ARLIS/NA Pre-Conference Executive Board Meeting Agenda
Peel Room, Sheraton Centre, Toronto
March 30, 2012 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM
(Continental breakfast served beginning at 8:30 AM)

Present: Jon, Debbie K, Tom, Mari, Sarah, Laurel, Sandy, Alan, James, Rina, Debbie B-S, Gregg, Daniel, Melanie

1. President’s Announcements (Jon)

Jon convened the meeting at 9:06 AM EST. He thanked everyone on the Executive Board (EB) for their hard work this year. He recounted the EB’s accomplishments over the past year, particularly those approving and assisting committee initiatives:

- The finalized agreement with the University of Chicago Press regarding Art Documentation (AD).
- The re-approval of the current ARLIS/NA Strategic Plan and its Action Plan.
- Working with Jamie Lausch Vander Broek to start a dialog with TEI on retention and membership;
- Sarah Falls convening a Virtual Conference Advisory Committee (VCAC); (Jon felt that the VCAC was a stellar group with a progressive approach to virtual conferencing that will complement current programming);
- The Communication and Publications Committee's (CPC) creation of an Editorial Board for AD;
- The creation of numerous new Special Interest Groups (SIGs);
- Fostering productive dialog regarding another joint conference with the Visual Resources Association (VRA); (Jon praised Mari’s leadership in planning the Minneapolis conference with VRA, and he noted the positive talks to collaborate on financing joint conferences).
- The EB’s support for the Toronto Conference Planning Committee (CPAC); (Jon asked the Toronto CPAC to produce a report indicating how the EB could support CPACs better.)
- Tom Caswell’s bringing forth a proposal to allow members of the ACRL Arts Section to attend ARLIS webinars. (Jon observed that this would be a good opportunity to extend what ARLIS/NA has to offer to other groups in terms of educational content.

Jon invoked Executive Session to discuss urgent issues with TEI.

Jon mentioned his revisions to the Executive Board meeting minutes of March 15, 2012. Following this, Sandy made a motion to approve the minutes as revised. Mari seconded. Motion approved 9-0-0. **MOTION #1**

Alan noted that there had been 112 action items over the course of the year, and that 16 remained undone.

3. **Liaison Reports (James, Laurel, Sandy, Rina, Sarah, Alan)**

James noted the Kress Travel Award winner, Ryan Evans, who will present a paper on rehousing special collections in alternative library spaces at the IFLA meeting in Helsinki, Finland. James note that the Public Policy Committee (PPC) has asked the EB for its approval of the Florence Declaration; James moved that the EB endorse the Florence Declaration; Sandy seconded. Motion approved 9-0-0. **MOTION #2**

Gregg asked if other groups had also endorsed it. Daniel will look into whether organizations have signed the Florence Declaration or whether it has been limited to individuals. **ACTION ITEM #1**

Laurel will meet with chapter chairs the next day about relevant items from the EB Pre-conference Meeting. She will answer questions and bring them back to the Post-conference EB meeting. Jon asked if a chapter chairs meeting has regularly happened previously. Laurel noted that this was third time it has been done. Vanessa Kam started the practice. Jon thought that this meeting was a great practice as it improved lateral communication within ARLIS/NA. The Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) noted that surveys indicated that there was a perceived lack of lateral communication in the society.

Sandy had three main items. She indicated that the CPC will meet here to consider publication initiatives that the Professional Resources Editor could take in line with the strategic plan.

She discussed the timeline of transitioning the ARLIS/NA Web Site to the Joomla Content Management System. She noted that Nedda Ahmed was to meet with a CPC subcommittee about suggested changes to the AWS, make the changes on the current AWS and then collaborate with TEI to make Joomla transition happen. She would then fine tune the Joomla site over the summer, rolling it out by September. Sandy presumed that TEI was still going to
adhere to this timeframe. Jon considered this a high communications priority for TEI to tackle, and that this be made clear to Scott and whomever the next TEI manager will be.

The AD Editorial Board will meet after the release of the first University of Chicago Press issue and make suggested changes then. Judy Dyki had been talking to Editor Christine Sundt about her use of the Visual Resource’s Editorial Board. Judy and Jonathan Franklin will chat with Inge Reis, a board member, for her ideas on how to communicate with it.

Rina reported that the Development Committee (DC) was seeking to change its own structure to divide its tasks more equally. She noted that Darin Murphy wanted to enlarge the committee from its current 12 to 15 or 16. He wanted to create subcommittees comparable to those of the Awards Committee (AC) or Professional Development Committee (PDC). He hoped to organize three of these subcommittees, for Conference Finance, the Society Circle and one other. Jon noted that this already was one of the larger committees at 12 members; he wondered if they had delegated tasks efficiently? Rina said that some of the initiatives did not get done, and so much of the work fell to the DC Chair. She indicated that they need to keep better track of development calls, as some of these had fallen through the cracks. Debbie K thought that perhaps they needed more clarification of tasks and that a larger group would be harder to administer. Debbie wanted to work with the DC about its organization and work flow.

**ACTION ITEM #2** Gregg also thought that an informal structure would be more effective; he suggested that the CPAC representative to the DC spearhead the conference development, while the DC Vice-chair could oversee the Society Circle. Tom noted that frequently the CPAC rep to the DC was already overloaded with other conference duties and did not always have time to lead the conference development efforts. Sarah noted that the PDC subcommittee structure was effective.

Debbie B-S said that when she was the development person for the Los Angeles conference, she recognized that occasionally an EB member with clout was needed to help make some calls. Debbie K thought that the EB should be involved in making development requests and that the DC should remain at 12. Gregg and Debbie will work with them. Jon said that he had communicated his willingness to assist the DC to make fund-raising calls. He thought that the DC should stay at 12 for the moment, but was not opposed to the concept of creating subcommittees. He thought that such subcommittees might be made more formal by including this organizational structure in the PM. Debbie B-S also mentioned that a spreadsheet might be kept that included the name of an ARLIS member (whether they were on the DC or not) who might have worked with a particular vendor before and had developed a good working relationship with them.
Sarah noted that the Summer Educational Institute (SEI) Committee has forwarded its list of potential donors to the DC as a result of the March 1, 2012 call between ARLIS/NA and VRA members. Darin and Sonja approved the SEI list.

The PDC had a productive call with the SPC on potential goals.

The year-long mentoring workshop was going on currently.

Sarah also will announce at the First-Time Attendees Meeting that a new virtual mentoring program will be starting in two weeks. Rachel Resnik has said that this program of mentoring and virtual mentoring will need a “small army of mentors.” Details will go out in a few weeks on ARLIS-L. Jon asked if there will be a packet of guidelines for mentors available. Sarah indicated yes that an FAQ would be sent to mentors. There will be no new special funding costs with the virtual mentoring program.

Alan said that the Cataloging Advisory Committee (CAC) was going to spend much of its time at the Toronto Conference considering ramifications of LC’s RDA implementation announcement.

4. **TEI Contract Discussions (Jon)**

Jon noted that he, Debbie K. and Gregg will have a mid-April conference call with TEI’s Scott Scherer about a new contract. This call was made more urgent by the abrupt resignation of Chris Roper in March 2012. He wanted to discuss with Scott about a long-term issues and a replacement for Chris. **Executive session.**

5. **Financial report (Tom)**

Tom indicated that the Toronto conference looked financially healthy overall, if expenses come in at or below projections. Registration was down by about $25,000 against estimates, although revenue from exhibitors, workshops, hotel booking commission and development efforts have aided profitability. Development efforts in Toronto exceeded estimate by about $13,000. The monthly financial statement was posted to Wiggio. We were behind in membership as of March. We were about $13,000 under membership revenue estimates (estimate $90,000, actual revenue $77,000) from October 2011 until Toronto conference time.

The reported 2012 budget of $104,760 was incorrect. The audited amount for 2011 was $99,632. TEI offered the first three months of service for free; accountants, however, amortize
the total (including the “free months”) over the span of the three-year contract. This reduced the monthly amount to pay over three years. Therefore, $3,000 would be taken out after 2012. TEI added a monthly fee increase of 5% in March 2012. The increase was based on the National Consumer Price Index for Milwaukee, WI, or a maximum of 5% a year. In January and February 2012, we paid $8,991 which escalated to $9,441 in March 2012. Tom projected TEI costs of $104,760 for 2012. With the 5% cost escalation the total will amount to $112,000, minus $3,000 amortized savings for a figure of $109,000. Tom wondered whether the EB needed to reapprove the new budget of about $5,000 more for 2012. (The 2012 Budget was approved at the Mid-year EB Meeting in September 2011.) Debbie K. felt that it would be better off to approve it for the record. Tom made a motion to raise the amount budgeted in line 5415 of the 2012 ARLIS/NA Budget to $109,291 from $104,760. Debbie K. seconded; the motion passed 9-0-0; MOTION #3

Tom also indicated that an added cost would be a video production for the Memories Project at the Toronto conference; videographer Martin Iskander will record videos of ARLIS/NA members recalling their memories of the organization at a 40th Anniversary Party booth. This effort at capturing a bit of ARLIS/NA history would cost $1,087.50. As the conference budget was doing well, Jon felt that this would be a worthwhile added expense. Tom noted that this would come out of a miscellaneous line of the administrative budget not the conference budget. Tom made a motion to approve Jon’s request to fund the video production for the Memories Project for $1,087.50. Debbie K. seconded. Motion approved 9-0-0. MOTION #4

Tom instructed EB members to submit stipend reports and receipts to Paul at TEI within 30 days. ACTION ITEM #3

Tom noted that discussion was ongoing about where ARLIS/NA financial documents were posted on the web and also adding our audit document to the AWS. ACTION ITEM #4

Tom also noted that he and Debbie B-S had signatory sheets for Gregg and Debbie to sign for the ARLIS/NA checking account and Vanguard account. ACTION ITEM #5

Jon praised Tom for his very good work this year.

6. Toronto Co-Chairs Update (Karen McKenzie and Carol Ann Fabian)

Jon requested that Karen McKenzie (Art Gallery of Ontario) and Carol Ann Fabian (Columbia University), Conference Co-chairs provide the EB with ideas about how the EB could improve its
responsiveness to local CPAC planning efforts. Carol Ann responded that she would report some general, high-level areas of concern.

- **Points of Contact between the EB and the Toronto CPAC, Their Timing and Frequency.** She noted that the conference planning process started earlier than usual and that there were peaks and valleys in the planning process over the year, with many “fits and starts.” She felt that communication gaps with the EB, occurring primarily during the summer, caused some discontinuity in the planning process. The conference planning wiki and weekly conference calls were “extremely useful.” She noted that earlier EB presence on the conference calls, particularly from the president and treasurer, would have been helpful.

- **Distribution of Alternative Voices Fund.** The Toronto CPAC had more than 30 speakers from outside of ARLIS/NA; Carol Ann wanted the local CPAC to have the flexibility to select appropriate speakers for the conference, and then hand this schedule of speakers back to the Diversity Committee (DiC) for them to consider allocation of Alternative Voices Speaker funds. She did not feel that the CPAC should be in the fund allocation business.

- **The Society Circle Lacked a Champion.** Both felt that the Society Circle should be a stand-alone development issue; each conference might want to appoint one person to oversee the Society Circle event, particularly its development efforts. This person could come from the DC, EB or within the CPAC. They also felt that the event needed to recognize better its high-end donors. Gone are the days when one vendor will step up to pay the total cost for a Society Circle event. For this reason, development for this $25,000-30,000 event needed to be carefully managed. Karen noted that if the society takes the Society Circle seriously, it needs to be structured so that donors are well recognized.

- **Structuring Communication Pathways.** The EB must structure communication pathways before planning begins on each conference. This covers communication on a number of issues, particularly development. The EB should consider issues surrounding development at each conference, particularly in the manner of how the DC and the CPAC communicate. Because of the conference’s significance to the health of the society, Karen felt that the ARLIS/NA Treasurer needed to be the final authority on all major financial aspects (developers, finance, exhibitor/vendor relations) of the conference. Additionally, TEI (and previous management companies) have been inundated with conference planning questions by various CPAC members. Because ARLIS/NA stages volunteer-driven conferences (much more so than other organizations), we need to be mindful of who needs to communicate with whom and when they should do it. Carol Ann felt that points of contact with TEI needed to be reevaluated.
• **Creation of a Bootcamp for the Next Year’s CPAC.** Karen made the suggestion that the new CPAC and representatives of chapters proposing to stage a conference attend a bootcamp taught by previous coordinators. This would be a mentoring relationship, so that there would be less “reinventing of the wheel.” The wiki is helpful, but the Pasadena CPAC was not on the wiki. The Toronto CPAC called on people going all the way back to Denver.

• **Scheduling of EB Meeting.** Because the EB met on Friday rather than Thursday, the schedule of all sessions had to be on Saturday and Sunday, all business meetings fell to Friday, and the timing of these events affected Friday workshop attendance. They felt that the process of compressing most events into two days was not good.

• **Full Day Tours Did Not Succeed.** Tours also were affected by the truncation of the schedule, as people often had to decide between a full-day tour or a workshop. In the past, tours were rich funding sources for ARLIS/NA; this was not true in Toronto. This could also have been affected by the economy and the amounts people had to spend. Karen observed that she did not think that tours were the source of profit that they once were, and ARLIS/NA may be slow to recognize this. Karen also thought that the EB might reconsider registration costs, hiking them to boost organization profit. She felt that ARLIS/NA was always selling itself short.

*Jon* thanked Carol Ann and Karen for their good criticism. He indicated, if he were to do it again, he might not have ceded so much to Chris Roper as his chief CPAC liaison. Carol Ann thought that each CPAC might want to designate one person to be their main liaison to the EB. He also noted that the EB made it clear to him that they needed to cut costs and could not afford a week-long stay.

*Carol Ann* also praised the use of Sched software as a tool for the next CPAC.

*Jon* complimented the Toronto CPAC on its planning and noted that they stayed ahead of curve every step of the way. All agreed that Jill Patrick did her job very well.

7. **Documentation Advisory Committee Update & Renewal of Charge** *(Jon and Debbie)*

*Debbie K.* noted that Heidi Hass and Jennifer Friedman will chair the group this year. Debbie has sent letters of confirmation to them for the task force’s charge for the coming year. Discussion of revision of the conference planning manual will have to be put on hold, due to Chris’s resignation. *Jon* indicated that he felt that the EB should make a motion to renew the committee’s charge for the upcoming year. All agreed. Debbie made a motion to continue the charge of the Document Advisory Committee (DAC) for the 2012-2013 year with Heidi Hass and
Jennifer Friedman as Co-chairs, but limit their purview to revision of the Policy Manual and Bylaws (not the Conference Manual). Ted Goodman and Rachel Resnik are other members. Sarah seconded. Heidi will discuss renewal of charge, with an extended timetable, at the Post-conference EB Meeting. **Motion was tabled until Heidi’s appearance on Monday.** Jon indicated that the EB should communicate any major issues it has with the Policy Manual as amended to Heidi. Sandy mentioned that the CPC was considering the Policy Documents Editor position as it was mentioned in the Policy Manual, and would remind the CPC about this question when it met in Toronto. **ACTION ITEM #6**

Eventually, the EB will need to approve the changes made by the DAC.

Jon and Tom had concerns that Chris Roper’s access to various accounts be rescinded. Jon will follow-up to Scott, about other accounts, i.e., Wiggio documents and account, GotoMeeting passwords. **ACTION ITEM #7**

Jon adjourned the meeting for lunch at 11:50 EST.

8. **ArLiSNAP Transition to Section Status** (Alan)

Alan indicated that ArLiSNAP had been considering moving from Special Interest Group (SIG) to Section status over the last year. They sent in a petition of signatures to Alan for verification. Of the 51 signatures submitted, 41 were ARLIS members, 10 were not. As per the ARLIS/NA Bylaws, “...these groupings, shall be considered by the Executive Board upon written petition of thirty (30) Individual members of the Society who desire to participate in the activities of the proposed Section.” The 41 signatures was enough to warrant Section status. Alan moved that the ArLiSNAP Special Interest Group be changed to Section status as per this petition. Debbie K. seconded. Motion approved 9-0-0. **MOTION #5**

Alan will contact Bryan Loar/ArLiSNAP Cochairs regarding the change in status. He will also notify Nedda to alter the AWS. **ACTION ITEM #8**

9. **Membership Renewal and Recruitment Proposals** (Rina)

Rina discussed a membership retention and recruitment plan developed by Membership Committee (MC) Chair Jamie Lausch Vander Broek and Scott Scherer at a recent meeting. The first step in increasing membership would be for the MC to work with TEI to assemble a list of art information professionals that might be interested in joining ARLIS/NA. She asked Jon if this is something that we should pay TEI to undertake? Jon said yes.
Rina next described an incentive to those who recruit new members. For each new member referred s/he would receive $25 off their own membership fees. Debbie K. asked if TEI offered an online way of facilitating this? People thought that this could be built into the online renewal form. Debbie B-S asked if TEI could track the $25 credit to be used later? People were not sure. Rina will ask Scott about this. **ACTION ITEM #9**

Another part of the MC recruitment and retention plan was allowing lapsed members to return to the organization for 6 months free. People did not want members to let their memberships lapse to save money. Rina thought that this would be a one-time discount. The EB was not supportive of this idea, but preferred the incentive plan for recruitment of new or lapsed members. The EB decided to move ahead with $25 incentives; it wanted more information from TEI on the lapsed membership idea.

The potential members list would be drawn from various sources, library school students, people who attend chapter meetings, local chapter connections. Local chapters will be encouraged to forward names of individuals to the MC. The MC has created a Google site to compile likely names. Laurel offered to encourage the chapters to forward names. Jon suggested that attendee lists at chapter meetings be studied for names. **ACTION ITEM #10**

Sandy suggested focusing on recruitment in regions where the conference will take place. Sandy also suggested using ArLISNAP to recruit other students. The ARLIS/NA Vice-President (Gregg) will have to contact ArLISNAP about whether they are informed of the new students attending each conference. **ACTION ITEM #11**

Jon indicated that there were 110 new or 1st time attendees at the Toronto conference. In other years, student numbers have been 30-50. 560 attended in Minneapolis, of this 120 were VRA members. There were 560 in Boston. Tom reported 451 paid in Toronto, (568 including vendors) with a revenue projection of $86,705; pre-conference estimates set registration revenues at $110,000. There were only 30 complimentary registrations versus 60 or more previous years.

The MC wants Jon to reach out to the DiC to recruit a diverse membership. Jon should encourage the MC and DiC to work together on recruitment. **ACTION ITEM #12**

Rina should communicate with the MC about membership ideas approved by EB. She should encourage the MC to interact with Laurel and the chapters and DiC to recruit. **ACTION ITEM #13**
TEI has not been asked to contact lapsed members in the past.

10. Establishment of Strategic Planning Committee as a Standing Committee (Debbie K.)

Debbie K. indicated that Hannah Bennett will chair the Strategic Planning Committee; Debbie K. did not know if the committee roster had been finalized. They will speak at the MC and the Leadership Breakfast. Debbie K. will be the SPC Liaison.

11. Joint Conference Financial Model Proposal Update (Jon, Tom, Debbie K., Mari)

Jon discussed the call with VRA on 22nd of March, 2012; 8-9 people were on the call. The group has had 5-6 calls over roughly 6 months. Maureen Burns and Jolene de Vierge put together a draft proposal financial model. Jon thought that an agreement was very close. The survey indicated that the ARLIS/NA membership wanted future joint conferences with VRA and perhaps CAA. Tom will produce a document looking at the model and the actual results from Minneapolis. EB agreement with the financial model does not commit ARLIS/NA to specific joint conference dates. Revenue based model for the last 5 years, so the figures can be flexible.

TEI can calculate its own management costs related to conference activities; this figure could help the EB keep costs down with TEI during joint conference years. The ARLIS/NA President and the VRA counterpart will set up a Task Force on Joint Conferences; Jon and Allan Kohl will prepare a draft charge for this committee, hopefully by mid-April 2012. Formation of this committee is contingent on EB approval of the financial model.

VRA would like a joint conference in Seattle, WA, in 2015. ARLIS/NA cannot make the decision at this point.

Executive session.

Tom will continue some involvement with the joint conference financial model process, even after he leaves the EB.

12. Sponsorships Benefits for User Groups Lunches/Meetings (Rina)

ARTStor was given Gold Sponsorship status based on them giving a user-group lunch. Does that meet our model for Gold Sponsor status? It requires a contribution of $4,000 or more to become a Gold-level Sponsor. ARTStor will spend $3,000 to feed people at their user group meeting and contributed $1,000 as well to meet the $4,000 level. The EB felt that an
organization should spend $4,000 to benefit the whole society; the lunch for the user group did not qualify as a general benefit. Jon noted that in the past, organizations were encouraged to sponsor lunches to enable the society to meet the conference hotel’s food and beverage minimum fee. Jon felt that we should not bestow Gold Sponsor status when the lunch serves as a promotion for their product only.

Debbie K. asked Rina to go back to the DC to ask them to clarify what kinds of benefits the society receives when organizations sponsor lunches for user groups. What activities aren’t sponsorship? This needs to be clear in the prospectus. Jon thought that there needed to be some documentation (probably in the Policy Manual) on this for future EBs and CPACs. ACTION ITEM #14

13. Committee Roster Approval (Debbie)

Debbie K. distributed a completed list of all chairs of committees, sections, liaisons, divisions and SIGs; two committee chairs—Awards and the CAC—remained unfulfilled when the EB last voted on the roster. Rebecca Cooper will be head of Awards; Anna Maria Oldal will chair CAC. CAA Liaison will be Tony White. The DAC will be chaired by Heidi Hass and Jennifer Friedman.

Debbie K. made a motion that the EB approve the roster of committee chairs and liaisons as updated; Tom seconded. Motion approved 9-0-0 ACTION ITEM #15

14. Movers and Shakers Proposal (Debbie)

Debbie K. discussed the Library Journal Movers and Shakers issue; she would like ARLIS/NA to adopt this concept and recognize what ARLIS/NA members do in their workplaces. Kathryn Wayne would be interested in chairing a Task Force to consider the issue. The task force consider how we would find the people, how would we recognize them and how would we publicize the awards. Mari suggested that ARLIS/NA and ARLIS/UK and Ireland could co-sponsor the awards. The point was to recognize people who are in the middle of their careers, not just at the end. Debbie K. thinks that this meets all aspects of the Strategic Plan. She will continue work on this. ACTION ITEM #15

15. Pasadena Conference update (Debbie K.)

Debbie K. noted that there were 26 members of the Pasadena CPAC, and she is very positive about the group. A Pasadena CPAC Meeting has been scheduled already for July 26-27, 2012 in Pasadena.
16. ARLIS/NA JobNet Fee (Jon)

Judy Dyki requested EB clarification of the policy that those posting jobs on the ARLIS-L and the AWS had to pay a fee. The rate was the first 200 words $100, additional words 50 cents a word. Institutions with ARLIS/NA members receive a 25% member’s discount. ARLIS/NA no longer has institutional members. This service has brought in about $2000-4000 for the last few years. JobNet is free and highly accessed. Sandy felt that if it was a free service, then ARLIS/NA should charge a fee to post.

Debbie K. felt that this should be a fee-based service. Sandy will follow up with Judy as to whether a notice should be posted on the AWS about fees charged for job ads. A fee statement might be added to the ARLIS-L message. ACTION ITEM #16

Jon adjourned the meeting for a break at 2:46 EST.

17. SEI Profit Imperative (Sarah & Jon)

Sarah reported that the DC has been working with the SEI Committee. The SEI has earned $50,000 since its inception in 2004. Elizabeth Schaub has indicated that SEI is facing some increasing costs (speakers’ fees, housing costs, ADA costs), and wanted a way to meet those. SEI should approach development corporate donors in consultation with VRA and ARLIS/NA DCs. It is important to ARLIS/NA that it generates profit, as it is an important source for the society. Jon was reluctant to set a specific profit percentage. It is imperative that it should not lose money. The EB felt that SEI could raise tuition or increase development efforts to achieve a modest profit level. Sarah will respond to SEI Elizabeth Schaub first. ACTION ITEM #17 After hearing from Sarah, Laurel can discuss with chapter officers about creating chapter travel awards for their members to attend SEI. ACTION ITEM #18

18. UCP Art Documentation (AD) Report (Kari Roane)

Kari Roane is the University of Chicago Press Acquisitions Manager for New Journals. She discussed contract changes in the institutional member category into regular institutional subscribers to AD. Seventy-two institutional subscribers lapsed (from 2009-2010) when UCP took over; UCP went after them, but 60 hadn’t re-subscribed of the 72. UCP got print backfile copies to fulfill sales. Unlimited institutional circulation was at 244 print and electronic, 187 US, 57 non-US. UCP hoped for 223 in the first year, 260 in the second. UCP has a program to allow institutions in disadvantaged countries get their publications, including AD. She also discussed
licensing and royalty arrangements with Ebsco. UCP also handles all of AD copyright permission requests. The production transition has been smooth, Judy Dyki working with UCP production team, including the new cover design. Bridgeman supplies cover images, changing for each issue. Press releases were vetted by Judy and Jonathan. UCP will arrange for ARLIS/NA members to access AD through the Members Section of the AWS. UCP has AD backfile online from 1982 on, and the ARLIS/NA Newsletter, 1972-1981. JSTOR CSP backfile goes back to 2005. Institutions can elect to subscribe to a 5-year moving wall subscription. Sandy observed that with UCP handling AD, ARLIS/NA has increased its number of institutional subscribers. Debbie K. asked if UCP will offer only e-subscriptions. Kari said they will in a couple of years. Debbie K. asked about the prospects for increased royalty income. UCP projects 380 subscriptions by 2016 (from 203 in 2010), so royalties hopefully will increase.

On behalf of ARLIS/NA, Jon expressed his excitement to be partnering with the UCP and thanked Kari for her report.

Jon adjourned the meeting at 4:39 EST.