

American Library Association – New Members Round Table
Executive Board Electronic Meeting
March 26-27, 2003
Held through NMRTBD List
(nmrtbd@ala.org)

Officers in Attendance:

Joseph Yue, President
Bill Armstrong, Secretary
Nadine Flores, Outreach Director
Shannon Tennant, Networking Director
Dora Ho, Past President
Sally Gibson, Member Services Director
Stacey Shoup, NMRT Councilor
Beth Kraemer, Vice President
Bill Jenkins, Treasurer

Guests:

Entire NMRTBD list (includes all chairs of committees and any general member of NMRT who chose to subscribe to the list in order to attend the meeting).

I. Call to Order --Board members to sign-in by 10:00am MST
Process began at 6:30am.

II. New Business

a) Footnotes publication format and schedule proposal (Sally Gibson) (see full proposal at end of minutes)

Board Action Requested:

“Change the Footnotes publication schedule and format in the following three ways:

- Increase publication schedule to four issues per year in August, November, February, and May.
- Publish three issues online, and publish the fourth issue, right before annual, on paper.
- Alert membership of three online issues with email announcements sent by the ALA printing office to the entire membership (not just NMRT-L)”

Motion: Motion made by Shannon Tennant to approve the Footnotes proposal. Bill Jenkins seconded the motion.

Discussion:

Stacey Shoup raised a question concerning the workload for the committee, wondering if it foresaw the preparation time for an online issue as being less intensive than the prep time for a print issue. Citing from personal experience the necessity for only one person to work on the layout and the difficulty for one person to have to do 3 issues, she further inquired whether the

shift to online would make it possible for several people to work on the layout, or even rotate committee members from issue to issue.

Shoup also questioned whether the content of the print would differ at all from the content of the online version.

Sally Gibson responded that the print issue will be different than the online. "First the print issue will be different than the online. There will only be one issue in print and that will be the May issue. Thus you can carry it with you to the conference. More than likely this will be the issue with cheap eats, conference events, etc.

Further, she stated that, "In terms of the committee work, more than one person can create the pages and load them into the ALA software. For the August Footnotes issue, it took 3 hours to load the files. The new software is supposed to make this easier and we need to make sure that the burden does not fall to one person to get the online issue loaded onto the web."

Bill Armstrong stated his approval of the proposal as it stands. "The move to online issues with email notification I think is a timely move, will meet our membership's needs and desires, and will save considerable money, which can be put to other creative uses. Divisions within SLA are doing this successfully now. An extra print issue might provide a chance to fill in any gaps, or even to try an entirely different kind of issue, if so desired. I would be interested in ideas on the print, but I don't think anything specific regarding its content needs to be decided now."

Archival issues, he further stated, can be worked out with the Archives Committee later.

Stacey Shoup asserted her agreement with Armstrong's statements, and wanted to clarify her question to Sally Gibson. "Will the committee (esp. the editor) have time to do 4 issues instead of 3, and maintain a high level of quality in both content and layout?"

Gibson responded in the affirmative, stating that the 4 issues would maintain the same level of quality and content that Footnotes currently produces.

Joseph Yue called for the vote, unless there was further discussion.

Vote:

Beth Kraemer, yes

Stacey Shoup, no (felt 4 issues was too much of a workload)

Sally Gibson, yes

Voting was temporarily interrupted when Bill Jenkins inquired as to whether there was any interest in a proposal for three issues instead of four. If so, he would make such a proposal.

Shortly thereafter came a response from Jennifer Knievel to Stacey's objection to the workload imposed by four, and the likelihood it would prove too much. (Full text of this response can be found under Supporting Documents.)

Dora Ho said she would be willing to second Bill Jenkins's proposal, though at this point, there was no official proposal yet before the Board.

Voting resumed:

Shannon Tennant, yes

Nadine Flores, yes

Bill Armstrong, yes

Motion carried.

b) Booth Committee New Vendor Support Request (Nadine Flores) (see full proposal at end of minutes)

Board Action Requested:

“To approve new vendor support request for 200 bags and 200 pens for distribution at the NMRT Booth at 2003 Annual Conference.”

Motion: Stacey Shoup moved to accept the Booth Committee's vendor request proposal. Bill Armstrong seconded the motion.

Discussion:

Sally Gibson requested some clarification: “From the proposal I am reading that the plan is to use up the old bags from past conferences at Orientation yet both the Booth Committee and the Orientations Committee are requesting more bags. Do we have any idea how many old bags are left and how many bags the Orientation committee is requesting? In the past how many bags has the Booth given away?”

Beth Kraemer contacted Kim Sanders, NMRT's liaison at ALA, and received the following numbers of items remaining:

349 tan/black bags (from MW)

36 red handle-less bags (from 2 conferences ago?)

160 pens

25 blue highlighters

Kraemer did not have figures for numbers of items given away in the past.

Joseph Yue's recollection was “that we usually did not end up with that many left over bags unless they were not delivered at orientation (it happened twice in the past few years).

Yue further expressed the opinion that even if we were to have bags left over from both Booth and Orientations, we could still use them for the next year.

Shelly McCoy offered the following information:

“I think the numbers have varied in the past (for what we've given away at the booth) because it was just leftovers from Orientation. One year, the bags didn't show up in time for Orientation so

all were given away at the Booth. Last summer, when I chaired Orientation, we had 300 bags - which is the standard order for annual I believe - and probably had 100 or so leftover to be taken to the booth (they had handles though).”

Vote:

Beth Kraemer, yes

Dora Ho, yes

Bill Jenkins, no

Sally Gibson, no

Nadine Flores, yes

Stacey Shoup, no

Bill Armstrong, no

Discussion ensued:

From Dora Ho:

I understand that we don't want a lot of left over for the year to come. However, vendors support are getting harder and harder to come by. They may support us this year and may be not the following year. I don't see anything wrong on sending in the request. It is hard to say even whether they will be granted in the first place.

I would really ask those of you who voted "NO" to reconsider. It is good for us to have extra left over at the booth, if Orientation did not pass out all of the bags. Pens and bags are major attraction to get people to stop by.

Just my 2 cents!

Dora

From Bill Jenkins:

My concern is that if we are changing our request to an exhibitor, then we need to back it up with some solid numbers. (e.g. last Annual we gave away x number of bags at Orientation, and y number of bags at our Booth, and thus would like you to consider giving us z number of bags for both.) At this point, I do not feel that I have heard any solid numbers, and if we already have a surplus, I do not think it is wise to build it up more.

We generally ask vendors to support our current year activities. We do not ask them to help us build up a surplus and I do not think it we want to be seen as taking advantage of exhibitors' generosity. We should have a better idea of how much we need and then request it. I still feel that we have enough surplus for Toronto to cover most, if not all, of the Booth's needs and be able to more accurately measure for future years.

I would not consider this un-similar to how we have recently overestimated expected attendance for the Highsmith workshop, and how that has not put us in the best situation.

BillJ

From Joseph Yue:

I do not think the number presented is overstated estimates. The 300 bags of the new design is for current year which means it will be used up at this annual conference. Orientation has been a major program for us in the past few years and if the turn-out is low, it will be because of overall low conference attendance, not because we over-estimate. Moreover, who is to say we cannot give out 200 some bags at the NMRT booth?

I really do not think we can afford to give the impression that orientation is more important than booth in attracting new members. It is really time to provide the resource where it is needed. Since we are working on creating an accurate measure of resources used, it will be easier to know how many left than how many people do not get a bag. We are not really asking for a large number. Furthermore as Dora points out, sending in the request does not mean we will get it. It never hurts to at least try.

Joseph Yue
NMRT President

From Bill Armstrong:

My earlier vote on this issue was based on a wrong interpretation of the data Beth sent out on "leftovers". (And Beth, this is not your fault or anyone's fault, really, for it's hard to guess how others will interpret data.) Apparently, the large number of bags does not represent "leftovers" in the sense I was interpreting it to mean, rather these represent pretty much Orientation's normal allocation for Annual. That leaves Booth with what will probably be an inadequate supply. And as I stated earlier, I do support the notion that each should have its own guaranteed supply, as both are important avenues for recruitment. Amounts can be adjusted in successive years.

For the above reasons, I am changing my vote to a "yes".

Bill Armstrong
NMRT Secretary

From Sally Gibson:

I agree with Bill J. We should not stock pile for future years and we have not been given a firm count on how many bags the booth gives away. Besides someone can stop by the booth at anytime. Orientation is at set time with other program competition and you need items or "giveaways" to attract the audience.

Sally Gibson

From Shannon Tennant:

I apologize for my late vote - my institution hosted a state-wide library meeting today.

I vote "no" on the proposal. I support the development of the Booth, but I agree with BillJ that the current vendor situation requires us to be very conservative with our requests for outside funding. I think if this year's booth can gather some hard data, then we should revisit this next year. I also think that the financial and international conditions will mean a lower conference attendance this year and that the supply of bags will be adequate.

--Shannon

From Joseph Yue:

Since it is a tie vote, I cast the vote in support of this proposal. Motion carried.

For the sake of accurate record, Nadine will research and confirm or correct the following statement before this meeting's adjournment:

The only bags left were the 36 bags from two years ago and for various reasons including each Orientation Committee preferred a slightly different design, there bags not utilized in those following MW Meeting or Annual Conferences up to 2003.

This hopefully will establish that any left over proir from Orientation at Annual Conference up to 2003 were completely distributed at the booth in previous annual conferences. We do not have any records that any left over bags from NMRT Booth, if any, have ever been lost in transit.

Joseph Yue
NMRT President

Vote, Final Tally:

Beth Kraemer, yes
Dora Ho, yes
Bill Jenkins, no
Sally Gibson, no
Nadine Flores, yes
Stacey Shoup, no
Shannon Tennant, no
Joseph Yue, yes

Motion carried.

c) Booth Committee literature rack purchase proposal (Nadine Flores)

“The proposal for the purchase of literature rack was withdrawn. In accordance to our procedures on expenses, she had consulted with the Treasurer, President and Vice-President/President-Elect and had decided to cover the cost of the literature rack from NMRT funds accessible to the Outreach Director.” - Joseph Yue

III. Announcements

None

IV. Adjournment

Joseph Yue asked if there was a motion to adjourn. Motion made by Bill Armstrong, seconded by Beth Kraemer.

Further Discussion related to Agenda Item II c:

From Bill Jenkins:

First, I am having a lot of concern about people being asked to change their votes midstream.

Second, Beth reported that ALA has 385 bags on hand. These are 385 leftover bags.

ECRC has not requested bags yet for Annual, so now as it stands, ECRC will request 300 for Orientation (I may be off on the number, but I believe 300 is in the ballpark), 200 for Booth, and then we have 385 leftovers. So that's 885 bags.

I feel that this will lead to an unnecessary surplus. But since we have not been successful at keeping discussion and voting separate, and now the meeting is adjourned, we cannot do anything meaningful.

BillJ

Thursday, March 27, 2003, 10:37pm

From Joseph Yue:

I think it is best to address the other issues you mentioned tomorrow. I hope more information will be available and all of us will have a bit more energy to discuss concerns/issues you have raised further.

At this point, I would like to point out, in the event that you are not aware of options currently available, that the meeting has not been adjourned yet. Please refer to the message included below. Furthermore, any board member can make a motion to reconsider or rescind.

Friday, March 28, 2003, 6:32am

From Stacey Shoup:

In my view, we should reserve our vendor requests for urgent needs precisely because they are getting harder to come by. If we request vendor support for bags and the vendor doesn't see their sponsored bags out for a year or two, how does that look? Trust me, vendors do take the time to keep track of these things!

I would also suspect that vendors will want more information on numbers of bags given out in the past, etc before they will agree to support this. I voted no because I am in favor of getting more information so we can make a more informed decision.

Stacey

Motion: Sally Gibson moved that the Board reconsider adjournment. Was not satisfied with answers concerning her questions about the number of bags and who was submitting a request. Seconded by Stacey Shoup.

Meeting declared still in session by Joseph Yue, who proceeded to address the Board with the following comments:

From Joseph Yue:

It never hurts to refresh our memory on parliamentary procedures. It is also NMRT's mission to groom new leaders, all those in attendance/visitors may be encouraged to learn more about meeting rules from this email.

1. In response to Bill Jenkins's comment on changing votes, it is a voting member's privilege and prerogative to change his/her vote up till the result of the vote is announced (see p149 in Sturgis).

2. As for mixing discussion with voting, if one person decides to vote by including arguments rather than introducing amendments or new motions earlier, I believe other members should be allowed to do the same. That is, unless the meeting becomes chaotic. Board members can always call "point of order" (see p88 Sturgis).

3a. On requesting more bags, why do we need to include the additional 300 bags if Orientations Committee already has what its need for Annual 2003? Why are we binding our hands by past practice instead of responding to new reality? I have asked for verification on all the numbers presented and if the information is correct, what we we need are the extra 200 bags, not 500.

3b. Also, if the information is correct, we can safely say that at least 150 or more bags have been distributed at the NMRT booth in the past few annual conferences. Furthermore, we can inform vendors that the estimated number was 150 probably we ran out and not because of lack of interest on the part of attendee.

4. It is board member's prerogative to call a question and vote at any point during discussion. Everybody who has volunteered for board positions will advise to do that sparingly but it is not against the rule. Not being satisfied with the voting result can be addressed in different ways. I believe a positive way to handle this is to seek recourse through parliamentary procedures while the meeting is in session. Board members can make a motion to reconsider or rescind a previous decision.

5. It is NMRT board members' responsibilities, as elected representative elected by members, to familiarize themselves with the standard meeting procedures adopted by ALA.

While we can hold a workshop, it will never replace members taking time to read the procedures, achieve an understanding to the point that they know when they need to refer to the book or ask for clarification/guidance. As librarians, we should all be able to get hold of a copy, even on a

temporary basis. The meetings have always been announced well ahead of time and meetings schedule is set after consultation with all board members. There is at least one month's lead time to get prepared. I would also like to remind everybody that few have requested assistance or none has requested a workshop since we take office.

6. For those of you who had been wondering, yes, I raised a point of order and hopefully had resolved the out of order matters.

Thus, our current order of procedures will be as followed:

Since there is an objection to adjournment, the meeting is still in session.

Is there a motion on any matter or announcements?

Joseph Yue
NMRT President

Motion: Bill Jenkins moved “to reconsider the vote by which the motion to request bags for the Booth was passed yesterday.” Seconded by Shannon Tennant and Beth Kraemer.

From Bill Jenkins:

I am making the motion to reconsider as others have indicated that they did not have questions answered to their satisfaction and I also believe there may be further clarification/information which can be provided.

BillJ

Discussion:

From Stacey Shoup:

Request for information. Can someone please clearly restate the number of bags we currently have at ALA headquarters, the number of bags to be requested from the vendor, and the basis of the estimated total need?

Thanks,
Stacey Shoup

Nadine Flores replied that she was “still waiting for confirmation of the actual amount of bags.”

From Bill Jenkins:

I am raising a point of order as I believe that we still need to vote on the motion to reconsider.
BillJ, Treasurer

Vote on motion to reconsider:

Stacey Shoup, yes

From Sally Gibson:

I would also like clarification on which committees are requesting bags from the vendors. The proposal clearly states in section D #3 "Orientations Committee has also requested pens and bags. ECRC may need to adjust the request or field additional vendor as necessary/appropriate."

It also states in section B that the Orientation will be using up the remaining bags.

So is the Orientation committee requesting bags from vendors for the 2003 Annual Conference.

Sally Gibson

Vote to reconsider (cont.):

Sally Gibson, yes

Bill Jenkins, yes

Beth Kraemer, yes

From Nadine Flores:

Orientations Committee has always received bags and pens, it is just a formality of submitting the request. However, this year Booth requested the same. Any new vendor request must meet with Board approval.

From Sally Gibson:

Nadine please answer yes or no so that I can be completely clear on what is being proposed for the 2003 Annual conference. I have left out the numbers because I know we are still waiting on the final count but I also think it is important to clarify how many committees are requesting bags.

The Orientation committee is requesting bags.

The Booth committee is requesting bags.

Plus we have left over bags at ALA headquarters.

From Nadine Flores in response to above:

"Orientations placed a vendor request as did Booth Committee."

From Joseph Yue:

Based on the fact that information is not as well organized as it should have been and is now late Friday, I do not think this matter can be resolved in the next few hours. Therefore, can we entertain a motion to recess till 11:00 MST March 31, 2003?

From Joseph Yue:

Motion to recess take precedence over all motions except to adjourn. We can pick up on Monday where we are right now--voting on the motion to consider the approval of booth 2003 vendor support request if we are going to have a recess.

Joseph Yue

Meeting recessed until Monday morning.

Vote to reconsider (cont.):

Nadine Flores, yes

Monday, March 31 - Meeting resumed:

From Beth Kraemer:

I thought I had posted these numbers on NMRTBD last week, but it seems many of us did not receive the email... ah, the joys of technology!

I talked to Kim Sanders, our ALA liaison, last week. Here's what is currently in storage at ALA for NMRT:

349 tan/black canvas bags

36 red bags w/o handles

160 pens

25 blue highlighters

--Beth

Vote to reconsider (cont.)

Bill Armstrong, yes

From Sally Gibson:

Based on the responses received this is my understanding

The 2003 Orientation committee will be submitting a vendor request for bags and pens for the 2003 Annual conference. In the past the request has been for 300 bags and they use at least 200 of them.

The Booth gives away at least 150 bags and probably could give away more.

There are 385 bags, 160 pens, 25 highlighters in storage.

Thus I believe that the amount of bags currently in storage is sufficient to cover the needs of the Booth and therefore they do not need to submit a vendor request.

Sally

From Stacey Shoup:

So, where are we? Voting on the motion for vendor support? I was under the impression that our chair would re-adjourn at 11 am MST.

I will be travelling on business most of the rest of this week, but will be checking email remotely at least once a day. Regretfully, it looks like I will not be able to actively participate in the rest of this meeting.

Stacey Shoup
NMRT Councilor

Vote to reconsider, Final Tally:

Stacey Shoup, yes
Sally Gibson, yes
Bill Jenkins, yes
Beth Kraemer, yes
Nadine Flores, yes
Bill Armstrong, yes

Motion: Bill Armstrong moved to recess until Tuesday (following day); seconded by Nadine Flores.

From Bill Armstrong:
Good afternoon, folks:

The vote tally on the motion to reconsider is 6 Yes, 2 no-votes [Ed. Note: meaning two people have not voted], so the motion passes. However, as Joseph is not able to preside for the rest of the day, and Beth is not feeling well, I'd like to entertain a motion that we recess until tomorrow. If we can get a second, and there are no objections, we will resume tomorrow.

There's still conflicting information that I'd like to resolve. I think once we all have the same, definitive information on which to base a decision, we'll be able to conclude this in a satisfactory manner for all concerned :)

Stacey, if you'll be able to check your email at least once a day, that should be sufficient.

Bill A.

Meeting Recessed

Tuesday, April 1, 2003

From Joseph Yue:

We are still sorting the information. Unless there is an objection, we will continue the recess until tomorrow.

At this point, I would also like to thank Michelle of the Orientations Committee for providing valuable information on past vendor requests for bags. It will be most helpful if ECRC can also do the same and confirm the number and style of each request in the past three years.

From Joseph Yue:

I just want to update you all on the status of the meeting.

There is a big project that is going to take place at my library for the rest of the week and I have been taking care of all last minute preparation. On top of this, there are various other issues I have to help resolve for the upcoming conference.

Normally, the vice-president or the past president usually steps in to run the meeting but Beth is out sick and Dora is not able to access email frequently.

Thus, Bill Armstrong, as one of the two remaining officers, has graciously been helping out with presiding the meeting and get things moving. He will verify the additional information we have received and hopefully we will have a pretty accurate and clear picture on past bags usage soon.

I still think we need to resolve this issue soon and not defer this to annual conference board meeting. Thank you for your patience.

From Lisa Weber:

Hello Joseph,

ECRC only has bag request information for the last two years, however, I was chair of Orientation three years ago so I can tell you what we received for that year (which is basically what Michelle has already shared with the board). Three years ago Orientation received 300 red, synthetic bags with zipper closures, without handles and the NMRT logo on one side.

Last year Nadine requested 300 red bags with handles.

For Midwinter I requested 300 bags. Orientation requested that the bags be modified, EBSCO said that wasn't a problem and asked for specifications. At that point I put them in touch with Michelle and she told them what her committee needed. I didn't hear anything back from her, so I'm assuming the bags were delivered as requested without any problems.

Lisa Weber
ECRC chair

Monday, April 7, 2003

Meeting Resumed

From Joseph Yue:

We ended up taking a week's break. Bill A. has helped quite a bit in verifying various pieces of information even though this is not his responsibility as NMRT officer. I want to thank him formally for his effort.

We do hope to wrap this up soon and is in the process of putting together a report that hopefully makes sense to all parties involved. Just so that we are not in limbo again, let's set a target date as Apr 9 (Wednesday) to have the summary distributed and resume our discussion on this.

Joseph Yue
NMRT President

Meeting Recessed until April 9

Wednesday, April 9, 2003

Meeting Resumed

From Joseph Yue:

The board meeting is back on after recess. Two issues are at hand:

1. Update on past usage and current inventory of vendor sponsored bags will be sent out by Beth or Bill today.
2. Motion to reconsider carried. Anybody cares to make a motion to resolve this issue later today?

Joseph Yue
NMRT President

From Beth Kraemer:

“Here is the report that Bill Armstrong masterfully put together to explain the bag situation for all of us.” (see Supporting Documents for full-text)

Beth Kraemer

Thursday, April 10, 2003

From Joseph Yue:

I want to direct board members' attention on the need to set the direction for future actions. In other words,

1. What measures do we want committees to implement to gather an accurate number of bags we can distribute at both booth and orientation. I am not sure slowly adding numbers of bags, says 50 a year, is inline with the fast pace development of NMRT. Also, do we want to set the

percedant to go down to this level of management decision (vote increment year by year) or should the board set the tone/direction and ask supervising board member and officers to monitor the development?

2. I also recommend the board to look into passing a motion to recognize that Booth is as valuable in reaching out to new and current members as Orientation and that they are equal status and their events/service target different segment of conference attendees. I do not think it is good to leave any NMRT committees the sense that they are "second class citizen" or that what they are not doing is not as important and as valuable to further the goals of NMRT as other committees. All NMRT committees are vital part of the organization and they need to collaborate, help each other, not competition or minding only their own committee interest.

Joseph Yue

From Sally Gibson:

I think we need to treat bag requests at the NMRT conference level not the committee level. In other words how many bags are needed for the conference. I do not think we need separate vendor requests for the Booth and Orientation committees. Those committees can work together to decide a number needed and then submit one vendor request.

I am certainly not saying that one committee is more important than the other. I think it is more important for our committees to work together before approaching vendors. Look how long it took us to straighten out how many bags we had and who was submitting a request for what. We want to avoid multiple requests for the same item.

Therefore I think the board should maintain the current situation which is one vendor request for bags. Currently the Orientation committee requests bags. I think that situation can remain with the clear understanding that the Orientation works with the Booth committee to ensure that their needs are also met.

From Joseph Yue:

Let me clarify since we are back in the discussion stage of the original motion.

The proposal is submitted to document a need for same or similar items by another NMRT committee so that the organization can move forward, not stay at where we have been. In other words, giving Booth Committee the same number of bags when the committee can help distribute more bags and thus promote NMRT. What we need is to establish a realistic baseline on how many bags NMRT Booth can distribute at annual conference.

From Stacey Shoup:

I agree 100% with Sally. This isn't about micromanaging the committees, it's about trying to organize our requests. My concern is that if we ask vendors for assistance without being organized, they will not only turn us down, but never consider us again. We want vendors to think of us as a worthwhile and beneficial partner, right?

Furthermore, no one should take follow-up questions to proposals personally. I happen to resent the notion that the board favors one committee over others!

From Bill Armstrong:

I'd like to address Joseph's comments and Sally's as well, as they relate to the matter at hand, namely, Booth's request to place its own order for a specified number of bags and pens.

1) I do think that committees responsible for ordering supplies will need to implement some sort of system that will guarantee they have an accurate counting of what they receive for MW and Annual, what they give out at these meetings, and what is left over. They can document this and will then have sufficient information from which to make a judgement about the magnitude of the order they should place the following year. Successive chairs will, of course, need to have this information available to them.

But I do not think the Board should place itself in the position of micromanaging this process of tracking and placing orders. This should remain in the domain of the committee and its supervising Board member. More is not needed from us, nor is it all that helpful. And I must respectfully disagree with Sally in the assertion that things are simpler with only one order. Actually, I think that has complicated the matter greatly, as far as keeping track of specific uses and needs within this one order.

2) I am in agreement with Booth being given its own authority to act in its and our best interests by placing its own orders in the future. This, too, however, will require a better bookkeeping system than we've had, but I have every confidence that these committees can do this, in cooperation with and under the direction of their supervisors.

With Orientations now responsible for both MW and Annual, its process is already simplified. Having Booth place, maintain, and keep track of its own orders really simplifies bookkeeping that much more. Again, I think record keeping will be much easier with these two separated. ECRC can always compile these requests into one order for the vendor's sake. Nevertheless, there would remain records of two requests going into ECRC from two independent committees, each keeping their own records. Part of our problem this year in our trying to straighten things out was due to the fact that the needs of these two committees were combined into one request to ECRC, with one committee simply handing down leftovers.

Suggestion: Perhaps we, as a Board, need only authorize these two committees to take charge of their own orders after this year, based on need, assessed from all data available. And let the matter rest in their hands and the hands of the supervising Board members. If they get too many or too few in one year, let them adjust accordingly. But let's give them the authority to do so.

From Joseph Yue:

This is very helpful. I also want to point out that procedures are already in place. All new and past vendor request approved by the board are handled by ECRC. Only ECRC and the President are authorized to finalize vendors support.

In other words, any approved vendor request will then go to ECRC. They are in charge of keeping track on what request there are, what each request is, which vendor can provide what type of support, work with individual committees if what they want is not available or there are other alternatives.

From Nadine Flores:

Sally Gibson wrote:

"I think we need to treat bag requests at the NMRT conference level not the committee level. In other words how many bags are needed for the conference. I do not think we need separate vendor requests for the Booth and Orientation committees. Those committees can work together to decide a number needed and then submit one vendor request."

[Nadine's response:] ***I agree, it should be just one vendor request for all the committees, and of course this is where ECRC plays a big role, and if I am not mistaken, ECRC has always handled orders in this matter. BillJ can comment on this.***

From Nadine Flores:

If it is a matter of documenting items received from vendors, then ECRC can document (along with the committee receiving the vendor support), in their reports.

From Bill Jenkins:

While we are having a lot of relevant discussion, I feel that we have moved beyond the proposal that is before us now and we have brought up many additional issues.

Rather than amending the proposal multiple times, I would like to see the proposal referred back to the committee for adjustment and then discuss this again at Annual. Hopefully, the committees involved with bags could develop and test new systems for counting bag distribution and we would have more accurate numbers for discussion as well.

From Joseph Yue:

I am redirecting the discussion--

1. does the board feel that we have more than enough bags for both events (we will need a vote on this)
2. and if so, what are the specific directions that all relevant committees can realistically implement so that there is new data for discussion at future board meeting (we need a consensus on this)

Joseph Yue
NMRT President

From Bill Jenkins:

I would like clarification on this as this mixing of committees is partly why we have gone in circles.

As Bill A reported, we have 378 leftover bags. The proposal was for a new vendor request for bags for Booth. With this number of leftover bags, I would like to see Booth use those and work on a revised proposal for the future (possibly with Orientation.)

As Bill A also reported, Orientation has not requested bags for Toronto and ECRC has not requested bags from EBSCO for Orientation in Toronto. Orientation's request was not part of the original proposal and currently would move forward as usual.

Friday, April 11, 2003

From Sally Gibson:

I think we should entertain the idea of tabling the proposal until the Annual conference. Clearly we need to discuss the proposal in person.

From Beth Kraemer:

I'm not sure that tabling the bags proposal until Annual is an option, unfortunately; the proposal deals with a request *for* Annual...

From Bill Jenkins:

Ok, I'll ask again.

Is there a reason that Booth cannot use the leftover 300+ bags currently at ALA?

Although it is not in the proposal, is there a reason that Orientation cannot move forward with their ongoing request for bags from ECRC and EBSCO and ignore the extra bags at ALA?

I do believe that this our best, most straightforward, least complicated, and wisest course of action. Our inability to come to agreement on anything else clearly demonstrates that we are not ready to act on the current proposal in its current form.

From Joseph Yue:

Bill J,

You ask that the new vendor request be formally approved so that NMRT can start getting its record straight. What you are proposing is basically what has been done in the past and is the main reason, if I hear correctly from you in the past ten months, why it is difficult for you as treasurer to ascertain how vendor support has been used in the past.

Please clarify.

From Bill Jenkins:

Board approval of new vendor requests has been around NMRT longer than I have, so this is not something new.

The vendor request in front of us, bags for Booth, is not something that I currently support for 2 reasons. 1) We have plenty of leftover bags from Orientation at the moment, which leads me to 2) The current Booth proposal does not provide accurate numbers as I and other Board members have expressed interest in.

I am not saying that I am against the idea of Booth requesting bags in the future, but I think it makes the most sense to use what we already have and for Booth to provide a request which answers Board member's questions. I am also not saying that I am against Booth having bags. If so, I would say that they should not use the extras.

What I am saying is that the Board does not have enough information, the current request could be improved, and we have taken far too much time on this issue.

To say that I am suggesting a specific course of action in this instance that may or may not contradict previous statements I have made is a misperception and a misrepresentation.

BillJ

From Stacey Shoup:

I, too, fail to understand why Booth can't use leftover Orientation bags this ONE time. Then we can coordinate vendor requests and spend time at annual discussing the best way to do so. If someone can explain the reasons against Booth using the remaining Orientation bags already in storage for Annual 2003 only, I'd be eager to listen.

Motion: Bill Armstrong offered as a friendly amendment to the original motion, "That Booth be allowed to request 100 bags, with Orientation continuing with its order as planned."

From Bill Armstrong:

Sorry, Bill, that your question hasn't been answered yet, so I'll do my best. There are actually two issues involved here; one, of adequate numbers for the two groups; and two, independent representation for each, such that each can order according to needs.

Concerning issue number one, then, your comments and questions below indicate a willingness to supply the numbers, and I think that's great. Though I'm not sure if you mean for Orientations to up their anticipated order for Annual from 100 to 300. If they don't, they're liable to be short. At any rate, this is progress. If we can supply both with the amount they feel they can really distribute, particularly with Booth having enough to allow them for the first time to market NMRT aggressively at Annual, then I think this is a wonderful step forward.

But I think we need to take one more step, and that involves issue #2; that of "independence." I think we've already seen, or at least you seemed to indicate as well, that much of our tracking problems stems from the centralization of this entire process with only one committee. I think it's time to give Booth a chance to operate as its own agent, and keep its own records. This does not bar or prevent, however, contact and cooperation with Orientations. But I think it will give each a chance to concentrate on its own unique needs and strategies.

With the above in mind, I'd like to offer the following as a friendly amendment to the motion at hand: That Booth be allowed to request 100 bags, with Orientation continuing with its order as planned. (This makes 478 for Orientations, 100 for Booth, with 178 likely to be left over from Orientations for Booth to use. Final Probable Distribution: 300 for Orientations, 278 for Booth.) The numbers should be adequate, and Booth will finally be started on the process of managing its own needs and orders.

Bill Armstrong

From Joseph Yue:

I am asking this one more time, if any board member wants to refer this back to the committee or delay the discussion, it is to the board's interest that specific directions be given. For example, we need to know such and such and this is how it may be addressed these concerns. Make sure that this is doable goals and can be implemented. If additional resources are needed to help committee/board members/etc to work on this, that stipulate that in the motion.

From Bill Jenkins:

I feel that we are making this too complicated again, so I will again pose simple questions...

1) Is there a reason why that Orientation for Toronto cannot place their 300 bag as usual? Regardless of what we have at ALA at the moment, why can they not place their usual request with ECRC and thus EBSCO? The Board should not be touching Orientation's request, as Board action is only necessary for new requests; Orientation's bag request was approved a long time ago.

2) Then, is there a reason why Booth cannot use the 300+ bags at ALA for distribution at Booth. I believe this is an adequate supply, and then Booth could develop more accurate counts.

3) Taking the previous two points into consideration, is there a reason why Booth cannot resubmit their proposal when a) they have better numbers, b) do not have a surplus?

From Bill Jenkins in response to Joseph Yue's previous comments:

I am willing to refer this back to committee if others are interested in it. It will probably take me an hour or two to submit a motion as I am inbetween meetings at the moment.

From Joseph Yue to Board:

An amendment has been moved. Is there a second?

From Beth Kraemer:

I second Bill Armstrong's move to amend.

Motion to amend seconded.

From Beth Kraemer in response to Bill Jenkins previous comments above:

This is my understanding of the situation... Orientation cannot simply order 300 *more* bags for Annual, as they already have received a portion of that 300 in an earlier shipment; those are part of the "surplus" that is sitting at ALA (please note that these aren't actually surplus--they've all been claimed...the only question was how many are actually there to claim). Orientation only has before them the option to place an order for 100 bags, not 300.

From Bill Armstrong:

Beth's assessment is correct. Orientation will order only 100 more, as is already their plan, based on the numbers already in storage. We are neither diminishing nor increasing this.

Discussion of Amendment: Call for discussion by Joseph.

From Bill Jenkins:

I am voting no as I think the proposal needs a larger overhaul than just this amendment and I am not comfortable with the precedent we are setting with all of this.

From Beth Kramer:

So here's my final point...

If Bill A's friendly amendment were to be approved by the Board, we would be sending a request to EBSCO for 200 bags (100 for Booth, 100 for Orientation). ECRC, in their skillful way, will simply merge the two requests as one request to EBSCO. Because we received that mystery shipment of 159 bags in January, we don't need to request the full order of 300 for Annual that Orientation usually requests at this point in the year.

My suggestion is that we wrap this up quickly so that we can focus our efforts on getting ready for Annual. At this point I would like to call for a vote on this friendly amendment. Please note that this is a vote only for this amendment, and not for the original proposal.

From Joseph Yue:

Question has been called. Please send in your vote for this amendment, *not* the main motion yet, by 12 noon MST Saturday (April 12).

Vote on Amendment:

Bill Jenkins, no

Beth Kraemer, yes

Stacy Shoup, no

Sally Gibson, no

Dora Ho, yes

Bill Armstrong, yes

Shannon Tennant, no

Nadine Flores, yes

With a tie vote, Joseph Yue voted "yes", thereby breaking the tie. **Amendment carried.**

Vote on Main Motion: Vote on main motion called by Joseph Yue, all votes to have been cast by 12:00noon (MST) Monday, April 14.

Bill Jenkins, no

Once again, I am voting no on the main motion (Booth Committee's Vendor Support Request).

Part of a successful proposal anticipates Board members' questions before they are asked, and answers Board questions during discussion. Another part of a successful proposal is an accurate presentation of previous circumstances, and a plan for the future. Using the above definitions, I do not feel that this proposal was successful.

I also feel that it is part of the Board's duty to assist committees in creating successful proposals. Since I feel that we could address Booth's needs for the current year and make a better proposal and thus a better presentation to vendors, I have discussed informally with some Board members about making a motion to send this back to committee. I am frankly disappointed in individual Board members' lack of commitment to this idea and furthering NMRT's goals in preparing our members for ALA process.

For an example of a proposal that much better addressed these issues, I think the Footnotes proposal is a good example. There were some timing issues during the meeting that precluded some questions and discussions, but the basic proposal had specific detail and questions were further answered when asked.

I would happily vote yes for a Booth vendor support request that addressed the above issues, as I am fine with the basic concept. However, the manner in which this proposal has been presented causes me to vote no as I am uncomfortable with the precedent it sets in terms of the Board's expectations, support, and acceptance of committee proposals.

From Joseph Yue:

Please vote yes and no. Explanation, discussion and such should be sent out before people start casting votes.

From Bill Armstrong:

Just to be sure everyone's clear on what the current vote is for, here is a restatement of the main motion as amended:

Main motion as amended: That the Board approve a new vendor support request by the Booth Committee for 100 bags and 200 pens for distribution at the NMRT Booth at 2003 Annual Conference.

Vote on main motion, Final Tally:

Bill Jenkins, no

Bill Armstrong, yes

Nadine Flores, yes

Sally Gibson, no

Stacey Shoup, no
Dora Ho, yes
Beth Kraemer, yes
Shannon Tennant, no

Joseph Yue broke the tie vote by voting “yes”. **Motion carried.**

V. Adjournment:

Joseph Yue asked for a call to adjourn. Motion made to adjourn by Stacey Shoup, seconded by Shannon Tennant, Beth Kraemer, and Dora Ho.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00pm MST, April 14, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,
William W. Armstrong
NMRT Secretary

Supporting Documents

1) Footnotes publication format and schedule proposal

From Jennifer Knievel and Jill Grogg, Chair and Assistant Chair / Footnotes Committee:

Date: 24 March 2003

A. Board action requested:

Change the Footnotes publication schedule and format in the following three ways.

§ Increase publication schedule to four issues per year in August, November, February, and May.

§ Publish three issues online, and publish the fourth issue, right before annual, on paper.

§ Alert membership of three online issues with email announcements sent by the ALA printing office to the entire membership (not just NMRT-L)

B. Background:

Current Practice

Footnotes is currently published three times per year in August, December, and April. All three issues are on paper. Each issue is laid out by the Footnotes committee members using desktop publishing software, delivered ready to print ("camera ready") to the ALA printing office, and then printed and distributed by the ALA printing office to the NMRT membership. The approximate cost for each issue is \$1200, for a total cost of approximately \$3600. The cost would of course be higher if the ALA printing office were also responsible for layout, as has sometimes been the case in the past. The Footnotes committee has been discussing the possibility of publishing Footnotes online for some time.

Survey

The Footnotes committee recently conducted a survey of the NMRT membership. The survey asked members about what format they wanted to receive Footnotes in, what content they would like to see continued or added (announcements, member profiles, tips and tricks columns, online photo galleries, etc.), if they would like Footnotes to be published more or less often, and what they find most useful about Footnotes. The survey response rate was higher than expected, drawing a whopping 152 responses, representing approximately 10% of the entire NMRT membership.

Some results of the survey were overwhelmingly decisive. For instance, the membership nearly unanimously wanted a column about tips and tricks for new librarians and an online photo gallery. It is significant that only one person in all 152 thought Footnotes should be a shorter publication. "Longer" and "the same length" were approximately tied.

However, some results of the survey were not as unanimous as the committee hoped. For instance, the preferred method of delivery was a near tie between email delivery and online accessibility in a public (non-passworded) site, with paper taking third place.

The Footnotes committee feels that there is a way to meet all of the needs expressed in the survey, and also the needs of the committee and NMRT. We would like to expand to four issues per year. We would like three issues to be online, with email notices sent to alert the membership. The notices would be sent by ALA and go to all members, rather than announced on NMRT-L, which does not reach all NMRT members. The fourth issue would be the Annual Conference issue, sent in May, and would be the only paper issue of the year.

C. Rationale:

Content

The membership overwhelmingly wanted several additions to content, including a column on tips and tricks for new librarians, announcements about NMRT members (new jobs, etc), photo galleries, more member profiles, and more "Meet the Board" articles. Though the membership was tied on whether or not they wanted longer issues or issues of the same length, it is notable that almost none of the members want shorter issues. Adding a fourth issue will allow us to add the content requested by the members without substantially increasing length.

Committee Participation

The Footnotes committee is a popular one. Adding another issue would allow us to provide more committee participation to NMRT members. Changing the format to three online issues and one paper issue would allow members to gain experience with different publication formats. It would preserve the opportunity for layout of a paper version, while adding an opportunity for web page development. It would also target the publication schedule to coincide more closely with both the ALA Midwinter conference and the ALA Annual conference.

Cost

NMRT is, like all volunteer, non-profit organizations, on a tight budget. Changing the delivery mechanism to online, rather than paper, will allow the round table to save money on printing, publication, and postage, which they can then spend on the needs of other committee projects. Publishing Footnotes in this fashion will save NMRT at least \$1,800 per year, and maybe more.

Member Needs

The membership would like to see an online version of the newsletter. NMRT has always represented cutting-edge thinking in the greater ALA organization, because as a small, autonomous round table, we have great freedom to try new things. NMRT's newsletter is now behind the curve. Many other groups in ALA are publishing their newsletters online. The ALA printing office has said that the groups whose online newsletters are successful are the groups that send email announcements, so this is a critical element of this proposal. Footnotes has represented the benefit

members receive for their membership dues. We would like to suggest that this is no longer the only appropriate benefit to identify as the benefit of dues. We suggest targeting year-round resume reviewing as a benefit. The one print issue can still be considered a benefit as we transition to other services which represent benefits to members.

D. Impact on ...

1. Organization:

Increasing the number of issues per year will help keep the organization more informed. We can more accurately address member needs by providing more timely information, and more opportunity to create personal connections via the newsletter or committee work.

2. Committee (issuing proposal):

This proposal will require more stories and more web work from the committee. It will also decrease the need for desktop publishing. It would be valuable to the committee if one or two committee members were targeted as members responsible for putting all the articles on the web. ALA's new content management software makes it possible for one or two Footnotes committee members to be responsible for adding the online issues to NMRT's webpage. Thus Footnotes could have more control over the loading and updates of the files. The committee work could shift from desktop publishing to web content management.

3. Other committees:

This proposal will give other committees more opportunities to inform the membership of projects, progress, and goals. There will be more uploading for the web committee unless a standard liaison role is developed between the committees. This will also give other committees more flexibility in the kinds of announcements, and the amount of information, they can submit to Footnotes.

4. Finances (Please indicate amounts here with only brief descriptions.

Detailed descriptions of costs should be supplied in "E. Supplemental information" below.)

a. Itemized expenses:

Current, the cost is approximately \$1200 per issue. Cost would be higher if the committee asked ALA's printing office to do the layout, which is currently handled by the committee. The annual cost is approximately \$3600.

This proposal would cost approximately \$200 per issue for mailing out the link to the online version. This amount depends upon what policies we set up for contacting members without email addresses or whose messages bounce, and who sends the message. The cost could be lower than the estimated \$200 per issue. Costs would also include \$1200 for the one paper "Annual Conference" issue. The total annual cost would be approximately \$1,800 at most. I would like to emphasize that this proposal will save NMRT at least \$1,800 per year, even while expanding communication and access for the membership.

b. Amount not covered by current allocations:

None. This proposal will save the round table money.

E. Supplemental information (e.g. complete text of the report or policy; and for any proposal that requires additional funding, provide a description and justification for each item):

1. The committee feels it is important that one issue before we move to an online format should include a "Footnotes is going online" announcement, so that the members can be prepared for the change. If this proposal is approved at this electronic board meeting, we can include such an announcement in the upcoming April issue. If this proposal is delayed until the Annual conference, then we would need to plan on sending the August issue on paper. That would change the cost for the first year to \$2,800.
2. We would like to plan to store all these files on the ALA server for the sake of continuity, simplicity, and storage. If this proposal is approved, we would also like to discuss the implications for archival records with the Archives committee.

2) Response by Jennifer Knievel, Footnotes Editor, to Stacey Shoup's objection to the extra workload imposed by 4 issues:

Board,

Sorry for the delay everyone. I was in a meeting all morning long and just got back and read the messages.

Jill Grogg, the incoming Footnotes Editor, and I have discussed this possibility. We think that the increased workload will be manageable with this proposal. Let me explain why we think so.

1. We will, as a committee, create a template for the web pages, so the only layout we will have to do for each issue will be adding in the text. This will take significantly less time than laying out the issues on paper (which we will only have to do once a year). Also, this workload can be handled by more than one committee member. As Stacey pointed out, generally the editor or the assistant editor does all the layout, which by far takes the most time. So time for layout would be reduced.
2. The content that we would like to add is mostly in the form of columns (e.g. Tips and Tricks for Librarianship), which can be done by committee members as early as they would like. That allows the committee to distribute the work a little more evenly over the year, rather than having such a high concentration right before an issue comes out. This is already the case somewhat, but the emphasis here is that the expanded content would not add to the immediate pre-issue rush, and so could be easily managed so that it does not cause too much stress on the committee.
3. The Footnotes committee is fairly popular, and I think that we could try to solicit more members for the committee if we need them to help with the work.

4. Even with four issues, the changes I've described will actually make each individual issue a little less work-intensive than each issue currently is, so I think we can manage it without really overwhelming the committee members.

Does this address your concerns somewhat?

Thanks.

Jennifer

"Shoup, Stacey" wrote:

- >
- > That's fine, but without further assurance I vote no on the current
- > Footnotes proposal.
- >
- > I strongly believe the workload of 4 issues will be too much. I'd much
- > rather see extra energy put into improving the content and layout of 3
- > issues before we commit to 4.
- >
- > Stacey

3) Booth Committee New Vendor Support Request

NMRT Proposal (new vendor support request)

From: Nadine Flores, Outreach Director for Booth Committee

Date: March 26, 2003

A. Board action requested: To approve new vendor support request for 200 bags and 200 pens for distribution at the NMRT Booth at 2003 Annual Conference.

B. Background: In the past Orientations Committee has passed on to Booth Committee left over bags and pens to pass out at NMRT's booth at Annual. The current plan is to use up all the remaining bags from the past two years first currently stored at ALA Headquarters.

C. Rationale: The bags and pens are popular give-aways at NMRT booth.

D. Impact on

1. Organization:

Wider exposure for NMRT at Annual and possibility of gaining new members. This new request will also mean additional reliance on vendor support.

2. Committee (issuing proposal):

The approval of this request will enable Booth committee to provide more attractions at the booth and also provides as a service to current and potential members with a packet of information compiled for that conferece/year.

3. Other committees:

Orientations Committee has also requested pens and bags. ECRC may need to adjust the request or field additional vendor as necessary/appropriate.

4. Finances (Please indicate amounts here with only brief descriptions. Detailed descriptions of costs should be supplied in "E. Supplemental information" below.)

a. Itemized expenses: \$0.00

b. Amount not covered by current allocations: N/A

E. Supplemental information (e.g. complete text of the report or policy; and for any proposal that requires additional funding, provide a description and justification for each item):

N/A

4) Report on Number of Bags (related to Booth proposal for vendor request); report put together by Bill Armstrong

Final Review (how is that for optimism?) of Leftover Bags Status:

Bottom line: We have 378 bags.

Analysis and Explanation of Bottom Line Figure:

According to Kim Sanders (per our telephone conversation today), we have 342 bags left from MW. These come from two shipments, whose contents were not counted at the time of arrival. The first shipment would have corresponded to Lisa Weber's order (placed late October) for MW 2003, and was assumed to be 300 when it arrived in Fall 2002. This is the box that Kim shipped to MW 2003. In January, after this box was shipped, another box was received from EBSCO labeled with 159 bags in it. Why this one arrived at all remains a mystery. Kim did not ship this to MW. No other order was submitted by Lisa, and that remains the case today. No order for Annual 2003 has yet been submitted (per phone conversation with Lisa today).

As Michelle Turvey has stated, Orientations gave out 96 bags at MW 2003. If you subtract this from 300, then the remaining number is 204, which is what they assumed they had left over. But this is assuming that 300 were actually in the box. It is highly likely, based on the number of actual items we have remaining in stock (and these have been counted by Kim), that the box was short by 21. That being the case, what Orientations received at MW 2003 was likely a box with 279, meaning that what remained at the end of MW from that shipment was actually 183 (279-

96). Add this to the box of 159 that remained behind and unopened at ALA headquarters, and you get the number of bags that we actually have in stock "left over" from MW; in other words, 342. Of the older bags from previous years to be added to this number, there are 36 (red, handleless bags), so our real total of bags currently in our possession is 378 (342+36).

Keep in mind that Orientation's request for 100 additional has not yet been placed. So what we have is the number stated above, 378, with no unfilled orders outstanding.

Question: How many bags will Orientation and Booth likely give out at Annual 2003 in Toronto?

Historical Use:

Annual

Unfortunately, we only have numbers for Annual 2002 (Atlanta), but those are probably the most important ones anyway for determination of Annual 2003 need. According to the figures Michelle Turvey provided from past records, 300 bags were requested for Annual 2002, with 36 left over. These are the red, handleless bags, however, and the ones ordered for Annual 2002 were red with handles. So it appears that these "leftovers" represent bags left over from conferences prior to Annual 2002, and were simply not used at Annual 2002 either. This means that the full 300 ordered for Atlanta were actually used there, and would represent a combined Orientation/Booth usage figure for Annual 2002.

MW

For MW we have two years worth of numbers. In MW 2002 (N.O.), 50 bags were given away at Orientations. For MW 2003, 96 were distributed. (There is no Booth at MW.)

Restatement of Current Situation: We have 378 bags for use at Annual 2003.

Question: Will Toronto likely draw a greater attendance than Atlanta, less, or about the same?

For Future Orders:

We may want to recommend that in the future Orientations cut their request for MW down to a more realistic figure, as it doesn't seem to correspond to the amount given actually given out. As for Annual, that figure, too, may need to come down if we wish Booth to be able to place its own request.