Executive Board Meeting, Wednesday, September 5, 2007
Meeting conducted via conference call: 3pm CT

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

1.) Awards Manual and Calendar
   a.) Funding Requests
   As brought up in our last meeting, do we really want to limit funding requests so that no funding can go to entertaining award recipients? It was suggested that we could limit entertainment to one funding request per committee.

   Because the current policy does not allow this special funding, we would need to change the policy manual. Scott pointed out that our current financial situation does not allow for this sort of request. If one committee is given funding, all will have to be eligible. Could we add the phrase “if funding allows?” Scott notes that the requests could become significant given the number of committees.

   The suggestion was made that awardees could be invited to come to a Society event that they may not otherwise be entitled to come to, but since they must already be coming to the Convocation and Reception, it’s not certain that this perk would add much to their experience.

   At end of discussion, agreed to leave the policy the way it is, given that there is no money available and offering the possibility would be unsupportable.

   b.) Wittenborn Committee and the issue of rotating this committee among the chapters
   If the Wittenborn selection were to rotate, where do we start and what would the rotation be? It was suggested that the Chapters’ Coordinator could talk to chapters to get a rotation schedule going.

   The issue of unequal representation is brought up. Smaller chapters would have a disproportionate role. It was noted also that some members of ARLIS/NA are not members of chapters. The suggestion was made that we still rotate the selection regionally, but not by chapter. Perhaps the chapter could oversee the process, but include any ARLIS/NA member who is in the relevant geographical area.

   The value of doing it by chapter is that the process is transparent and predictable. It may be possible to set up a rotation schedule that frequents the more populated chapters more often. It was decided to get input from the chapter chairs. Also to implement a rotation based on membership number, we would need to get a sense of how many members are in each geographical region. This will be possible once MemberClicks is up.

ACTION ITEM 24:
Cate Cooney, as Chapters’ Coordinator will open up the discussion of how chapters might rotate this duty with the chapter chairs. Since some chapters have more members, perhaps they could have a more frequent rotation slot. Deadline: Before Mid-Year Meeting

2) Summer Minutes
Price will send the summer meeting minutes via email, so that there can be a motion to vote and a vote taken.

3) Membership Structure Proposal
a). Returning to the question of whether the list should be open to all or restricted to members only
A strong argument for restricting access is that it can be seen as a benefit of membership. The networking enabled by the list is a huge benefit for members. In addition, there are tangible costs to the Society, so restricting it to those who contribute makes sense. In addition, the Membership Committee showed in their restructuring document that we don’t offer a lot of benefits to our membership.

On the other hand, in this age of open communication and Web 2.0, it seems counterintuitive to restrict access. It’s a great way for students and non-members to learn about the society. The question of the real value of the content on the list is raised. It is a good networking tool, but by and large the content is not particularly high in value.

It was suggested that if we keep the list open to anyone, that we do need to provide another means of communication (e.g., blog) for members that does add value to the membership. Our members have stated clearly that they want other means of communication.

It was decided to keep the list open to all, but to actively investigate and implement other channels to allow meaningful communication with the Society.

b). Other points of the membership proposal
Take round tables off the membership benefits’ list

It was moved to have a vote on whether the Round Tables should be removed from the formal structure of ARLIS/NA and become informal interest groups. The motion was put forward, seconded and voted on. Passed unanimously.

c). Changes to the dues structure; i.e., an increase in fees
Though no one wants to raise the fees, it seems an inevitable and necessary step. Dues have not increased since 1998. It was suggested that at our mid-year meeting we could work out a revised fee structure. Increases to the due structure should also be seen in relation to the improved services we are putting in place (Memberclicks, blog, focus on technology (Geek Squad)).
Discussion returned to the issue of the discount for post June 1 renewals. It was felt that this unnecessarily complicates the dues situation and the rationale for this change isn’t clear to the board. The membership committee’s proposal suggests that this is for “good will.” In general the board feels that the change isn’t worth any good will it might engender and it potentially opens up the idea of deliberately waiting to renew in order to get a discount.

It was noted that this must be done at mid-year because of the need to set out budget and the need to send out membership renewals soon.

**ACTION ITEM 25**
Price and Nasserden will take our revisions and reactions back to the Membership Committee. Deadline: before Mid-year meeting

**ACTION ITEM 26**
Ultan Boudewyns will talk to Elizabeth Clarke about the idea of discounting late renewals. Deadline: before Mid-year meeting

4) Pre-conference and post-conference meeting schedule in Denver
The programming for the conference includes tours on Thursday afternoon, workshops on Friday, sessions on Saturday, Sunday, and Monday, and more tours on Tuesday. When do we want to meet?

There is a desire on the part of board members to reduce the number of nights required at the conference. To accomplish this, it was suggested that we have a full day pre-conference meeting on Friday and then a partial day post-conference meeting on Tuesday. Or the post-conference meeting could be eliminated and done by conference call or email later in the week. It was noted that it is good for the new board to meet one another and begin to jell. A dinner on Monday night might allow for this. It was questioned whether this allows enough time to bring together the threads of the conference. Usually the planning co-chairs present a wrap-up to the board. It was noted though that this is often just a confirmation of the number of registrants and that the real report follows.

5) Publications for sale
Koskinen explains that in June/July, Roger and the Publications committee had the idea of purchasing 250 copies (25 cloth and 225 soft cover) from Scarecrow Press of the *Occasional Paper: Art Museum Libraries and Librarianship* for approximately $9000.00. 250 is the minimum number necessary to receive a 25% discount from the distributor. These copies could be resold by our own Headquarters, profiting ARLIS/NA. They would be sold at full price to non-members and at 15-20% discount to members. It could be viewed as a benefit of membership although members already get the 15% discount. (The member discount of 15% is available indefinitely from Scarecrow Press.) If we were able to sell all of them, the lowest net yield would be about $1180.
It was noted that to date, 1000 copies had been produced (750 paper and 250 cloth bound). 486 paper had been sold and 170 cloth had been sold.

The Publications Committee felt that if we sold them via AWS we’d have to offer a higher discount than Scarecrow offers. This would eat into our profit margin. Offering this through HQ would represent a significant increase in that our current offerings are just Occasional Papers which provide only a small revenue stream. The Publications Committee wonders if it is worth our while to do this?

Discussion is deferred until our mid-year meeting

5) Other issues
a). Did we resolve the CAA mailing list issue?

b) Schaub has a question that she will bring to the group via email next week.

c) Nasserden has a question about the awards process, but she will begin by going to the Melva Dwyer Committee for clarification.

d) Whiteside will be sending info about MemberClicks to our email inboxes.

Meeting Adjourned 5:18 pm
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