

ACRL Board of Directors, I
ALA Annual Conference
Javits Convention Center, 1A-12
New York, July 7, 1996

Attendance:

Board Members: Patricia Senn Breivik, William Miller, Susan Martin, W. Lee Hisle, Helen H. Spalding, Jill Fatzer, Bernard Fradkin, Frances J. Maloy, Victoria Montavon, Linda S. Muroi, Carol Pfeiffer, Mary Reichel, Althea H. Jenkins

Visitors: Gloriana St. Clair, Nancy Magnuson, John Cullars, Maija Lutz, Ginny O'Herron, Barton Lessin, Paula Walker, Linda Watson, William Loudon, Esther Grassian, Loanne Snavelly, Randy Hensley, Richard Jackson, Don Frank, Leslie Bjorncrantz, Laurene Zaporozhetz

Staff: Jack Briody, Mary Ellen Davis, Irving Rockwood, Cynthia Taylor, Hugh Thompson, Elisa Topper

Call to order

President Patricia Breivik called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m. and asked if there were individuals who wanted to address the Board during the open microphone session.

Open microphone session (27 minutes)

Gloriana St. Clair, the immediate past editor of *C&RL* thanked the Board for giving her the opportunity to serve in that capacity for the past six years. St. Clair suggested that both the journal and the *C&RL News* were major professional development opportunities provided by ACRL. St. Clair stressed that the Board may be unaware of how much the membership appreciates the opportunity to receive the publications and reminded them of its popularity. St. Clair thanked the ACRL staff particularly Pam Spiegel who helped with the copyediting, as well as Mary Ellen Davis, Hugh Thompson, and Althea Jenkins. St. Clair also thanked the Board for its support. Breivik and the Board thanked St. Clair and applauded her for her efforts over the previous six years.

Loanne Snavelly, vice-chair of Instruction Section, voiced a concern about the new wording on the appointment acceptance form that says that ACRL owns the rights to all work produced by the committee. Snavelly said that IS has a tradition of publishing through the section and is concerned that individuals will be reluctant to publish with ALA.

Problem

Jenkins responded that the wording received upon the advice of ALA attorney was to make clear that the committee's work was the property of the association and that an individual cannot sell or distribute the work as the individual's own. Snavelly also expressed concern that ACRL has right of first refusal and that this does not reflect the current procedure. "By accepting this appointment, I agree that all working papers and final products of the group are the sole property of ACRL and are not to be used for any personal projects unless written permission has been obtained from the appropriate governing body. I also certify that it does not represent a conflict of interest. I understand that failure to attend two meetings without an explanation acceptable to the chair constitutes grounds for removal." Snavelly said that IS was concerned about the publications issue. Snavelly said that IS has a history of members who serve as authors on committee projects and whose work is published by ACRL. Jenkins said that the conflict of interest statement is intended to verify that the committee work is not in conflict with anything else the individual is doing.

P.B.

motion forms at me

Announcements

Mary Reichel said that she has a doll in front of her that belonged to Liz Futas that was part of Futas's collection that is being sold at Booth 147 to raise money for the Liz Futas Scholarship.

1.0 Adoption of the agenda

Motion: Martin moved and Fradkin seconded adoption of the agenda.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

2.0 Approval of Midwinter meeting minutes

Breivik asked if there were corrections to the minutes. Miller said that item 22.8 had a typo that should be corrected.

Motion: Martin moved and Reichel seconded the approval of the minutes of the Midwinter Meetings with the correction of a typographic error.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

3.0 Discussion of minutes

3.1 April 11, 1996, conference call

The Board had no comments about these minutes.

3.2 Spring meeting

Martin asked that page 7, item 5, second paragraph from the end should insert the word "what" before the word clear.

The Board had no comments about these minutes.

4.0 Consent agenda

4.1 Purpose statement for use of endowment income

4.2 Professional Development Committee, revised charge

4.3 Funding to support sections' "Basic Services"

4.4 Certification Task Force report

Reichel asked that items 4.2 and 4.3 be removed from the consent agenda.

Motion: Fradkin moved and Martin seconded the consent agenda consisting of items 4.1 and 4.4.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

4.2 Professional Development Committee, revised charge

Reichel said the charge did not include "develop" in item 3. Miller responded that the committee was not going to develop anything. Hisle said he had brought this point up before. Spalding added that the changes were not made as had been asked for in the telephone conference call; the phrase "and report" should be added to the first task. Breivik said that ACRL did not lack for units to do programming and that we needed a unit that could look at the overall structure of delivery. Reichel asked if adding "develop" would conflict with other section and committee programming. Breivik replied that she did not want the committee's time taken up with putting on their own programs.

Motion: Martin moved and Fradkin seconded the approval of the new Professional Development Committee charge: To promote the professional competence, growth, and development of academic librarians through the education process. (Note: Tasks are identified in document 4.2)

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

4.3 Funding to support sections' "Basic Services"

Reichel asked if the document had been shared with units that will be affected and if ACRL knew the budgetary impact. Reichel also asked for a discussion about why the money could not be used for programming. Spalding responded that the Budget & Finance Committee has reviewed the impact of the increase in section funding and that sections have not requested an increase in basic services funding. Spalding enumerated the sources of funding now available to sections, e.g., section newsletters, manuals, brochures, conference programs, basic services, initiative funds, etc. and said that units were welcome to ask the Board for additional funds.

Motion: Spalding moved and Martin seconded tabling the motion until the second Board meeting where the motion could be discussed in relation to the impact on the 1997 budget.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

5.0 Strategic Plan Implementation: Policies and process for making changes to the plan

Breivik said the Board felt that it was important to get in place a policy and procedure for changing the plan.

Motion: Hisle moved and Montavon seconded the motion to approve the policies for implementation of the strategic plan as outlined in Document 5.0.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

5.1 Planning evaluation (ad hoc task force) cycle

Breivik reminded the Board that measuring the success of the implementation of the plan has been difficult and that the Board had asked Jenkins to work with Maureen Sullivan to devise criteria for measuring success. Breivik reported that Sullivan requested an opportunity to talk more with the individuals about the "meat" of the issues and Breivik suggested appointing a short term task force that would work with Jenkins and Sullivan to develop the criteria before the next Midwinter Meeting. Fatzer asked about the composition of the task force. Breivik said that Board members would be on the task force. Pfeiffer asked that some of the more experienced Board members serve on the task Force. Breivik suggested that Ray English, Carol Pfeiffer, and Frances Maloy serve on the task force.

6.0 Criteria for measuring successful implementation of the strategic plan

Breivik said this issue has been one that the Board has struggled with for a while. Jenkins suggested that this item could be tabled since the Board had not seen the final document until that morning; Jenkins suggested that the Board members should have the opportunity to review the document carefully.

Motion: Fradkin moved and Muroi seconded that the motion be tabled until the second Board meeting.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

7.0 Paraprofessionals and non-librarian in academic libraries Task Force report

Fradkin reviewed the origin of the document and the process used to develop the ideas contained in the report. Fradkin reminded the Board that this is the second report prepared for the ACRL Board on the issue of paraprofessionals and that concern had been expressed that no action had been taken on the first report so that this task force focused on creating clear actions that could be taken. Fradkin also said that the committee did not focus on nonlibrarian professionals working in academic libraries and that this should be looked at in the future. Fradkin suggested that this would be a good time to discuss the issues in the report.

Spalding asked for clarification about whether accepting the report would mean that the fiscal actions were by default approved before the Budget & Finance Committee had the opportunity to review the document.

Breivik said that the report could be accepted and that this did not mean that each of the recommended actions would be implemented.

Fradkin said that the six items on action agenda I were a core group of actions that the task force was recommending. Breivik noted that this is the second task force that completed its work in less than a year.

Motion: Reichel moved and Martin seconded that the Board accept the report of the Paraprofessionals and Non-librarians in Academic Libraries Task Force, commend it for an excellent report, and discharge the task force.

Action: The motion passed with Fradkin abstaining.

The Board then discussed the specific actions.

Item IV. Provide award for best chapter programming.

Jenkins informed the Board that following the ACRL policy on awards, funding through non ACRL sources must be identified that would sponsor the award before it is approved. Pfeiffer suggested removing the word state from the recommendations so that regional chapters could be included.

Breivik agreed that non-ACRL funding should be identified. Fradkin said that was a possibility but that it was also appropriate that this award be an exception because it is an incentive award.

Miller commented that he was not in favor of adding another award to an awards program that already had a deficit budget of \$13,000.

Pfeiffer suggested offering the award short-term and look for sponsorship. Miller suggested offering the award once to see if it was worth establishing the award permanently.

Breivik said that the award would call attention to those programs that support paraprofessionals. Hisle suggested offering the award in two years.

Martin said that developing criteria, procedures, and setting up records would take at least a year to develop anyway.

Breivik said if ACRL tried offering the award once the Board could serve as the award committee and then if the Board wanted to continue, fuller procedures and committees could be put into place.

Esther Grassian, chair of IS, asked if the Board would consider offering the award as an Initiative Fund rather than an after the fact award. Grassian said the money could give chapters an opportunity to develop something new.

The Board was receptive to this idea and Breivik summed up the discussion: the Board would offer the award as part of the Initiative Fund in 1998 and the Board would serve as the selection committee.

Motion: Hisle moved and Fradkin seconded approval of offering an award to ACRL chapters to target paraprofessionals and their concerns in their programs, literature and membership drives as part of the funding in the 1998 Initiative Fund.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

Item VI. Offer "first-time" discounts on conference registration at ACRL National Conferences to encourage participation of paraprofessionals at the National Conferences.

Reichel said she was uncomfortable voting on this without hearing about the other types of registration discounts, e.g., local arrangements committees don't get discounts on registration. Reichel also thought that this would be an institutional incentive rather than benefit to individuals. Breivik asked if it should be referred to the 1999 National Conference Committee with the encouragement to consider this recommendation. Reichel agreed that made sense.

Motion: Miller moved and Reichel seconded that the 1999 National Conference Executive Committee consider discounts on registration when preparing the budget.

Discussion: Hisle asked if it were possible to implement this recommendation for the Nashville conference without reworking the registration budget since three years was such a long time away. Spalding said that the 1997 budget which includes the Nashville budget would be approved on Tuesday and that ALA has already increased the overhead thereby decreasing the net revenues.

Breivik passed the gavel to Miller and offered a friendly amendment that the Board, in keeping with the commitment in the Strategic Plan to address the continuing education needs of paraprofessionals, encourage the committee to find a way to do this.

Spalding said that it was important that this not be lost in three years and that we identify individuals who come to the conference and find out what brought them. Breivik said that the program should be more than a discount but should also consider welcoming events and programs for paraprofessionals.

Fradkin said the Task Force did not want to encourage special, separate tracks for paraprofessionals and that the paraprofessionals should be included in the main program.

Amendment: Breivik added the friendly amendment to the motion that the Board directs the 1999 National Conference Executive Committee to address the needs of paraprofessionals in the program of the National Conference.

Fradkin said that COLT is looking for a home for its 1999 conference and that COLT was considering doing it in conjunction with the ACRL 1999 conference. Spalding said the amendment should include an assessment of the incentive to see if it is productive.

Action: The Board unanimously approved the amended motion.

VIII. Provide travel scholarships to chapters that offer the greatest number of continuing education programs for professionals.

Pfeiffer asked if this was intended as a travel scholarship to attend ACRL National Conference.

Reichel said that she cannot vote in favor of this without more of the "how" and specifics of the award. Reichel asked why it would be limited to chapters as opposed to individuals and suggested that a group be asked to develop a more concrete proposal. Miller said he would oppose this because the travel funds would be quite expensive. Fatzner said that vendors could sponsor this.

Jenkins clarified that the Task Force report had recommendations and that many needed to be fleshed out and that in the spirit of the report the Board could put into place a mechanism to deal with the recommendations. Miller suggested that the Board needed to give more time and attention to the recommendations than was possible in the next 45 minutes.

Motion: Miller moved and Montavon seconded, that the Board table the rest of the report from the Paraprofessional Task Force and put it on the working Board agenda for conference calls and the fall meeting

Discussion: Martin suggested that a standing task force be established to deal with these issues. Pfeiffer suggested that a standing committee might be established.

Amendment: Martin offered a friendly amendment to table the remaining items and have the president establish an ongoing group to deal with issues of paraprofessionals.

Hisle asked if ACRL should investigate the feasibility of establishing the group. Jenkins said that when new groups are established a charge and composition must be approved at the same time.

Action: The friendly amendment was declined and the Board approved the motion to table the action on the report and include the review of the report on the Board's working agenda.

8.0 Implementing Article II, Section 1 of the ACRL Bylaws

Jenkins said that she has observed Appointments and Nominations Committees carrying out their work and that the appointments assignment was a large task with upwards of 200 appointments being made in a year. Jenkins said that the committee also has to develop a slate of nominees. Jenkins said the bylaws call for there to be a nominations committee separate from the appointments committee so that the Board can get more timely reports and not overburden any one group.

Breivik commented that she found the appointments and nominations committee process confusing and difficult.

Motion: Reichel moved and Martin seconded that ACRL establish two separate committees to carry out the appointment and nominations functions.

Discussion: Miller supported this division of functions because of the large amount of work involved. Reichel said she chaired the Appointments & Nominations Committee in the mid-80s and she agreed.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

9.0 1999 National Conference Site

Jenkins said staff tries to bring two sites to look at that are suitable and meet all of the criteria. Jenkins said that staff had looked at many sites that met our basic needs and that staff had settled on Detroit because the city had the dates, the space, and provided concessions to ACRL to make it more attractive to ACRL. Jenkins said Detroit was attractive because of the fact that over 700 academic librarians live within a 300 mile radius of the site and that nearly 50% of the attendees at the Pittsburgh conference had been from the surrounding area.

Fatzer asked if ACRL had statistics about repeat attendance. Hisle said he is sad that ACRL cannot get a conference in the West but that he understood that there were chapter reasons, date reasons, site reasons, etc. but that it was unfortunate that ACRL could not get a site in the southwest. Fradkin agreed.

Miller said that as someone who worked in Michigan for nine year and spent time going to meetings in COBO hall he had no problems but that ACRL will have to do a big selling job of the city. Breivik said that

Detroit has really changed since the last ALA Annual Conference and that ALA was seriously looking at Detroit as a site and that the city of Detroit would roll out the welcome carpet for ACRL.

Reichel said that Detroit would be a good location to bring in Canadian librarians. Fradkin said that he hoped ACRL would consider Canada as a site. Reichel said she did not see how ACRL could take the revenue out of the U.S.

Motion: Martin moved and Miller seconded the approval of Detroit as a site for the 1999 ACRL National Conference on April 9-12, 1999.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

10.0 ACRL/LITA Joint National Conference

Breivik asked Michele Newberry, the president of LITA, to address the Board. Newberry said that LITA thought it was worth exploring with ACRL the possibility of holding a joint conference since both divisions were planning conferences for 1999. Newberry said that LITA had about 30 exhibitors that had never exhibited with ACRL and that this could be an advantage to ACRL. Newberry said we would need to work out the management of the conference and the revenue sharing of the conference.

Breivik said that LITA had indicated that it was willing for ACRL to manage the conference and follow ACRL policies and procedures.

Spalding asked at what point the agreement would have to be finalized. Breivik said that she would hope to have it ready by the Executive Committee.

Newberry clarified that the member participation would have to be worked out; that LITA was willing for ACRL to staff the conference. Newberry said one possibility would be that ACRL would be reimbursed for all expenses and that proceeds would be split after all expenses covered. Spalding said that covers only one issue; ACRL was assuming all of the risks. Newberry said how the risks were shared would determine how proceeds would be split.

Breivik said that Miller and incoming LITA president Tom Leonhardt would have to work this out.

Martin said that this sounded like a continuing of the discussion and not an action item. Spalding said that ACRL had already said it would pursue the joint conference but that ACRL and LITA had to get to the sticking points on finalizing it and that it was important to get a committee appointed. Breivik said that all the points in the document were agreed to except for the one point about the financial issues. Pfeiffer asked when the new committee would be appointed. Jenkins responded that the planning committee should be appointed in September.

Newberry asked if the Executive Committee could act for the Board. Fradkin said this is a very big decision and has a huge financial impact and this decision should not be made without full disclosure and Board discussion.

Breivik said the Board needs to get something in writing but that it did not have to wait until Midwinter. Jenkins suggested that LITA share with ACRL the agreement between LITA and LAMA. Spalding pointed out that ACRL budgeted quite differently from LITA and LAMA.

Maloy said that she was torn about the value of holding a joint conference and asked what the rest of the Board thought about this issue. She said that she sees the benefits but also sees that it is a big risk for ACRL

to give up name recognition. Reichel said that she thinks it is a great idea but that staff responsibility would have to be worked out. Martin agreed. Miller said that the risk was that there would not be enough profit to split. Pfeiffer said she had concerns about the risk. Fatzer said that she saw it as a great way to reach out to academic librarians who were not ACRL members. Hisle said he is a big supporter of the concept.

Martin suggested that the leaders of the two divisions talk on Wednesday morning in the ACRL suite.

11.0 Standards Study Task Force report

Breivik said that accreditation continues to be a big issue and that ACRL should establish a short-term task force to develop 1) a philosophical framework for assessing libraries in terms of desired campus outcomes; 2) prototypes for such assessments, and 3) recommendations for one or more processes for implementation of the former with a time frame for completion. Fatzer said she was excited by the idea but asked that attention be given to the work the ACRL Board funded on *Output measures for Academic Libraries*.

Breivik said that ACRL's revised standards don't mean much to the accrediting agencies as currently written.

Fatzer volunteered to be the Board member on the Task Force. Fradkin suggested encouraging librarians to volunteer for participation on accreditation teams.

Jacquelyn McCoy (who chaired the College Library Standards committee and who was a member of the ACRL Output Measures Committee) commended the Board for making the link between output measures and standards.

Motion: Fatzer moved and Martin seconded that the Board accept the report of the Standards Study Task Force, commend the task force for its report, and discharge its members.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

12.0 Standards and accreditation

12.1 Guidelines for University Undergraduate Libraries

Motion: Reichel moved and Pfeiffer seconded that the Board adopt the ACRL Guidelines for Undergraduate Libraries.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

O'Herron explained that the document will also be forwarded to the ALA Standards Committee for a final review.

13.0 Constitution and Bylaws Committee

13.1 Constitutional Revisions

13.2 Rationale

Nicholas Burckel, chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, and Nancy Magnuson, incoming chair addressed the Board. Burckel said that Jenkins had asked the committee to streamline the Constitution and Bylaws when the committee had to revise the constitution to remove the listing of the chair of the now defunct Planning Committee as an ex officio member of the ACRL Board and make the document compatible with the ALA Constitution. Burckel said that the Committee worked on the principal that items covered in the Bylaws should not also be covered in the Constitution. Burckel explained that for there to even be the possibility of placing the revision on the 1997 ballot the Board has to approve the revision at this conference as the Constitution calls for two votes by the Board no less than two months apart as well as two months written notice to the membership. Burckel explained that a positive vote on the revisions did not obligate the

Board to this particular revision but instead got the process underway and more revisions could be made in the coming months. Burckel said that a negative vote would eliminate any possibility of placing the revision on the 1997 ballot which would then delay any action until the 1998 ballot.

Motion: Spalding moved and Fatzer seconded the approval of the revised Constitution.

Discussion: Reichel and Hisle voiced concerns about needing time to ask questions about the changes. Pfeiffer clarified that if the Board votes on the document today the Board could still make changes to the document at the Midwinter Meeting.

Reichel said that she will vote on this but that substantive issues may arise so that it still may not be possible to finish the document in time for the Spring 1997 ballot.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

16.0 ACRL Councilor Nomination

Breivik said the Board needed to fill for one-year the position of ACRL Councilor left vacant by the election of Lee Hisle to the office of vice-president. Breivik explained that the Board appoints an individual to fill Board vacancies until the next elections. Breivik recommended Maxine Reeker for the position of ACRL Councilor.

Motion: Fradkin moved and Martin seconded the appointment of Maxine Rencker as the new ACRL Councilor to fill the position vacated by Lee Hisle.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

17.0 Adjournment

Breivik adjourned the meeting at 4:12 p.m.

The Board also received the following FYI documents:

ALA Executive Board Actions

Schedule of ACRL Events

**ACRL Board of Directors, II
ALA Annual Conference
Javits Convention Center, 1A-12
New York, July 9, 1996**

Attendance:

Board Members: Patricia Senn Breivik, William Miller, Susan Martin, W. Lee Hisle, Helen H. Spalding, Jill Fatzer, Bernard Fradkin, Frances J. Maloy, Victoria Montavon, Linda S. Muroi, Carol Pfeiffer, Mary Reichel, Althea H. Jenkins

Visitors: Anne Beaubien, Maxine Reneker, Don Frank, Ginny O'Herron, Don Frank, Beth Woodard, John Cullars, Ginny O'Herron, Henry Stewart, Susan Phillips, Thomas Abbott, Carol Moulden, Ray English, Jeanne Boyle, Lisa Browar, Beth Jo Mullaney, Ann Schaffner

Staff: Jack Briody, Mary Ellen Davis, Irving Rockwood, Cynthia Taylor, Hugh Thompson, Elisa Topper

Call to order

President Patricia Breivik called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m.

Approval of Agenda

Motion: Miller moved and Martin seconded the approval of the agenda as presented.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

17.0 Consent Agenda

- 17.1 ECLSS Bylaws Change
- 17.3 1997 Annual Conference Programs
- 17.5 New Publications Advisory Appointment Criteria
- 17.6 Resolution Honoring Gloriana St. Clair

Motion: Maloy moved and Spalding seconded the approval of the consent agenda.

Fatzer asked if document 17.5 was referring to a new group that would duplicate the efforts of the Publications Committee. Cindy Fairies, chair of the New Publications Advisory Board, replied that this is an existing group that reviewed the book proposals that had been operating without clear criteria for appointment. Document 17.5 remained on the consent agenda.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

17.2 Standards and Accreditation Committee: IS "Guidelines for Instruction Programs"

Breivik said that this will be the last set of standards that are approved based on the outmoded, non-output measures based standards. Ginny O'Herron, chair of ACRL's Standards and Accreditation Committee, agreed that future standards and guidelines brought by the Standards & Accreditation Committee would be output-measures based.

Motion: Fradkin moved and Fatzer seconded that the Board approve the revised "Guidelines for Instruction Programs."

Names in body of text does not match

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

17.4 ALA Literacy Assembly Representative and Resolution

The Board took no action on this item because it will be acted on by the ALA Council.

19.0 Image Enhancement

19.2 Revised Charge

Anne Beaubien, chair of the committee, asked that the Board approve the charge as follows:

"To identify knowledge, competencies, responsibilities, and working environments that appropriately represent academic librarians, to identify and recommend methods for informing appropriate audiences about who academic librarians are and what they do, e.g., programs, publications, training, and work with the ACRL staff to compile human interest stories. To seek active participation in the development and revision of the profiles of librarians in vocational interest inventories and other guidance materials."

Fatzer asked whether the work with SIGI Plus was successful. Beaubien replied that there was mixed success and there was still a lot of work to be done. Martin asked about the revised wording. Beaubien replied that there is a role for librarians beyond the library. Montavon said that it implied they would only be looking for roles outside the library. Fatzer suggested an alternative editorial correction that added "in and beyond the library after the word environments." Beaubien said the charge is intended to say that academic librarians should be involved beyond the library walls.

Breivik said she had concerns about what the committee would actually be doing. Breivik said that she thinks what the committee has done with the interest inventories is wonderful but that she has concerns that this unit would be duplicating efforts with the new ACRL Council of Liaisons trying to work with outside groups. Beaubien replied that the nine associations identified are organizations in which it is hard for a personal member to have a direct input. Beaubien said the committee had in mind associations such as ARL where individuals could have an impact and offered to share the plan with the Board as it was developed.

Miller asked if the committee would be willing to work with ALA's Public Information Office (PIO) to get more human interest stories about academic librarians in the media. Beaubien replied that the committee had discussions with ARL and PIO to have some media training at Midwinter Meeting. Beaubien said the committee also wants to get an article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* about academic librarians who have won awards at the ALA Annual Conference.

Martin reminded the Board that the item before the Board was the name and revised charged and the Board should act on those issues and ask the committee to keep the Board informed about its activities.

Reichel asked if there was an equivalent committee dealing with recruitment to academic librarianship and if ACRL had a committee dealing with recruitment. Fradkin said the charge touches on that issue by mentioning guidance issues. Breivik agreed and suggested adding recruitment to the charge.

Jenkins said that ALA has a Recruitment Assembly and that a member of this committee should represent ACRL on the assembly.

Beaubien was agreeable to adding to the charge that the committee would send a representative to the ALA Recruitment Assembly.

Motion: Reichel moved and Martin seconded that the Board approve the revised charge of the ACRL Image Enhancement Committee with language added about working on recruitment to the profession and about the committee serving as the liaison to the ALA Recruitment Assembly.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

19.1 Revised Name

Motion: Miller moved and Maloy seconded that the Board approve the change of the name of the Image Enhancement Committee to the Professional Enhancement Committee.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

18.0 ACRL Relationship with its Chapters and Affiliates

Motion: Miller moved, Spalding seconded that the Board appoint a task force consisting of members from the ACRL Board, Budget & Finance Committee, and four members from Chapters Council to revise the existing ACRL Chapters Relations and Benefits documents to identify incentives for rewarding chapters, and involving ACRL national members in local activities.

Hisle apologized to the Chapters Council for the rancor the Board's work on chapters had created and was pleased that there was a new plan in place.

Reichel called the question.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

20.0 International Relations Committee Revised Charge

Motion: Martin moved, Maloy seconded that the Board accept the revised charge for the International Relations Committee.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

21.0 ACRL Publications Committee--Modification of Strategic Plan

Breivik reminded the Board that there is now in place a document about how to modify the strategic plan.

Motion: Fradkin moved and Maloy seconded that the Board approve the modification to the Strategic Plan recommended by the Publications Committee that adds the following language as Strategic Direction 1.5 under Goal 1: "1.5. ACRL will promote study, research, and publications relevant to academic and research librarianship."

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

Reichel and Fradkin thanked the Publications Committee for helping the Board see that a process was needed to modify the plan.

22.0 ACRL/LITA Joint National Conference

Miller reported that upon further discussion with the LITA leadership there have been second thoughts about the joint conference since there is a new LITA executive director coming in, and since there is not yet data available on the success of the LITA/LAMA joint conference. Miller said that ACRL and LITA leaders agreed that it makes more sense to wait before considering a national conference.

23.0 Academic Status Committee--Institutional Priorities and Faculty Reward Project

Jenkins reported that this is an excellent opportunity for participating in a cooperative project with AAHE and other higher education organizations and institutions. Reichel added that the project supports ACRL's

strategic plan since it has librarians considered in the mainstream of the academy. Miller says the project is a breakthrough for academic librarians and that ACRL is fortunate to be associated with the project. Fatzer voiced a concern about the project appearing to be a grant proposal and wondered if the grant was already funded. Jenkins replied it was. Fatzer said the project summary e-mail message, 3rd paragraph said that "ACRL would develop a model of academic librarian activities and responsibilities which address the profession's and higher education's top priorities and which would serve as criteria for performance leading to tenure and promotion decisions." Fatzer said that if the task force would be charged with drafting a statement describing the work and activities of academic librarians she wants to make sure that this group would work with the Professional Enhancement Committee. Reichel suggested making a member of the ACRL Professional Enhancement Committee a member of the task force.

Jenkins said that she saw the work of the groups being different. Fatzer agreed but said that she still did not want to see the wheel reinvented.

Martin asked what impact this work would have on institutions where librarians do not have or do not want to have faculty status.

Fradkin said he wanted to make sure that the Board is not sanctioning faculty status over academic status positions. Reichel suggested that the Task Force would use the statements, guidelines, and standards ACRL has in place in carrying out its work.

Fatzer called the question.

Motion: Reichel moved and Fradkin seconded that the Board approve ACRL's participation in the Institutional Priorities and Faculty Reward Projects; that the ACRL Board establish a Task Force consisting of 5 members with representation from the following types of institutions: university, college, community college, library school, private and public institutions to implement the activities described in document 23.0 and that Bede Mitchell be asked to chair the Task Force.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

24.0 ACRL Strategic Plan

6.0 Criteria for Measuring Success of Strategic Plan

Motion: Fradkin moved and Miller seconded that the Board take off the table the motion to approve the criteria for measuring the success of the strategic plan as outlined in Document 6.0.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

Breivik reminded the Board that it has looked at this document a number of times and that it has been challenging to develop the document and that while it may not be perfect she hoped that there would be consensus on a workable set of criteria that would be used to evaluate success on moving forward the strategic plan. Breivik felt that it was important to remember that the criteria might only be in use a year before the Board improved the criteria.

Fatzer questioned the value of routine surveys over the focus groups that consultant Dadie Perlov has preferred. Reichel said that she felt the document was a useful model and that the Board should adopt the criteria, share it with the ACRL members, and then decide how the Board should begin to implement it and that the implementation should be handled with care and realism.

Fatzer asked about the statistics survey and said the Committee had worked hard to keep the survey parallel to ARL and wondered if the Statistics Committee agreed with the recommendation.

Maloy suggested that it was important to follow through on the implementation so that items were followed up on. Fradkin suggested that an implementation schedule was needed.

Brevik suggested adding focus groups to the criteria, getting the information to the membership, and identifying several items to begin measuring.

Motion: Fradkin moved and Pfeiffer seconded that the ACRL Board accept the criteria for measuring the success of the strategic plan and begin to develop an implementation plan.

Reichel asked the status of the document. Jenkins said that it was a procedural document. Reichel offered a friendly amendment.

Withdrawn Motion: To simplify actions, Fradkin and Pfeiffer withdrew their motion.

Motion: Reichel moved and Maloy seconded that the Board thank the drafters of the document, that the document be publicized to the membership of the association, that input be sought, and that ACRL move forward with an implementation plan.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

25.0 Budget and Finance Committee

14.1 1996 Third Quarter financial report

Spalding reported that the report shows the National Conference separately as the Board has requested. Spalding also noted that expenses and revenues were both down but that the Board does expect about \$100,000 less in deficit net revenue at the end of the year than projected in FY 1996. Spalding also said that the transfer to the Fund for America's Libraries was made. Spalding noted that sales are up, that production of *C&RL* was now in-house so that there would not be the usual large end of the year transfer to ALA for production services. She also noted that phone expenses were high and that ACRL staff had asked ALA for detailed accounting of the expenses. Spalding noted that both the RBMS and CNI pre-conferences were financially successful. Spalding noted that the Choice budget was coming in about where projected and perhaps a bit better than projected.

Martin asked why if membership was at an all time high that membership revenues were less than budgeted. Spalding explained that the money came in on the anniversary date. Fatzer thanked staff for the additional text provided with the budget and said that it was very clear and easy to follow. Fatzer asked about the endowment money. Spalding replied that the ALA endowment and thus the ACRL endowment had done quite well. Spalding said that only \$40,000 had been put in the endowment by ACRL in 1993 and that it was now worth over \$70,000. Spalding said that the ALA Endowment Trustees preferred that no principal ever be spent because for every 1% you spend, you lose 3% interest. Spalding added that the trustees made an exception for awards because of the importance of having the award money available. Spalding said the ALA Endowment Trustees were planning a session for ALA Midwinter to discuss how investments were made. Spalding said that since meeting with the ALA Endowment Trustees the ACRL Budget & Finance Committee felt much better prepared to make better use of the endowments. Spalding explained that the term "Bank fee" really meant investment management fee. Martin asked if the gross payout were available. Spalding said that it was not available on paper but that trustee Margolis could provide it. Spalding said the ACRL Budget and Finance Committee commended the ALA Trustees for turning around the investment strategy so that the principal is no longer being spent. Reichel asked if ALA had a standard spending rate. Ray English, incoming chair of the Budget & Finance Committee, explained that the spending from the endowment is only dividends on stock in the endowment fund plus interest on bonds. English continued saying that the rate of return has averaged about 12% but that since the spending account is limited only to the dividends on stock and the interest on bonds that there was only about 3% and when you take away the bank fees there is only 2% left.

Fatzer suggested sharing this information with the membership and encouraging members to contribute to the endowment.

25.2 Financial support for sections

The Budget & Finance Committee reviewed existing basic services funding and had been advised by staff that the funds seemed to cover phone, photocopying, etc., but that what the sections wanted most often were mailing labels for their memberships.

Motion: Spalding moved that the ACRL Board provide two sets of mailing labels to each section each year, in addition to basic services funding, which remains at the 1996 funding levels for the 1997 budget.

Fatzer spoke against the motion and said that the Board should not interfere in the internal affairs of the sections and that the Board should look at increasing basic services funding.

Martin asked why the Budget & Finance Committee had changed from its original recommendation in Document 4.3 to increase basic services funding. Spalding explained that no section has asked for additional funding. Loanne Snavely, vice-chair of the Instruction Section, addressed the Board, and said that the IS has not requested an increase but had felt that there was not enough money to do some things. Snavely said that while the mailing labels were nice they would need more money to print what it was that needed to be mailed since IS was a large section. Reichel said that once this is voted on she would make a motion that the funds not be limited and that units be able to use the funds anyway they choose including section programming. Spalding asked why not increase program funding? Reichel said that for smaller sections they might only be requesting \$450 a year and that this might be used to photocopy a handout.

Jenkins said she did not intend to short circuit the discussion but that when the Board asked that the funding structure be looked at not all of the increases in basic services would cover the costs of two sets of mailing labels and she had recommended to Budget & Finance that they consider including the mailing labels because that is what many member leaders have told staff they would like. Jenkins said that if units are permitted to use their allocations for anything they want it might mean that the procedures for funding conference programs, the initiative fund and the like will need to be rethought.

Maloy commented that some Board members felt that sections should have more autonomy in how they can spend their money. John Cullars, WESS liaison to the ACRL Board, said that WESS was happy to hear that more money might be available for mailings.

Breivik said that the Board felt that the work of the sections was very important and that the Board wants to give them more support but that perhaps the Board was trying to do this without enough thought.

Lisa Browar, immediate past chair of RBMS, said that RBMS is one of most successful programming unit ACRL has, its 1995 preconference netted \$8,000. Browar felt that RBMS members felt the \$600 was gratuitous, that most of the members used their institution to fund RBMS projects. Browar felt that most of the members were in high administrative positions and that ACRL should trust them to be fiscally responsible.

Tom Abbott, chair of ECLSS, agreed that the ECLSS members had spent the allotment many times over, through the support of their institutions.

Spalding reminded the Board that the Basic Services funding is a relatively new concept and that if sections felt that changes were needed perhaps a group should explore the issue.

Don Frank, incoming chair of ULS, said that ULS does not have a newsletter but that the ULS program was extremely important and that he would appreciate any flexibility.

Pfeiffer asked what the total impact of the increase in basic services recommended in Document 4.3 and two sets of labels would be. Jenkins replied that it was being calculated.

Reichel asked if the joint meeting of the Board and Budget and Finance Committee at Midwinter Meeting could address the issue of section funding. Fatzer pointed out that it was a minimal impact on the budget. Spalding noted that under the proposal in document 4.3 some sections would not get an increase.

Martin said she felt the Board needed to do something longer-range that considered issues of competitive funding versus automated funding, how funding is allocated across ACRL units, etc., and that this would take time. Martin suggested there were three alternatives: 1) two sets of labels plus funding as is; 2) increased funding; 3) or two sets of labels and increased funding. Fatzer said she would vote against the current motion because mailing labels without additional money to print and mail were not useful.

Reichel agreed and said she intended to vote in favor of document 4.3 once a motion was entertained.

Hisle called the question.

Action: The motion was defeated with Martin and Spalding voting in favor, Miller abstaining, and the rest of the Board voting against the motion.

Motion: Fatzer moved and Maloy seconded to untable the motion to approve Document 4.3.

Action: The motion was approved unanimously.

Jenkins said that the difference in basic services funding from FY 1995 was only approximately a \$1,850 increase and that adding the labels was an additional \$1,110. Breivik suggested that a group be constituted to study a long term financial strategy for funding of ACRL units.

Motion: Maloy moved and Reichel seconded that the Board approve the recommended basic services funding for 1997 as outlined in Document 4.3. Miller offered a friendly amendment to add the two sets of mailing labels.

Action: The amended motion passed unanimously.

25.3 Initiative Fund Request

Jenkins said that there was an interest in repackaging the President's Leadership program to offer the revised workbook and offer a "training the trainer" session at the Midwinter Meeting and at the Annual Conference in San Francisco. Jenkins said that the costs for these sessions would be about \$7,500 for Dadie Perlov's time and that coincidentally there was potentially \$7,500 left in the Initiative Fund .

Motion: Fatzer moved and Muroi seconded that the \$7,500 left in the FY1996 budget be carried over to the FY1997 budget to fund the replication of the leadership program at the 1997 Midwinter Meeting and Annual Conference.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

25.4 1997 Recommended Budget

Motion: Spalding moved that the ACRL Board of Directors approve the 1997 ACRL budget (as it will be adjusted to reflect the increases in section funding), which is projected to realize a fund balance due to the National Conference projected revenues, and does not include a transfer to the ACRL endowment; and approve the 1997 Choice budget, which is a deficit budget, but realizes an operating fund balance that includes the mandated operating reserve and does not include a transfer to the Choice endowment.

Spalding noted that the ALA overhead rate was increased from 15.8% to 17.1% and that ACRL would pay this increased overhead rate on the revenues from the National Conference. Spalding also noted that the 1997 budget also includes an additional \$5,000 for the Council of Liaisons budget. Spalding said that the chapter funding was kept at the 1996 level, that the budget would be revised to reflect the increased section funding and that Jenkins intended to fill four vacant positions. Spalding also noted that the National Conference registration rate was a large increase and that the 1997 budget included preconferences for WESS and RBMS.

Reichel asked if the budget included enough funds for Miller's program at the Annual Conference. Miller said there was sufficient money in the budget for the programs.

Fatzer asked about lines 84 and 86 and why they did not show staff time. Jenkins explained that if the grants were funded staff time would be shown.

Spalding said the Choice budget will have a deficit but that it would be smaller than previously projected and that the fund balance carried forward would cover the deficit.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

Spalding reported that the membership dues subcommittee would have a draft report for the Board at the Midwinter Meeting and that the Board did have the report from staff about National Conference risk.

Motion: Hisle moved and Reichel seconded that the Board establish a task force chaired by a member of the Board that includes two members of the Budget & Finance Committee, the chair of the activities section council, and a representative of a type of library section to develop a proposal on how to fund ACRL units other than chapters.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

Hisle said that he thought the members of the organization needed to trust each other. Maloy volunteered to chair this task force. The Board thanked and applauded Helen Spalding for her long service to the Board.

26.0 Community Information Organization

Jenkins said that at the 1995 Midwinter Meeting in Philadelphia the Board approved this group going forward with a grant proposal and that this document shared with the Board the revised work of this group with ASCLA, PLA, and the Fund for America's Libraries.

Miller said he attended the CIO meeting and that the proposal has come a long way since its first inception.

Reichel asked when the group became a committee. Jenkins said that is an advisory committee that would help oversee the project but that it is not a new permanent group of ACRL. Reichel requested that the group be called a task force and not a committee. Martin said that if the project is not funded or when it is completed that the group would go out of existence.

Fatzer said that it was a good proposal and asked that it be strengthened by sharing more examples of community information organizations already in existence.

Maloy asked why there is so much money for travel for training rather than teleconference. Miller responded that only nine groups were to be trained and that teleconferences were not economically feasible for such a small group.

Fradkin asked if this should have a sunset clause. Miller replied that the group felt that they would spend one more year seeking funding.

Motion: Martin moved and Spalding seconded that the Board approve the Community Information Organization grant proposal and give staff and committee members authority to revise the proposal as needed to suit potential funders and work with the ALA Development Office to secure funding.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

Breivik asked that the Board's best wishes and thanks for their good work be conveyed to the CIO committee.

27.0 Equal Access to Software and Information

Jenkins explained this was a joint ACRL/AAHE project and that the committee was asking that they be allowed to work with the ALA Development Office to fine tune the proposal and seek funding.

Motion: Martin moved and Fatzer seconded that the ACRL Board approve the EASI grant proposal and give staff and committee members authority to revise the proposal as needed to suit potential funders and work with the ALA Development Office to secure funding.

Action: The Board unanimously approved the motion.

28.0 Council of Liaisons Report

Jenkins explained that this report was brought forward to inform the Board of the Council's work in this area. Jenkins said that the nine associations have been very warm in receiving ACRL's overtures and inviting them into their network.

Breivik said that 1998 was targeted for having an educational summit for the Council of Liaisons. Fradkin said he found the reports very good and helpful in understanding ACRL's work with the associations.

Hisle asked if there would be a standard format for the reports. Jenkins replied that there was a new column in *C&RL News* called "ACRL: Partners in Higher Education" and that she expected future reports to be of publishable quality.

29.0 Rethinking ACRL at Conferences Task Force Report

Miller said the document indicates the thinking of the committee and that the committee would welcome comments from the Board. Breivik suggested posting the document to the ACRLeads. Martin suggested sharing the document with the ALA Structure Revision Task Force. Breivik asked if the committee could bring a revised document to the ACRL Board by the Midwinter meeting. Breivik said that it was important to

recognize the efforts of the ACRL Membership Committee and CJCLS for their efforts in increasing membership this year.

30.0 Section Newsletter Policy

Staff member Hugh Thompson said that the request from the Publications Committee was to reinstate language that let the sections know what to reasonably expect in terms of how much funding the sections can expect for their newsletters.

Jenkins asked the Board to review the section newsletter policy (found in section 4.8 on page 27 of the July 1996 edition of the *ACRL Guide to Policies and Procedures*) and that the issue would be brought to them for action at the Midwinter Meeting.

Martin suggested that this issue should be folded into the discussions of the section funding task force. Reichel requested that it not be included in the discussions about section funding because in the past the issue of funding section newsletters has consumed enormous amounts of the Board's time.

31.0 Vice-president's Report

Miller reported that booth sales and donor solicitations were going well for the Nashville National Conference and that Carla Stoffle had pointed out to him that the conference would occur while he was president of ACRL.

Miller reported that the 1997 Annual Conference program included a joint effort of six ACRL sections to hold a program featuring the Disney Imagineering staff entitled "Imagining Academic Libraries in the 21st Century: Envisioning the Learning Library." Miller said that his friends at UMI were so excited about the program that they pledged a minimum of \$1,000 to support the program. Miller said that awards would be presented at the beginning of the program, that there would be a showcase, and after the program the group would move into the Academic/Research Librarian of the Year Reception.

Miller said that the expenses are under budget for conference programs as shown on the attached list. Miller hopes to have a report from the task force on retention of ACRL leaders by the Midwinter Meeting. Miller said that in addition to the ongoing emphasis of goal 1 of the strategic plan, professional development, that he expected the government relations committee would increase in its importance and visibility. Miller also expects to work more closely with ARL and the ALA Public Information Office.

Miller referred the Board to the chapters/relations documents about language on homepages and incorporation. Breivik said that about ten of ACRL's chapters are not incorporated or are not a part of the state or regional organization. Breivik has asked them to let ACRL know if they need help to incorporate or join the state association. Henry Stewart, chair of Chapter's Council, asked if the Board had a preference on whether the chapter's incorporated individually or with their state association. Jenkins and Miller replied that either way was fine.

Breivik asked staff to prepare language about the policies and procedures relating to chapters implied in document 18.0.

32.0 ACRL Councilor's Report

Hisle said that a resolution would be introduced at Council tomorrow to ask ALA staff to follow and adhere to the terms of the Operating Agreement. Hisle also said he expected some resolutions on human rights issues to be brought before Council. Hisle said that tomorrow was his last session as Councilor and that he had

really enjoyed it, had found it a very valuable experience to work with a variety of librarians, and encouraged ACRL members to consider service to Council.

32.1 ALA Sunset Policies

Hisle said that the document on conference issues was intended to solicit comment about how meeting sites were selected, etc. Breivik asked about the sunset policies. Jenkins said that PLA had in place a structure for reviewing their committees and asked how this might interface with the policy proposed by Council. Breivik said she thought it was wonderful ALA was putting into place a sunset review process and asked that Hisle ensure that the wording not limit how ACRL implements its own sunset policies. Jenkins explained that ALA had been given ACRL's previous strategic plan and process for unit review because that was what was in place 1 • years ago even though it is no longer in force in ACRL now.

Reichel asked Hisle about the background behind the Operating Agreement resolution. Breivik said that some of the divisions felt that there were some memos this year that seemed to not be in the spirit of the Operating Agreement and that this was an attempt to head off a lengthy opening of the renegotiation of the Operating Agreement.

33.0 Executive Director's Report

Jenkins referred the Board to Document 14 and offered to answer questions.

34.0 Report from ALA Structure Task Force

Martin reported that the task force was looking at how ALA should work better and was not interested in major restructuring. Martin said two hearings drawing 50 or 60 people have been held during this Annual Conference. Martin reminded the Board that the task force had formulated a document that asked a lot of questions that was available on the ALA homepage. Martin said that there would be another meeting in October and that more input was needed from the membership. Breivik asked by what deadline input was needed. Martin replied that she expected the task force would be reporting back to council at the next Annual Conference--the end of the task force's two year term. Martin posited that much of what would be addressed in the future would be governance issues.

35.0 Issues needing to be addressed

Reichel asked how new business could be introduced. Jenkins replied when the agenda was approved new items could be added. Reichel asked if the Board was familiar with the new Sturgis rules under which the Board was supposed to be operating. Jenkins said she is trying to obtain an abbreviated version of Sturgis. Reichel asked that motion forms be used at future meetings to help clarify to the Board its actions. Breivik said she would not object to it but that she wanted to know what benefit there would be. Maloy asked how the process would work. Reichel explained that as you make the motion you write it down and then it is taken by the recorder. Breivik said that an overhead would help so that the motion could be shown. Breivik suggested that the Board consider the suggestion and discuss it at some future time.

Breivik suggested that the Board discuss the Constitution issues in the remaining five minutes although the substantive discussion would take place at Midwinter. Breivik said this would be one opportunity for the Board to articulate questions they had so that the Constitution and Bylaws Committee could respond to the concerns. Reichel asked about Article V and wondered why the Executive Director should be an officer of the association. She said she would like some explanation of why the change was made.

Reichel asked why ACRL was examining its Constitution and Bylaws. Jenkins replied that she had discussed the structure of Constitution and Bylaws with colleagues at ASAE (American Society of Association

Executives) and that it was clear ACRL's Constitution and Bylaws were a mix and that items should be clarified. Breivik said the other reason the change needed to be made was because the Planning Committee was eliminated and that ex officio position the chair held on the Board needed to be removed from the Constitution.

Reichel expressed pessimism about being able to have a good in-depth discussion at Midwinter. Breivik said that much discussion could happen by ACRL Board conference call. Reichel suggested that in the spirit of open meetings that the proposed changes be put on the ACRLLeads listserv so that wide input could be sought.

Spalding reminded the Board that she suggested that Board actions be distributed to ACRL leaders on ACRLLeads as soon as possible after Annual Conference. Miller asked if past chairs of all the units could be kept on ACRLLeads. Jenkins said that the Board had requested that no one be removed from ACRLLeads.

Breivik suggested to Miller that he send to the Board a timeline and process of review of the proposed changes to the Constitutions and Bylaws.

Breivik said that an issue still under discussion was the issue of a dues increase and that the Membership Committee was reviewing the membership packet and needed to be reminded to finish their report.

Breivik said that it will be an uphill battle to get the 1999 National Conference in Detroit put in a positive light and that a Michigan librarian will be writing an article about the delights of Detroit that will be published with the notice of the Board action.

Retiring Board Members' Recognition

Breivik thanked the Board members for their hard work this year. She then thanked Sue Martin for her work and leadership on the Board and presented her with a gift. Breivik also thanked Helen Spalding for her long years of service to the Board representing the Budget and Finance Committee and presented her with a gift.

Passing the Gavel

Breivik then passed the gavel to Miller. Miller said that he had enjoyed all of his interactions with Sue Martin and admired Helen Spalding's work on the committee.

Adjournment

President Miller adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

The Board also received the following reports for their information:

- ACRL Leader Retention Task Force Report
- ACRL Government Relations Committee Report
- ACRL Racial and Ethnic Diversity Committee Report
- ACRL Task Force on Electronic Publications
- ACRL Appointments and Nominations Committee Report