ARLIS/NA Post Conference Board Meeting
Minutes
April 30th – May 1st 2007
Atlanta, GA

Monday, April 30, 2007

Attending: Elizabeth Clarke (HQ), Cate Cooney, Sue Koskinen, Marilyn Nasserden, Rebecca Price, Fran Scott, Elizabeth Schaub, Ken Soehner, Amy Trendler, Deborah Ulan Boudewyns, Ann Whiteside

1. Call to order (Ultan Boudewyns): Deborah Ulan Boudewyns called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm.

2. Conference debriefing (All)
   a. The move to MemberClicks seemed to be appreciated by the membership and was eagerly looked forward to.
   b. Elizabeth Clarke noted we learned this year we need to pay close attention to how we administer the Society Circle event. It should be a very special for Society Circle members. Some were upset this year because of difficulties in transportation after the event. It was noted that this is particularly important as the Society Circle grows.
   c. The enthusiasm in new members was noted. New voices program was ‘transporting’ and very well attended. The board and the society as a whole should definitely plug into the energy and enthusiasm of that group.
   d. The board talked about the discontent of the exhibitors. The exhibitors called a meeting with Ann Whiteside to talk about several issues: such as, not having their names properly entered in the program, difficulty in getting away for lunch, and excessive idle hours in the Exhibit Hall. They feel that the conference sessions (with 3 or even 4 programs simultaneously scheduled while the exhibits are open) take too many visitors from their tables. As a result they feel their costs are too high for the benefits – they’re seeing too few members. Ann Whiteside reported that she met with a group of the exhibitors and they had an excellent meeting. It should be done more often. The meeting started out contentiously, but they talked through ideas and developed solutions. Whiteside felt that we helped to turn the situation around by being receptive and by working with them to find solutions to the problems. They even came up with a session idea that involves vendors. Eumie Imm-Stroukoff will be exhibits coordinator next year and she is on top of their concerns. Idle times are difficult to address, since members need to be at sessions. Many of the issues have built up over the years. Whiteside pointed out that we do have responsibility to the vendors because of what they do and all that they sponsor at each conference. It is a complex relationship though – both collegial and business. A board member suggested a vendor forum each year. We need to educate new career members so that they have a good understanding of what the vendors offer us. Ken Soehner proposed and will suggest to Eumie
Imm-Stroukoff that new members have guided tours through the vendors’ exhibits. They could talk about “How you work with vendors; What is expected at the conference?” Vendors don’t realize that new librarians are intimidated by them and unsure how to approach them. There was general agreement that a guided tour would be very good for first time attendees (and even more seasoned attendees). A board member noted the value of talking to vendors about approval plans and what they are and about databases and what they offer. We should let first time attendees know that they can learn from vendors – the vendors are here to educate, not just to sell. There was a suggestion for a proposal for a session on establishing relationships with vendors. New librarians need to know that they can make contact with vendors and not just accept from their local Acquisitions Departments that they should not make those contacts.

**Action Item 1:**

*Ken Soehner will talk with Eumie Imm-Stroukoff about the possibility of new members having guided tours through the vendors’ area in the Exhibit Hall at the Denver Conference. Deadline: June 15*

e. Elizabeth Clarke reported that a high number of attendees are getting in free of charge. There were over 100 non-paying attendees this year. Exhibitors pay a flat fee, which allows 2 people in – that number should be separated from the paying registrants number. It isn’t entirely clear whether there are vastly too many free entrants, or if we distinguished the registrant types, we’d have a better sense of the issue.

**Action Item 2:**

*Elizabeth Clarke will find out about the registrant type and the number of free entrants. Deadline: July 1*

f. The board discussed the new members at the conference. It was noted when we think of new members, we need to remember it’s not just new librarians, but first time attendees. We need to include first time attendees in the “new” group for programming. There were many good comments on the first time attendees’ orientation and the subsequent informal dinner. Ann Whiteside reported that over 35 first time attendees went to dinner with several board members.

g. Several problems with the program were noted. Some tours started earlier or later than stated in the program and people had trouble finding them. Some tours were cancelled only at the last minute. Some of the problems with the program this year resulted from too many people working on the program and that plans for next year were addressing this problem. Cancelled tours are a difficult problem because they have to pay for themselves and it’s often unclear until the last moment that there won’t be enough participants to cover them.

3. **Review of Strategic Plan (Ultan Boudewyns)**

a. Deborah Ultan Boudewyns proposed that it would be useful to go through the Strategic Plan as we begin thinking of our next year. The board will also want to
keep the Strategic Plan in mind while working on the restructuring. Ultan Boudewyns called for questions about the Strategic Plan and suggested that as we work on restructuring we pull relevant lines from the Strategic Plan to show how the restructuring aligns with the Strategic Plan. For instance, “pursuing partnerships with other organizations…” (in Vision) – are we doing that? Elizabeth Clarke noted that the Strategic Plan should be used as a tool for assessment and understanding our role. We could start the process of determining whether we’ve accomplished what we hoped to accomplish. A board member suggested that Whiteside’s report includes this already. Elizabeth Clarke clarified that Ann Whiteside’s report is from her perspective as president. It’s good to have an assessment from board perspective too and it makes the board more accountable to the membership. The evaluation becomes an exercise to look at goals and to look at how well you are addressing the objectives of the society based on what you’re actually doing. This helps maintain focus. Deborah Ultan Boudewyns pointed out that one major goal for us is the assessment, but we also will want to pay close attention to how we can facilitate some of the Strategic Plan objectives via technology. Keeping the Strategic Plan document relevant and fresh is related to our hope to make things more fluid.

One board member notes the particular relevance of Goal IV [To increase the effectiveness and support the professional growth of art librarians and visual resources professionals.] to the restructuring. As liaison, we look at how the restructuring affects the work and goals of each group to which we liaise. The various groups are working on aligning goals with the Strategic Plan. The board’s role can be to bring this all together. Ultan Boudewyns suggested we look at the Strategic Plan as we go through the committee reports and ask the committee heads to frame their reports / goals in terms of the Strategic Plan.

It was suggested that each liaison write a separate report about how their group’s annual goals meet Strategic Plan goals as a recap to what’s been accomplished over the year. There was a request for clarification: we need a better understanding of which groups we’re expecting submissions from. The initial suggestion was that we could request them from all committees, divisions, sections and round tables. The question is raised about how we’ll get them, since they’ve already met. The Vice President is liaison to DSRTs and therefore the obvious point person for these documents. It was noted that the request for goals is not new and that DSRTs shouldn’t be surprised to have to supply goals. The point was made that because of restructuring the groups are expecting to become less formal and this request for an account of goals aligned with the Strategic Plan would be conflicting. It was agreed that this request should be carefully considered in relation to the assessment. The board doesn’t want the request to appear punitive. Is there a way to get at this information via the assessment – not solely as part of the Strategic Plan process?

It was proposed to start with the committees, to avoid sending mixed messages to the DSRTs. Discussion turned to the value of compiling these goal reports. The
process could make writing the annual report at end of the year easier because the groups have a ground plan from the start. The process enlightens the groups and the board. These reports would be put on the web. It was pointed out that there is value in the exercise, as it will increase communication across groups.

Either the board members should try to align their liaison groups’ goals with the Strategic Plan or we ask the groups to do that work. It was suggested that the groups should do the work of aligning goals with the Strategic Plan because they know their groups best. The board returned to discussion of the value of having DSRTs undertake this task. The point was made that DSRTs “have a certain number of calories to burn” and that all these tasks may be too much. It may run counter to what the Assessment Task Force is suggesting. Perhaps we should reconsider asking this only of committees. Do we want to include chapters? A board member suggested that it would be good to get this document from each chapter. It was noted how this supports our desire to have more communication with each chapter. There was discussion around timing for chapters – some don’t meet for a while. It was decided that an early deadline is good so that the experience of conference isn’t forgotten.

**Action Item 3:**
Liaisons will collect goals from Committees and Chapters and ask them to demonstrate how their goals work with the Strategic Plan and to the assessment document. **Deadline: June 1.**

b. Deborah Ultan Boudewyns suggested that Committee and Chapter goals be posted to AWS. An email with link and announcement should be sent to ARLIS-L. The combined document will be sent to Nedda Ahmed. There is the possibility of highlighting each committee and how their goals align with the Strategic Plan.

**Action Item 4:**
Deborah will compile these goal documents and send to Nedda for posting to AWS. **Deadline: June 15.**

4. Clarify Liaison Roles (Ultan Boudewyns)
   a. Deborah Ultan Boudewyns asks if all board members are clear on their roles. A new member asked Ultan Boudewyns for her expectations. Ultan Boudewyns asked current liaisons to speak to what they’ve been doing this year. Sue Koskinen visited chapters (Southern California, Mountain West, Northern California) and talked about affiliation agreement. She felt it was critical that she be there for the vote; some chapters may not have voted to remain a chapter if she hadn’t been present. Throughout the year she maintained mail contact with chapters and followed their email lists. She also followed the chapters’ officers’ listserv. She liaised with her committees.
b. The board discussed the question of whether liaisons are primarily reporters or take the role of facilitators in regard to their committees. A board member noted that for chapters they are facilitators and advisors and reporters as well, providing a conduit to the board. She noted the importance of being present at the meeting. Another concurs that her presence was crucial – esp. during the discussion about the affiliation agreement. Chapters felt board representation at their meetings was very important. Ultan Boudewyns encouraged the liaisons to feel empowered to be facilitators of the groups. Elizabeth Schaub asked for clarification about whether board members are active members in their liaison committees or advisors, but not working committee members. It was noted that sometimes it is good to help direct a group, when discussion isn’t moving forward, but that board liaisons do not take an active role in the work of the committee.

c. It was observed that we just heard two accounts of how important board presence at chapter meetings is and that in both instances it was very effective and very productive. A board member concurs that having a board member attend meetings is important, so that it’s not just chapters having to come to the board. Ann Whiteside clarified her position: that we are at a place in the maturity of our society and we do need board members to manage the functional areas. The society needs a facilitating person to handle each functional area. There is an advantage to having one person as a point person for the chapters since they focus ONLY on the chapters. She pointed out that board members can and should attend local chapter meetings and be a presence at those meetings.

5. Restructuring Assessment Task Force – Conference Wrap-up (White)
   a. The board suspended its discussion on liaison roles so that Lynda White could present the board with the suggestions of the Assessment Task Force, which had just met to discuss their findings from the conference. Groups will be submitting reports on how they feel about the proposal. Ken Soehner suggests that as liaison, he will get them. We could send an email asking
      1) whether they agree with general agreement
      2) express opinions on each section
         a) board changes
         b) DSRTs

**Action Item 5:**
Board members will collect and submit reports from their liaison groups reporting on how the groups feel about the Assessment Task Force proposals. As much as possible, the groups should be asked; 1) whether they have general agreement with the proposals and 2) express opinions on the section about a) board changes and b) DSRT changes. **Deadline: June 1**

If the groups didn’t talk about these areas specifically, they could report on what they did talk about. A board member wonders if they will be able to report on this if they didn’t talk about it in this way. Most groups only discussed what would affect them directly. They will need to be able to continue their conversations
online. For those who didn’t prepare a report, what is the best way to get a report from them? Deborah Ulan Boudewyns has asked current chairs to send names of new chairs. Reports will come to the board.

It was suggested that each of us could summarize what we heard at our committee liaison meetings – could put together a report and send it to committee heads so that they can confirm or correct what we heard.

Lynda White noted that Task Force could summarize meetings that Task Force members went to. Ken Soehner commented that Task Force has done lots of good work so could be released, but the insight that the Task Force gained may be very helpful in compiling summary reports. In sum, liaisons on the board will summarize committee reactions and Task Force members will summarize the meetings they went to and then the board will take it from there (see Action Item 5 above).

b. Deborah Ulan Boudewyns raised how best to bring together this information and reaction. The board discussed their initial reactions from the conference meetings. Semantic issues seemed important to note and address as we frame the issues --- groups won’t be ‘informal’ but will be flexible; there won’t be lack of leadership, but hopefully more opportunity for leading. One member suggested the membership want the structure, but without the bureaucracy. Structure seems to bring a sense of formality to positions. It was noted that when discussion came to communication – it was important for the groups to realize that they don’t report so much to the board, but to the membership at large. Change frees them, rather than dissolving them. The point was made that it would be good if we had more models to understand and visualize a future. Cate Cooney suggested the model of ‘mystery readers’ reading group may be useful --- interested people met together over time – sometimes many, sometimes few.

c. Groups need to be goal-oriented and driven by common projects. Many of our groups are identity driven. For instance, groups resist change because they identify themselves as ‘academic’ librarians or ‘art & design’ librarians, rather than as librarians with concerns about collection development in the broader sense or about instruction in specific areas. The board recognized that we venture into deep psychological waters when we try to go against that structure by identity. A board member wondered about taking a small step first --- begin with changes on board with a move to the functional responsibilities, then later bring in further changes. Lynda White noted how DSRTs are confusing to new members and if we staged the implementation of the changes, we would still need to address that. It was suggested that perhaps new members should get a phone call early on from a member.

d. Deborah Ulan Boudewyns introduced the issue of meeting space and suggested that we supply a list of possible meeting spaces at next conference. It was noted that it is too difficult for individuals to self-schedule meetings. Conversely, it was
noted that by self-scheduling the interests of a group are made evident. We could put a list of meetings in the program with a contact person. Or at the point of scheduling, the group has to provide reason for meeting. We could pay for 2 or 3 self-scheduled rooms.

Elizabeth Clarke turned to the broader issue of meeting space by bringing up the fact that we book conferences and hotels way out and we need to book enough rooms for 64 meetings now. It was suggested that the board take the initiative to book fewer rooms as of 2010 and 2011. A board member asked what the cost is for hotels with so many breakout rooms. Elizabeth Clarke replied that we cannot get reasonably priced hotels with enough breakout rooms. She continued that most hotels can offer space for 40 – 50 meetings – but our group isn’t particularly large, doesn’t use a lot of sleeping rooms and doesn’t use a lot of food from the hotel, so the need for more break-out space becomes expensive. One member wondered whether we couldn’t do something different each year. It was noted that the problem is that there needs to be some consistency for the Conference Planning Manual.

A phased implementation might make sense – it would allow us to see changes over time and be adaptive. Perhaps as of 2010, we go for hotels with fewer rooms for meetings and use local places to host some of the meetings (local museum, local university, etc.). Do we want to vote on idea of fewer rooms for meetings in 2010?

Motion 1: that starting with 2010 conference we look for hotels with space for 40 meetings to increase flexibility in hotel selection.

Discussion: It is worth thinking of our goal: is the goal to decrease # of meeting rooms purely for financial reasons, or for flexibility of hotel choice. The board will need to recognize the fact that there are groups for which we will have to struggle with their ability to meet.

Approved unanimously.

6. Discussion about phased implementation of Assessment Task Force recommendations. (White, Whiteside)
   a. Ann Whiteside wondered if we need a task force to implement the board changes. It was noted that the recommended changes are relatively straightforward, reflect a good plan and should be implemented. Lynda White noted that the board changes don’t affect the policy manual and require few changes in the bylaws. It was suggested that we wait for comments from groups. On the other hand, the need for speed was also brought up. We desperately need a Communications Officer as MemberClicks comes online. The Nominations Committee will need to be in on the coming board changes, as they will be looking for people soon. Current regional representatives need to be willing to take on these roles. Ann Whiteside noted that as we move forward in this direction that board members
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should plan on attending local chapter meetings to reinforce the notion that board is involved at that level and that we truly want this new structure to continue working well for chapters even with changes. Nominating committee doesn’t have to select geographically, but will continue to look across entire membership to fill positions.

b. Lynda White noted that Southern California chapter had suggested that chapters could perhaps help fund a board member coming to their meeting. This would be a problem for the many chapters with few members and not much money. A regional representative noted that it would difficult not to meet her chapters already this fall – since this is year of transition, not year of implementation. The regional representatives visiting with chapters this year will give the chapters a year to get comfortable with notion that there will be a chapter coordinator next year. The board can decide who will take functional roles so that Nominating Committee knows whom to recruit. We could have two ideas running in tandem this year, allowing us to move forward. It was noted that new people will not come on board ‘till next year. Move forward with transition and keep current chapter liaison roles, though the board will discuss possible shifts in committee liaison roles.

7. Deborah Ultan Boudewyns suggested we adjourn for day.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:25 pm.

Tuesday, May 1, 2007
Deborah Ultan Boudewyns called the meeting to order at 8:33 am.

8. Headquarters (Expectations (reports, etc): Ulan Boudewyns, Clarke)
a. Deborah Ultan Boudewyns noted that Craig Fleming (HQ) initially sent monthly messages with tasks for each month for each board member. In the management calendar there is a listing of all reports that are to be sent to the board members. There are about 10 reports listed for each month. (Contract with Headquarters is in board section of the website.) The Executive Committee will continue reviewing the contract. They will be looking at contract in next few weeks. Fran Scott notes that auditor’s report is broken down in sections (publications, conference, etc). Is it possible to have Headquarters breakout fees for various services related to web expenses: e.g., ISP)?

b. Elizabeth Clarke questioned value of sending information to chapter groups. She says she never hears back from them and wonders how useful it is. Ann Whiteside suggested that for communication purposes, it is useful to continue. Others concur that it is a good practice and that monthly updates are useful.

c. Elizabeth Clarke will check with Craig Fleming about why his profile never appeared on the web. It was suggested that the HQ staff online profiles be rotated every two months, so that by the end of year all of Headquarters staff have been
up. Begin with Craig Fleming’s in May. Add a note in News and Features. Locate the Headquarters’ staff profiles on the same page as the board members’ listing, below the board members.

**Action Item 6:** Sue will communicate with Carol Graney and with Nedda about posting these profiles. We can post them all, and Carol will add note in News and Features.

7. Pre-Conference Meeting – unfinished business (Ultan Boudewyns)
   Returning to the issue of a banner issue for Jeanne Brown, ALA liaison. ALA will make banners, but we would rather have our own so that we can take it to other venues. Fran Scott noted that in terms of timing, for this year we should use the ALA-provided banner (since we need it in June).

8. How will the board communicate for the rest of year? (Ultan Boudewyns)
   Last year the board used a combination of conference calls and email. Deborah Ultan Boudewyns suggested that once a week is necessary. Ann Whiteside noted that most of the time the board needed to meet once per week, though there were lulls. Better to set it up for every week, with the option to cancel at the last minute if there is no need to meet. The time last year, Wed. 4-5:30 worked well. All confirm that that time will work this year also. Ultan Boudewyns asked for preferred method of communicating. An advantage of email is the ability to use subject lines to distinguish topics and the written record is easy to attain. Conference calls are more difficult to conduct and harder to participate in, but there is value in discussing a topic together synchronously, so the board will plan to continue once per month conference calls. Ultan Boudewyns proposed a conference call the first Wednesday of each month and email the other Wednesdays. As president, she will organize and facilitate each call.

9. Plans for Assessment Task Force and Next Steps (Ultan Boudewyns)
   a. Deborah Ultan Boudewyns noted that at the membership meeting she promised the membership a framework and timeline as first steps. The board has feedback from membership – for collecting, thinking about, and moving forward. But we cannot really move on plan and implementation until we get the reports back from the groups. So, today the board will work on a timeline to get to the membership. Ultan Boudewyns stated she doesn’t want to slow the process, but that we do need the reports before we can proceed with any implementation.

   b. Deborah Ultan Boudewyns suggested putting together the Implementation Task Force first. Others suggested that the board should first determine the charge of Implementation Task Force. There is a desire to get board changes implemented quickly, but with care so that feedback provided in the Assessment Task Force report can be a factor. It was noted that we don’t have to wait for all data before we start implementing changes at board level. There is a risk of being too slow to respond. The board needs to act, finding a balance of forward movement and of
getting information. People are energized and we need to capitalize on that energy. It was suggested that the functional changes are necessary changes and although it is conceivable that we will get further input from the membership that will affect those changes, it seems more likely that the membership input will focus on the DSRT and questions. There is agreement among the board members that we should proceed with implementation of changes to the board.

It was suggested that we don’t need an Implementation Task Force for board changes. Further, it may be difficult to charge the Implementation Task Force until we get the comments in. The board was reminded that here was discussion yesterday about staging the implementation – with the board changes first. The board discussed whether the issue of Regional Representatives was reason to have an Implementation Task Force in place sooner rather than later. It was pointed out that we seem to be asking the Implementation Task Force to do what the board ought to be doing. Board has to take risk and make decisions and then send that plan to Implementation Task Force. Also noted was the importance of working very closely and carefully with chapters on changes. The information is coming to the board from the membership: Ken Soehner will be summarizing data from DSRTs and the other board members will be collecting feedback from our committees. The decisions should be made by the board.

**Action Item 7**

**Deb will compile all Assessment TF responses for the Board. Deadline: June 8**

c. **Timeline (Ultan Boudewyns)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 1</td>
<td>Receipt of reports from conference feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 8</td>
<td>Document from Deborah Ultan Boudewyns compiling these reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 13</td>
<td>Begin discussion at online board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 11</td>
<td>Identify those recommendations that we can move forward with for initial changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this is sketchy and incomplete, it is enough for now and until the board has more feedback from the membership. We can let membership know that July 11, we’ll begin implementing first steps.

d. Ken Soehner suggested that in meantime we have a discussion about how we want these functions distributed among the regional representatives during the transition. Membership seemed to recognize the value in the concepts of these changes, but they are concerned about the reduction of contact with the board at their local meetings. It was suggested that we plan and begin changes to the board with the provision that if we get a lot of feedback that counters these ideas, we can pull back.
10. Functional roles for new board:
   a. Secretary: The Membership Committee would report to the secretary.
      The difficulty of taking notes, preparing minutes, and having a large, active
      committee was raised. If the person in this role does not take notes at board
      meetings, then he or she should have a title other than secretary. It is possible to
      have a recording secretary who reviews notes taken by someone else. It was
      suggested that the board could ask a student member to take the notes and could
      provide defray some of their conference costs as payment. A confidentiality
      clause would be written in their contract. The difficulty in getting a student to
      stay at the conference for an entire week at this time of year was noted. An early
      career librarian might be more suitable in that respect. The secretary would still
      handle the email (online) and conference call meeting notes. Note-taking at the
      mid-year meeting would have to be handled differently from the annual
      conference. It is noted that liaising with the Membership Committee is a big job.
      It was suggested that at the very least another board member could take notes
      during discussion from the Membership Committee liaison.

   b. Chapters Coordinator:
      This position seems relatively clear cut and well-outlined. As described in the
      report the position seems to have fewer major responsibilities, but would still be a
      lot of work. There is not as much ‘product’ coming from it, but a lot of intangible
      work. The ebb and flow of the work, depending on the intensity of the issues
      concerning the chapters, was noted. Several noted the close working relationship
      that the Chapters Coordinator position would have with other Board Officers: for
      example, the Educational Officer. The Chapters Coordinator should work with
      Professional Development Committee and therefore there would be a lot of cross
      communication with these two officers. It was noted that there are often policy
      decisions at chapter level and the Chapter Council person would have that in mind
      and could be a mentor in those areas. Also will be working with Membership
      Comm. on initiative for new members (SP Coal III, Objective C). The new
      position will have a lot of liaison responsibilities. One advantage of the
      coordinated nature of this chapter liaison position is that as all chapter bylaws
      changes will come through one person, there will be greater consistency in how
      they’re approached and treated.

   **Action Item 8**
   Fran will create News & Features item with info about chapters and DSRTs
   funding requests – where are guidelines, involvement of board liaison.
   Deadline: June15

11. Interrupt discussion because Ken Soehner has to leave soon:
    Ken Soehner noted the need to communicate immediately with the membership.
    Only about 35% of membership attended the membership meeting yesterday, so
    others need to know what was said. What is the tradition of this communication?
    Ann Whiteside noted that there has not been a strong tradition of communicating, but
that we can fix that by making a greater effort to communicate more frequently with the membership.

It was suggested that an announcement from the president with a list of the new board members and a recap of membership meeting statement would be a good start. All other liaisons should be sending an email to their groups introducing themselves to their group. Deborah Ultan Boudewyns reminded the board that the News & Features section of the website is a good place to put announcements from board members, but that the messages should probably be filtered through the board. This is a good way for membership to get to know us and to get to know what we’re discussing. In addition it was noted that it is good for messages to come from all board members over time (not just the president). This reinforces the idea that we have a friendly conversational environment. It was agreed that it is better to communicate too much than not enough. As members are directly to the News & Features section more frequently, it becomes part of their routine.

10. (cont.) Return to discussion on functional officers:
   c. Development/Marketing:
      Ideally the person taking on the role of Development/Marketing will have experience or a very strong interest in development. Elizabeth Clarke confirmed the necessity of having specific talents. In this position, there are clear successes and clear failures and a strong component of accountability. It was noted that quite a few members of the Development Committee have development experience and they will be working with the coordinator. The first task (Vendor Relations) is a good place to start and will involve liaising with the exhibits coordinator and the conference manager at each conference. This will help with continuity for the vendors. Especially in light of the situation this year, it would be good for this person to meet with the vendors at each conference. An example of where this person could step in to help was the confusion this year in the perks of the sponsorship package, and whether those include advertising in *Art Documentation*. This position will be key in assuring that nothing slips through the cracks.

d. Education Officer:
   Deborah Ultan Boudewyns noted that the Education Task Force plan will be reported on later. The Assessment Task Force plan outlines a lot of work and responsibilities in the tasks for this officer, but it is a liaison role and the committee has been highly functional in the past. It was suggested that the Educational Officer’s capacity will be to advise, facilitate, and direct the Professional Development Committee and to liaise with other functional board members. The PDC will be responsible for the actual work of developing educational programs. It was hoped that this officer could also help us understand and plan where SEI should be headed in the next few years.

e. Communication Officer:
   All recognized the enormity and potential impact of this position covering both Publications and Information Technology. The information technology piece will
work closely with the Secretary and membership initiatives and with the Education Officer and outreach and education initiatives. The technology role will have to be very collaborative. The board questioned whether the Information Technology position should be an advisory position and report to the Communication Officer? In support of this, it was noted that the Publication Committee already has a sub-committee off the AWS. Information Technology covers so many areas – it is key to communication so that is where it is focused now, but it may be that this officer would deal with information technology issues across the society. It was proposed that for the transition, we have an Information Technology advisory group who would help us make technology decisions and then once those major transition decisions are made then this could come under the Communication Officer. It was agreed that we should be much more flexible technologically, but that we do need to work with McPherson-Clarke. It was also stated that we should capitalize on our members’ expertise and knowledge in acquiring and utilizing new technologies.

It was noted how so many goals are listed under the Communications Officer. Perhaps we should have a technology person to work closely with Communications Officer. We could look at it as a content person and a technology person. How would we separate these out? Are we talking about another Board Officer? Can we afford another member at the board table? If we determine that we need it, can we make sure that we afford it? Members have told us that we need this position.

There is an issue of urgency in that the Nominations Committee needs to know our plan so that they can begin recruiting appropriate candidates. It was suggested rather than adding a permanent position to the board, the Information Technology position could be added as a Special Appointment. Elizabeth Clarke cautions that because technology costs money and we do not know how this conference has done financially, it would be premature to take any immediate steps. A board member suggested that despite that it is important to implement a ‘geek squad’ to begin looking at these technologies or ARLIS won’t survive. Another member noted that having someone in an Information Technology Special Appointment role, who give us someone from whom we could receive advice on issues as they come up. As we investigate new technologies, we need that kind of advisory piece to outline the issues.

**Action Item 9**

Regarding setting up ‘geek squad’ and/or Special Appointment for technology. Sue can flesh out what this person would do. Sue will bring back description to board. Will add consideration for an honorarium for the position. **Deadline: July 15**

Perhaps next year at this time we’ll have a better idea of whether a technology officer is a viable option and needed on the long term. Gives us time to
implement Memberclicks and to see how that works and what can be added to that.

f. Conference Planning Officer:
The Conference Planning Officer will provide continuity and organization for the conference planning process and takes a lot off president’s back. It was noted that this position is quite different from the others. This one is more practical and the others are more conceptual. This position allows one to have vision for future conferences and the direction conferences could take. This officer would go to CPAC meetings. One advantage of this position is that it gets a national/society perspective into the conference planning. There is a strong educational component to this position, thus requiring collaboration and communication with the Education Officer.

As a reminder, it was noted that the task force did suggest in their report, that the specific roles are not stated in bylaws so that they can develop or change over time.

It was noted that the Conference Planning Manual has been recently revised. The major change in this is that the conference planning liaison role moves from president to a board member. It was suggested that the person in this liaison role would need to be decisive and strong because there are always political issues to be dealt with.

Recap of board members interested in functional board positions:
Communications – Sue Koskinen
Chapters Council – Cate Cooney, Amy Trendler
Development/Marketing– Marilyn Nasserden
Education – Elizabeth Schaub, Cate Cooney, Amy Trendler
Conference Planning – Elizabeth Schaub, Marilyn Nasserden

12. Liaison Reports
a. Museums Library Division – Reported from Ken before he left: the Museums Library Division would like to remain in existence, but that is the only feedback that he has at this point. Reason and objectives will come in his report.

    Discussion: Groups should submit goal or what they will talk about to get a room to meet.

b. Liaison reports will be done next week in email – they will be put on the agenda.

c. Sue has logistics question: The Publications Committee has some policy manual changes. She will send them out and we will look and then will vote on them via email.
d. Elizabeth Schaub raised one issue from Professional Development Committee meeting. Someone inquired about the liability of ARLIS/NA in mentor/mentee relationship. Is ARLIS/NA responsible in any way?

**Action Item 10**
**EC will look into this issue of liability of the society in the mentor program.**
**Deadline: July 15**

13. Miscellaneous Wrap-up Items
   a. Follow up various task force reports (Nominations, Collaboration, Education). Many task forces have completed their charges. Their reports will come to the president. Deborah will share those on the next agenda.

   b. Ann noted that past board members suggested that when board members go off the board list, we should tell them good-bye. It provides a sense of closure for them.

   c. The request was made that Craig could double check that board members are on lists that they are supposed to be on.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:35 am.
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