

**Association of College & Research Libraries  
Board of Directors Meeting I  
Midwinter Meeting  
San Antonio, Texas  
January 21, 1996  
Agenda**

**Attendance:**

*Board Members:* Patricia 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; Executive Director Althea H. Jenkins

*Visitors:* Bob Almony, Marilyn Martin, Alma Dawson, John Cullars, Susan M. Allen, Thomas G. Kirk, Ginny O'Herron, Esther Grassian, Lee Marie Wisel, Isabel Stirling, Amy Paster, Alison Ricker, Maija Lutz, Nicholas E. Gaymon, Cindy Faries, Henry Stewart, Susan Phillips, Gloriana St. Clair, Richard Werking, W. Bede Mitchell, Stephen Wiberly, Susan Brynteson, Mark Rosenzweig, Barbara von Wahlde, Susana Hinojosa, Ellen Johnson, Barbara Wittkopf, J. Douglas Archer, Lynne Bradley (ALA Staff)

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

**Call to Order**

President Patricia Breivik called the meeting to order at 2:08 p.m.

**Open Microphone session.**

She opened the proceedings to the Open Microphone session where the Board sets aside half an hour at the beginning of their first meeting to hear from any member who wishes to address the Board.

Alison Ricker, STS, referred to the minutes of the Fall 1995 Executive Committee and expressed her concern that the ACRL Board was not able to respond quickly enough to work with UMI to give an award to libraries. Ricker stated that it was important for ACRL members to get awards and urged the Board to revisit the issue so that in the future ACRL can respond more quickly to offers such as this.

Ricker then addressed the request made to coordinate conference programming and reduce meetings. She said she saw how on one level reducing the number of meetings and programs is good but expressed concern that combining programs could lead to "a wishy-washy blah presentation." She asked that the need to reduce programs be balanced with the need for meaningful programs. She also said on behalf of STS that committees have an important role in bringing new members into the association.

Reichel asked Ricker if STS had more volunteers than slots. Ricker responded that there was not a great surplus but that they had plenty of members that wanted to work.

Bob Almony, who chaired ACRL's Budget and Finance Committee from 1982-86, then addressed the Board. He said that ACRL was nearly broke in 1982 and that by 1986 it was the richest division in ALA. He said that though he had remained an ACRL member he had been more active in LAMA the past ten years. He said that he was addressing the Board today because of a rumor he heard that the ACRL Board was squandering ACRL's money and that they might be asking for dues increase after giving away \$100,000 to ALA.

Breivik told Almony that she was pleased he had raised the issue. ACRL would never squander money but that ACRL did give \$50,000 and Choice gave \$50,000 to ALA Goal 2000 after a great deal of thought and effort because the goals as they were articulated--strengthening ALA's presence in Washington D.C. and stronger emphasis on information policy--were so much in keeping with ACRL's new strategic plan. Breivik added that the Board felt that ALA could do far more than what ACRL could do on its own and that it was a wise investment of ACRL's money to further its goals.

### **1.0 Announcements**

With no one else stepping forward to use the open microphone Breivik moved to the agenda. There were no announcements.

### **2.0 Adoption of the Agenda**

Breivik asked for corrections to the agenda. Breivik announced that item 4.41 was dropped and that she would be asking the Board members to report on their leadership activities as they had been assigned at the retreat. Reichel asked for time for informal sharing of information. Breivik responded that if the Board finishes the agenda the Board could share environmental reports between agenda items 14.0 and 16.0.

### **3.0 Approval of Annual Conference Minutes**

*Discussion:* Breivik asked for approval of the minutes from the 1995 Annual Conference. Fatzter asked that the spelling of Loanne Snavely's name be corrected on page 8. Reichel asked that the word mailing be changed to meeting on page 9.

*Motion:* Breivik moved approval of the minutes from the 1995 Annual Conference.

*Second:* Reichel seconded the motion to approve the minutes as corrected.

*Action:* The motion passed unanimously.

### **3.1 Review of December 18 Board Conference Call Minutes**

*Discussion:* Breivik asked for discussion of minutes. Miller asked for correction of the spelling of Linda's last name and Larry Oberg's last name. Fatzter suggested at bottom of page 7 that what she said was "Fatzter said the nature of the programs. . ." Reichel said that on the same page she did not say SOLINET was a not-for-profit organization and asked that the minutes be corrected.

### **4.0 Consent Agenda**

#### **4.1 Request for Approval of 1997 RBMS Preconference Concept**

#### **4.2 Request for Approval of 1997 WESS Preconference Concept**

#### **4.3 Request for Approval of 1997 IS Preconference Concept**

#### **4.4 Constitution and By-laws Committee**

##### **4.41 Request to include By-laws change on spring ballot to remove Chair of Planning Committee from Board as ex-officio member without vote**

*Discussion:* Breivik reviewed that the consent agenda was for items that seemed more routine in nature. Fatzter said that the dates on the WESS submission were wrong--the dates and days don't match. Breivik explained that approval of preconference was for the concept not the budget which would be approved at Annual Conference. Reichel asked that item 4.2, the WESS preconference, be removed from the consent agenda.

*Motion:* Fradkin moved to pass the consent agenda.

*Second:* Martin seconded the motion.

*Action:* The motion passed unanimously.

#### **4.2 Request for Approval of 1997 WESS Preconference Concept**

*Discussion:* Reichel said that the idea for the WESS preconference was interesting but very focused and that we needed to make sure that it would be successful. Breivik invited WESS to address the question of generating attendance at the preconference.

John Cullars, the WESS liaison to the ACRL Board, said that WESS did realize that the topic was very focused and that while many WESS members are at large institutions and have this experience there are also many WESS members at smaller institutions who don't have this European experience and that it would be helpful for them to have this information about acquisitions. Cullars said that the WESS membership is largely responsible for collection development and that there is some feeling that not enough had been done for smaller institutions. Cullars said WESS was not certain it would attract enough participants but that it wanted to try. Fatzer asked if they had thought about publicizing beyond WESS, e.g., RASD collection development folks. Cullars answered that they would do this as well as advertise in *C&RL News* and other places.

Miller said the proposal indicated the conference hotels were available at no cost. Jenkins replied we get ALA meeting hotel space free. Cullars said they also need to raise \$2,000 for AV costs and that they had a list of 12-15 vendors that could contribute \$250 each to fund this.

Martin asked Cullars if he knew what the break-even point was and what the cut-off date was. Cullars said Jenkins had worked with the committee and informed them of this.

Breivik said that the Board is encouraging WESS to be creative with advertising to make it work. Fradkin asked if WESS had a preconference before. Cullars said no but that WESS had a successful conference in Florence.

*Motion:* Reichel moved approval of the WESS preconference concept.

*Second:* Pfeiffer seconded the motion.

*Action:* The motion passed unanimously.

#### **5.0 President's Report on 1996 Program Activities**

*Discussion:* Breivik reported that the majority of ACRL's programs were related to the leadership theme and that they had a very successful program planning meeting. Breivik asked if anyone had questions and indicated that publicity would begin soon. Breivik added that this program was a "test case" for ALA to have a conference within a conference. Breivik said that staff would be working with ALA staff to identify other programs on leadership so that they are all identified within the program making it easy for conference attendees to identify all leadership sessions.

Fatzer asked if all programs would be taped and if not how they could ensure that all sessions are taped.

Jenkins responded that a notice would be sent to all section chairs asking if they thought their program should be taped and that ACRL and ALA staff would evaluate which should be taped because ALA does not tape all programs.

Fatzer indicated that ECLSS was particularly interested in having its program taped as they were working with alternate delivery modes all of the time.

Breivik reported that there was additional synergy and excitement about the various program groups working together.

## **6.0 Executive Director's Report**

*Discussion:* Jenkins reviewed her report and introduced new staff: Irving Rockwood, Editor & Publisher of *Choice*, and Elisa Topper, Director of Member Services. Jenkins then called to the Board's attention the following items:

- ALA has moved forward with technology and now has a new web page; ACRL has a prototype homepage. All of ALA is connected to an internal LAN and that after the Midwinter Meeting ALA was switching to a new system and that staff e-mail addresser were changing. The *Choice* staff have been looking at what is needed to upgrade *Choice* and bring it into the 21st century.
- ACRL membership is growing and in November was up to 10,789--a new high for a November figure. Staff had implemented a special promotion campaign to community and junior colleges librarians.
- ACRL has been implementing the ALA donor policy and has received accolades from ALA about how responsible ACRL has been about following the policy.
- ACRL is a CNI member and the Board approved two projects recently: 1) Creating new learning communities and 2) User education materials on the Internet. The Board had asked Tom Kirk to represent ACRL on the new learning communities committee initiative. CNI held a "New Learning Communities Conference in the fall at IUPUI and a report had appeared in *C&RL News*. An ACRL/CNI preconference is being planned as a follow up to broaden the base of librarians able to participate in such initiatives on their campuses and things were well underway. Barbara McAdam, Esther Grassian, and Keith Morgan were working on the user education materials project, and CNI offered a grant to fund a pilot site that would mount materials on user education on the Internet. A call for proposals had been issued and Seven proposals were received and reviewed by ACRL and CNI, and a site will be announced soon.

Jenkins also reported that National Conference plans were well underway.

## **Government Relations/Chapter Task Force report**

*Discussion:* Tom Kirk thanked Susan Phillips, Lee Wisel and Henry Stewart for their help in formulating the report. Kirk said that the Government Relations Committee had more work to do than they could be reasonably expected to handle. Kirk reported that there is a steady barrage of technical information coming from the ALA Washington Office that the committee needed time to work on. Kirk said the Task Force recommends reformulating the Legislative Network to give that responsibility to Chapters Council and Chapters.

Kirk suggested that Chapters Council could appoint a coordinator for the Legislative Network and that person would be an ex officio member of the Government Relations Committee. Kirk said efforts should be made to develop an educational program to help members get more involved and respond to the ALA Washington Office's calls for action. The Government Relations Committee could then focus on analyzing legislation and advising the ACRL Board and ALA Washington Office. Kirk paused and offered to answer questions about this part of the report.

Breivik asked Henry Stewart how Chapters responded. Stewart reported that he felt that Chapters Council reacted favorably and have already identified a possible coordinator.

Reichel asked about the ACRL representative to the ALA Legislation Assembly and suggested that this liaison role should be part of the Government Relations Committee Charge.

Kirk asked if he could work on revising the charge and return to the Board a little later.

Reichel said she saw it as closing the circle and not a new proposal. Jenkins suggested another option would be to include it in a list of duties and keep the charge as written. Reichel said that this would not serve her purpose as well. Reichel said she feels that people need to see the role of the Government Relations beyond ACRL. Kirk said it also parallels the sentence in the charge about a liaison to the Chapters Council. Kirk also pointed out the report is in draft form because they had not had a chance to consult with Chapters Council until this meeting. Kirk also indicated that membership would begin in July not in September.

Breivik thanked the task force and said that it was a major step forward in the strategic plan and that it would facilitate the plan well. Breivik then asked if Kirk wanted to comment on the process. Kirk indicated that they learned that e-mail needs to be used in combination with other kinds of communication. He said that e-mail is good for sharing information but that for decision-making some type of real-time discussion was necessary, e.g., a conference call. Kirk said that inevitably in the e-mail process some folks stay engaged and others stay silent which thwarts the group process. Kirk said that in e-mail "A" makes a statement and individuals respond but that you don't get a sense of the groups' response. Kirk said he drafted the document, faxed the document to individuals, and then e-mailed portions of the document to stimulate discussion. Kirk reported that even with this, group decisions were not made; but the conference call made a group decision possible within 40 minutes. Kirk summarized that e-mail had kept individuals informed but not enabled a group decision and that e-mail could be used for association business with the idea that it be supplemented with other means of communications. Kirk suggested that ACRL should factor in funds for conference calls to supplement the e-mail.

Breivik thanked the committee and explained that she wanted to look at the process because the Board had a commitment to the Strategic Plan to work quickly. Breivik said that there is a lot of talent available that is not on a committee because not everyone can't come to two meetings a year. Breivik said she felt that shorter term task forces offered an opportunity to involve more talented people and that this task force's work reinforced the notion that the e-mail combination is an effective way to work quickly. Breivik said that Fradkin's paraprofessional task force was also working this way.

Kirk added that he was on the K. G. Saur Award Committee and that they did their work by e-mail after Annual Conference. Kirk said that the Saur Committee felt that this was a way to involve individuals who couldn't come to conference.

Reichel said that as these communication models are developed it will be important to identify what tasks are appropriate to handle in between conferences and what issues need a wide hearing and should continue to be handled at conference.

Breivik suggested a tip sheet on this topic would be helpful.

Fatzer suggested use of a listserv with a public comment tool to make it easier for broad participation. Fatzer said that she was thinking of Martin's Vision group as a good example of using the listserv. Fradkin said his group was going to communicate on established listservs that paraprofessionals were already participating in. Fradkin thanked Kirk for his insights on the use of e-mail and association business.

Breivik asked Kirk to finish his changes before the second Board meeting and then thanked the Task Force for their good work.

#### **12.0 Division-wide fundraising coordination**

*Discussion:* Miller referred to document 13.0 fundraising guidelines and indicated that he was still thinking about the issues. Miller said that the Colleagues Committee has been asked to raise \$55,000 for the ACRL 8th National Conference in Nashville and that it was a formidable task to raise money for additional ACRL activities and to coordinate with ALA. Miller said it was a complex issue that needs program officer support within ACRL and that it may have budget implications along those lines. Miller said he is developing a document that will recommend a program officer to coordinate fundraising.

Spalding asked if Miller meant a new position.

Miller indicated it might be existing staff but that a volunteer should not be managing the fundraising program.

Reichel reported that sections had told her they were looking for money to support their programs and that the sections said they did not know about the fundraising guidelines.

Miller said Joe Boisse developed a list of potential vendors to approach and that ALA had reviewed and approved the list after two names were removed because ALA planned to approach them. Miller said the problem was communication; that some people are not aware of the strategic plan.

Breivik reminded the Board members to bring these guidelines to the attention of the sections.

#### **8.0 Publication Committee Resolution**

*Discussion:* Richard Werking, Chair of the Publications Committee, presented a resolution on behalf of the Publications Committee and the six editorial boards and general membership. Werking said that he had addressed the Board at the 1995 Annual Conference about the strategic plan and the concern of these groups about the lack of specific mention of publications in the new strategic plan. Werking reported that all of ACRL's editorial boards had expressed concern and dismay about this lack. Werking said that Martin had visited the Publications Committee at the Annual Conference and indicated that it was a dynamic document and that change could be proposed.

Werking cited Breivik's article on the strategic plan in the January issue of *C&RL News* and that members were invited to comment on the plan and propose ideas. Werking said this theme was repeated at the leadership session. Werking said that continuing education was also a topic of discussion at the leadership session and that he had served as the first chair of ACRL CE committee. Werking pointed out that publications have a role in CE. He said that the Publications Committee was not asking for removal of anything from the plan but instead wanted a short addition to the plan that for the previous decade had been a part of ACRL's four goals. Werking said that the Publications Committee wanted this language to be reinstated as one of the 19 new strategic directions as explicitly stated in the Strategic Plan. Werking further pointed out that addition was only 100 characters and would take two lines. He emphasized that this was not a request from a special interest group but was on behalf of the whole association. Werking added that he realized that the Board might not want to revise the plan at every meeting and that the Publications Committee was proposing that the change be effective with the new fiscal year.

Breivik said that the Board had discussed entertaining changes to the plan at the Annual Conference. Werking asked a procedural question; he had hoped the Board could consider the request now, voting it up or down and implementing it later.

Maloy indicated that this is new for the Board and the amendment was making the Board realize that a mechanism was needed for making changes to the plan. Maloy suggested the Friday leadership session could be a call for suggestions for the plan. Maloy said she doesn't mind anyone bringing changes to the Strategic Plan at anytime but that it did make sense to coordinate.

Werking clarified that at this point there was no time stated as to when the plan would be reviewed.

Fatzer said the strength of the strategic plan was that it had received wide review and consultation and that she would not want to amend it in a patchwork way. Fatzer felt that solicitations should be in advance of the Friday leadership session.

Martin said she felt that publishing was implicit in mission, vision and first strategic direction but that this was festering and that it was important to get on with business. Martin asked what the Board thought of making the change along with the caveat that this was not a normal procedure.

Breivik said that she disagreed. She said she felt that there had to be an organized procedure and that it was not appropriate to move ahead without a process.

Reichel said the Board had a Committee with a comment and asked if a committee could ask for a motion. She said Werking could make a motion and the Board would have to react to it. Reichel said that they could not respond that they would not consider it.

Breivik said we don't have the process.

Werking clarified that he did expect that the Board would take action on it today. Jenkins said the Board could receive Werking's recommendation and refer it to Executive Committee with a request that the Executive Committee develop a process for making changes to the Strategic Plan and that the item would be back on the agenda at 1996 Annual Conference as an action item.

Martin supported Jenkins' suggestion but expressed concern that it would snowball with requests from other interest groups.

Hisle said that if we are hearing many members say that the strategic plan is missing important items then we need more input and need to look at the plan.

*Motion:* Martin moved that the Board receive the recommendation to modify the Strategic Plan from the Publications Committee, that the Executive Committee be asked to establish a procedure for modifying the plan at its Spring meeting and that the Publications Committee's request be brought to the Board for action at the 1996 Annual Conference.

*Second:* Hisle seconded the motion.

*Discussion:* Fatzer asked that the minutes show that strategic plans are short term and will always be revised but that the process needs to be developed. Fatzer continued that it is not unusual that we are

already hearing requests before it was a year old; that is normal and this is the way strategic planning ought to work.

Breivik clarified that she was not against the concept but felt that due process was important to avoid the appearance of preferential treatment.

Maloy asked if she could ask another question.

Breivik called the question.

Reichel asked for personal privilege. Reichel said we are having a discussion about the report so Maloy could ask a question. Breivik said she didn't like to be that formal and Maloy could go ahead and ask the question. Maloy asked how strategic direction 1.5 relates to 1.1.

Werking responded that ACRL has been a publisher for many years and that promoting publications was very important. Werking said that strategic direction 1.1 does not indicate that promoting publications was a priority for ACRL.

Hisle said if you look at 2.2 and 2.3 we specifically mention ARL so that he sees why we would need to mention publications.

Werking said in addition 3.3 and 3.4 talk about working with other organizations and that it was important.

Hisle called the question.

*Action:* The motion passed unanimously.

## **11.0 Budget and Finance Committee**

### **11.1 FY1995 Final Report**

Spalding said that the final budget report for FY 1995 was in the December issue of *C&RL News* and that although the year ended well membership and *C&RL* did not have the revenues expected. Spalding said that overall ACRL ended with a \$1 million fund balance and that part of this balance is the mandated reserve. Spalding reported that in 1996 \$385,068 was the amount of the mandated reserve and that other uses of the fund balance was to cover unexpected situations or shortfalls.

Miller said there had been a concern from the audience and wondered if the Budget & Finance Committee would recommend a dues increase this year. Spalding replied they did not anticipate that the Budget & Finance Committee would be recommending a dues increase this year.

Breivik said Miller's question caught her off-guard because she thought that the question of a dues increase was to be considered a part of an entire financial plan.

Miller replied that he was trying to address Bob Almony's concern. Breivik said that the Board was trying to look at the entire financial picture and that part of the rationale for eliminating committees is to have more money. Breivik said that it was OK to clarify that the 1996 spring ballot would not have a dues increase but that she wouldn't want members to think ACRL did not have to look seriously at the possibility of a dues increase.



Spalding said a dues increase was a possibility every year since the Budget & Finance Committee looked at the issue at every Midwinter Meeting.

Reichel said Breivik and Jenkins spoke eloquently to contributing to ALA Goal 2000 and then asked if the contribution was already subtracted from the bottom line.

Spalding said it was out. Jenkins clarified that in FY1995 the contribution was paid in August, 1995 and that the final payment was paid in the first quarter of FY 1996, October, 1995.

Reichel thanked them for the clarification and said she didn't think she had received the document the leadership council received.

Fradkin asked how the mandated reserve was calculated and if it was for catastrophic purposes.

Spalding explained that it was 40% of the average expenditures of the past three years and that with a National Conference every two years ACRL will need a higher reserve level. Fatzer asked if ACRL could buy insurance against the event. Spalding replied that the Budget & Finance Committee had asked for more information. Jenkins said staff would do research on the insurance question.

Fradkin asked if the operating expenses requirement of the National Conference could be removed from the 40% mandated reserve if the conference was separately insured. Spalding said that was not how ACRL looked at it. Spalding said there were wild swings in the budget due to the National Conference and asked if the National Conference could be shown separately in the budget.

Jenkins clarified that ALA does not require 40% of previous 3 year average and that this was an ACRL Board policy. Jenkins said that ALA requires that divisions only have an amount to cover the projected expenses in their mandated reserve to hold a National Conference.

Spalding said that the policy was established in conjunction with the National Conference being held every three years. Fatzer suggested we ask ALA if we have to have the reserve if we are insured another way. Breivik asked to hold discussion until we had information about insurance. Breivik said that the Board would need to consider a two- or three-year cycle in relation to fundraising and many other things. Spalding said the Budget & Finance Committee would keep working on it. She then clarified that the *Choice* budget was separate from ACRL and that the *Choice* budget had a positive fund balance in FY1995.

### **11.2 FY 1996 First Quarter Report**

Spalding reported that FY 1996 had been budgeted at a deficit but that so far book sales are ahead of budget and that the revenue from classified ads placed in *C&RL News* was reducing the bottom line. Spalding said that there would be salary savings due to open positions and other savings so that the total deficit might be reduced to \$50,000 keeping in mind that \$114,000 is a conference deficit due to planning expenses for the 8th National Conference in Nashville. Spalding said that so far the budget looks better than had originally been projected. Spalding added that *Choice* will be coming forward with a large request for capital expenditures that will be an investment.

Fatzer asked about the format of the reports. She said that the text simply reports the numbers in the charts without explanation. and said that she would prefer more written explanation rather than oral.

Breivik asked if there are members of the Board that would work with Jenkins to identify what types of textual explanation they wanted. Miller and Fatzer volunteered to send comments to Jenkins.

Spalding said that while the FY 1995 final budget looked good, we should remember that it was a National Conference year. She said the Budget and Finance Committee wants a new, steady revenue stream. The committee thought it would be wonderful to build a large endowment to generate revenue for future projects.

Reichel said she thought the Board still needed to work through a policy that dues would cover membership costs.

Spalding said the Budget & Finance Committee was looking at the whole picture of membership services and costs and that some of the assumptions and definitions needed to be reviewed.

Breivik said it may be time to change policies and to do it consciously.

Fatzer asked Spalding why she didn't see expenses in the line for Council of Liaisons. Spalding replied that in FY 1996 expenses were show on the line for committees and that in FY 1997 the Council on Liaisons has its own budget line.

The Board took a five minute break.

## **7.0 Intellectual Freedom Update**

*Discussion:* Barbara Jones, chair of ACRL Intellectual Freedom Committee (IFC), reviewed the timeline for comments to version 2.2 of the Access to Electronic Information, Services, and Networks: An Interpretation of the Library Bill of Rights. She indicated that her committee as well as Paul Evan Peters from CNI and Nancy Hannick from the Coalition for Government Information, would be making comments and that a new draft was expected by Monday morning. Jones reported that the ACRL IFC had reviewed the document carefully, had made changes in response to comments, and had endorsed the document conceptually. Jones reported that she did not expect substantive changes before tomorrow.

Jones said she attended ALA Executive Board meeting and that the consensus in the room was that something needs to be passed at the Council meetings during this Midwinter Meeting due to pressure to get some policy that addresses electronic information on the books.

Breivik reported that the division presidents, vice-presidents had met that morning and that with the exception of PLA and ALTA, this group found the document too long and negative. Martin added that in addition to being too lengthy, LITA felt that the Bill of Rights already covered these issues and that this interpretation was not needed.

The use of the term "primary clientele" which creates a problem for youth services librarians and the injunction against charging fees for electronic services continue to cause discussion among the various ALA constituencies.

Breivik added that she felt the entire tone of the document was too negative and had too many references to not abridging the rights of minors. The Board gave some specific editorial suggestions to Jones to convey

to the ALA Intellectual Freedom Committee. A lengthy discussion followed about the procedure for reviewing the next version of the document.

The Board thanked the ACRL Intellectual Freedom Committee for its hard work.

#### **10.0 ALA Washington Office Presentation**

Lynne Bradley, ALA Washington Office Deputy Director, presented a brief report based on the Washington Office Midwinter 1996 update. She said that the ALA Washington Office's main activities had been hiring Andrew Magpantay, establishing the Office for Information Technology Policy (OITP), and moving from an office of 25 years.

Breivik interrupted Bradley's presentation to say that the Board already had this background information and asked if she could instead respond to questions. Breivik said ACRL was excited about ACRL's new relationship with the Washington Office and want to get it off to a good start.

Bradley said that historically the ALA Washington Office has dealt with issues of concern to ACRL and that she expected a large part of the communication/liaison relationship would be through ACRL's Government Relations Committee. Bradley brought to the Board's attention some resources that ACRL could tap in addition to herself as staff liaison. These included: a new legislative counsel who is an expert on intellectual property, the new OITP which works on indepth projects such as telecommunications issues, and the availability of many of the ALA Washington Office documents on the web.

Breivik asked what would happen if there is an issue where ACRL has a different perspective from the ALA perspective. Bradley replied that it was difficult to respond in general. She said that academic librarians may have a very different day-to-day perspective to share but that but it may differ from the implementation of the policy.

Martin gave an example of the National Periodicals Center which academic libraries wanted but which other parts of the library and information science community did not support. Martin said that Congress responded by saying the library community does not know what it wants and did not pass the bill.

Bradley responded that outsiders like to see the library and information science community split and that the ALA Washington Office hopes to bring different factions together.

Jenkins said that on issues affecting higher education and the academic library community ACRL is asking for advance input on issues and statements that ALA Washington Office would be drafting. Jenkins asked if ACRL would be able to look at those drafts and have an opportunity to have an impact on those statements.

Bradley said a committee was looking at this issue. Bradley clarified that the ALA Washington Office primarily takes direction from the ALA Committee on Legislation so that it was important to keep membership in this committee diversified so that all types of libraries were represented.

Jenkins asked if the Committee on Legislation had guidelines that ACRL could have that would help members understand how they could have input.

Bradley said that she will share the document with ACRL. Bradley said they are still working on balancing the need for responses to brush fires and to the longer term issues. Bradley indicated that ALA recognizes the need to be more proactive and that it wanted to get basic statements in place so that ALA can initiate discussions and not just respond to issues brought by others.

Reichel said the Handbook says the Legislation Committee is a standing committee of Council that has full responsibility for the association's total legislation activity at all levels and directs the associations activities.

Fatzer said there is a related issue about how different emphasis on issues are addressed. She gave the example of the discussion of abolishing the National Endowment for the Humanities that emphasized the dissolution of the Library Program but said nothing about the preservation program. Fatzer asked how she and ACRL could raise their voices.

Bradley said that the Washington Office wants to hear from members about such issues and that the new 800 number should facilitate communication.

Breivik said there was a time problem and asked the Board if they wanted to extend to 6:00 p.m. or if they wanted to cut off discussion. Breivik thanked Bradley for coming and indicated they looked forward to the continuing dialog between ACRL and ALA Washington Office.

#### **14.0 Interaction with ALA--Issues from Board Subcommittee**

Breivik asked the Board to finalize questions for the ALA candidates for presidents. There was some discussion and the questions were finalized as shown in document 14.0

Spalding, Fradkin, and Hisle planned to attend the ALA Candidates forum and would try to ask the Board's questions of the candidates.

#### **Sharing of information**

Reichel reported that the ANSS section had asked Linda Muroi a lot of questions and that the Board should be sensitive to the fact that people were proud of their activities. Reichel said that the Board needed to re-ask the question about what can the Board do to help units further the strategic plan. Reichel also said that the Board needs to be ready to respond to conflict and be ready to act.

Spalding agreed that the organization is strong because it has had strong activities, staff, and programs and that the Strategic Plan is not implying that everything was wrong until now.

Miller agreed that there was misunderstanding about the plan.

Breivik said this is where the liaison role is very important and that Susan Phillips said it was the best Chapters Council meeting they ever had.

Martin said that at the Annual Conference orientation program they would review the origin of the plan.

Fatzer said that the satisfaction with the plan correlated with the involvement of the officers and their sharing of their information with their members.

Breivik said the Board will also have to deal with members who are not doing their work

The Board deferred items 14.0 and 15.0 until the next meeting.

**Adjournment**

*Motion:* Reichel moved to adjourn the meeting.

*Second:* Martin seconded the motion.

*Action:* The motion passed unanimously.

Ref: midw95f.bd1

