Preliminary Remarks (Jon)

Jon indicated that this meeting was being recorded.

He discussed the Executive Board’s (EB) ability to go into “executive session” but that this should be done judiciously. The EB should also be clear when it has decided to go out of executive session.

Jon noted that there were several key financial issues that needed to be dealt with during the first day of the meeting; some issues may have to be postponed until the October 20, 2011 conference call.

Jon thanked Scott for coming to the meeting, and noted that relations between ARLIS/NA and TEI had been going “exceedingly well.” TEI was bearing some of the cost of having Chris and Scott attend the Houston meeting.

Jon indicated that the goals of communication and transparency during his tenure were being met. He sends out messages to the membership once a month. He wanted to start posting video messages to the ARLIS membership, and had a video camera now in his office. The museum had a Vimeo account, so Jon felt the he should produce a message to the membership first. He hoped to get a message done within a week-ten days. **Action Item 1**

He encouraged individual EB members to communicate with the membership on issues within their purview. He also noted that the Nedda Ahmed and Carol Graney have archived the President’s messages on the ARLIS Web Site (AWS).

On the communication and transparency theme, Jon noted that the Document Advisory Committee (DAC) was established and will report at the midyear meeting. The Art Documentation (AD) work of Sandy and her team is an important communication tool, and the contract with the University of Chicago Press started during Mari’s term was exciting. He has been pleased with the inclusive nature of the ARLIS/NA Strategic Plan process. The central hosting of chapter web sites has been positive, as will be the possible use of a new management calendar for internal documentation.

Chris has done a fine job with planning of the upcoming Toronto meeting and has been a key liaison for the EB with the local committee. He also has set up the ARLIS EB’s Wiggio web site which has aided internal communications. TEI has created a presence, a new headquarters page, on the AWS. The strategic plan was also moved on the AWS (to the “About the Society” tab) making it easier to find.

Member responses have been very positive about the EB’s decision not to take an official ARLIS/NA position to the ARTStor log-in question.

The society is in a good financial position; the Finance Committee has recommended that the current $100,000 invested in a one-year certificate of deposit, due to mature on November 23, 2011, be placed in another 3-year certificate of deposit to earn the maximum yield. Jon was also pleased with the society’s membership figure, 1244 members, “quite positive.” Clark and Associates, the previous management group, however, did not keep good data on the membership. Currently, the society has two-years of accurate data on its membership.

Jon noted that he is committed to professional development virtual conferencing, and has discussed this with Sarah Falls who has committed to producing a formal proposal (hopefully by the October 20th call) regarding a virtual conferencing task force for the EB to consider. **Action Item 2**
Approval of 8/18/2011 Minutes and Review of Motions and Action Items (Alan)

Alan noted that he uploaded the 8/18/2011 minutes, but no one saw them as they were not in the minutes folder. He continued with a review of all motions and action items made during the first half-year period. These minutes will need to be ratified.

Sixteen motions have been made during the previous half-year, all passed without opposition or abstention. The EB had completed 20 of 29 action items, 8 on-going and 1 was no longer relevant.

Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) Status Report (Jon)

The SPC took a deserved summer off, but was now gearing up for the action plan phase of the process. Most of the SPC has remained, only two members left. The SPC is concentrating on using the action planning processes and methods used by the 2000-2005 SPC. The SPC will assign action items to various groups—the EB, liaisons, committees, divisions, SIGs, sections—for completion.

The SPC wanted to contract with an outside consultant to look at the strategic plan to determine how to implement it. This was not done. Instead, the SPC looked to a long-time ARLIS/NA member—perhaps one on the 2000-2005 committee—for guidance. The consultant could also give advice on the timetable for implementation.

Debbie asked if she should get in touch with Pat Barnett about the next SPC roster. Jon said that this would be good to do. Action Item 3

Sandy noted that perhaps the AWS strategic plan page be updated to indicate who is on the committee and where they are in the process. Action Item 4

Liaison reports: Professional Development Committee (PDC) (Sarah)

Sarah discussed occurrences within the Professional Development Committee (PDC) and its two sub-groups Education and Mentoring. Stacy Brinkman, Chair of the PDC, reported having problems uploading and archiving video webinars. The PDC lunchtime chats have proven successful, but because the Meebo service has been discontinued, the PDC will have to find a replacement. It needs to see if GotoMeeting or GotoWebinar software can replace Meebo. It may not be suitable, so replacement freeware will need to be found.

The PDC has a content management system (CMS) wishlist and has shared this with Nedda and the AWS group for inclusion in the larger debate about selecting a CMS.

The Mentoring Sub-committee (MSC) is looking forward to receiving action items from the SPC. The SPC is looking for new mentoring models at the annual conference; they are considering “drop-in mentoring,” creating a brief mentorship at the conference, and “virtual mentoring.” They have edited their DVD mentoring training down to a very tight program.

The MSC is looking for a fourth committee member, perhaps someone who hasn’t gone through the mentoring program to get an outside perspective. If any EB member has suggestions for the fourth person, contact Rachel Resnik directly. The group is also hoping to start a mentoring program with ARLIS/SE.

The SEI group has received a sponsorship proposal from the University of Michigan. The 2012 SEI folks are working on a draft budget, timetable and curriculum. They are considering a tuition increase, and, if so, will bring it to the ARLIS/NA and VRA EBs.

Tom wondered about the special funding that the Mentoring group was given to re-do their training DVD. They’ve abandoned the idea of making a new DVD, but new content would be streamed on line. Sarah will return the check to Chris, and the Mentoring group will invoice possible new expenses before the end of the year. Action Item 5

Sandy asked Sarah about conference mentoring programs that might be started for people, like Ph.D. students in the humanities, who were only thinking about art librarianship.
Liaison reports: Canadian Member-at-Large (James)

James first discussed his Canadian Member-at-Large report. ARLIS Canada, Daniel Payne, the next Canadian Member at Large, will serve on Melva Dwyer Award Jury as he will administer the award next year; Vanessa Kam has also expressed interest. James will send out call for volunteers in October and, at that time, he will also send out notes to publishers and vendors about the award.

James moved the ARLIS-Canada web site off of a MassCenter server to a private hosting service. There was some problem with down-time with the previous server.

As for the International Relations Committee (IRC), he noted the very successful trip to Mexico at the end of August 2011, and asked Debbie Kempe, who was on the trip, to share her impressions with the board. The trip’s itinerary, Katie Keller’s final report and Debbie’s report to the Kress Foundation were all posted on the AWS. A varied group went to Mexico and took in the vibrant art, archives and libraries scene of Mexico City. Three members of the tour—Clayton Kirking, Nicole Finzer and Kristen Regina—arrived early and participated in a well-attended video seminar hosted at the American Embassy in which they discussed activities at their libraries. Debbie made contacts that were lasting. ARLIS-NY is preparing a chapter meeting that will pass on experiences for Mexican colleagues and do, next year, a symposium on Latin American bibliography. Participants also had two days at the successful IFLA Conference. The bus company that transported tour members in Mexico wanted an additional $600; ARLIS was working with AMBAC, the Mexican Art Libraries group, to settle the matter. IRC also had a Flickr group up as well.

Jon asked Debbie about the possibility of expanding ARLIS membership in Mexico. Debbie noted that language is a barrier, so any Spanish-speakers attending ARLIS/NA events would need interpreters. Mari suggested looking to ARLIS/SC for member who were bi-lingual.

Jon asked if there was a group to which ARLIS/NA might send a liaison. Debbie thought AMBAC would be the group. He suggested creating an affiliate status with AMBAC, and that he had met its current chair, Elsa Barberina.

IRC has confirmed that a group of German art librarians will tour North America from April 14-22, 2012. Katie Keller is hoping have the agenda formed by November 2011. She has requested $500 from the EB for hosting and reception costs. ArtStor will host reception for the group.

For the Public Policy Committee (PPC), Marilyn Nassarden stepped down, so the group needs a new Canadian Member. Chair Roger Lawson has continued work on the Advocacy Policy draft, and James sent the latest draft to the EB. This draft deals with procedures for bringing public policy statements to the EB for its approval and official dissemination. The PPC wanted to know if committees, other than the PPC or the Cataloging Advisory Committee (CAC), could formally submit policy statements to the EB? Additionally, should these two committees vet the proposals before they reached the EB?

Debbie and Mari felt that the PPC should consider broad public policy issues, debate them and craft statements for EB approval. If they cannot forge a consensus, the PPC would then come back to the EB for advice.

James asked if the CAC should also consider policy issues and submit statements to the board? Jon felt that the PPC should be the primary filter to create any external statements to bring to the EB. James will relay the EB’s stance and the PPC will produce another Advocacy Policy draft in a week or so. Action Item 6

PPC asked that the EB authorize $60 for a committee member to receive an individual membership to the Center for Intellectual Property (CIP). James made a motion to this effect, with Mari seconding. Motion #1 Sandy asked whether this brings up again the question of whether ARLIS/NA would subsidize individual memberships? Tom noted that ARLIS/NA has organization memberships with ALA and CAA, but not individual memberships. Sandy asked if ARLIS/NA could create an institutional affiliation with CIP? James noted that Roger said that he had looked at all institutional memberships with CIP and that all the institutions were universities not societies. Also, the cost was $500 per year. Sandy asked if a librarian worked at a university that belonged to CIP, could s/he be a conduit for information? PPC does not currently have a member who works at an affiliated university. PPC might find a potential committee member from one of these universities. Jon asked if a liaison could apply for special funding? Chris noted that Policy X-8 noted that the liaison must get the money for attending annual conferences. Jon suggested that the EB alter X-8’s language to allow a PPC liaison to receive funding for this purpose. Tom said that the EB could be opening itself up to a host of other liaison requests. Mari wondered if the EB might reconsider opening up funding for liaisons.
Jon agreed that Roger should contact CIP about creating special membership status possibilities. If that didn’t pan out, the EB might consider altering X-8’s language. Chris mentioned that if CIP made an individual membership, could it be transferable within the PPC?

James withdrew MOTION #1, and would bring up the discussion at the next meeting.

PPC is currently watching policies on orphan works, HathiTrust case and the Google Books settlement.

Jon asked James if being the Canadian Member at Large means that he will administer, not jury, the award? Yes. James sent Heidi language about this.

Liaison reports: Communications and Publications (Sandy)

Sandy reported that Carole Graney scanned old conference programs and uploaded to the AWS under “News and Events”> “Conferences”>”Prior to 1995.”

Hannah Bennett, the Professional Resources Editor, is considering a new Occasional Paper, “Facilities Standards for Art Libraries and Visual Resources Collections,” but Jon Taormina has withdrawn from the effort. She also is considering a proposal to create a centralized collection of Art LibGuides. Nedda was concerned with maintenance of it. This would be a clearinghouse for LibGuides rather than the question of ARLIS/NA buying a LibGuides subscription and hosting them.

The Professional Resources Committee (PRC) was thinking about creating a handbook or primer on managing studio archives written for artists and studio assistants.

A sub-group of the Communications and Publications Committee was working on the AD cover design. The designer was originally working with text only, but now on a smaller format publication having a cover with public domain or licensed images. Judy will select the image in consultation with the University of Chicago Press (UCP) for each issue. All AD back issues were being scanned for JSTOR, will take a year. Chris asked the scanning company if TEI could get a copy of the AD back issues for archival purposes. A fee might be involved to obtain the copy. Members of IFLA were excited about AD’s JSTOR and University Press connections.

Jonathan Franklin worked hard on invitations to create the AD Editorial Board. Currently, the AD Editorial Board is a Special Committee appointed by Jon; all board members will be given complimentary ARLIS/NA memberships, except current ARLIS/NA members. The Editorial Board is a diverse mix of men and women, geographic areas, professions and ages. The Editorial Board will have a yearly conference call and Judy will be the coordinator for the group. Judy thought that six would be an adequate number to start if no more acceptances were received. UCP has been notified as to the Editorial Board’s roster.

Jon plans to write a follow-up letter to Editorial Board invitees who haven’t responded. Action Item 7 (He indicated that the letters would go out next week.) He commends the CAP for its terrific job. Its efforts gave ARLIS/NA fine “exposure and credibility.” Sandy also noted for special thanks the Task Force for AD within CAP, consisting of Jonathan Franklin, Judy Dyki and Sandy Brooke.

Debbie made a motion that “The ARLIS/NA EB commends the Task Force for Art Documentation for its exemplary work in securing a new publishing platform for Art Documentation and thereby creating a firm foundation for the continuation of the Society’s premier publication.” Tom and Sarah seconded the motion. MOTION #1 passed unanimously 10-0, with no opposition or abstentions.

Jon will send out an email to the ARLIS/NA membership on ARLIS-L about the formation of the AD Editorial Board.

Action Item 8

Debbie mentioned that the contract with UCP regarding AD brings up issues about e-archiving and copyright transfer.

LUNCH BREAK

Liaison reports: Chapters (Laurel)
Laurel noted that the chapter listservs have started the migration to LSoft Software. ARLIS/DC Maryland VA Chapter has made the transition, with Northern and Southern CA looking for a moderator(s) for their shared list. (ARLIS/Tex-Mex decided against migration.) She has also spoken with the DC Maryland VA Chapter about future conferences. Her main focus has been the Fall 2011 chapter meetings and to get as many EB members to visit as possible. There are several in the next couple of weeks with no one attending; she also mentioned that EB members could Skype their presence to the meetings.

All EB members need to let Laurel know which meetings that they can attend. This is not a smooth process. Additionally, Laurel will keep track of the chapter list-serv migrations to LSoft Software. **Action Item 9**

Laurel will do Western NY, Rina the Twin Cities, James the Canadian ones in ON and Montreal, Sarah the Ohio Valley, Sandy the NY. If there is a meeting with no EB representation, Jon will attend via Skype or GOTM. Last year, ARLIS/NW met virtually as did Mountain West.

Some chapters have had virtual meetings, including ARLIS/NW and ARLIS/MW. This will be the case this year for these two chapters.

**Jon** will discuss the Strategic Plan at the ARLIS/Tex-Mex Fall 2011 Meeting.

Laurel has written three articles in chapter newsletters so far. Mari suggested that Laurel produce a summary of the EB Mid-year meeting for all chapter newsletters. She wanted all chapter members to feel connected to the national organization. **Jon** suggested that Laurel also mention in chapter newsletters about the chapter listserv migrations to LSoft Software. **Action Item 10**

**Liaison reports: Development and Membership** (Rina)

Rina asked about the Development Committee’s (DC) prospects list, and whether some prospects listed as EB only, should be reserved for EB contacts. Some of these “EB only” prospects are annual requests for awards money. Jon felt that the DC should be able to handle almost all requests. Within the DC, a committee member who has some relationship with the potential donor should do the request. Jon mentioned that dividing requests within the DMC by alphabetical order was not as effective as determining who has a relationship with a potential donor. Only high dollar amount requests should be referred routinely to the President.

**Chris** felt that Sonia had sent out good documentation about requests to the DC. Don of TEI will work with exhibitors and advertisers for the Toronto conference; if he thinks that an exhibitor has expressed interest in sponsorship, he will refer Sonia to that contact, and vice versa. He calls this “cross-pollination.” Invoicing handled through TEI.

**Liaison Reports: Cataloging Advisory Committee** (Alan)

No news to report.

**TEI Report** (Chris)

Chris noted that TEI has added a headquarters page for the AWS. It’s located under the “Organization” tab, and discussed some of TEI’s responsibilities. Under the EB tab, Scott and Chris’s photos will be added. For the EB meeting TEI uploaded to the Wiggio shared account an updated TEI org chart, membership stats and trends, and a current project list.

The two chapters who will migrate listservs to ARLIS/NA’s LSoft software have paid ARLIS/NA for it. ARLIS/Central Plains uses TEI’s internal list-serv option (which does not have an archiving capability) which is free.

Chris noted that he is pretty close to being on schedule for the Toronto conference hotel contract negotiations.

Chris has scheduled a meeting of the sub-committee concerned with the redesign of the ARLIS AWS. The meeting will enable the sub-committee to ask TEI questions about the AWS wish list.
Chris has reached out to chairs of the 2014 Washington, DC, Conference. Roger Lawson was doing site inspections that day, visiting 14 possible hotels.

Scott discussed the difficulties ARLIS/NA experienced with TEI in 2010, and the personnel changes that he has made as a result of it. He has assigned at least two TEI employees per account. Scott outlined TEI's departments, each with 3-4 people: Administrative (financials), Membership, Customer Care, Media Services and IT. Association managers, like Chris, now have assigned back-up teams. TEI is 25 years old, has 24 on staff and 18 clients.

TEI has compiled membership statistics since 2008, and the EB has access to this on-going data a downloadable Excel file. Scott asked about ARLIS/NA's membership retention rate. He underscored that the Membership Liaison or Membership Committee (MC) Chair (Jamie Lausch Vander Broek) should spend the day with Scott to learn about membership management techniques before the end of December 2011. Action Item 11 ARLIS/NA has 10-12 membership categories; we need to look at the retention rate by member type. Does ARLIS/NA have membership problems in geographic areas? This needs to be considered. It always costs less to maintain a member, than to get a new one. Retention is critical. Retention and recruitment are two different areas for volunteer organizations. Retention is about value, quality of services and the intangibles of belonging.

Scott also mentioned reclamation. ARLIS/NA has 500 former members some died, sick, retired, laid off, in financial distress. We should have waivers for former for medical disability and lay-offs, perhaps a year or two of free membership.

For those who left for less tangible reasons, an amnesty program works well. (First six months free, and a reduced rate after that.) For retirees, a retirement membership could be started.

For recruitment of new members, one can buy lists of possible recruits. More effective are incentives, whereby a member refers others. Do this once or twice a year on a fixed schedule, perhaps a month or two before the annual conference. Referral programs are inexpensive, and may include the cost of incentives.

TEI is installing its first Joomla content management system (cms). By early 2012, Chris will know what works and what doesn’t with a cms. List-servs do a job, but they are on the decline in popularity. CMS are better. Forums are increasing popularity, as they avoid list-serv email floods over hot topics. TEI also has stand-alone forum software called PHPBB, which is open source. TEI can handle both.

The EB can check how Chris spends his time for ARLIS, as he charts this. ARLIS/NA purchases 180 staff hours per month. It should consider periodically what tasks Chris is doing.

TEI can host (and back-up) chapter web sites for free; six chapters already do this. If chapters run a wiki, cms, list-serv or forum, TEI can handle this.

Mari thanks Scott, Chris for their efforts at running a joint conference in Minneapolis. She noted that TEI's changes have moved the relationship in the right direction. ARLIS/NA pays TEI $8,991 per month.

Jon asked that TEI Monthly Reports include more historical perspective, providing stats about hours from the previous year, for example. Chris will add a column for the previous contract year on the Excel sheet. Action Item 12

Tom noted that the management calendar’s publication services hours would need to reflect ARLIS/NA’s new relationship with UCP about Art Documentation.

Jon and Debbie have considered having TEI produce a mid-year report for the EB and membership. This would assist in transparency. They will discuss to see if a mid-year report be part of the new TEI contract. Action Item 13

Scott suggested that ARLIS/NA get one membership in the Center.org (American Society of Association Executives).

Lunch Break

Membership type change (Rina)
Chris and Rina discussed the Art Documentation (AD) membership ramifications of the ARLIS/NA contract with the University of Chicago Press (UCP). One ramification was the ARLIS/NA cannot use the term “business membership.” The contract with UCP states: “Starting with volume 31 (2012), ARLIS/NA institutional and business affiliate members will be converted to standard institutional subscriptions at the Press.” ARLIS/NA shared with UCP a complete list of its over 300 business affiliates, institutional and overseas members. In addition, “UCP also has no involvement with setting ARLIS/NA member rates.” Kari of UCP indicated that UCP anticipates the possibility of getting small margins handling AD (estimated at $3,300 after $10,000 is paid to ARLIS/NA), and does not want to compete with ARLIS/NA for subscription funds for AD. UCP hoped to pick up revenue from 203 of the 300 names on the list. What do we want to have left on our side?

How does ARLIS/NA maintain close relations with important sponsors while at the same time not undercutting UCP’s low margins? Only about 30 of the over 300 on the list are active sponsors. Some change to the ARLIS/NA By-Laws will be necessary. How do we communicate the change in membership to those close to the organization? Jamie Lausch wanted to know what to tell our business affiliates. Do we reconcile ourselves to losing their $190 memberships and how do we let our closest sustaining sponsors know about a change in membership nomenclature?

Chris advocated adding membership to the tiered “affiliate sponsorship types” Gold, Silver and Bronze at $4000, $2500 and $1500 respectively. (These types are in the Conference Planning Manual.) The Affiliate Sponsorship Types are different from Society Circle members who are philanthropic individuals not organizations. Consensus was to offer a package of benefits (membership, discounted ad rates in AD, etc) through the affiliate sponsorship types.

Jon indicated that more thought needs to be done by our Development Committee on pricing these affiliate sponsorship types, as $1500 might be too much for some. He asked Chris and Rina to discuss membership benefits and sponsorship categories with the Development Committee. Also, perhaps a lower tier ($500 level) should be added for the business affiliates. Jon requested this for the October 20th call. Action Item 14

Chris indicated that he would contact Kari about not contacting those to whom we would offer affiliate sponsorships. Action Item 15

SEI Funding Proposal (Sarah)

Rebecca Price reported that the University of Michigan (UM), (at which the 2012 SEI Conference will be held) has agreed to be a co-sponsor, offering discounted rates and food and beverage services, a break on liability insurance, to pay for potential disabilities accommodation costs should a participant require them. UM would be legally obligated to provide those services, with no expectation of recovering revenue. Sarah made the motion that “ARLIS/NA accepts the offer by the University of Michigan to be a co-sponsor of the SEI 2012 Conference.” Laurel seconded. MOTION #2 passed unanimously 10-0, with no opposition or abstentions.

Jon made a motion that the EB thank SEI Co-chairs, Elizabeth Schaub and Betha Whitlow, as well as Local Chair Rebecca Price for their work in forming a co-sponsorship agreement with the University of Michigan and thank the University of Michigan (Robert Camp in particular) for its generosity in providing this support for SEI 2012. Mari seconded. MOTION #3 passed unanimously 10-0, with no opposition or abstentions. Mari asked how they would be thanked? Sarah will relay the EB’s thanks. She will get the language from Jon. Action Item 16

Document Advisory Committee (DAC) (Heidi Hass)

The Document Advisory Committee—Heidi, Tony White, Ted Goodman, Rachel Resnik and Jennifer Friedman—to divide up the Policy Manual amongst the members and have each member send their sections to the committee chair responsible for that activity. Heidi indicated that she expected that committee chairs would discuss policy manual changes with their committees and perhaps with previous committee chairs. They’ve heard from 75% about revisions to the policy manual. Each EB member will receive sections of the policy manual for which it is responsible for review. Changes in the policy manual will be tracked in a Word document for the EB to examine.

The DAC would like a timeline as to when the EB would like to see suggested changes to the policy manual, conference planning manual and to the by-laws. Jon answers that he would like something by January 15, 2012; Heidi indicated that she felt that changes to the policy manual, conference planning manual and by-laws could be passed to the EB by January 31, 2012. Heidi will furnish both an unmarked text and a text with tracked changes.
Jon will ask Heidi to share with the EB a list of the groups that she is going to be contacting during the DAC updating process. **Action Item 17a**

The DAC made preliminary discussion about by-laws changes and focused on the issue of electronic voting. Heidi indicated that the DAC would first like to come up with new language on by-laws changes for the EB to review; second, it would ask the EB about the mechanism for implementation.

Sandy states that one other section of the by-laws will have to be altered: Article 2 on membership categories.

James wanted to the DAC to clarify the by-laws about an EB member also chairing a committee. In his case, the Canadian Liaison is also the Chair of the Melva Dwyer Award Committee. Jon will discuss with James about alterations to the ARLIS/NA Policy Manual before he sends language about the Melva Dwyer position to Heidi for changes. **Action Item #17b**

**Future Joint Conferences (Mari)**

The current situation regarding future joint conferences was discussed. VRA and ARLIS/NA EBs exchanged Minneapolis conference reports. Jon provided his take on the conference and sent it to Maureen Burns, who forwarded it to the VRA List-serv. The Joint Task Force on Collaboration Report (2008) was also discussed.

Mari indicated that joint conferences take the boards of ARLIS/NA and VRA a great deal of time, and they need to be planned with an understanding of the extra time and money these joint meetings take. She advocated that a Joint Task Force be put together to consider future joint conferences.

Jon stated that the EB needed to press forward with consideration of future joint conferences, to act in good faith, look at members’ perspectives and to think long term. He endorsed the Joint Task Force idea, but indicated that the EB needed to consider financial issues first. If an equitable financial solution can be made, then he would be in favor of the Task Force’s formation. The earliest that another joint conference could be staged would be 2015. Debbie agreed with Jon.

The Joint Task Force would establish best practices for the planning and management of all future joint conferences; these best practices would include the creation of a joint financial agreement, mutual understanding of hotel contracts and cultural differences between the two groups. How joint will committee meetings and special events be? Clarification of whose management companies do what, and how will they be paid? What are the functional roles of each board? The Task Force could give the EB options about whether there will be another joint conference and, if so, what are the best practices for these?

Executive session is invoked.

Executive session is ended.

Jon said that he felt that there were real benefits to having interactions with VRA or other allied groups, and that it would strengthen ARLIS/NA as a result of these experiences.

He would not select members of the ARLIS/NA and VRA Joint Conference Task Force from the EB. The task force would consider only future conference collaboration with VRA only, not other groups such as SAA, SAH, CAA, etc. Greta Bahnemann, in previous communication with Jon, raised the idea of holding meetings at both conferences next year, to get a sense of what kinds of collaboration ARLIS/NA and VRA could establish.

Alan mentioned that perhaps a task force made up of knowledgeable ARLIS/NA members can examine what it is membership wants in a joint conference with VRA? This task force might be more objective in thinking about membership needs. He also stated that he is not sure that the membership would have a positive view of joint conferences given the past financial model used. Sandy agreed that more probing of the membership needed to be done.

Mari felt that other collaborative activities with VRA should be considered. Debbie asked about collaborative activities that could be done yearly, aside from having a joint conference.
Jon asked that Tom and Chris (and whoever else was interested) collaborate on providing joint conference financial models that can work for ARLIS/NA. He felt that it was important that financial information was recorded for future boards by experienced EB members, like Tom, who have gone through the joint conference planning process.

Sandy made a motion requesting Tom to recommend a financial model for future joint conferences. Alan seconded. MOTION #4 passes unanimously 10-0, with no opposition or abstentions. Tom would bring information on a workable financial split to the October 20th conference call. Action Item 18

Honoraria for Art Documentation Content Editor Judy Dyki and ARLIS AWS Editor Nedda Ahmed (Sandy)

Sandy asked that the EB go into Executive Session due to confidentiality issues about compensation. She did research about what other comparable, non-profit, professional organizations pay their web site editors, copy editors and publications editors as honoraria and a discussion ensued about her findings. Sandy will put her research on Wiggio for the EB to consult. Action Item 18a

Executive Session invoked.
Executive Session ended.

Sandy proposed that ARLIS/NA pay the Art Documentation Contents Editor an honoraria of $4,000 per year and reimbursement to Judy Dyki for her travel to meet with editorial staff at the University of Chicago Press Journals in March 2011. For the ARLIS AWS editor, she recommended an honoraria of $2,500 per year for a total of $6,500 per year, up from the current total of $3,300.

Tom wondered whether the EB should consider all honoraria. He also projected that the 2012 budget would be in the red, and that we need to think carefully before raising honoraria costs right now.

Sandy made a motion that ARLIS/NA reimburse the Art Documentation Contents Editor for her travel to meet with editorial staff at the University of Chicago Press Journals in March 2011. Also, ARLIS/NA would reimburse all future Art Documentation Contents Editors for travel to attend the compulsory University of Chicago Press Journals annual editors meeting. Laurel invoked. MOTION #5 Motion passes unanimously 10-0, with no opposition or abstentions.

Jon and Debbie asked for a review of all Honoraria for ARLIS Publications Committee positions, List Moderator, Web Site Moderator, Art Documentation Editor, Occasional Papers Editor, Reviews On Line Editor(s). Debbie also asked that stipends information be pulled together, too. Tom was asked to gather data on stipends and honoraria and some historical data, if possible. Action Item 19

Hosting of LibGuides (Debbie)

Yuki Hibben, Moderator of the Academic Division, contacted Debbie. Yuki said that a SIG member got in touch with her suggesting that ARLIS/NA get a subscription to LibGuides. This would enable ARLIS/NA to host the production of its own LibGuides for those who may not have access to the service or a place where SIG or Division leaders could produce their own for the organization, i.e., the popular LibGuide produced by the SIG for Textile and Costume Design. There was discussion on this issue within the Academic Division, and there was some confusion about whether the LibGuides would be used as a clearinghouse or a tool. Nedda Ahmed questioned the value of creating ephemeral guides that might not be maintained as members came and went. Debbie noted that freeware existed that can be used for this purpose and that the use of this should be encouraged. She counseled that the EB take no action.

Tom agreed.

Debbie should respond to Yuki about this issue, asking her to emphasize the use of open source options. Action Item 20

Affiliate/Liaison Status Review from MLA (Debbie/Jon)
Four weeks prior, Jon received an email from Alyssa Resnick, 2013 Pasadena Conference Co-chair and Liaison of the Music Library Association (MLA) to ARLIS/NA; she indicated that the MLA was not affiliated with ARLIS/NA. Alyssa brought this issue to the MLA Board, which welcomed “Affiliate” status with ARLIS/NA. Should we initiate an affiliated relationship with MLA? Debbie noted that Alyssa was not sure whether ARLIS/NA did need to initiate affiliate status with MLA. She attends both conferences, but did not see a lot of overlap with ARLIS/NA. Jon defined a “liaison” as an ARLIS/NA member who is connected with a particular association with which our organization has shared interests. This connected individual is then asked to collect and also to push out information to that group. In the case of the liaison, no formal relationship has been made by ARLIS/NA with the individual liaison or other group. “Affiliate” status is a more formal relationship, in which “two organizations agree to be partners and try to collaborate.” ARLIS/NA does currently have liaisons with non-affiliated organizations.

Sandy looked in the organizational documents and found that “affiliation” is quite specific in what it means; ARLIS/NA and an affiliated group can “share mailing labels, give reciprocal conference registration privileges at member rates, exchange information (publications, conference information) regularly.” ARLIS/NA can fund liaisons for attendance at affiliated organizations’ conferences. Chris found that liaisons are discussed in context of affiliation in the ARLIS/NA By-laws, Article 14, Sections 1-5 stated: “Affiliation or disaffiliation with organizations shall be authorized by the EB as provided below.” He continued: “Formal affiliation or merger with another organization must be approved by a 2/3’s majority of those individual members voting by a ballot conducted in accordance with Sections 2 and 3 of Article 19. The Society may hold an institutional membership in another organization, the President may appoint a member or members of the Society to represent the Society or to serve as Liaison to another organization. Formal affiliation may confer the rights and privileges deemed appropriate by the EB.” A two-tiered system exists, that can allow a liaison to a non-affiliated group. There is also a substantive affiliation that has been formalized by 2/3rds vote and confers specific benefits.

Jon will contact the University of Illinois ARLIS/NA Archives to figure out which organizations have a formal affiliate relationship with ARLIS/NA. Some may have been missed on the AWS. Action Item 21

ARLIS/NA has 15 organizational affiliations currently according to the AWS. (See AWS “About the Society,” “Affiliated Organizations.”) Jon mentioned that a broader task force on collaborations should discuss this. Liaisons do not have to attend the other group’s conferences, but they should at least monitor its list-serv or communications equivalent.

Debbie will check on our affiliate’s web sites to see if ARLIS/NA is listed. If not, Debbie should correspond with them to check on our affiliated statuses, and, if so, if they can acknowledge that in a public way. Additionally, if we vote to affiliate, do we then have to vote to disaffiliate? Debbie will also respond to Alyssa that currently the EB respectfully declined from creating a formal affiliation with MLA. Action Item 22

The EB did not feel that a formal affiliation effort was necessary with MLA. Alyssa was free to send out emails about MLA as she saw fit.

Jon indicated that the EB needs to research the liaison/affiliate relations in the By-Laws and Policy Manual before we ask the Document Advisory Committee (DAC) to clarify this liaison/affiliate relationship in those documents. No action item for the DAC at the moment. It was Jon’s view that it should be clarified that liaisons do not need to be appointed only to formally affiliated organizations.

Management Calendar and Maintenance (Debbie and Chris)

Chris received an inquiry from one of the awards committee chairs about the management calendar (last updated in 2008) and whether or not they should follow this. Chris suggested that ARLIS/NA consider Toodledo Online Task Management software. Chris was not able to look at the Management Calendar and consider if it needed to be updated, and, if so, who should be contacted about making updates to it. He would like input from the EB about the management calendar and possibly ideas about task management software. Chris indicated that he would try to work with a low-tech solution first, but would also provide some other, more robust options for the EB to consider. Action Item 23

Mari mentioned that, two years ago, the EB was to review their sections of the Management Calendar and make necessary revisions. Only Mari and Ted Goodman sent theirs to Nancy Short. A problem in the calendar is that the annual conference dates change, altering the schedule year to year.
For another client, LRA, Chris cuts out items from their management calendar and reminds leadership about upcoming action items.

Jon asked all EB members review their responsibilities in the Management Calendar (roughly by December 10, 2011) and to give Chris her/his thoughts about how robust a task management system ARLIS/NA needs. Action Item 24
Debbie also underscored that cost is a big factor in the EB’s deliberations. Jon felt it important to find software that can automatically adjust the calendar to take into account shifts in the yearly conference’s meeting times.

Management calendar at: http://www.arlisna.org/organization/admin/docs/admin/docs_index.html

September 30, 2011

Day 2

Conference Updates: Toronto 2012 (Mari)

Mari had a couple of concerns. First, what was the status of the Welcome Party? It will not be at the Winter Garden but will be staged at the Art Gallery of Ontario (AGO). The price is comparable to Minneapolis. Cost: $44,000, included 1 drink and transportation. Second, was there a problem with the meeting rooms at the hotel? All sessions will be on the mezzanine level, with the possible exception of convocation which may be downstairs in a large ballroom. The poster session will also be downstairs near exhibitors.

Toronto is an expensive city used to lots of conventions. Hotels are not too competitive about rates. This year, ARLIS/NA does not have a large room block, so there is not a scary financial commitment. Rooms are costly at $209 CN. There are some lower-cost hotels nearby, but Chris cannot vouch for their caliber. In Pasadena, there is a lower-cost Courtyard Inn for students, near to the Sheraton conference hotel. Mari felt that it was important that the President send out a reminder to the membership of the financial importance of staying the conference hotel.

Chris still needs to work out a suite for the President in Toronto; Jon would like host a reception for new members in an intimate setting that does not cost extra. He would like the EB to attend. This is important for recruitment and retention purposes.

Jon provided the highlights of midyear CPAC follow-up conference call. Toronto planners, Carol Ann Fabian and Stephanie Frontz, are doing good work and producing a fine program. Plenary speakers are scheduled for each day. Michael Brand and Diane Thorneycroft scheduled as speakers.

Tom mentioned that in Minneapolis, all projected costs came in well under budget. In Toronto this will not be the case. Another big event will be a Welcome Reception/40th Anniversary Party with cake and champagne. Tom indicated that this would be a fine sponsorship opportunity. Jon will contact Jill Patrick about this sponsorship opportunity. Action Item 25
Because some Minneapolis events (namely the Society Circle reception) did not go well, Jill has been working with an event planner, whom OCAD is paying.

Registration will cost $225 CN, but will barely cover the cost of events. The conference events need $30,000 of sponsorship. Jon has okayed use of the Alternative Speakers Fund to supplement speaker honoraria.

Efforts are on-going to winnow down the number of tours in Toronto, due to costs.

Executive session invoked.

Executive session ended.

Rina will ask Sonja and Darren to offer to Jill to collaborate with her on development at the Toronto Conference. Action Item 26

Jon is concerned about the length of the Convocation; local planners have thought to limit presentations at the Convocation to only named awards. Travel awards would be distributed at the Membership Lunch. Also, the
Membership Meeting will need to be briefer this year than last. The Toronto CPAC will not speak and the EB will need to limit its remarks.

2012 Toronto Conference Budget (Tom)

Tom is anticipating Toronto be a good draw, better, perhaps, than the attendance at Minneapolis. There will be a reduced number of exhibitors in Toronto (35), compared with over 50 in Minneapolis. The tours income is estimated at $19,000 (vs. $14,000 in Minneapolis). Local planners are being asked to reduce tour costs to retain a comfortable profit margin. This year, if the Society sells out its room block, it will be paid a hotel booking commission of $16,000. The Speaker’s Fund (which is restricted fund money) should be adequate; the local committee could use up to 15% of the fund, or a maximum of $6,600. Usually, the Society does not come close to spending this amount. Estimates are for the Development Committee to raise $28,000. Hotel catering costs at the Toronto Sheraton will be very high. Because registration costs will be paid in American dollars, ARLIS/NA stands to lose money on currency adjustments in Canada. If all goes well, Tom has projected a positive Toronto balance of $37,000, minus an exchange rate loss of $6,000.

In order to attract local booksellers and non-profit organizations to exhibit in Toronto, Kari and Karen want to offer local booksellers half tables at reduced price of $400 rather than the full table cost of $850. They want to provide a lower cost option for locals without offending the regular vendors. Locals can share a half table, but no more than two. The EB needs to consider maintaining good will with regular exhibitors vs. filling the place up with regulars and locals or one-time vendors. Debbie made a motion that ARLIS/NA, at its Toronto Conference, offer 1/2 tables for $500 and full at $850. Tom seconded. MOTION #6 The motion passed unanimously 10-0, with no opposition or abstentions.

The possibility of having non-book related vendors at the Toronto Conference was raised, but not enacted. While it could constitute a new revenue stream, organization of such an area would take time for the local committee.

Chris related that DAP, because it was already an exhibitor, asked if it could get an ad in the conference program for a 25% discount. Bundling regular exhibitor fees with a discount in advertising, is good marketing. It underscores that ARLIS/NA is concerned about vendor conference costs and encourages them to support the conference book at a reduced price. The price of the conference program is fixed; the more ads that we solicit, the lower the printing price. Jon asked Rina to communicate this idea of bundling to the Development Committee to get their opinions, but Chris indicated that there wasn’t time for this, as the Conference Prospectus needed to go out. Debbie introduced the motion for ARLIS/NA to offer exhibitors a 25% discount to advertise in the Toronto Conference Program. Sarah seconded. MOTION #7 The motion passed unanimously 10-0, with no opposition or abstentions.

Conference Updates: Pasadena 2013 (Chris/Debbie)

Chris indicated that the Committee for the Pasadena Conference (April 25-29, 2013) seems to be well-organized and motivated. They have already set up list-serv, and Chris has already had conversations with them about the 2012 CPAC meeting (which Debbie will schedule). They are also working with a local graphic designer on their conference logo; in lieu of payment, the designer will receive free space in the conference exhibit hall.

Conference Updates: Washington, DC 2014 (Chris/Laurel)

Laurel reported that the Washington Conference Committee has 14 hotel site visits set up. Roger has also set up a Google Docs account and sent out a call for volunteers. The goal is to sign a hotel contract before the end of 2011. From the 14 hotels visited, the committee will narrow the list further, then request RFPs from that small group.

Liability Insurance (Chris)

Debbie made some inquiries about liability insurance for members of the IRC Study Tour of Mexico in August 2010. Additionally, ARLIS/NA will need liability insurance for the Pasadena Convention Center, as it is a city-owned venue. Private hotels usually cover occupants under their own liability policies. Chris contacted the Aon Associates, (endorsed by the American Society of Association Executives [ASAE]), for a quote. Aon works primarily with associations and non-profit organizations. Chris mentioned two options: the first included cyber coverage (which is unnecessary because ARLIS/NA’s networks are operated and insured by TEI). The other is a policy that covers ARLIS/NA for one year, and would cost $500 plus another $4 to increase the liability limits from $2 million to $4
million. Over the last several years, TEI has not seen large increases in its clients' liability premiums. It is likely that the price next year will be approximately $525. Currently, ARLIS/NA has directors and officers liability insurance which covers the actions of the EB. This new policy would cover someone tripping and falling at the conference, regardless if it were in the US or abroad. Actions by Chris at the annual conference would also be covered. (Chris is covered by TEI, so they would be the primary insurer, but ARLIS/NA’s policy would also come into play.)

Debbie moved to purchase the Aon Business Owner’s policy with the higher liability limits beginning October 1, 2011. Tom seconded. MOTION #8 Jon had one reservation about the $10,000 limit for medical expenditures. He asked “Is there some other coverage that would come up out of this general aggregate limit if it were indeed a medical expenditure?” Jon was not comfortable with the policy until the limit was checked. Debbie withdrew MOTION #8. Chris will check with the insurer to see if there is a possibility to increase the medical liability limit. Action Item 27

ARLIS/NA Budget 2012 (Tom)

First, Tom discussed the four special funding applications (an action item). The first was a chapter request from ARLIS/SC for $500 for promotional materials to be distributed at the Toronto Conference. It is typical for the CPAC of the following conference to request money for marketing its efforts at the previous one. Money is typically given, not always through a special funding application. Tom felt that this was a legitimate use of the money. ARLIS/SC currently had $1,875 in its chapter treasury. The chapter will cover any overages. Motion: Sarah made a motion approving the special funding request by the ARLIS/SC Chapter for $500 for promotional materials. Sandy seconded. MOTION #8 The motion passed unanimously 10-0, with no opposition or abstentions. Laurel will notify ARLIS/SC about their $500 special funding award for promotional materials for the 2013 Pasadena Conference. Action Item #27a

The International Relations Committee (IRC) requested $500 to help cover hospitality costs of 10 German art librarians on their IRC-sponsored study trip to the New York and Washington, DC, areas. (The IRC asked for $10 per person for five events.) Debbie encouraged Katie Keller to make this request. James made the motion that the EB accept the special funding request to provide $500 for hospitality costs of the 10 German art librarians attending the IRC-sponsored study trip in 2012. Debbie seconded. MOTION #9 The motion passed unanimously 10-0, with no opposition or abstentions. James will follow up with IRC to tell them of the acceptance. Action Item 28

The Development Committee (DC) requested $750 to print letter-press invitations to all past Society Circle members to attend the Society Circle reception at the 2012 Toronto Conference. Tom noted that all guidelines say a special funding request can be a maximum of $500. The DC has no budget. Mari brought forward a motion from the request of the DC to spend $750 on letter press invitations for the Toronto Society Circle Event. Sandy seconded. MOTION #10 Jon objected to the $100 to be paid for a ARLIS art school student graphic designer to add the ARLIS logo to the invitation. Sandy thought that the $100 be removed. Is this going to generate more than it costs? Mari felt that the EB was over-controlling the issue and wanted to support the flexibility and creativity of the DC. Jon wanted it clarified that all those attending the Society Circle reception must be Society Circle members. The invitation must make this clear that they are asking previous members to re-enroll. Sandy offered to share the EB’s concerns about the invitation’s clarity of purpose and design costs to the DC. Action Item 29 Debbie amended Motion #10: “The EB grants the DC request for up to $750 for a printed solicitation to past and current members of the Society Circle that mentions benefits including the upcoming Toronto Conference event. Design and wording of the invitation must be approved by the Board.” Mari agreed to the amendment. Rina seconded. The motion passed unanimously 10-0, with no opposition or abstentions.

The Artists Files Working Group (AFWG) requested $119.40 to cover Inmotion web hosting fees for Artist Files Revealed Project. The AFWG consulted TEI to host this, but they could not, so another host had to be found. This would be a retrospective cost reimbursement. Sandy made a motion that we spend $119.40 to retrospectively cover the costs of Inmotion hosting of the Artist Files Working Group’s Artist Files Revealed Project. Tom seconded. Motion #11 The motion passed 9-0, with none opposed and 1 abstention. Tom will follow up the AFWG. Action Item 30

Tom brought forward a motion from the Finance Committee’s (FC) request to renew the $100,000 Vanguard Certificate of Deposit for another 2-3 years depending on which time period has the higher yield. Sandy seconded and strongly encouraged the reinvestment in the 3-year CD. Motion #12 The motion passed unanimously 10-0, with no opposition or abstentions. Tom will follow up with the Finance Committee on this EB decision. Action Item 31

Tom submitted this Treasurer’s Budget Report for 2012:
Review of 2011 budget through August:

Net income as of the end of August is over $36,000; other revenue to be added into the operating budget before the end of the year includes $47,000 in deferred dues, for a total of $83,587. Anticipated expenses for the rest of 2011 include payments to TEI ($36,000), Art Documentation production and mailing ($12,750), honoraria ($2,550), executive board and staff travel expenses ($4,850) and GoTo meeting ($800) for a total of around $57,000. Given these figures, I anticipate a year-end net income of around $26,000.

Review of 2012 budget draft:
The draft budget has some accounts color-coded: blue indicates restricted funds, orange for conference-related revenues and expenses, and green for the accounts affected by the transition of Art Documentation publication from TEI to the University of Chicago Press.

Revenue/membership:
Membership revenue for 2011 will surpass the projection of $127,550 by a few thousand dollars, although the projections for individual membership fell a couple thousand dollars short. Categories that did well enough to make up the balance were Institutional, Business Affiliate and Overseas—totaling over $44,000, compared to the projection of $38,000. For 2012, I have scaled back the projection for individual memberships to better reflect what has been a gradual decline in this category over the past few years. All three of the categories that did better than expected in 2011 will not be a part of the 2012 budget as those revenues will be collected as Art Documentation subscriptions by the University of Chicago Press.

Revenue/restricted funds:
Accounts 4204-4209 (in blue) indicate monies that we can draw from restricted funds, so amounts listed here are not money we need to raise.

Revenue/Toronto conference (orange):
- I projected registration numbers similar to what was projected for Minneapolis. Even though Minneapolis was a joint conference and had potential to draw from a larger universe of registrants, it ended up not being a large conference by ARLIS standards. I’m projecting around 500 registrants for Toronto (and hoping that we’ll have more).
- We’re expecting fewer exhibitors, given the added complication of U.S. exhibitors having to work through a customs broker.
- Our hotel contract includes a booking commission that will generate $16,574 in income if we sell out our room block.
- Tours income is showing as higher than in previous years because there are many tours planned; tours expenditures are also proportionately higher. It’s likely the number of tours will be winnowed down before registration opens and we’ll expect the profit margin to remain roughly the same.

Revenue/publications:
I’m not expecting publication income to be much different from 2010, and no new publications are on the horizon. A new line (4545) has been added for our royalty from the U of C Press. Our guaranteed royalty for 2012 is $10,000, which is budgeted here. It could end up being higher. Art Doc advertising (4602) is budgeted at $0 since that will be handled by U of C. Royalties income (4902) is budgeted lower than in 2010 since we will no longer collect directly from EBSCO or H.W. Wilson as part of the U of C agreement.

Expenditures/Art Documentation:
Lines 5121 through 5124 represent production costs we’ll no longer have (around $28,000). Account 5301 (Art Documentation Content Editor travel) has been added and budgeted for $1,000 to accommodate required travel to Chicago for an annual editors’ meeting.

Expenditures/legal and accounting:
Line 5405 is budgeted at $15,000 to accommodate our biennial full audit.

Expenditures/exchange rate:
Line 5425 is budgeted at nearly $6,000 since conference registration will be paid in U.S. dollars and most expenses will be paid in Canadian dollars. Calculated at total conference expenses x3%.

Expenditures/insurance: Line 5413 is $500 higher than last year to cover a new liability insurance policy.

Expenditures/conference:
Conference hotel expenses will be high. Catering costs are significantly higher than they were in Minneapolis. A welcome/anniversary party with cake and champagne is being planned (a good sponsorship opportunity).

Summary:
The bottom line of the 2012 budget shows a nearly $13,000 deficit, which could be avoided if individual membership levels increase or if conference registration ends up higher than projected. Next year will be the first transitional year of our new contract with the University of Chicago Press, and as such I budgeted conservatively on the revenue side. We will be giving up institutional, business affiliate and overseas memberships, which in 2010 amounted to around $44,000. Other revenue we will no longer have includes Art Documentation advertising (around $8,000 in 2011) and around $500 in royalties. At the same time, we have added a $1,000 travel expense line for the Art Documentation content editor to attend a mandatory U of C Press annual meeting. So, looking at the transition, we will be down $53,500 in revenue from 2011. What we will gain initially in the transition is at least $10,000 in royalties and $26,000 from no longer having production or postage costs (plus the added benefit of being able to redirect TEI billable hours to other projects)—but overall, the transition results in a deficit this year that could be interpreted as causing the overall projected budget deficit. Still, I think we need to look more closely at our individual membership numbers, and get them back to where they’ve been in years past. Another potential revenue stream could come from ARLIS web advertising, which is something we’ve discussed on past occasions but have not implemented.

Tom sent this outline version of the 2012 ARLIS/NA Budget above. **Action Item 31a**

Chris will send to Rina the names of 23 former ARLIS/NA members who, because they are not current members, cannot attend an upcoming webinar, so that a membership renewal form can be forwarded to them. She will forward these 23 names to the Membership Committee. **Action Item 32**

Tom indicated that ARLIS/NA has never, to his knowledge, ended the year in the red. Mari brought up the idea of not having conferences every year, but every other year. This was floated by the EB before the Boston Conference in 2010. The EB felt that the Annual Conferences can make significant profits for the society, and that the conference was very important to its membership.

Tom made a motion to approve the ARLIS/NA 2012 Budget. Mari seconded. **Motion #13 The motion passed unanimously 10-0, with no opposition or abstentions.**

Tom raised the question about adding advertising to the AWS to raise additional money. The EB debated as to whether we should pursue this. Jon indicated that the current effort to redesign the web site would be a good time to consider this. Sandy thought perhaps the Society might add TEI hours toward pursuing web site advertising. She will gather information about web site advertising norms, implementation costs and revenue projections for the November 17 conference call, and will discuss this with the CPC and Chris. Jon mentioned that previous meeting minutes should be consulted to see what had been discussed in this regard. **Action Item 33**

Adjourned 2:00 PM CDT