

Minutes

CLIP Notes Committee

6 January 2010; 4:00pm-5:15pm (EST; virtual meeting via conference call)

Members present: Jill Gremmels (Davidson), chair; Jennie Callas (Randolph-Macon); Rachel Crowley (Rose Holman Institute); Lynda Duke (Illinois Wesleyan) (joined at 5:00); Janet Fore (St. Mary's) (left at 4:30); Lawrie Merz (Messiah) (*minutes*); Debra Rollins (LSU, Alexandria); Doris Ann Sweet (Assumption); Nancy Weiner (William Patterson)

Members absent: Christopher Millson-Martula (Lynchburg College); Erin Smith (Westminster); Kathryn Silberger (Marist); Sharon Britton (BGSU-Firelands)

Guests: Rebecca Sullivan (Luther); Frances Yates (Indiana University East)(left at 4:45)

1. Current CLIP Notes

a. In progress (reports, discussion)

- i. **Web Searching** (Rebecca Sullivan, compiler; Erin Smith, lead editor). Rebecca reported that she has received 114 responses (51%) so far but was hoping for more. Erin and Rebecca agreed that Rebecca could make some personal phone calls to about 12 regional libraries to try to get more responses (wants to get up to at least 55%). Rebecca has received very good materials and plans to begin data analysis this week.
- ii. Rachel asked if there were reports of trouble accessing survey; yes, Rebecca did get some feedback of complications getting the statistics. Also survey timing over-lapped with Collection Development survey (need for coordination in future).
- iii. **Collection Development** (Doris Ann Sweet, lead editor). Doris Ann reported that there were an acceptable number of responses (over 100) and things were going well. They are accepting surveys through this Friday (8 January). Because of the length of documents, they will have to extract parts of documents rather than full documents, for the most part. They wondered what an acceptable number is of the 207 surveys sent out (answer: 135; 65%) [*Update since meeting: Jill reports that the compilers now have 135.*]

b. Preliminary proposal

- i. **Strategic Planning/Mission and Vision Statements** (Eleonora Dubicki, compiler; Jennie Callas, lead editor). Committee had positive response to the proposal, noting timeliness of topic, with 10 years having passed since the ARL's SPEC Kit on strategic planning and with current budgeting constraints.
 1. Overall, consensus is good and a "go."
 2. Suggestions should be sent to Jennie by end of week (she will be out of the country for 3 weeks).
 3. Suggestions made at meeting included: (1) As much as possible, include answer options for survey questions rather than having many open-ended questions; (2) changing the word "Academic" in the proposed title to "College"; (3) in survey question on timeframe covered by plan (6th bullet),

allow for several timeframes (how long the *whole* plan covers; how long shorter projects/portions cover); (4) add question on when the document was initially drafted (positioned before question on how often plan is reviewed (9th bullet)); (5) it may be hard to determine how long it took to produce document (10th bullet) so include “if known” or similar language.

2. Planning for future direction of CLIP Notes (follow-up from visioning session at Annual last July)

- a. **Update of survey participants list.** Erin Smith did this just a year ago and there are still a significant number of changes since then. Rebecca noted that, of the original 271 participants, 63 were listed (based on Erin’s update) as returned or inactive; Rebecca sent her survey to the remaining 208 and even then, 18 got returned). Rachel suggested that participants be asked if they wish to continue and be given a timeframe for response (Erin did this). Discussion of who should update list and how often. Agreed that the compilers should not have to; that this is the CLIP Committee’s responsibility. As for timeframe, Jill suggested possibly twice a year.
- b. **Survey of compilers:** Lynda had drafted this after Annual last July, but we haven’t sent survey yet. We need to move forward with this. Do we want to send the survey? Tacit consensus that we do. (Suggestion that we could make survey using GoodleDocs to allow for open-ended responses.) Also, want to send survey to current survey participants (what do you like about CLIP; how do you use it; etc.) Rachel agreed to send the surveys; Lawrie offered to help.
- c. **Future of CLIP Notes.**
 - i. **What other models do we want to consider?** Jill suggested one format might be to have review essays with samples (surveys optional). Rachel suggested a best practices approach, noting that the activities and documents of the CLIP survey participants don’t necessarily reflect the best practices. We decided we might try to work up a few models. Nancy offered to develop one possible model, getting input from the Committee members. Suggestion was to do this on ALA Connect—Nancy will initiate the discussion of one model.
 - ii. **How might we develop 2-3 potential models?** Is it a reasonable goal to take these models to the CLS Executive Committee at Annual in June (all changes must go to them)? Committee agreed that it is reasonable to have models (and other changes) to take to Annual. We can “talk” (virtually) throughout the spring and be ready to take proposals to CLS Executive Committee in June. Decided that we should not wait for surveys of compilers and of CLIP survey participants before working on new models and changes. Move ahead and then let survey responses, as they come in, inform our discussion and considerations.
 - iii. Rachel reflected that a web presence would be really useful, especially since it is hard for ALA to work with all of the various formats in which CLIP documents are submitted (e.g., PDF, HTML, links). With the copyright CLIP, they included websites in the CLIP publication directing readers to some of the documents.
 - iv. **Is ALA/ACRL interested in selling future publications as web-accessible** and are they currently pursuing this? Jill has talked to Kathryn Deiss and feels that CLIP Notes has an opportunity to take the lead. Kathryn is excited about pursuing this. Debra said she got that sense from the planning meeting at Annual (2009). Jennie pointed out that ALA Editions has already launched a model of web-accessible documents, where you have access for a period of time. Apparently,

according Kathryn Deiss was no drop in print sales when the University of Rochester publication was also made available as free PDF download.

- 3.** The meeting ended abruptly when the conference call terminated automatically at 5:15, but the committee had discussed everything on the agenda by that point.