ARLIS/NA Executive Board  
July 17, 2013 Conference Call  
3:00pm EDT  
Meeting Minutes  

1. Call to Order and Roll Call  

Present—Gregory P.J. Most, Carole Ann Fabian, Deborah Kempe, Deborah Barlow Smedstad, Daniel Payne, Sarah Sherman, Melanie Emerson, Martha González Palacios, Sarah Falls, Eric Wolf, Robert Kopchinski  

2. President’s remarks  

Sorry for long interim between calls. Debbie Kempe and I had wonderful time on study tours with Russian and German colleagues.  

All future conference calls will resume the first Thursday of the month schedule. The next conference call will take place August 1st at 3:00 EDT; Deborah Barlow Smedstad will join us from vacation; Martha González Palacios will not be able to participate, as she will be flying, but will send end reports before leaving  

3. Approval of EB Meeting Minutes  

Gregg: Alan Michelson submitted but will be on vacation. Eric will let Alan know to make his changes.  

Action Item #11: Eric will contact Alan Michelson to make sure revisions are made to pre-conference minutes.  

Gregg: Can I have a motion to approve pre-conference minutes?  

Deborah S.: With corrected changes, correct?  

Gregg: That will come with discussion, yes.  

Motion #10 Deborah Kempe moves that the Pre-Conference Minutes be approved pursuant to submitted changes.  

Deborah Barlow Smedstad seconds  

Discussion:  

Deborah Barlow Smedstad: pursuant to submitted corrections; Gregg indicated that change should be Anne and Kathryn  

Carried Unanimously
Gregg: Thanks you and thanks for liaison reports; any discussion of liaison reports? Let’s start with Daniel

Eric: One thing first; do we want to approve the last conference call minutes (May 17) as well?

Gregg: I apologize; thank you. Were there any corrections we wanted to discuss?

Eric: I made the changes I received from you (Gregg), Deborah Kempe, Mar and Robert; unless there is anyone else I hadn’t heard from

Gregg: O.k., can I have a motion to approve the revised minutes of May 17 conference call.

Motion #11: Deborah Kempe moves to approve the minutes of the May 17 Conference Call
Melanie Emerson seconds

Gregg: were there any additional changes to the May 17 minutes? I think not.

Carried Unanimously

4. Liaison Reports & Discussion

Daniel Payne’s reports:

PPC

- A policy statement on cuts to art libraries is being drafted (on Monday 15 July; document should be available prior to 17 July EB meeting); preparatory discussions included recommendations that the document:
  - should specifically highlight how libraries inherently comply with and indeed enact the mission statements of publicly funded arts and cultural institutions; cuts to libraries, or even more drastic measures such as closures, prevent organizations from implementing their educational mandates;
  - will look to wording from or structure of the Florence Declaration for inspiration;
  - include specific mention of VR libraries;
  - could mention specific examples of closures; such as Cornell U, which closed its VR library and terminated librarian positions, then several years later, reinstated them;
  - will include a bibliography of related articles, links to policy documents and other pertinent supporting information;
  - will likely offer template letters, press release notices, etc. that libraries might use when faced with serious budgetary reductions.
- Ideally a survey could be used to poll ARLIS/NA members as to their direct experiences with financial retrenchment and/or recommendations for a broader institutional policy; however,
this will be conducted at a later date and will ideally be used as a follow-up to the policy statement. The format and/or software to be used for this initiative is under discussion.

IRC

• From all reports, the Russia study trip was a resounding success that seems to elicit only the most glowingly superlative adjectives from all who attended!
• A suggestion was made to institute a $100 registration fee for future IRC Study Tours to show a firm commitment and thus aid immeasurably in planning preparations. Debbie will present on this issue at the July EB meeting.

ARLIS/NA Canada

• HAL 2.0: in preparation for the second volume of the *History of Art Libraries in Canada* publication, Jonathan Franklin has sent Jo Beglo’s preparatory research files. A meeting has been set for 21 August between working group members Margaret English, Effie Patelos, David Sume (the latter two will likely e-attend via Skype).
• MDA revisions: Liv Valmestad has been contacted to launch discussions on revising the terms-of-reference and jury decision-making guidelines for the Melva Dwyer Award. A meeting will occur in mid-August and planning will be enacted to analyze the feasibility of amending policies in time for the 2014 award.
• Planning is well underway for the ARLIS/NA Ontario Chapter’s panel discussion on “Social Media and Arts Information.” Presenters will include information professionals, practicing artists, and those involved in arts management. The event will be held at OCAD University on 17 October 2013 at 7 pm.

Daniel—I just received in the last half hour the draft statement from Public Policy Committee as well as the survey Patrick Tomlinson is working on; so I don’t know if you have read through it, maybe we should defer this discussion to next meeting?

Gregg—defer to August meeting to allow time to process; as it just arrived 10 minutes before this conference call. Many thanks for this, as it is very pressing

Daniel—yes it is a good starting point; they are open to radical changes and welcome input, also on survey, its intention, target audience, etc.

Carole Ann—in preparation for discussion in August could we also have some indication of dissemination mode and distribution—who they intend to send this policy statement to.

Daniel—it would be sent to various listservs, ARLIS website; please share any other thoughts. They have been working on this with Basecamp, which they have been very happy with

Carole Ann: I did read it quickly and I did have some concerns, so it will be good to discuss in August
Gregg: this is very good; but I agree with Carole Ann that having an external distribution list is something PPC should come up with. Anything else with IRC or ARLIS/Canada?

Daniel: I will leave that to you and Deborah Kempe later in this call

Gregg: O.k., let’s bring that up now, Debbie

Deborah Kempe: Sure; there was some discussion back and forth about a fee or suggested donation back to the Society for those who attend the study tours, to support the tremendous effort that goes into these tours and for the benefits participants get from them. There was back and forth about this between committee members, Gregg and myself. We thought of starting with a deposit that we would suggest they forego at the end as a donation. I think we should ask the committee for a collective recommendation for the board to approve, so we are sure that IRC is completely in agreement. I think we have time for this because we will not be announcing the next trip for some time. This is an action item for me: to request that the committee come back with a recommendation

Action Item #12: Deborah Kempe to request that the IRC come back with a recommendation regarding fees/donations from participants in Study Tours

Gregg: I think that is a good idea

Carole Ann: is it the case that these trips are only cost recovery at this point?

Deborah Kempe: that is correct

Carole Ann: so why would we make it only a voluntary donation instead of an absolute fee for the costs of organizing one of these things?

Deborah Kempe: that is one of the questions I am asking, as we do charge a fee for all of our tours and workshops

Carole Ann: Yes, I don’t understand why we wouldn’t have a fee associated with these trips.

Deborah Kempe: We could impose a larger fee, but the hesitation on the part of some members on the IRC to do so is that it could prohibit the participation of younger and entry level people in these trips, making it too expensive for them to participate.

Gregg: I have asked Holly Hatheway the chair of IRC and the Kristen Regina, the organizer of this trip to come up with a list of actual costs and expenses that were incurred in planning the trip to Russia to gauge what an appropriate fee would be; I think many charges were born by their host institutions; whether that is fair or not, I do not know; but I think a lot of people had to plan very far in advance (visas were hard to get, etc.), so a lot of people signed up and dropped out, and waitlisted people could not attend due to this complication. I think most people who did make it paid their own way; it was an arduous trip of love; but I do think a modest donation recovering costs is a good idea.
Deborah Kempe: I also want to point out that I think we are virtually unique among organizations in that we do not seek to gain income from tours from our membership.

Gregg: I also think we are unique among organizations our size in that we do offer study tours; I do not think many like organizations offer such type of planned program, which is new for us. I just want to make sure we are doing something that is equitable for our membership.

Deborah Kempe: ARLIS has been doing this program for 6 years now. Holly Hatheway is working on a manual for trip planning that is bringing together the lessons learned these years and which should be helpful going forward.

Gregg: Good, we look forward to discussing this further in August.

Daniel: One more thing I would ask about: there has been discussion in ARLIS Canada about revising the terms of reference for the Melva Dwyer Award; I am engaged with Liv about this in August. What is the procedure for that generally? If someone was changing the Wittenborn Award, would that be for the Awards Committee?

Gregg: Good question. I think the committees set the guidelines. I am not sure about the Dwyer Award, but the Wittenborn Award was changed to one recipient by the committee. Probably should be brought to the Board, not for a vote, but for information.

Daniel: It does say we ARLIS Canada administer the award, but I will work with the Awards Committee.

Gregg: Good; before getting to Sarah Falls, are there other liaison report discussions before we move on?

Eric: There was no report from CAC, because they have not yet heard back from Library of Congress since they sent their letter regarding not using relator codes for art cataloguing. They are awaiting response.

Melanie’s Report

Only a couple things to report:

- Interviews for the co-editor of the Multi-Media & Technology Reviews will be held the week of August 5th. The search committee (Hannah Bennett, Judy Dyki, Terrie Wilson, Doug Litts, and Emilee Mathews) has narrowed the applicants to two candidates. The hope is to make a decision shortly after, then the first installment of the M&T reviews could follow the next ARLIS/NA Review (September/October).
- AWS Redesign update: Roy/TEI is working on migrating content to the new AWS. Nedda is working on Joomla tutorials so she can begin her work after the migration is complete. It is her hope these should only be minor edits and updates to content.
• I am working with Debbie and Gregg to refine the idea of a Publicity Officer/Media Relations Office. I am planning to have a position description next month.

Gregg: Good; Melanie do you have anything additional to report?

Melanie: I actually don’t

Deborah Kempe: do you want to discuss the Gerd Muehsam award here?

Gregg: that is at the bottom of the agenda

Deborah Kempe: An item from my liaison report, from the Diversity Committee. Report from Patrick Tomlin, Stacy Griffin and Kai Smith regarding grant proposal that they would like to bring forth for ARLIS to increase diversity opportunities and education for underserved populations which is an admirable initiative and one they have thought quite a bit about. I thought it was a September 2013 deadline, but it is actually a September 2014 deadline, which gives us more time so we can have a better feeling of a means to carry it off; as I am not confident we could pull it off yet, but we can discuss this further on email. Which brings up the next point related to that, which is that I am always anxious to tie any initiative like this to our overall mission and our strategic plan. And looking at the strategic plan I see that there really isn’t anything that addresses diversity as a goal of our organization. I think we should ask the Strategic Planning Committee if that was by design or if it should be incorporated somehow.

Gregg: Two things jumped out at me in your report. One was the question of mention of diversity in the Strategic Plan and I think this is something that Hannah should be able to address either by including it an updated version of the plan or say why it was not there at all. The other thing was the nuts and bolts of administration—the first report I heard was this was a six-figure type of grant they were going after, and administering it through TEI; is this something that they are, and we are ready to do. Like you, I thought how could we do this by September, but having an extra year gives us time to look at this more closely and figure out what all the issues are.

Eric: I was on the Strategic Planning Committee under its last iteration under Pat Barnett and I believe that part of why it was not included in the Strategic Plan, as it was certainly discussed in depth, was because we were adamant that we wanted the plan to be realized in the 5 years of the plan, and there was a consensus that this discussion had been going on for at least the 13 years that I have been active in ARLIS, with a standing Diversity Committee; and we didn’t want to put goals that could not be realized in the 5 years covered by the plan.

Gregg: I do think the Diversity Committee does need to see how it can fit into the Strategic Plan.

Deborah Kempe: I do think this should be included in the Strategic Plan. I think we should assert a commitment here.

Gregg: I think I will leave it Deborah Kempe’s hands to bring it to the Diversity Committee and the Strategic Planning Committee.
Action Item #13: Deborah Kempe will discuss integrating Diversity into the Strategic plan and having the Diversity Committee tie proposal to Strategic Plan and with respective committees.

Carole Ann: I am fortunate (or unfortunate) to have received a large IMLS grant in my career, and it is a large undertaking, and my concern is that if the committee and the board would like to pursue this, that we have to the task force make a more formal proposal about what are the exact programmatic pieces that are being proposed and what are the sustaining commitments of the society, who are the specific persons being charged with carrying our these responsibilities. I don’t know if this can be given to our management company. And there are various reporting responsibilities (though they have been reduced from quarterly to annual); who would be responsible for this work?

Deborah Kempe: I am familiar with those grants, too. And Carole Ann, those are exactly the points that I have brought to them. I did receive responses from them, and I will share them with the board. If we do them, we have to be successful.

Gregg: I agree, and this may be biting off more than we can chew; it is certainly possible. Let’s bring this up in the September mid-year board meeting; that gives us about a year to move forward on it, or not. Other liaison reports or discussions? Debbie Smedstad kindly offered a written Treasurer’s Report. Any questions for the Treasurer?

5. Treasurer’s Report (Deborah Barlow Smedstad)

It’s a pleasure to be able to report GOOD news instead of news that we just ‘squeaked’ by. Due to a robust attendance (both attendees and exhibitors) and outstanding fundraising efforts, our current ‘profit’ for the Pasadena conference stands at $129,489. There will be a few adjustments made to specific categories in the upcoming June financials, but these will not be significant.

Obviously, I have been working hard to finalize the Washington conference budget and now, after the CPAC meeting, I will be able to present a final conference budget in the next few weeks. As you are probably aware, the conference budget lines constitute about half of the full ARLIS/NA budget, so it’s really important to get these numbers in line before I have to do the FY14 budget, that will be presented to and voted upon at the mid-year board meeting.

You can view the May Financials on Wiggio (posted a few weeks back). If you have any specific questions for me, please let me know before the meeting so that I can look up the transaction details.

6. Old Business

Conferences
+2013 Pasadena Conference update

Deborah Kempe: Following on Debbie Barlow’s report on strong conference income; great news! Should make a difference next year. Gregg asked me to share the impact of the Getty Grant on the society’s bottom line (not reflected in conference financials as it is general ledger). I am working on a final report that I will share with the board and next year’s conference
It will be narrative and financial. We received $69,000 with the grant; once the expenses were tallied, $10,722 of the grant can be registered as income to ARLIS because it was used for the participants’ costs for registration, workshops, and tours, plus a hotel rebate of $750.00 resulted, thanks to hotel rooms paid by grant. Also, three spouses were registered as guests bringing in $595.00 (totaling $10,722.00). The grant also helped with fundraising to secure support from donors with an interest in Latin America, including the Espigas Foundation in Buenos Aires ($1,000), Oxford ($4,000) and Karno Books ($200).

+2014 CPAC Meeting in Washington

Gregg: Last week here in Washington D.C., CPAC met here at the National Gallery. The Washington conference is steaming right ahead. Some program issues, lack of an architecture session, some papers to be brought together. Some exciting news: Susan Stanburg from National Public Radio will be our convocation speaker; her title is “Why the Arts Matter”, which will be an exciting and she promised the librarians from NPR will attend.

Deborah Kempe: Gregg, Robert and the Conference team are really on top of the game, and the development team as well. I was very impressed.

Gregg: Thanks Debbie; we did have the development chair skype in at the Pasadena conference planning meeting, but this year we actually had Kathryn Wayne (fundraising chair for Washington) attend (using my stipend) and I think it was really worth it. Several times she was able to make very helpful.

Deborah Kempe: we have a fundraising goal of $100,000 for Washington (we made $72,000 last year).

+2015 Ft. Worth Conference update

Deborah Kempe: Did I forward a message about the four co-chairs?

Daniel: Yes, it went to ARLIS Board list, sent on July 1st.

Deborah Kempe: I have nothing further than that.

Gregg: Robert has put together cost analysis of various hotels, and soon will need to arrange a site visit with co-chairs. I think one can be crossed off, but the others require a visit. So Robert, put that in your calendar in the next few months.

+2016 Seattle Joint Conference update

Gregg: The only news on Seattle is that VRA has unofficially come up with their 2015 venue, so they want to introduce that before they announce the Seattle conference. ARLIS has its chairs, but we will not announce that yet.
Martha: I have a question about the Fort Worth Conference. I just wanted to check that the chairs have been officially approved.

Gregg: they are appointed and do not require board approval.

Deborah Kempe: do we need to send something to ARLIS-L?

Robert: we could also do it as an e-blast, or ARLIS-L or both.

Eric: I believe it was announced on the ARLIS-Texas/Mexico list.

Gregg: Deborah Kempe, since these are your appointments, maybe you should announce them on ARLIS-L and Robert can do an e-blast.

Action Item #14: Deborah Kempe to announce Fort Worth co-chairs via ARLIS-L; Robert via e-blast.

SEI venues

Sarah Falls: There were a couple of applications this year. Over the past 10 years there have been many venues who wanted to host it, but all the original applications have been used up; they are now seeking new applications. One thing they found with Ann Arbor, is that the Mid-West has better attendance due to accessibility and affordability. Liz Gushie is currently chair of VRAF and has made a procedure for vetting locations and application process

University of California, Berkeley and University of Illinois Urbana Champagne and University of Wisconsin were applicants. UIUC was thought to be the best venue by VRA for next year and the following year. They want the ARLIS board’s thoughts on the location.

Gregg: I have gone over the applications and I would like to go into Executive Session briefly. May I have a motion to enter Executive Session?

Motion #12: Deborah Kempe moves that meeting enter Executive Session

Seconded by Melanie Emerson

Begin Executive Session

End Executive Session

Gregg: The two venues under discussion are the University of California at Berkeley and the University of Illinois at Urbana Champagne. The VRA has approved the UIUC venue and we need a motion to vote on the venue.

Motion #13: Sarah Falls moves that board approve proposal that 2014 SEI take place at the University of Illinois at Urbana Champagne
Seconded by Martha González Palacios

Gregg: discussion on these two venues

Deborah Barlow Smedstad: what about University of Wisconsin?

Gregg: it did not make it through the vetting process. Besides my discussion during executive session, I do think that the library school at Urbana is committed to supporting SEI and the modest cost of housing and venues is strong

Sarah Falls: having been on the curriculum committee of SEI, I think the support of a library school and a large university library gives you a wide availability of teachers

Gregg: which saves money as you don’t need to fly them in or pay for hotels. Any champions of Berkeley?

Deborah Barlow Smedstad: hard to say, as I haven’t seen the applications.

Gregg: good point, I will bring them up now.

Carole Ann: I think as an executive board, our role is not to reexamine the work the committee has done, but to act on it; based on their work determining cost, we should act on it and accept their recommendation of UIUC.

Gregg: I agree, do you think we need to discuss this further and vote next call. Opinions please?

Carole Ann: this is procedural, if we feel we do not have enough information, we can ask the committee for more information.

Gregg: do we want the motion revised or do we want to vote on the motion on the table?

Motion carried unanimously

Gregg: I will be in touch with VRAF alerting them that the ARLIS board has approved venue

Action Item #15: Gregg to inform VRAF that ARLIS EB has approved UIUC for 2014 SEI venue.

TEI Contract

Gregg: we are operating until July 31 under extension of old contract. Carole Ann, Deborah Kempe and I have reviewed the current contract and have not gotten to the point of making revisions we would like so we can present it to the board for approval. We first must run it by our lawyers. The status had not changed since May. We might need to approach Mike
McManus for an additional one month extension. I hope Deborah Kempe, Carole Ann and I can get together next week to work some more on this.

Archiving conference planning worksites

Robert: I did secure PB Works paid account. These are the four work sites I am aware of: 2011 Minneapolis, Toronto, Pasadena and Washington. I have moved the Minneapolis and Pasadena sites to the paid account; I do not yet have access to the Toronto site, but when I get that, I will move it to the paid account. Last week I received news from PB Works that they are changing their plan which causes me to pause before moving Washington DC site; they are changing the number of free users we can connect to our account (they are not singling us out, but doing it system wide), but they will be limiting guest users when this renews. They will limit us to 10 users unless we want to pay. We have a year to figure out how to do this. Maybe this means we should move to Basecamp, as we were already discussing in the last meeting.

Gregg: that would definitely be the push.

Deborah Barlow Smedstad: that is pretty outrageous

Deborah Kempe: that is a big jump from free to $995.00

Gregg: it is; I think for the DC group we must have over 20 members already, not to mention CPAC and headquarters; wow, and extra $1,000 we’d have to pay for it.

Robert: we have 11 months, and long as it active it won’t be deleted. And that was the motivating factor, was archiving them.

Deborah Kempe: does Basecamp have limits on users?

Robert: no, Basecamp is based on projects; we are subscribed for 40 projects.

Gregg: so it is possible that this may be the push for the Fort Worth or Seattle team to move.

Carole Ann: what does VRA use?

Sarah: they are using Basecamp for SEI

Gregg: VRA is using Basecamp. We should consider moving our conference planning from PB works to Basecamp, after D.C. conference.

7. New Business

Gregg: we have already discussed Diversity Committee/Strategic Plan and proposed IRC study tour fees, so the last thing on the agenda is an issue that came up with the Gerd Muehsam Award, which I will hand off to Deborah Kempe and Deborah Barlow Smedstad.
Award travel expenses [summary]

Deborah Kempe brought up an issue that Robert Kopchinski raised concerning submitting fees for reimbursement from awards that are not strictly “travel awards” but awards for “excellence”. We need to clarify what qualifies as “registration and travel expenses” that are reimbursable for such awards. For example, does “registration” include tours and workshops, or is it just for the general conference registration fee? The board agreed that the language on the awards descriptions must be clarified regarding what expenses are covered in the future. As the language was not clear, any questionable submissions from the last year should be reimbursed.

Action Item #16: Gregg to discuss clarification of language in travel awards and have new language posted on website.

Gregg: One thing that did not make it on the list, the question of Affiliates. Sarah Falls had to leave; but Sarah Sherman is here.

Sarah Sherman: Ohio Valley Chapter was concerned with language in their by-laws about affiliates. They originally approached Laurel Bliss asking if they needed to change their by-laws. This was tabled as Robert was going to check other organizations. I told her that it was o.k. to go on until we got back to them. This has been a long going issue that was never resolved (can ARLIS/NA members participate in Chapters and chapter events).

Gregg: My recollection of the discussion was that we would let sleeping dogs lie for the moment, pointing out the many chapters that have large affiliate groups that we thought those affiliates would eventually become members of big ARLIS (whether that is true or not is another question), but that we would keep potential members involved. I thought we sort of agreed that we wouldn’t pursue it further.

Deborah Kempe: I know there are the legal issues that come through, but we don’t really want to revisit this.

Sarah Sherman: I told them it was o.k. as is for the time being, but we would get back to them. I am not sure how to move forward.

Carole Ann: I think the word “affiliate” is problematic; when we did this before that word affiliate has legal ramifications. Other chapters use different words; I believe the New York Chapter uses the term “friend”; I think affiliate suggests greater liability, it is too strong.

Gregg: I don’t know if I really want to bring the lawyers back into this; but maybe we should have all the chapters use the same language. I like the term “friend”, it does not imply anything legal. We have talked about when they send in their dues as friends they sign a waiver of liability.

Carole Ann: I think we just need to go back to the year we did this last, it was when I was on the board with Margaret Webster and Anne Whiteside as President and Vice President. I don’t know if the minutes are available online.
Gregg: This is a Secretary issue; Eric could you find those minutes and send them to the board?


Eric: I will check into this.

**Action Item #17: Eric to find discussion of Affiliation Agreement in EB minutes from 2005-2007 and distribute to board before August conference call.**

Gregg: I hope we can finally resolve this.

Deborah Kempe: The New York Chapter does say non ARLIS/NA members “may affiliate as a Friend”.

Gregg: We may need to have standard language for all the Chapters to follow. Let’s see what Eric finds and then we may need to come up with language that all the Chapters will use for “friends”. We will revisit this in August.

8. Adjournment

**Motion #14: Deborah Kempe moves to adjourn meeting**

Melanie Emerson seconds.

**List of Motions and Action Items**

**Motions:**

#10 That the Pre-Conference Minutes be approved pursuant to submitted changes.

M: Deborah Kempe; S: Deborah Barlow Smedstad; V: Carried Unanimously

#11: To approve the minutes of the May 17 Conference Call.

M: Deborah Kempe; S: Melanie Emerson; V: Carried Unanimously

#12: That meeting enter Executive Session.

M: Deborah Kempe; S: Melanie Emerson

#13: That the board approve proposal that 2014 SEI take place at UIUC.

M: Sarah Falls; S: Martha González Palacios; V: Carried Unanimously
#14: To adjourn meeting.

     M: Deborah Kempe; S: Melanie Emerson

**Action Items:**

#11: Eric will contact Alan Michelson to make sure revisions are made to pre-conference minutes. Completed.

#12: Deborah Kempe to request that the IRC come back with a recommendation regarding fees/donations from participants in Study Tours.

#13: Deborah Kempe will discuss integrating Diversity into the Strategic plan and having the Diversity Committee tie proposal to Strategic Plan and with respective committees.

#14: Deborah Kempe to announce Fort Worth co-chairs via ARLIS-L; Robert via e-blast. Completed.

#15: Gregg to inform VRAF that ARLIS EB has approved UIUC for 2014 SEI venue. Completed.

#16: Gregg to discuss clarification of language in travel awards and have new language posted on website. Completed.