1. Communication with Members (Jon)

Jon Evans convened this telephone conference at 3:06, thanking everyone for their attendance during their busy workweeks. He indicated that there was a lot on the agenda, and that we probably would not get through all issues. He asked Rina and Debbie if some of their big issues could be handled via email?

First on the agenda, Jon wanted to consider issues of communicating with the ARLIS/NA members. He felt that it was critical that the Executive Board (EB) communicate with a “unified voice,” and that members of the EB should also make their ideas known to the membership. Jon talked with Nedda Ahmed and Carol Graney about how to communicate via the ARLIS/NA Webs Site (AWS). He then opened the question of communicating to the membership to the EB for their comments.

Mari Russell expressed her view that people don’t often go to AWS, and that we need to promote it. Jon agreed, and suggested email communications from the EB point to content on the AWS.

Jon emphasized that the membership needed regular communication, once a month, and that the EB needed to be visible. He did not feel that the AWS was used sufficiently. He asked what can Nedda and Carol do to support communication?

Jon felt that communications from the President needed a featured place on the AWS, as the President’s statements were currently tucked away under the “news” tab. It was buried too many layers down.. Would a blog work? Does the President and the EB have time and commitment to keep the blog fresh? Sarah Carter wondered if the problem with AWS communication was location specific or was it the way messages were presented? She introduced the idea of video updates? She wondered if textual presentations were too long and buried down in layers. She felt that video could be up front and accessible. Jon mentioned Alyssa Resnick’s recent suggestion on ARLIS-L concerning the use of video for fund-raising purposes. She proposed a “Why do I donate to ARLIS?” feature where EB members spoke to the camera. Debbie Kempe mentioned that Camtasia software was easy to use to produce a short video message.

Jon asked how to figure out video content? It could be content-driven; Sarah, for example, could report on professional development issues.

Mari thought that this kind of video reporting could be part of the EB’s role. She suggested that members be urged to contact members of the EB directly.
Debbie stated that some in ARLIS indicate that the work of the EB is mysterious. It was noted that there are 10 of us who could help with this, and that ARLIS HQ Chris or Scott could also do videos. Pat Barnett could be featured. Mari noted that many don’t have any idea of what the EB did and that this could make its work more transparent. She thought that videos could be short, say, two minutes in length.

Sarah thought that maybe we could use Go to Meeting software, like the education committee. We could offer chats with a few board members present. The technology could go wrong and we would need good technicians at each location. Mari likes Go to Meeting video conferencing; Jon hoped to find time when 3 or 4 can get together to do it.

Jon thinks it interesting, and joint conferences with VRA might be a good issue to explore with video.

Sandy Brooke discussed the upcoming membership about attitudes toward the AWS. Membership has to express what it wants in the AWS. Jon Franklin has begun a draft survey, but was not complete. The way in which the survey would be conducted was not yet clear. Sandy reported that interviews for the ARLIS/NA Prof Resources Editor were finished. There were 4 candidates and that all selection committee members felt unanimously that Hannah Bennett was the strongest candidate. She accepted the position. Jon thanked the Communications and Publications Committee for its rapid decision.

### Action Item
Jon would like Sarah to look into the possibilities for using video for EB messages to the membership. He mentioned that she look at Camtasia and others. He wanted her to provide a list of possible video software and then make her recommendation.

2. Approval of minutes (Alan)

Chris Roper and others indicated that they needed a copy of the 3/28/2011 Post-conference EB meeting minutes; they were sent out before the call, but there was some sort of snafu, and were resent out after the call. We will review and approve the minutes from 3/28/2011 and 4/14/2011 at the next call.

3. Financial report (Tom)

Tom Riedel sent out the most recent financial report. He did not have much to say. The auditor’s figures show deferred income. Tom moved amounts around providing a rosier picture. ARLIS/NA made $32,000 for 2010. Tom was waiting for corrected February financials. Chris was working on final cost for Minneapolis. Chris noted that the hotel cost was lower than expected.
3. Financial report (Tom)

Tom Riedel sent out the most recent financial report, which included the audited financials from 2010. Tom substituted the audited figures for those in the previously distributed December detailed budget. The auditor deferred some expenses paid in 2010 to 2011, resulting in a more profitable 2010 ($32,000 in the black) than expected. Tom was waiting for corrected February financials. Chris was working on final cost for Minneapolis. Chris noted that the hotel cost was lower than expected.

4. Chapter listserv proposal (Tom)

Vanessa Kam spoke with Tom about chapter list-serv proposal.

***Formal motion: Does the EB want to pay another $600 for 5 pts with L-Soft? ARLIS/NA would need to subsidize cost for Hosting Chapter web sites. Laurel Bliss moves to approve. Mari seconds. Motion approved unanimously.

5. Archaeology and Classics SIG proposal (Debbie)

Debbie was recently contacted by Amy Ciccone who wants to form a Special Interest Group (SIG). Arch + Classics, She sent out a note before the Minneapolis conference requesting all who might be interested in an Archaeology and Classics SIG inform her and she would set up a meeting at the conference. She got 10 replies. At the conference, 4 people met with Amy, where they covered various topics and seemed enthusiastic about building a SIG focusing on archaeology and classical studies. According to the ARLIS/NA By-Laws the SIG must not conflict or overlap with another. The SIG does not need a certain number of signatures, as a section does.

Jon wondered what the impact on the ARLIS/NA budget might be of adding another meeting space requirement to conference planning; they also might strain finances conceivably with a special funding request. Costs were thought to be minimal. Jon expressed support for the new SIG.

Chris indicated that he negotiates space and that ARLIS/NA could expand too far. He asked if there was a system of reviewing SIGs from time to time?

Discussion turned to whether a mechanism to review SIGs was in place. Is it written into policy manual? In the past, some had been dissolved.

Sandy was a little concerned that there might not be enough interest. Others said that it was worth letting them organize, as they might be able to generate interest. Jon noted that these were legitimate concerns, but that there were no guidelines about size or numbers.
It was decided that self-scheduling rooms could meet this SIG’s needs.

Was a motion needed to approve a SIG? No vote was necessary. Jon informed Debbie can inform Amy that “they are a go.”

6. **Liaison reports (James, Laurel, Sandy, Rina, Sarah, Alan)**

   **James:** Nothing.

   **Laurel:** She was putting chapter events on the Wiggio Board. Representatives could be reimbursed for attending a chapter meeting.

   **Sandy:** Sandy discussed with Jonathan Franklin about the formation of an editorial board for Art Documentation. Jonathan indicated that he was preparing a draft to present to the CPC. Judy Dyki was moving ahead with the University of Chicago Press (UCP) to redesign the Art Documentation cover. Art Documentation will appear in a smaller size with page numbers. UCP has contracted with cover designer to do this special project. The AWS survey was being prepared. The new PR Editor has not been paid her stipend as yet.

   **Rina:** Nothing.

   **Sarah:** Nothing.

   **Alan:** Nothing.

7. **Strategic Planning Committee update (Jon)**

   **Jon** reported that Pat Barnett indicated that Focus Groups were being held about the strategic plan. The first had already been held. The second would occur the afternoon of 4/14/2011 with all liaisons. The focus groups will use 5 questions as talking points. A focus group with ARLISnap was coming up.

8. **AWS and Art Doc Editor Stipends (Sandy)**

   Sandy discussed compensation for several ARLIS/NA editorial positions. She and Jonathan Franklin agreed that large stipends might be in order, particularly for the Art Documentation Content Editor (Judy Dyki) and AWS Editor (Nedda Ahmed). Others meritng consideration were the Art Documentation Copy Editor (Eileen Markson), Art Documentation Reviews Editor(s) (Doug Litts and Terrie Wilson), the Professional Resources Editor (Hannah Bennett) and the Moderator of the ARLIS/NA list-serv (Judy Dyki).

   The responsibilities of the Art Documentation Content Editor and the AWS Editor have increased. Peer review requires more work; Judy has done very well. Working with UPC and JSTOR has been a huge job for her. Nedda has done a lot of background work in the
discussion of a possible new content management system (CMS). The Art Documentation Content Editor receives $1,800, the AWS Editor, $1500.

Sandy did some compensation comparisons. The University of California Press pays Copy $3200 per year for editing services, for example. This meant that ARLIS/NA was low-balling three-fold, or so. Sandy mentioned new compensation figures of possibly $3,600 for the Art Documentation Content Editor and $3000 for the AWS Editor. These were still low costs, Sandy emphasized.

Debbie asked when the last time raises were made? Tom didn’t know. Tom wondered whether the low stipend discouraged people from applying for these positions?

Jon asked how much to increase the positions?

### Action Item

Jon asked Sandy to make a formal recommendation as to the amount of increases? He wanted objective data to figure the costs. He asked her to balance current market values with costs that were reasonable for a non-profit like ARLIS/NA to pay.

Tom noted that he would need to make changes to the budget. Payments were made in May and November. He could pay them retroactively for November as long as the EB approved. Chris agreed.

9. TEI update and priority list (Chris)

Chris indicated that he was working to update a monthly report sent to the EB. It will contain membership figures, project list updates and action items. He hoped to prioritize action items. Chris reported that TEI used a lot of hours in Minneapolis. The ARLIS conference budget was made up of a rolling average. He asked if we should revisit the budget this year?

10. Conference attendees list on the web (Chris)

Chris brought up the question of whether or not to put a list of names of conference attendees on the AWS? This year we did not offer to “opt out” option for attendees. TEI will do this in Toronto to opt out. The Toronto registration will automatically update if they opt in as they register.

Do we want to put the attendee list on the AES permanently? Is someone’s name and affiliation private? Should this information be on a password protected site? How does board feel? For privacy, members can opt out or not opt out for conference directory. Who can you publish? The AWS a public place?
Mari asked if we can still get a paper list of attendees? Chris mentioned in response the cost of printing and trying to be green. Paper lists stopped a few years ago. Tom mentioned that he sent out a PDF of attendees for the Denver conference.

PDF vs AWS? The AWS is open to everyone, but could password information. What is the reasoning behind not publishing?

Sarah was concerned about publication of the list on website. She supports sending out an electronic list to attendees. The AWS is a repository.

Jon thought putting it on the AWS was fine initially, but he also saw that privacy issues were valid. He was not sure about the privacy issue, but he agreed that a list of conference attendees (who allowed permission to publish) should be available to conference goers. Toronto will allow opt-outs.

11. Collaboration/joint conferences with VRA (Jon)

Jon indicated that this issue was complex and would need to be explored at the next meeting on May 19. He noted that collaboration with VRA needs our full attention. He wanted the benefit of the ARLIS membership survey to help us decide the ongoing issues with VRA. The survey response should be done in late May or early June.

Maureen Burns has asked for a conference call, but Jon hasn’t responded as was waiting for the survey information.

Tom indicated that at the Minneapolis joint conf with VRA, ARLIS spent about $30-40,000 on TEI time; these costs were not shared by VRA. He thought that we needed to reconsider cost sharing with VRA about TEI.

Some concern was raised about sharing donor lists. Mari indicated that she declined writing shared thank-you to donors. She indicated that we would do well to be cautious and not share everything. Jon mentioned that that’s a concern. Debbie suggested that we dedicate the June call exclusively to this. Jon was in favor of this. The EB might also consider a separate call devoted to that topic.

Tom would have his final financial report done by April 30. Jon indicated that June 9 might be a good date, as he was in Toronto on the 16th for CPAC. He wanted all of the information before that meeting.

Chris asked for more clearly defined ARLIS preferences for the number of complimentary rooms and suites. The hotel contract was not negotiated at the same time as the decision for comp rooms. He thought that this needed to be done at same time. How many suites for multiple presidents? Who’s comped? The comping procedures for joint conferences need to be spelled out.
At the next joint conference, a team from VRA should be ready to assist at the help desk. This would cut down on the number of staff TEI would need to bring and the amount ARLIS would have to fund.

Rina, Laurel and Mari would not be present at the May 19th call.

12. Virtual Conferencing Advisory Group (Jon)

Passed on this issue due to lack of time.

13. Why I donate or am a member video proposal (Jon)

Passed on this issue due to lack of time.

14. 2015 conference proposal (Jon)

Passed on this issue due to lack of time.

15. New Action Items (time permitting) (Alan)

Passed on this issue due to lack of time.

Adjourned 1:17 PM 3:17 PM Central time.