ARLIS Executive Post Conference Meeting
Hilton Minneapolis Downtown Director’s Row 4
03/28/2011, 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Meeting commenced at 8:15 with ARLIS/NA President Jon Evans calling the meeting to order.

1. Welcome and Meeting Logistics

Jon opened the meeting by presenting a gift to Past President Mari Russell, noting that she did an “admirable job” and was an “incredible leader.” Mari replied that she should have done the President’s job at mid-career not late.

2. Minneapolis Conf Overview and Thanks

Minneapolis Conference planners Rebecca Moss and Jessica McIntyre expressed thanks for the opportunity to discuss the just-completed conference. Being a joint ARLIS + VRA meeting made the planning for this one unusual. They both thanked the ARLIS/NA Executive Board for making decisions quickly.

The Minneapolis Conference Planning Committee will produce a document from survey responses. The Toronto Conference Planning Committee already wrote up their evaluation survey and Minneapolis will coordinate with Toronto to gain feedback about the Minneapolis effort. VRA will also coordinate with the Toronto planning committee. Rebecca and Jessica expressed interest in creating a survey sent to those ARLIS/NA members who did not attend the Minneapolis conference to understand why. Toronto will do two surveys and send them out to conference attendees and non-attendees.

Jon Evans commended the local organizing committee for its exceptional job; a “good vibe” was made at the July CPAC meeting; Rebecca and Jessica worked well with their counterparts in VRA, among them Heidi Raatz and Allan Kohl. Maureen and Mari collaborated well and personified this united spirit. Jon indicated that the degree of ARLIS/NA and VRA collaboration was positive and bodes well for future.

Jon indicated some highlights from the Minneapolis conference for him. The closing plenary speaker, Wing Young Huie, was great. The ArLiSNAP meeting was quite interesting. Jon commended ARLIS/NA Treasurer Tom Riedel and his VRA counterpart Billy Kwan for putting together solid budgets. He also cited two successful sessions, those on emerging technology and semantic web.

He noted that there was a lot valuable feedback at the Leadership Breakfast, and he anticipated taking away ideas from that event. ARLIS/NA Committees in their meetings seem engaged and energetic as “people were looking to do big things.” Exhibitors mentioned periodic irritations in the hall and its hours; Chris Roper of TEI smoothed over ruffled feathers at times. Issues about the exhibitors were discussed at the CPAC meeting.

There was also concern over the Founder’s Fete event at Gale House, as there was not enough food or bartenders. Guests at this event could go to the museum and come back, but few did, and many did not find the musical entertainment at the event. It seemed that there were not adequate guides to direct event goers to various places. Jessica McIntyre indicated that Gale house could not provide certain things.

ARLIS/NA Liaison Sandy Brooke indicated that Opening Plenary gathering had a blank background, with no clear ARLIS/NA graphics to identify the event and its organization. She indicated that ARLIS members were particularly affected by visual stimuli and would have liked some event branding.

Mari Russell commended the attentiveness, dedication and hard-work of the four local co-chairs, and was thankful that their institutions allowed them to spend so much time to do the preparation.
Sandy Brooke commented on how well the local committee brought out the local flavor of city; in this the local chapter did well. She mentioned that organization management firm usually did much more at conferences, but in Minneapolis the local committee took on many new tasks and did them very well. Jessica mentioned some confusion about what services that TEI would provide and what they needed to do. Jessica also thanked Chris for his hard work in Minneapolis.

3. CPAC Debriefing Meeting Report

4. Update on ARLIS/NA 2012 Conference in Toronto

Margaret English hoped to take members into Toronto, especially to the city’s theater which was renowned.

Jill Patrick mentioned that local conference planning meetings would start in April. Chris Roper would attend these via Skype: He would meet with the local Development Committee, too. Jill indicated that almost all committee chairs had been found and that the Toronto group had already put together two surveys of the Minneapolis conference.

Tom Riedel noted that the verbiage on the survey should read “VRA+ARLIS/NA Joint Conference,” not only ARLIS/NA. Jill said that she will make this correction. Tom was happy to see that an evaluation was also sent to ARLIS/NA members who didn’t come to Minneapolis.

Jill hoped that there might be some major differences with the Minneapolis conference, too. She cited one event, the Founder’s Fete at the Gale House, had too many people involved in planning. It was an overly complex event with too many locations and too few guides directing people to various areas.

In Toronto, two chapters were collaborating to stage the conference. Both Western New York and Ontario had formed committees to oversee exhibitors and tours. For tours, Western NY and Toronto would engage low-cost tour guides (often free docents) who had strong local knowledge.

Mari noted that events at Gale House and the Walker Art Museum had traffic flow problems. In the bigger space at the Walker, there were no guides to direct guests. She mentioned how planners had to create a delicate balance between the conference reception area’s graciousness/navigability and affordability. The two locations costly in Minneapolis were costly, but the social amenities less than adequate. She also observed that no one wanted to move all events to the conference hotel. She emphasized her belief that greeters were important to direct guests and to make them feel welcome. Liaison Rina Vecchiola mentioned that greeters were also needed at the workshops.

Margaret English mentioned that University of Toronto had a sizable School of Information. This would provide benefits in two ways: first, students might be drafted as greeters and, second, she would be able to use the school’s sizable computer rooms for free (for workshops and other events). Toronto’s hotel had good proximity to many necessary venues.

Sandy commented on the “gruesome” early opening hours for exhibitors; their space in Minneapolis was good, small but cozy. Exhibitors expressed that ARLIS/NA should close the exhibition hall during lunchtime, as some booths were staffed only with one person and exhibitors had no chance to eat. She also wanted day passes for exhibitors; others on the Executive Board stated that Boston and Houston may have done this. Day passes for the exhibition hall might generate some extra revenue, and Sandy thought that the inclusion of day passes should be written into the Exhibitor’s Prospectus. In Toronto, visual arts students at multiple universities might come to the conference solely to come to buy books.
Gabrielle Ouellette said to Sandy that she would have liked to have a break and attend sessions. She thought that exhibitors could have mentees who could babysit booths and, at the same time, learn something about the book-selling business.

The idea was raised about creating workshops on book selling using exhibitors as workshop instructors. Offering half-tables for local vendors proved popular in Minneapolis.

Sandy also mentioned how she would like to see a “buddy list for roommates.” She wondered if TEI could host a site that advertised roommates, as ARLIS-L was “too much of a free-for-all.” ArLiSNAP had did provide its own site for roommates.

Sandy asked about how attendees many stayed off-site? No data was collected on this.

Chris Roper reported that the Toronto conference would need additional meeting space onsite with more breakout rooms closer together. He was still working on the guest room rate, which stood at $209; meeting room rental costs were $9,000 per room. Chris said that the size of the required room bloc was not so bad. He can reduce the bloc if needed in January 2012. The Minneapolis conference had 559 paid attendees (exceeding the minimum room bloc), with 1 refund request, and 9 who did not pick up their registration materials. Eighteen people bought single day registration. Chris will know more about rated by the April 14 Executive Board Conference Call, but we already have got the space we need. Chris asked if ARLIS/NA would need the Chestnut Street facility for $2,000? The group answered affirmatively.

Jill asked if we exceed the minimum room quota could we get a low-cost room bloc for poor students? Chris believed that we can’t provide another option for lower cost. Mari asked if there were any dorm rooms available for students? No, because universities would still be in session.

Margaret disclosed that James Rout had developed a “brilliant” ebay-like site that could sell fund-raising items for the Toronto conference year-round. He hoped to raise money so that ARLIS/NA could rent the Winter Garden for an event. James hoped to connect it to the Toronto conference web site which was already up. Jon cautioned James to check with Rina and the Development Committee to apprise them of it. Sandy indicated that James should be careful to follow all tax rules with his online auction and that he would need to set up a local charitable bank account correctly. ARLIS/NA must send a gift-acknowledgement letter to the donor. We are tax exempt and must provide a tax number to the buyer. S/he decides if they want to deduct the item from taxes. We cannot evaluate an auction item’s value. It was reiterated that James and Rina need to have the Development Committee to contact the local dev officer, Rebecca.

Chris mentioned an idea for a first-time attendee event at the Toronto conference. The local planning committee might approach a local restaurant to house a dinner for newcomers. A Group-on discount for a prix-fixe menu could be negotiated for at least 25 attendees. It would become an automatic networking event. The Toronto committee could reserve a restaurant for a Monday which for many is a shut down day. (In hindsight, this may not work too well, as most conference attendees are either gone by Sunday night or early Monday morning.)

Jon summarized that Toronto already had “a solid team in place.” It is already ahead of the game, and seems to be approaching planning in a meticulous way. Jon indicated that he and CPAC would need to do a walk-through of the hotel. In fact, he would start the CPAC meeting with the walk-thru. Jill and Chris will coordinate on this mid-year CPAC meeting. Chris encouraged the local planning committee and/or meeting chairs to arrange to bring their own data projectors as this will cut costs dramatically over hotel rental rates.

5. Liaison Reports
Canadian Member-at-Large (James Rout)

James reported that he had attended the International Relations Committee meeting and part of the Public Policy Committee meeting at the Minneapolis conference. He also attended the ARLIS/NA Canada meeting. ARLIS/NA Canada went over chapter reports and the plans for next year’s Toronto conference. They hope to raise $40,000 (Canadian) to stage an event at the Winter Garden; this was not out of line, as the Walker reception in Minneapolis cost $37,000.

James put together a blog for the planning team; he hoped to try a new money-making idea to replace the annual silent auction. He would create an eBay-like auction site. Margaret English had some donors in mind. It was agreed that James would discuss this idea with Rina and the Development Committee.

Education Liaison (Sarah Carter)

Sarah reported that she attended the Minneapolis conference’s Professional Development Committee meeting, and its Mentoring and Education Sub committees. The members of Professional Planning Committee (PDC) were very pleased to be working with Chris Roper and TEI on the transfer of the GoToMeeting software. They will be working on managing that transition by announcing to the listserv. They also discussed the new legal forms that each participant will need to sign.

The committee talked about the possibilities for virtual chapter conferences. They will discuss with the membership liaison. The ARLIS/Mountain West Chapter had used GoToMeeting meeting as well as GoToWebinar software successfully already. This could be a model for other chapters to follow.

There is continuing interest in assessment of demographics to ensure they are serving our membership's needs. This is a joint effort with the Membership Committee. Sarah expressed interest in seeing demographic information for ARLIS/NA to consider if the Education Committee is meeting a cross-section of members’ needs; she wondered if mid- or early-career professionals were getting what they needed from its educational programs, such as lunchtime webinars. Bryan Loar and Jamie Lausch were working on this on Google Docs. Maggie Portis, who is a member of both PDC and Membership, is also going to be involved. Rina will follow up by sending this info to Sarah Carter. There was a discussion of social networking account management by the committee. Issues of video longevity and persistence are of concern.

Jon was also interested in society demographic data to understand how it is changing. The 2008 ARLIS/NA Survey was available. Is it available easily via the web site? Jon wanted Chris to work with Sarah and Laurel to gather career-tracking information from TEI.

The Mentoring Subcommittee was concentrating on the updating of the training materials. It wanted to push the program out to the membership even through the chapters and other potential avenues.

Issues for the board: Does funding granted through a Special Funding Request expire? Yes, at the end of the calendar year. Are there any avenues for further funding? Reasonable additional costs will be considered by the board. If we return the funding, can ARLIS pay the invoice? Yes, if the check is returned.

Sarah also attended the SEI Meeting on Saturday, March 27, 7:30 a.m. Registration status is at 24, which is comparable with past years, with a cap of 45 attendees. Fine tuning of the schedule continues. There was continued discussion of faculty and curricular issues. SEI is set for University of Michigan in 2012 under the leadership of Rebecca Price. The VRA board is offering a Base Camp account for project management. Fundraising and Development efforts are ongoing. SEI did not have any Executive Board issues at this time.
Sarah noted that the Mentoring Sub-committee wanted to make a special funding request. Push out to chapters, Southern California (SC) and perhaps two more. Sarah wondered if the funds expired at the end of the year? Tom noted that if an expired check is returned, he can reissue it. Sarah also wondered how additional funding needs were handled outside of the usual request cycle? The answer was that it was up to the will of the board. They need to come back to the board with an official proposal.

**Communications and Publications Liaison** (Sandy Brooke)

Sandy attended the Communications and Publications Committee (CPC) and Sub-committee meetings dealing with Art Documentation and the Web Group.

She noted that the terms of the Art Documentation contract were favorable. They had a source that had clean back issues for digitizing. There was a run in the ARLIS/NA Archive at the University of Illinois. Sandy was anxious to redesign the cover of Art Documentation. The University of Chicago Press had the best response to the issue: John Taormina, Judy Dyki, Eileen Markson, Tony White, Carol Grainey, Lee Viverette, Jonathan Franklin [and Sandy] had worked hard on creating the Art Documentation transition.

Sandy wondered how would the Art Documentation editorial board be formed and how would it be comprised? She suggested that 10 names be forwarded, perhaps 4 internal, 6 external; we should consider figures active in CAA or AAM who well-known in field for a 3-year hitch. She wanted to know by what mechanism in the policy manual would the board be formed? Does there need to be a change in the By Laws (requiring a membership vote)? Or can the Executive Board constitute the board as it sees fit and then add its procedure to the policy manual without a membership vote?

Jon wondered if we wanted to do this ourselves or whether we wanted to alter the publications component of By-laws? He agreed with Sandy that we needed to attract some “stellar scholars” to the board. Jon noted that the timing transition for Art Documentation would be tight. The Executive Board would need documentation changes about formation of the board and nominees within 6 months. A mail-in vote would take 35 days. We needed to make some statement saying that we have a board and some description of terms of service, stature, and diversity. Target dates: The Executive Board would need options by the June CPAC meeting. It would need a document detailing what the board would look like and its potential roster. A discussion continued for some time about altering the By Laws or Policy Manual. To whom does the board report? Check with University of Chicago Press about how boards are customarily constituted. We need some documentation by June or July 2011 and then the names of 10 Board nominees. Tony White and Heidi Hass would thereafter need to change ARLIS/NA documentation.

Sandy also asked whether a content management system would be useful or not for the ARLIS web site? Chris would be part of this sub-committee evaluating the CMS. Why were Amy Lucker and Bryan Loar brought in? Amy and Bryan were brought in as members at large temporarily. Amy was tasked with an initial conference call with Nedda and the sub-committee to come up with wish list. What do we want the CMS to do? Do we need a 10 question survey to membership? Extensive discussion followed on whether a membership survey was needed, and, if so, how long would it be? How much say do Jonathan and Nedda need? A solution: Jonathan would come up with a survey and run it by the Membership Committee. He should contact Lynda White who has survey expertise. Jon stated that Jonathan, Nedda and Lynda White should discuss a survey and how extensive it should be. Jon would discuss any further responsibilities with Amy Lucker and other “temporary” members of this group.

Sandy noted that we had a source for conference programs in order to scan them for the web site.

**Development and Membership Liaison** (Rina Vecchiola)

(Notes from Jamie Lausch Membership Committee Chair)
We met jointly with the Diversity Committee and discussed outreach to diverse populations and the diversity of the Membership in general. We decided that we would look into two methods of addressing this issue as a group:
--Connecting with other organizations
--Connecting ARLIS to library schools

We then met as a Membership Committee (minus a few people who had other commitments). Current roster:
Ian McDermott, Yale Center for British Art
Maggie Portis, NY School of Interior Design
Kim Detterbeck, SUNY Purchase College
Phyllis Robarts, University of Miami
Stephanie Grimm, Library Student, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Virginia Allison, UC Irvine
Jamie Lausch, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Our main points of discussion:
Brochures -- printing and distribution for chapters, upcoming conferences (ALA)

Action item for the Board: Communicating the membership category changes to the ARLIS/NA membership
--This is a major area in which we would like guidance from the Board
--Additionally, the Membership Committee is worried that the elimination of the Overseas category will reduce our numbers significantly. Some members want just to receive *Art Documentation* and pay an invoice. Overseas cannot pay membership and invoice for publication? No membership vote is necessary on membership categories, as members voted indirectly by okaying the University of Chicago Press (UCP) contract? The Executive Board needs to address this issue by June 2011 to let UCP know about subscription info. Jon suggested waiting until a signed contract is back from UCP. He then wants Jonathan Franklin to send out a message to ARLIS/NA discussing membership; it should go on a splash page on ARLIS/NA web site.

Outreach to potential new members:
--Mexico via the upcoming IRC trip – plan to work with IRC committee to make sure they have brochures if they want them, other information or assistance
--Exploration of Digital Preservation population as potential members of ARLIS/NA
--Expanded outreach to CAA (coordinate with VRA? -- VRA is currently expanding their relationship with CAA — we could consider working with them if appropriate)

Outreach to better serve existing members:
--Reaching members who don't attend annual conference
--Are we meeting their needs? What could we do?

Finally, we eagerly await the Strategic Planning Committee's Action Plan, which should give us plenty of guidance for our activities over the next year.

**Development Committee (from Rina’s notes)**

Committee action item: create list of functionality requirements for prospects list for TEI. Communication with TEI has been inconsistent; Chris has been responsive. Development will be more responsible for contacting prospects. Committee action item: develop workflow calendar for Development, Toronto local development, and TEI.
Who is responsible for identifying new vendors?
Darin Murphy volunteered to be co-chair.
Committee action item: redraft committee charge to add co-chair and present to Rina and the Board.
Jennifer Friedman presented a proposal she had drafted about recognizing Society Circle donors and donors at levels under $100. Jennifer and Amy Trendler will work on Society Circle opportunities. They want to revamp the Society Circle and donation opportunities to it. She wants to get donors at all levels; ARLIS/NA needs to articulate more clearly what the Society Circle is. Information needs to spread about long-term giving.
How can MemberClicks be used to target messages to member donors?
Donation drive should take place separate from the membership drive.

ACTION ITEM (Board): pursue Toronto conference Web site advertising.
ACTION ITEM (Board): have travel award winners submit conference report that can be shared with sponsors.
ACTION ITEM (Board): what can committees use to share files and messages?
Add co-chair charge will present to board

Chapters Liaison (Laurel Bliss)

Laurel attended the Southern California chapter meeting on 3/26/11, where much of the discussion was about preparing for the Pasadena conference in 2013. Janine Henri, Vice-President, will be organizing a couple of meetings that will take place in Pasadena in the coming year.

Laurel ran the chapter chairs meeting on 3/27/11. The ARLIS chairs met separately for half an hour, and then jointly with our VRA counterparts for the remaining time. We discussed the methods of communication within chapters (listservs, blogs, etc). Meredith Kahn reported on the successes and challenges of hosting a virtual conference for the Mountain West chapter. This would be a good topic for a session at Toronto. We discussed strategies of recruiting new members and doing outreach to library school students.

Cataloguing Advisory Committee (Alan Michelson)

Alan attended the Cataloguing Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting on 3/24/2011. The CAC has three members serve as liaisons to other professional cataloguing groups, forcing some of them to attend multiple conferences. As they are representing ARLIS/NA in helping to form cataloguing rules, the CAC wanted to make a special funding request to fund travel costs. Some money has been allocated in the past to liaisons, but a method of distributing money to 11 liaisons needs to be reconsidered. Jon asks that this motion be tabled for the time being.

6. TEI Update

Chris attended various meetings including the Professional Development Committee (PDC), Finance Committee, ARLIS Web Site Sub-committee, and the Toronto Planning Committee.

Chris indicated that he will talk with TEI staff members Alex and Nicole about staffing levels at registration. This year, there was a lot of down time for them, so Chris may adjust staffing numbers in Toronto.

Silent Auction Committee mentioned to Chris that it made $6,410.

The Saturday VRA-ARLIS/NA Buffet Lunch at the Minneapolis conference was a big expense, and Chris needed to control costs in Toronto.
Mari thanked Chris for his gentle manner and efficient oversight, as most things went smoothly in Minneapolis.

7. Conference Call Schedule

Conference call monthly Go to meeting to host calls.

8. Task Forces to Update Bylaws, Policy and Conference Planning Manuals

The ARLIS/NA Policy Manual indicated that only committees can establish task forces; the President can establish ad hoc committees. Jon therefore asked for the formation of a Documentation Advisory Committee.

The charge of the Documentation Advisory Committee is to review and update the Policy Manual and the Conference Planning Manual, and to submit proposed changes to the By-Laws (including direction on electronic voting) to the Executive Board. The Committee will consult with society leaders. The duration of the Advisory Committee is one year. Co-chairs are V. Heidi Hass and Tony White, and members are Ted Goodman, Jennifer Friedman and Rachel Resnik. Jon indicates that he will work with the group as liaison.

MOTION: Mari moves to establish the Documentation Advisory Task Force as described by Heidi Hass to be chaired by Heidi and Tony White for one year. Motion seconded. Motion passes unanimously.

The Documentation Advisory Committee does not want to consider writing a joint conference planning manual. It also does not want to update the Management Calendar. The Committee is interested in how to do electronic voting, as it is not in compliance with bylaws now, especially with nominating.

The position of Administrative Documents Editor has existed in ARLIS/NA, and it might be useful to cyclically to re-activate it. This post was made during 1996 CPC revisions. The Documentation Advisory Committee may consider recommending the establishment of an Admin Docs Editor active every three years beginning in 2014. The position will be appointed and will receive a stipend.

9. Follow-up and Action Items for the Executive Board (Alan Michelson)

Action #1 (was #2 in 2010):
Amy will work with Boston CPAC to finish its conference report.
Deadline: May 30, 2011
Status:

Action Item #2 (was #41 in 2010):
Sandy will serve as a liaison with Nedda, Chris and Bryan Loar will coordinate with Amy, Nedda, and Bryan Loar on a conference call with himself, Scott and Roy to discuss the prospect of employing a content management system (CMS). Jonathan would come up with a survey and run it by the Membership Committee. He should contact Lynda White who has survey expertise. Jon stated that Jonathan, Nedda Lynda White, Sandy and Rina should discuss a survey and how extensive it should be. Is it necessary? Jon indicated that they might want to discuss the web site with leaders of committees, sigs, section chairs, chapter heads. Jon will discuss any further responsibilities with Amy Lucker and other “temporary” members of this group. If a survey is desired, Sandy and Rina will come up with a date to forward a focused AWS needs assessment survey to the membership.
Deadline: June 1, 2011

Action Item #3:
Chris will pull numbers of new members, non-renewals and renewals to help determine why our membership numbers remain fairly consistent.
Deadline: April 30, 2011
Status:

**Action Item #4:**
Chris will walk everyone through the board dashboard (discuss at post-conf board meeting)
Deadline: June 30, 2011
Status:

**Action Item #5:**
Jon will contemplate acknowledging Nedda and Judy Dyki formally. Sandy and Jonathan Franklin will consider how much of a pay increase Nedda and Judy’s positions should receive.
Deadline: June 1, 2011
Status:

**Action Item #6:**
Tom will work with Chris to document his experience/end results in negotiating the joint conference finances.
Deadline: April 30, 2011
Status:

**Action Item #7:**
The monthly financials will be posted to the board dashboard by Tom (Chris? Liz?)
Deadline: Not set
Status:

**Action Item #8:**
All current and former board members will send their expense reports to Chris. Tom will send a reminder later this week. (Tom sent out a reminder right after Minneapolis, c. March 24, 2011.)
Deadline: April 28, 2011
Status:

**Action Item #9:**
Alan will draft a letter formally accepting the offer of the DC/MD/VA chapter to host the 2014 chapter for Jon to sign.
Deadline: May 1, 2011
Status:

**Action Item #10:**
Sandy will get information from Tony on his recent experience setting up an editorial board for the CBAA journal.
Deadline: Not set
Status:

**Action Item #11:**
Chris and Rina will ensure that Institutional and Business Affiliate membership categories have been combined. Rina needs to coordinate with Chris who will have signed contract with UCP. Jon will wait until the signed contract is back from UCP. After he hears that the CPC contract is signed, Jonathan makes a message to ARLIS Membership; notice to go on AWS.
Deadline: June 30, 2011
Status:

**Action Item #12:**
Mari will ask for clarification on the SAH “Institutional Partners Program” from Abigail van Slyck. Van Slyck would like ARLIS/NA to “recognize them [SAH] as an institutional partner or affiliated member.” What
does she want? Access to SAHARA submit roster; reciprocal member with ARLIS. Do they want access to our membership list?
Deadline: April 30, 2011
Status:

**Action Item #13:**
Sandy will look into alterations to the *Art Documentation* cover.
Deadline:
Status:

**Action Item #14:**
Jon will contact the University of Illinois regarding the ARLIS Archives for date of renewal in June or July.
Deadline: May 1, 2011
Status:

**Action Item #15:**
Jon will check in with Amy regarding the VRA policy manual.
Deadline: Mid-May 2011
Status:

**Action Item #16:**
Chris will make a prioritized project list and circulate it.
Deadline: May 1, 2011
Status:

**Action Item #17:**
Rina will contact Kim Collins regarding her proposed database for development prospects; this was not done by the end of 2010. Is it necessary?
Deadline: May 1, 2011
Status:

**Action Item #18**
James and Rina will work with the Development Committee Chair Sonja Staum and the local Toronto Conference Development Chairs about the details of James’s “eBay” auction idea in lieu of a silent auction.
Deadline: May 1, 2011
Status:

**Action Item #19**
Sarah and Laurel will assemble career demographic data on ARLIS/NA members. They can get information from the 2008 member survey and Chris at TEI. They might also contact Jamie Lausch, Chair of the Membership Committee. Jon was interested in how is the society changing and how mid-career and early-career members are being served?
Deadline: April 30, 2011
Status:

**Action Item #20:**
Heidi and Tony will convene Administrative Documentation Committee. They will consider the implications (budgetary and otherwise) of having an Administrative Documents Editor budget every three years.
Deadline: 1 year
Status:
**Action Item #21:**
Jon will contact past ARLIS/NA Presidents and veteran members about the concept of a regular three-year cycle of having joint conferences with VRA. If the Executive Board decides for triennial joint conferences will a membership vote be needed?
Deadline: May 15
Status:

10. **Mid-year Board Meeting Update**

Possible dates: September 15-16 22-23 29-30, 2011, in Houston, TX.

11. **Other Issues and Concerns**

**Issues for Future**
Mari: How do we set up policies and guidelines for a joint conference with VRA in Washington DC in 2014?

12. **Adjourn**

Doodle later in the April

Meeting is adjourned at 12:15 CST.