

**PROGRAM PLANNING CHICAGO 2005 COMMITTEE
MEETING
Saturday, June 26, 2004
9:30 - 11:30 a.m.
Crowne Plaza, Lower Mezzanine**

Committee Members Present: Fitch, Megan; Gayle, Janet; Sheehy, Carolyn (chair); Wagner, Robin
Committee Members Absent: None
Guests: None

A. Welcome and Introductions

B. Chair's Report

1. ACRL Program Planning Committee

- 2005 ACRL Board will approve program proposals' content on June 29. Committee will be notified in July of Board's decision.
- ACRL Board will approve budgets at the end of July. Committee will be notified in September
- Speaker agreement letters, including AV request forms will be distributed in September.
- Speaker agreement letters must be signed and in the ACRL office by the end of December. Programs can not be advertised until all speaker agreement forms have been received.
- All AV decisions must be finalized by May 1 or section will be charged.
- Next 2005 ACRL Program Planning Committee meeting: 4:30 to 5:30, Saturday, January, 15, 2005.

2. CLS Executive Committee Meeting

- Carolyn will attend the CLS Executive Committee Meeting, report on the committees' proposal, and pick up the CLS Banner from the 2004 Committee. (The CLS banner is to be displayed at the 2005 CLS Program.)

3. CLS Program 2004

- Megan will attend and report back to the committee.

C. New Business

1. Program Co-Sponsors

- ACRL Professional Development Committee
- ACRL Personnel Administrators and Staff Development Discussion Group (Janet will attend discussion group and report back to the committee.)
- LAMA Human Resources Section

2. Program Publicity

- Postcards: decided not to do
- Poster Boards: will do only if needed for room location
- List servs: Robin, with assistance from committee members, will compile a list of list servs on which to advertise program.
- Notices: ACRL will send notices of program to American Libraries and C&RL News.
- Article: Robin will submit an article on the program to the CLS Newsletter.
- Advertising: Carolyn will check with MJ about advertising the program at the April 2005 ACRL National Conference

3. Program Hand-out

- Carolyn will draft a handout, based on material from speakers.
- Carolyn will bring 250 copies to program.

4. Program Web Site

- Program Web site to be linked to CLS Web site
- Megan will be responsible for Program Web site

5. Program Evaluation

- ACRL requirement to "Conduct an evaluation of program and submit a report to ACRL Director of Member Services within two weeks"

- Carolyn will ask Mary Jane if there is a standard program evaluation form.
- If a standard form exists, Carolyn will attempt to add the following to form:

Desired future CLS programs

Interest in CLS committee

- Carolyn will staple evaluation form to hand-out
- Robin, Megan, and Janet will distribute and collect evaluation forms

6. Meetings

- Virtual MidWinter 2005
- Annual Conference 2005: 11:00 to 12:00 Saturday; 4:00 to 5:00 Sunday

7. Additional items

- Carolyn will check if part of the program could be used for gifts for panelists. If so, Janet will purchase.
- All program committee members should arrive at least ½ hour before program.
- Allotment of program's 90 minutes: 5 minutes - Introduction; 17 minutes – each panelist and Question & Answer Period
- Carolyn will ask speakers for an abstract of their remarks by the end of February and a draft of their presentation by the end of April
- Carolyn will ask the panelists for their preferred order of speaking, method for handling transitions, and time warning system.
- Three days before the program, Carolyn will check

1. site of room

2. size of room (same as asked for)

3. can room handle AV

REPORT OF THE 2004 CONFERENCE PROGRAM PLANNING COMMITTEE

This year's program, "A Library Balancing Act: Patron Rights vs. National Security", was held at 8:30 am on Sunday, June 27 in the J.W. Marriott Hotel. About 55 people attended (with only 30% identifying themselves as ACRL members).

The program began with a review of the current state of the USA Patriot Act and its implications for libraries by Deborah Caldwell-Stone (ALA Office of Intellectual Freedom). She urged academic librarians to not only be informed about the law but to also preserve free inquiry by weighing in on the right of privacy for library users. If we fail to do this, she asserted, we make our rights and those of our patrons subject to the whim of imperfect men

Eugene Wiemers (Bates College) reported on the lessons he learned about managing information in libraries while developing campus-wide information technology security policies. According to Wiemers, librarians need to develop policies and procedures that obey the law, protect library equipment, preserve the confidentiality of library records, manage the authentication of users, and educate both users and staff. He recommended that libraries limit the collection of information about what people are reading while at the same time limiting the exposure of the library and the institution by carefully managing public computers and campus networks.

James Neal (Columbia University) exhorted librarians to enlist in the cause of ensuring free and open access to information. After outlining a litany of assaults on free speech and free inquiry, Neal called upon librarians to be the magnet that brings their campuses together to formulate institutional policies to protect the rights of students and faculty. By remaining true to our core values, librarians will be the bell ringers who call attention to the erosion of free speech and privacy rights and who keep the vision of free access to information alive.

Following the panel attendees participated in small group activities designed to begin the formulation of library privacy and confidentiality policies. The results of these activities will be available on the CLS web site.

Evaluations from those in attendance were generally quite favorable. Attendees rated the choice of speakers, appropriateness of the subject, appropriate level of presentation, and organization and clarity between outstanding and very good, while they rated the value of the group activity between very good and good. All respondents indicated that it was worth their time and effort to attend the program. Respondents particularly valued the speakers with their diverse perspectives, the fact that their presentations raised a number of good questions, and the handouts distributed at the program. Attendees felt that the group activity could have been improved upon and that the meeting location was too remote. They would have appreciated contact information for the speakers. Other comments were that it was a "great program," "one of the best sessions of this year's conference," and "group activities seem a juvenile way to involve professionals in the subject matter."

The chairperson would like to acknowledge and express appreciation for the outstanding contributions and hard work of the committee's members: Anne Ciliberti (William Patterson University), Akos Delneky (International College), Marilyn Dunn (Hartwick College), James Gwin (University of Richmond), John Pollitz (St. Ambrose University), Susan Swords Steffen (Elmhurst College), and Stephen Stoan (Drury University).

Christopher Millson-Martula (with reports by Anne Ciliberti and Susan Swords Steffen)

July 15, 2004