

**ACRL Literatures in English Section
Annual 2012 Executive Committee
Combined Meeting Minutes**

Saturday, June 23, 2012 8:00 am –10:00, Disneyland Hotel - North Exhibit Hall Room IJ

Attendees: Faye Christenberry (Chair), Jaena Alabi (Membership Chair), Laura Braunstein (Publications Chair), John Glover (Biblio-Notes Editor), Frank Gravier (Planning Chair), Arianne Hartsell-Gundy (Vice-Chair Elect), Robin Imhof (Reference Discussion Group Co-Chair), David Oberhelman (Virtual Participation Committee Chair, Conference Planning 2013 Chair), Chris Ruotolo (Website Editor), Amanda Rust (Secretary and Email List Moderator), Laura Taddeo (Secretary-Elect), Melissa Van Vuuren (Chair-Elect)

Monday, June 25, 2012 10:30 am – 12:00, Disneyland Hotel - Monorail B & C

Attendees: Faye Christenberry (Chair), Irene Herold (ACRL Board Liaison and guest), Laura Braunstein (Publications Chair), John Glover (Biblio-Notes Editor), Liorah Golomb (Past Chair and Job Shadow Coordinator), Frank Gravier (Planning Chair), Harriet Green (Member-at-Large), Arianne Hartsell-Gundy (Vice-Chair Elect), Robin Imhof (Reference Discussion Group Co-Chair), David Oberhelman (Virtual Participation Committee Chair, Conference Planning 2013 Chair), Chris Ruotolo (Website Editor), Amanda Rust (Secretary and Email List Moderator), Laura Taddeo (Secretary-Elect), Melissa Van Vuuren (Chair-Elect)

-
- I. Welcome and introductions
 - II. Agenda approved.
 - III. Minutes from ALA Midwinter 2012 Virtual Meeting approved.
 - IV. Announcements from ACRL Leadership Council (Christenberry & Van Vuuren)
 - A. The President's Report
 1. ACRL activity: six new discussion groups, including assessment, student retention, and more. Ten new standards and guidelines, 85 e-learning opportunities. Future of the Book report (all at LES agree the Future of Book looks interesting) as well as new Top Ten Trends in Academic Libraries and new Plan for Excellence.
 2. *College & Research Libraries* is now Open Access and has new editor. University of Illinois has digitized backfiles and made available through their institutional repository.
 3. Core Organizational Task Force will work on articulating values in face of streamlined restructuring. ACRL will create a survey to send

out to membership to ask about core values. There was also discussion on the ACRL brand and what it means.

4. Incoming President is Steven Bell.
- B. Communities of Practice Task Force: a lot of discussion went on around this report, as it involves the ACRL restructuring towards a new streamlined tiered model that has some possibility of eliminating interest groups and sections.
1. Main proposed changes are requiring an Interest Group to have 75 members minimum, and a Section 400 members minimum.
 1. There will be a process for looking at Section if membership drops below 400 for three consecutive years. It would then be given options to become an Interest Group or a Discussion Group, or fold into another section. Conversely a Section can be formed by an Interest Group with more than 400 members for three consecutive years.
 2. Affected sections “on the borderline” include: Western European Studies; Women and Gender Studies; Slavic and East European Studies; African American Studies; Asian, African and Middle Eastern Studies.
 3. LES numbers range from 515 to 580ish members, so this section will likely be unaffected. Section numbers are supposed to come out from ACRL monthly.
 2. Discussion Groups largely remain the same.
 3. If you want to provide feedback to board are encouraged to do so at 4:30pm Saturday meeting.
- C. The ACRL Conference had 600 proposals, and presenters will find out in August. Posters and round tables are still open. LES has historically not had official ACRL events except for dinner – should that change? ACRL may be able to help plan the section / group dinner.

V. Old Business:

- A. Review of LES budget & forecasts for 2012/2013 budget
 1. Things that came out of our budget: Job shadow program coffee and/or lunch, Emerging Leader co-sponsor (only \$500, not full amount), LES Social Hour, Students sponsored for Digital Humanities preconference, supplemental funding for MLA liaison (want to be sure to encourage MLA liaisons to submit for their full support).

2. Money left: \$610. NB: ALA program and some job shadow supported from separate budgets. Since we have the budget, do we want to continue the WebEx subscription for further testing?
 1. iLinc was tested and did have audio problems, was not quite as smooth. With WebEx LES would still need to use Connect for larger meetings, as WebEx cannot handle more than 25. In comparison, the limit for Adobe Connect is 100, and Christenberry offers to again host larger meetings via her institutional subscription. Imhof expresses that Connect seemed to work really well for the Discussion Groups.
 2. While iLinc can hold up to 100, but due to reverb issues the company recommends that ONLY the speaker is unmuted. Again, in LES Virtual Participation Committee testing, iLinc reverb was a problem.
3. Therefore: Motion to keep WebEx for another year, and passed.

B. Virtual Midwinter Meeting update (Oberhelman)

1. Since virtual meeting software is an issue, we should explore vendor underwriting! WESS does this well with European vendors. We could explore sponsorship from ProQuest, Gale, Alexander Street, etc.
2. This last ALA Midwinter (MW) was Virtual, with a total of about 9 online meetings. LES has used WebEx even after Midwinter for some program planning meetings for ALA Chicago. Big meetings seem to work well with Connect.
3. Virtual Participation Committee (VPC) will start to think towards Virtual 2013, and want to continue with feedback surveys, and then poll entire membership on whether we want to continue with all Virtual MW or keep some sort of presence at MW (dinner, All Committees slot, Discussion Group?), or go back to an entirely face to face MW.
4. Over Fall VPC will develop poll to send to LES Membership in Spring, after our second Virtual MW. VPC and Exec can then discuss feedback for a final decision at Annual Chicago.
5. Scheduling Virtual MW: need to make sure that groups reporting to Exec meet before Exec. Discussion Groups (DGs) and Membership forums have much more latitude.
6. For new chairs: we should point people to virtual meeting guidelines on wiki, Oberhelman will put up WebEx quick guide and schedule test meeting for new chairs. (Luckily Oberhelman has colleague who is WebEx expert and can assist.) Braunstein shares that in committee meetings, it worked well to have audience text questions to speaker. In addition, some committees may just want to do a conference call. Planning found that the doc sharing worked well for their purposes.

7. If there is more feedback on virtual meetings, send to Oberhelman. Will start planning around August for Virtual MW 2013. Post still on ALA Connect, open to public, and LES Wiki. Can point Connect users to Wiki.
8. Should do better advertising of our virtual meetings, more notices to LES-L etc.
9. Christenberry verifies that we all want to continue Virtual MW even for Exec, and Exec agrees that virtual is fine.
10. That said, we do want to find someone to attend the ACRL Leadership Council meetings at MW, if Vice Chair or Chair cannot make it.

C. 2012 Pre-Conference workshop (Courtney/Green)

1. Big success and very well attended! There were 60 participants, which as a full attendance. Original proposal was for a preconference for only 25, grew to 60 due to interest.
2. The morning was lecture, afternoon was hands on. Met burgeoning interest and need, seemed to be a successful introduction. Handed out flash drives with presentations and hands-on material to participants, which was a great idea. NB: flash drives also coming out of separate budget.
3. Van Vuuren shares that preconference planning is very different than program planning: while ALA program planning is very regimented with specific deadlines and responses due to ALA on a schedule, with preconference there is very little contact with ALA after acceptance, and you are largely on your own.
4. ALA will send a survey to participants for feedback, and the results will be interesting to see. One participant asked if the preconference would be repackaged for virtual environment, and LES could look into that if enough interest.
5. Preconference was probably a good advertisement for the Digital Humanities Interest Group.
6. Van Vuuren shares additional info for those planning future preconferences: the deadline for proposal was before the previous Annual, and therefore worked on over that Spring, so overall it is about a year and a half process. The Section doesn't have to cover funding, just the labor. The half day preconference is also an option, and sponsoring student attendance a good idea.
7. Glover asks if we know what section of ALA people came from, if there are interesting patterns -- attendance definitely was outside of and broader than LES.
8. Overall, the preconference was a definite success!

VI. New Business:

A. Emerging Leader with ARTS (Van Vuuren)

1. Now co-sponsoring an Emerging Leader. Van Vuuren worked on applications with incoming Vice Chair, and will likely receive new round of applications in Fall, form selection committee, and decide towards end of Fall, if schedule follows last year's.
 2. If sponsoring an Emerging Leader, the section has an option to require the Emerging Leader to submit a project; LES has not explored this option yet. If there is no section project, ALA will assign one.
- B. Association Options Fair (Sunday, 6/24/12, from 1:30 – 3:30pm: Hartsell-Gundy)
1. Reported at Exec II, as Hartsell-Gundy was attending during Exec I.
 2. Hartsell-Gundy talked to 12 people, including members of Spectrum and Emerging Leaders. She encouraged committee membership and talked to library school students about our job shadow program. The attendees were invited, so seemed more responsive and invested than attendees at ACRL 101 (ACRL 101 report from Golomb is later.)
 3. Christenberry will send official feedback to ACRL that the Association Options Fair seemed very helpful to us, and was good for in-depth individual networking.
- C. Low participation rates for the 2012 ACRL election
1. Braunstein expresses that she only received ACRL communication, was not sure what it was for. Exec generally agrees that we could put out more information on LES-L.
 2. Ballot fatigue may play a role in low participation as ACRL ballots are long and confusing. People may feel more connected to Section than wider ACRL, but you have to go through entire ballot just to get to the part for voting on Section matters.
 3. Since candidates have to write a statement for the ballot anyway, could we just save those and send to LES-L? Or tie into virtual participation somehow? The members that can only participate virtually may feel more disconnected than those that can. Nominating Committee will be responsible for emails to LES-L, and BiblioNotes editor will also publicize in newsletter.
 4. Interesting note: ACRL lost about 600 people, ALA membership also down, so membership down everywhere.

VII. Reports

- Chair: Christenberry

- Reminders: Social hour at Fire and Ice, in Garden Walk. Deadlines: committee minutes due by July 20th, so please send to Christenberry by the 19th and post to wiki and ALA Connect.
- Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect: Van Vuuren
 - Has reported on Emerging Leaders elsewhere, Oberhelman will discuss program plan for next Annual. So far main work has been committee appointments, which are now all populated except for possible switch on New Members that will be resolved here at ALA. There was a problem with ALA rosters (ALA just implemented new system) but seems to be resolved; however, if there are problems please email Van Vuuren.
 - It does generally seem like Virtual MW helps get fuller committee appointments.
- Past Chair: Golomb
 - Representing us at ACRL 101 during Exec I, will give report during Exec II.
- Secretary: Rust
 - Moving along as normal, Taddeo will take over, have been in contact and seem all set.
- Virtual Participation: Oberhelman
 - Covered elsewhere.
- 2013 Conference Program Planning: Oberhelman
 - Just sent out program approval notice to LES Exec Email list on Wednesday: we are approved to cosponsor “New Collaborations in the Digital Environment: Librarianship in European and American Studies” with WESS and SEES.
 - Speaker and topic ideas include
 - For those with Digital Commons/Labs, what are the skill sets, particularly relating to foreign language and lit librarians?
 - How are you collaborating with IT vendors? Dealing with language cataloging and discovery tools?
 - Collaborating between area studies librarians and new tools used in digital humanities projects? A possibility for the third speaker is a researcher specifically dealing with foreign language and digital humanities.
 - Looking into a digital humanities moderator from NEH, but may have to scale back due to timing.

- The major conference and programming news is that there are big changes for ALA Annual: all conference programs are now in convention center, with a max time of 1.5 hours.
 - Rationale: shorter more centralized programs so people can attend more programs. In addition, if a streamlined schedule means that committee meetings don't spill over to Tuesday, ALA will be a shorter conference and more affordable for the association and attendees.
 - Our LES/WESS/SEES request was for a two hour time slot, which will be reduced to 1.5 hours. The Section was not given any warning about this, even though we've been working on program for some time. To have a late change like this is less than ideal, and perhaps we will want to communicate this to the ALA Board. Would have been more ideal to make these planning changes for 2014.
 - ACRL was only given 19 slots for Annual, so it was very good news to have ours accepted.
 - We have a lot of funding for the program: WESS has a good sponsorship from the book vendor Touzot and ACRL will provide funding as well. ALA guidelines do not let us pay librarians, so we will not pay librarian speakers.
 - Oberhelman is meeting with programming committee, will report back at Exec II.
 - Continued report from Exec II: the planning committee now feels the need to have two plans, since it seems like we could be given either an hour or an hour and a half slot. The time period seems out of our control. If hour, want to make sure each section contributes.
 - The planning committee is currently in the process of selecting speakers, and wants to get invitations out by late August. Will discuss via email and WebEx and proceed.
 - Next step is more info from ALA on new scheduling requirements, Oberhelman will send info to Exec as it comes available.

- Membership: Alabi
 - Could not make Exec II, Golomb reports.

 - We have about 580 members as of February; have not received a more recent report from ALA.
 - Dan Coffey is incoming chair.
 - Will meet virtually in MW, both committee and forum, probably the second or fourth week of Jan but will finalize via a Doodle poll.
 - Possible topic: digital humanities, using presenter format as in last Virtual MW.

- Golomb posted a notice to lib schools with great response, about 66 shadowers. Couldn't match all, and not all seemed really interested in academic/humanities librarianship.
 - Golomb's first goal for the upcoming year: match people couldn't match previously, possibly offer an alternative like an email mentor.
 - Made useful change to sign-up form: added column in form asking people which universities they could get to. Previous question phrasing was how many miles the participant could travel, leaving it up to the Job Shadow Coordinator to guess/compute which universities the participant would travel to.
 - The form also asks interests but there is a drop down option list, and it's possible people fill out what they think we want to hear. Perhaps better to leave open ended to get more authentic response.
 - Had a little ACRL money left over, so don't seem to need any extra it yet. If needed in the future, can submit a request to ACRL friends up to four times a year, so relatively simple to get additional funding. Still have coffee cards left over, too.
 - Most people who successfully shadowed were in Washington, D.C.; Chicago, Illinois; Detroit, MI / Windsor, ON; Oklahoma, Indiana, and Las Cruces, New Mexico.
 - Hard to determine if/how library schools are posting the info Golomb sends.
 - Coordination is very time-consuming, but seems to be working well: all reports back, from both hosts and participants, say the shadow was a good experience.
- Nominating 2013: Golomb
 - Work done by Melton, Braunstein, and Golomb. Have six people to ask to run for offices, sent info to Melton for comment. Christenberry notes and Golomb agrees that if MW is virtual more people will run.
- Planning: Gravier
 - Working on updating the Information Competency Guidelines. Have completed a literature review and bibliography, sent to membership, and received feedback. Now need to consult with group of academics, have targeted MLA and WESS, working with Wenzel. Also looking at Associated Departments of English committee within MLA, and have offered liaison to WESS specifically for this project. Seeking out faculty reviewers via MLA and a liaison to WESS are the two next areas of focus.
 - May want leadership of LES to contact WESS to encourage more feedback.

- Governance procedures are due for review, the biggest task to verify in procedures is the status of (i.e., that they count) virtual votes and general virtual participation. Will also put out call for Exec to review.
 - Gravier is ending as chair, could appoint ad hoc continuation or hand off to DeVoe for continuation.
- Publications: Braunstein
 - Ruotolo has largely handed off McCullough to be new webmaster, McCullough will submit report after ALA. Drupal migration let everything get a refresh. Directory will need update and decision, per discussion under Membership; Pubs is happy to update but would like guidelines.
 - Ruotolo points out that the easiest thing is to use ACRL roster and copy over, otherwise requires lots of solicitation of new info.
 - Email list still active, good place for people thinking about section to lurk and get a feel.
 - Glover reports on BiblioNotes.
 - Have published all electronic issues without trouble. Want to make sure we get the word out when issue is available, the automatic ACRL publicity not necessarily on LES-L.
 - May create DH themed fall issue including write-ups on the new Discussion Group and LES Preconference.
 - May also include LES officer candidate write-ups, need to double check that deadlines with ACRL match up sensibly with publishing schedule. May also want to emphasize adding new book reviews.
 - Considering revising style, as it's been consistent for some time. LES Exec is fine with redesign, particularly if it can take more advantage of electronic format with online features like links out to featured LibGuides or other websites. ACRL archives the newsletter, so archiving is not our concern.
 - Braunstein reports that Pubs has completed a big project: the bibliography is now completely in Zotero, uploaded by members of Pubs. The next steps are to update with new sources if needed, then encourage entire membership to add and create a living resource. Landor will still lead, with additional help from Pubs. Landor did an excellent job of prodding with style and politeness.
 - Blog: McCullough is writing excellent longer thinkpieces, may experiment with shorter timely pieces as well (CFPs, other news). May also add co-editors, use for additional cross promotion of other LES activities, or link to article of the week.
 - Social media: Facebook generally used to announce social hour, could also cross-promote blog and newsletter a little more.
 - Wiki: Linda Stein interested in taking over, Aline Soules agrees. Seems to be more useful for minutes and committee business than Connect, in that committees can post their own information and not have to rely on others.
 - Main goals: smooth transition of administration.

- Publicize minutes more: ask Chairs that when they post to the wiki to also send a note to the members and lurkers in LES-L. Interesting minutes can be a recruitment tool.
 - Braunstein shares that clarification on where pieces of information are posted would be helpful. For example, Membership has some information on ACRL site, some on Connect, minutes on wiki. Exec agrees and will discuss and investigate Connect requirements.
 - Maybe some pages can be removed from the wiki.
 - Membership could only be a link rather than a new separate page; want to avoid duplication and need to update in two places.
 - Van Vuuren asks: what's on the wiki that can't be replicated elsewhere?
 - Braunstein then points out: as a radical proposal, do we need the wiki? Exec will think about it and talk about it for MW, continue in maintenance mode until then.
- 2012 Conference Program Planning: Martin
 - Martin cannot attend meeting to report, but Exec notes that the program went very well, and the room was packed to standing room only. There was lots of feedback and participation, with good questions afterwards. LES will get to see results of feedback survey.
- Reference Discussion Group: Berghausen/Eschedor-Voelker / Collections Discussion Group: Imhof/Soules
 - Imhof gives combined report.
 - Problematic room arrangement, participants had trouble hearing each other.
 - Had about 25 or so people.
 - Imhof polled the participants who had also attended virtual MW, and they largely agreed that it was valuable. (Which is good, because we're doing it again!)
 - One participant noted that she did not know about the virtual DG, so we should focus on publicity.
 - Hot topics in the discussion seemed to be PDA and Discovery.
 - If we continue to combine meetings, we can really have only one or two topics for discussion.
 - Exec generally agrees that the DGs need to split back out if only given one hour.
 - Oberhelman points out that we used to schedule back to back to help with spillover.
 - Herold shares that ALA will try to co-locate, and it's worth mailing your staff liaison about this.
- New Members Discussion Group: Dinscore/Green

- Green reports.
- Would like to increase attendance, as discussed elsewhere.
- However, group covered excellent topics like copyright and OA or the sciences vs. humanities, and gave many fruitful topics for future discussions.
- BiblioNotes Editor: Glover
- - Reported under Publications.
- Website Editor: Ruotolo
 - Reported under Publications.
- Discussion List Moderator: Rust
 - Reported under Publications.

VIII. ACRL Announcements and Board Update (Herold)

- A. Irene Herold is our Board liaison, and begins with asking if we have feedback on the new ALA schedule.
1. We share our large concern that this has happened in the middle of a planning cycle, which leaves some scrambling. Herold shares that accepted programs are guaranteed 1.5 hours, not 1, so we can use that information to firm up planning.
 2. The 1 hour slots are for smaller discussions and meetings. Herold notes that traditional meeting slots are not guaranteed, so sections may have conflict between DGs and programs. This has been a wide concern, and Herold will bring that info back to the Board.
 3. ACRL sessions at ALA are reduced to 17 slots, perhaps 19 at the most. One of those slots goes to the ACRL President's Program, so only 16-18 slots for Section programs. Herold's advice is to get cosponsors, increases likelihood of acceptance.
 4. Section annual reports, goals and planning docs now approved by ACRL liaison, not Board. Approving the ethics and copyright piece, within the new structure, is the big issue still up in the air.
 5. Herold gives a very useful background on the new ACRL structure, and the Communities of Practice report. Last year the ACRL board voted to abolish Interest Groups, which was highly controversial, and in subsequent discussions ACRL decided to have the Communities of Practice investigate the issue and report back.
 1. Discussion Group needs 25 signatures, and is given space at Annual and MW.

2. An Interest Group gets space, small budget, and can propose programs, are a check-off option at ALA renewal, and have an effect on ALA dues (if you are a member of many Interest Groups you may pay slightly higher dues).
3. Sections get budget, need slate of candidates, can propose programs, receive a board liaison and staff support. While Interest Groups are for hot current topics and more flexible, Sections are more established and ongoing.
4. ACRL's big question: how to create something manageable that meets membership needs?
5. The Communities of Practice propose:
 - a. NOT discontinuing IGs, but increasing the number of signatures needed from 75. Not agreement on total number, perhaps up to 100?
 - b. Increasing section requirements from just 100 signatures to 400, because a Section is such a large investment from ACRL.
 - c. So the pathway to Section is through Interest Group, as it gets larger. If an Interest Group has 400 or more members for three years, it can apply to be Section. That number seems to be a good tipping point.
6. Some Sections are concerned about their options. Membership is counted on a rolling average for three years. Smaller sections can merge, become an Interest Group, or special sub group within a larger Section. Golomb points out that Sections become a Section for a unique reason, so merging does dilute that specialization.
6. Golomb notes that ACRL 101 seemed poorly attended this year, without many new members, so was not a huge recruitment tool. Herold points out that there is now a virtual ACRL Orientation, but will give ACRL the feedback that it did not seem to be as robust in the past.
7. Christenberry also notes that the Communities of Practice Virtual Meetings were not well attended. Herold reports that those are being redeveloped and she will bring that feedback to ACRL.
8. Golomb and Christenberry report that they found the Sections Council face to face meetings very useful, and they would like to see that reinstated in some way. Herold shares that some in ACRL felt that it was not robust enough, but she will bring back to ACRL that our leadership found the meetings very useful.

IX. Adjourn AT NOON.

Minutes taken by Amanda Rust, ALA Annual 2012.