

RBMS Task Force to Review Core Competencies for Special Collections Professionals
Minutes, ALA Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA, 2015
Saturday, June 27, 2015, 6-7:30 PM
Hilton San Francisco Union Square – Union Square 19 & 20

Attendees:

Cherry Williams, co-chair, Indiana University, Jennifer Macdonald, co-chair, University of Delaware, Mary Lacy, Library of Congress, Mark Greenberg, Western Washington University, Alison Clemens, Yale University, Anne Bahde, Oregon State University, Fernando Pena, Palmer School, LIU, Elizabeth Call, Columbia University, Kimberly Tully, Temple University, Katharine Chandler, Free Library of Philadelphia, Allison O'Dell, University of Florida, Danielle Culpepper, Rare Book School, Stephanie Atkins Sharpe, Washington University (St. Louis), Elspeth Healey, University of Kansas

I. Call to order, introductions, assign recorder (Tully)

[Discussion of Survey, see agenda IV. C.]

Idea of a validation survey similar to that described in the Bishop/Cadle/Grubestic article (previously distributed by Cherry to the Task Force) posed by Jennifer. Anne suggested that there would be enough feedback during external review. Others voiced concerns about time commitment, results of survey may be too varied. Open comments might be sufficient.

Jennifer: would like to distribute draft competency statements and validate them by having people say how much this represents what they do in their job. Some responded with concerns about time and response rates.

Elspeth: [drawing from her experience with RBMS membership survey] stated that survey would be time consuming, but that targeted feedback on specific sections is possible using SkipLogic in Qualtrix or even Survey Monkey.

Mark: raised question of what are we looking for in terms of feedback: statistical validation or specific detailed comments.

Stephanie [representing ACRL Standards Committee]: According to Chapter 14 of by-laws only have to circulate document, gather comments in good faith, and then decide to incorporate comments or not, discussion of what 2008 group did followed (survey, followed by several drafts for review)

Cherry: voiced concern that without a survey the document may appear less rigorous/serious. At this point the group decided not to conduct the survey.

Call for getting the document out for review asap. Elspeth suggested using Digress.it which allows for more targeted feedback (and has already been used for other RBMS committee

business). She explained how Digress.it (<http://digress.it/>) works and the group looked at the website together.

Mark: proposed open discussion of document at RBMS 2016 for Participant Discussion or at Midwinter

Conclusions/Action Items:

Elspeth and Alison would create Digress.it site on RBMS website once current revisions are done and would send it out by early fall (would only take about two weeks to set up site)

Gather comments through both Digress.it and Midwinter open discussion and then make changes based on comments.

II. Approved minutes from Midwinter meeting as presented.

III./IV. Reports from subgroups on current revisions/Identify timeline for completion of draft

Some discussion of progress of current revisions in the public services section.

Current subgroups need to go in to the document and finalize revisions using suggesting mode and then the full group will get together to finalize.

Draft must be ready for open comments on Digress.it by mid-September to be up on the RBMS website by October 1st

Needs to be ready by January 8th for open hearing at Midwinter

Action items:

Subgroups work through July and early August on revisions in suggesting mode, then the full group will conference call the week of August 10th, preferably sometime between the 12th and 14th when Cherry is available. Cherry will create a doodle pool for this meeting.

Cherry and Jennifer will ask permission from Exec at Monday's meeting to have an open hearing at Midwinter (Cherry will schedule) and will also be asking for an extension of the Task Force term.

Brief discussion of circulating document to other shareholders (SHARP, SAA, etc.) through listservs, etc.

Action item:

Members of the Task Force asked to volunteer to contact particular groups by putting comment in the Appendix of the current document

V. Extension of Task Force Term

Anne asked for confirmation that current members will be receiving “new” appointments to the Task Force. Cherry assumed that would be the case.