing and distribution of videotapes of sessions? What aspects need to go through the Board and what can be decided independently? Perhaps we will want to use a company which would handle all of this. The Publications Committee might be the group to vet publications in any format.

The Board Liaison role may change to incorporate evaluation of activities as we proceed with the Strategic Plan. Committee chairs technically report to the President who can review the action items which then could be brought to the Board for discussion at the President’s discretion. It is essential for the liaisons to communicate with the Board in-between conferences as well as during them. We need to establish more due dates. Upon appointment, the chairs might be asked to submit action items before the pre-conference Board meeting for review on ARLIS/NA Board – L. Action items require deadlines which can be plugged into a timeline and revised when not met.

b. Society structure
Major functions need continuity, e.g. publications and standards. These might be handled better outside the committee structure and instead assigned to Board members. The question arose, as well, of whether regional representatives, who currently have dual roles, need to be Board members. It was noted that the geographical representation is important and has a functional rationale, e.g. communication. Would another model similar to the VRA, which has a board member responsible for all Communications, be better and providing a certain continuity being able to pull things together? This model would not solve the problem of continuity since board members change regularly. Someone should contact VRA to see how their structure is working. Strategy, policy, and guidelines should be a chief function of the ARLIS/NA Board and not administrative details which the committees should address. Could committees choose their own chairs? One professional society has the Board appoint the Committees and they elect their own chair. A Strategic Plan item might be to examine other models of association governance. We also might want to get some input from chapters about the regional representative structure. There exists a best practices website which describes organizations which are not just like us but which work well and Clarke will investigate this.

Action 52: Clarke will identify organizations similar in structure to ARLIS/NA and send us the url to allow Board members to look at best practices. Deadline August 4.

c. Shifts in direction

Some possible changes in ARLIS/NA’s emphasis were discussed. These shifts included distance learning, non-conference communications, advocacy, raising the visibility and promoting the value of art librarianship, and marketing the profession. Several issues to be addressed were identified: how are we different from other libraries and librarians, what are our services, how can we address the trends of closing of museum libraries and substituting generalists for art librarians. It was proposed that we could develop standard letters or white papers which can be used by the membership when needed. It was agreed that raising visibility and advocacy for the profession should be a major focus of the Society.

Top three areas to suggest for Strategic Planning in priority order with the last two tied are:

- Professional development and support
- Visibility and advocacy
- Communication and cooperation
- Standards and best practices

An assessment component should be incorporated into each area.
The President invoked her authority to set up a task force and resurrected the Statistics Task Force to review and continue the work of the previous Statistics Task Force.

Action 53: Board members will forward to Brown suggestions for members of the new Statistics Task Force. Deadline September 15.

17. New Business

Herschman will resign the Secretary’s position as of December 31.

Action 54: Brown will ask the incoming secretary if she will assume the Board position of Secretary earlier, as of Pre-Conference in Houston. Deadline December 31.

17. Review of Action Items

Some pending action items from the NY post-conference Board meeting were identified and given high priority for accomplishing.

- costs and benefits of the ARLIS/NA-chapter relation options/models.
- things connected with SEI.
- membership database.

The meeting was adjourned.

Notes:

Enacted by e-mail August 27, 2004

Motion 19: That the Board approve the recommendation of the AWS task force and engage Q Ltd to implement a re-design of the ARLIS/NA/NA web Site according to the proposal which Q Ltd. submitted. Approved unanimously.
Enacted by e-mail November 8, 2004

Motion 20: That the Board approve the funding of a student travel award for the Houston conference in the amount of $500. Approved unanimously.

Enacted by e-mail November 15, 2004

Motion 21: That ARLIS/NA approve the 2005SEI contract. Approved unanimously.