MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors
Boston, Massachusetts, September 21-23, 2011

Wednesday, 21 September: 1:00PM-5:00PM (Finance and Planning Committees); Thursday, 22 September: 9:08AM-4:47PM (Board); Friday, 23 September: 9:07AM-4:50PM (Board)

Present: Linda Blair, Daniel Boomhower, Pamela Bristah (recording), Susannah Cleveland, Kirstin Dougan, Jerry McBride (presiding), Ruthann McTyre, Michael Rogan, Laurie Sampsel, Cheryl Taranto, Judy Tsou, Liza Vick

Guest: Jim Cassaro (Planning Committee and Board)

The meeting was called to order by President McBride.

01. Approval of Agenda
   It was moved by Daniel Boomhower, seconded by Laurie Sampsel, and carried unanimously that the agenda be approved.

02. Recording Secretary’s Report. Pamela Bristah
   It was moved by Kirstin Dougan, seconded by Cheryl Taranto, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the Board meeting held in Middleton, Wisconsin, June 1-3, 2011, be approved as amended.

03. Parliamentarian’s Report. Susannah Cleveland
   a. Administrative Handbook
      Most activities this quarter have been related to revisions to the Administrative Handbook.
      • Major changes related to the constitutional amendments are finished. I still have it as a Word document and am working with Jon Haupt to get it to a web platform that will enable parliamentarians to work on it without needing CMS authorization.
      • Clarified committee membership and participation for students (V.A.1) and ex officio roles (throughout and V.A.4) as we discussed in Middleton.
      • Clarified formation of committees in section on Members-at-Large: the Constitution indicates that it’s the Board who forms them (Article VI.A. The Board of Directors shall establish committees to consider affairs of the Association that require continuous or repeated attention by members.) Other places in the handbook were inconsistent; past practices vary. Confusion here lies perhaps in the fact that the President is the conduit to the Board for communication from membership, so requests for new subcommittees often go through the President, but according to the Constitution, it’s the full Board’s final decision that forms them. Came up with:
         II. E. 9. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEES
         Members at large may recommend the establishment of committees additional to those specified in the Administrative Handbook, with the full Board finalizing such establishment.
         To replace:
         Members-at-large may recommend the establishment of committees to the President. (rev. 4/2009)
      • Similarly, I changed language in V.A.6. to clarify the President’s role in appointing members to subcommittees:
         V. A. 6. SUBCOMMITTEES
         The President appoints subcommittee members according to the procedures described above for committees. Subcommittees are responsible to and report to the parent committee. (rev. 7/2011)
         To replace:
         The President constitutes subcommittees according to the procedures described above for committees. Subcommittees are responsible to and report to the parent committee.
      • Made list of what things to include in budget requests consistent for all special officers, bringing some (like Administrative Officer) into the 21st century (with help from Michael and Linda!). Left
blanket statement for special officers vague (III.A.3), since not all have reimbursable expenses related to travel.

- Updated details about honoraria for editors and special officers (about whether they receive one, not amounts).
- Removed “Budget Request” section from Parliamentarian’s duties (was II.E.13.d); there is a general statement about budget requests for all members at large, and no individual statement of this for other members at large.

Questions for Board:

1. Should editors be defined separately in the Administrative Handbook? Currently, all editor position descriptions are listed ONLY within context of the Publications Committee (V.H.8). This leaves no logical place for description/acknowledgement of Notes assistant editor positions or Assistant Web Editor. If so, I would recommend the establishment of a new section on editors (probably as Section IV, following special officers since the roles are similar) and eliminating the descriptions in the section on the Publications Committee, changing that to a list.

The Board agreed with creating a separate section in the Administrative Handbook for all editors, and specifying that editors who are special officers report to the Board, and work with the Publications Committee as an advisory group.

2. Should we amend the makeup of the Publications Committee to reflect the roles fulfilled currently by Tracey Rudnick and Jim Zychowicz? (V.H.8.b)

The Board agreed to specify their roles as ex officio members in the Publications Committee section of the handbook.

3. Who officially has responsibility for the collection of annual reports? Some places, it’s the President, some places, it’s Past/Vice President; in practice, it seems to be the Reports Gatherer now. Should we clarify the distinction between calling for the report, and collecting it?

The Board agreed that the call for annual reports, including chapter chair reports, will be done by the Planning/Reports Officer, with reports to be sent both to the Planning/Reports Officer and the Vice President/Past President.

4. Do we want to revisit the digest of MLA-L? Responsibility for this lies with the Emerging Technologies Committee, but it doesn’t seem like it’s happening, and I remember some talk about whether this was the best place for those duties.

V. D. 9. a. POLICY ON MACHINE-READABLE RECORDS

5) The Emerging Technologies and Services Committee, or its successor, shall be responsible for maintaining a digest of MLA-L as currently published in the MLA Newsletter. If publication of the digest is discontinued for any reason in the future, the Subcommittee shall continue to be responsible for the compilation of the digest for periodic submission to the MLA Archives. (rev. 4/2009)

As the MLA Newsletter digest of MLA-L has long ceased, Board consensus was that this can be dropped from the Administrative Handbook.

5. Does the creation of promotional materials lie solely with the Publicity and Outreach Officer and the Outreach Committee now? If so, we need to remove some language from the description of the Development Committee; if not, no changes necessary.

The Board agreed to remove the language from the Development Committee section of the Administrative Handbook.

6. Should final budgets for workshops be submitted for the spring board meeting instead of September?

The Board agreed that preliminary workshop budgets will go to the Convention Manager and Program Chair for review before the Board spring meeting, with a final budget going to the Fiscal Officer for the spring Board meeting. Taranto will add this policy to the Fiscal Policies Handbook, and Cleveland will request Bonna Boettcher add it to the Convention Managers’ Handbook.

04. Administrative Officer’s Report. Linda Blair

It was moved by Ruthann McTyre, seconded by Daniel Boomhower, and passed unanimously by the Board to reappoint the Administrative Officer.

FY 2010-2011 final budget figures:

- Total ordinary income: $456,733.62, or 104.6% of the budget
- Total expenses: $525,934.36, or 106.74% of the budget
- Net income: $83,185.95
The net income figure includes income and gains on investments, as well as contributions. These sources of income are not included in the calculation of the budget, with the exception of amounts designated from award funds to fund those awards and allocations from the MLA Fund. Likewise, the total expense figure includes expenses that had not been included in the budget, but were funded with Board Designated Assets (BDA), moved from the MLA Fund. These expenses included:

- **Strategic planning:** $8702.80
- **Committee travel:**
  - MLA/AMS: $129.31
  - MLA/MOLA/MPA: $133.32
  - EOP: $675.60

These expenses were all considerably under what had been set aside in BDA ($5115 for committee travel, $50,000 for Strategic Plan).

The FY 2010-2011 budget projected a deficit of -$17,943. Taking into account only the income and expenses which were part of the budget calculation, the actual deficit was -$23,121.72, or -$5,178.72 larger than projections.

Notes on budget performance:

- **Dues income (1.0)** in all categories met or exceeded projections with the exception of institutional members (1.012) at 88.13% and corporate patrons (1.017) at 83.92%
- **Sales income (2.0)** likewise met or exceeded projections with the exception of Institutional subscribers (2.0112) at 83.92%, mailing list (2.02) at 63.4% and Scarecrow royalties (2.051) at 20.07%.
- **Other income (5.0)** was at 89.4% of budget, due to MLA Shop (5.022) at 65.02% and interest on savings accounts (5.03) at 62.64%.

On the expense side, miscellaneous expenses (11.0) were higher than projected primarily due to bank and credit card fees (11:04), at 121.14%.

Management Services (6.0) came in at 101.75% of budget, with significant overages occurring in online database and web design (6.012) at 154.67%, printing and design (6.015) at 140.78%, administrative posting/shipping (6.0161) at 152.19%, administrative supplies (6.0171) at 212.15%, and legal fees and audit (6.019) at 131.16%. Overage in this line is primarily due to work related to the IAML merger.

It is notable that this line also includes office and travel expenses for all Board members and several special officers, and that all travel lines were under budget except for one: Vice-President/Past President (6.061) at 100.99%, which only exceeded projections by $29.54.

Also all committee travel (7.03) came in under budget, with the exception of the Legislation Committee (7.0223) at 106.74%, which occurred because an opportunity arose to attend a hearing that had not been foreseen at the time the budget was set.

**Budget performance Q1 to date:**

- **Total income:** $165,488.84, or 37.53%
- **Total expense:** $34,352.96 or 7.26%
- **Dues (1.0)** received so far total $107,255, or 77.16%
- **Notes** subscriptions are currently at $19,475 or 74.05%

As of the time this report was run on Sept. 8, there was no **Notes** advertising to report; however one day later $6,345 was received.

The MLA Shop line (5.022) shows a receipt of $15, which represents our first ever online sale.

Under miscellaneous income (5.04), the amount of $37,118.40 represents fund transferred from IAML.

The funds transferred for the IAML award funds are entered in $6.0377 (Ratliff: $2,311.42), $6.038 (Coral: $30) and $6.0388 (Coral, socially responsible: $8,210.71)

Rogan noted that there are additional funds to be added to the Coral IAML Travel Fund, contributions made in the last quarter that will be transferred from the IAML-US bank account to MLA’s Fidelity account for the fund.

**Investments:**

Total value of investments at June 30, 2011 was $842,730.64, of which $647,847.29 was held in the Fidelity accounts, with $884.34 remaining in the Board Designated Assets account; the Calvert accounts totaled $194,883.35. On July 27, 2011, $29,475.39 was moved from Fidelity Permanently Restricted Assets and $12,343.16 from Calvert, to restore the Permanently Restricted Asset accounts to their historical dollar values. A total of $41,818.55 was deposited into the Temporarily Restricted accounts. This insured that all award funds had more than sufficient balances to fund their respective awards with the exception of the Bradley award, which does not yet have funds deposited in the TR accounts.
Total value of investments as of Sept. 9 was $803,466.86, of which $616,019.67 was held in Fidelity accounts and $187,447.19 in Calvert.

A total of $8,150.00 was moved to BDA from Fidelity TR to hold until the award money is spent. A check for $3,750.00 was also requested from Calvert TR to reimburse the Fidelity account for a portion of the award funds. These transactions will be reflected in the next investment report.

Fund totals as of Sept. 13, 2011:
Gerboth: $28,370.09
Duckles: $33,048.62
Epstein: $57,128.25
Freeman: $47,370.36
Mayo: $1410.56
Wicker: $15,407.27
Ochs: $37,784.23
RILM: $37,861.82

The Board discussed using a percentage of RILM fund earnings for MLA’s annual $10,000 RILM subsidy. Blair will get recent earnings figures for Board consideration.

Membership:
Membership figures shown for FY 11-12 are current to Sept. 6, and renewals have continued to come in daily since that time. Renewal rates seem to be roughly the same as at this time last year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership type</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012 to 9/6/2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual-US</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual-NonUS</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional US</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional NonUS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student US</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student NonUS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired-US</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired-Non US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining-US</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining-Non US</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate-US</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate-Non US</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Patron-US</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Patron-NonUS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Member-US</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessional-US</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessional-NonUS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes Institutional US sub</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes Institutional Non-US</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>1004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant number of MLA members joined IAML as new members this year; McBride will send a IAML membership report from A-R to the Board. The Board recommended adding IAML membership numbers to future Administrative Officer Reports, with historical figures available from Michael Colby, and asked McTyre’s Strategic Planning/Membership Committee to consider the pros and cons of instituting a late fee for MLA renewals, as some members don’t renew until convention registrations are due, about five months late.

Publications:

In FY 2010-2011, a total of 166 net units were sold in MLA’s remaining monographs published by Scarecrow. Royalties paid to MLA totaled $1003.22, of which $403.35 was paid out to our authors and editors, leaving a net profit of $599.87.

Sales and royalties for MLA’s series published by A-R Editions are reported for the 1st half of the calendar year 2011. A total of 192 units have been sold, earning royalties of $1,284.65. This is a report of royalties earned only; these have not yet been paid to MLA. Editor Mark Palkovic has been paid $350 for his work on IBS 36, Douglas Moore: A bio-bibliography. Author Jerry McBride will be paid $500 upon the receipt of the first royalty check for this volume.

Other activities:
The audit was conducted by SVA Associates onsite at A-R Editions during the month of August. We have now received our draft financial statements, which are available for the Board’s perusal and also our draft 990 income tax form, which after approval will be signed and submitted.

Copyright for Notes v. 67 has been registered, and the certificates of copyright have been received.

Also, on Aug. 10, 2011 a contract was signed with ATC (Association Travel Concepts) to manage Board travel. This service allows Board members, special officers and others who may need to book travel for MLA business to book through ATC, with charges directly billed to MLA’s corporate credit card. The service was available for booking travel beginning with the Boston Board meeting to be held Sept. 21-23, 2011.

The Board agreed to add committee members who travel on behalf of the organization and Freeman Grant recipients to the list of those allowed to book travel via ATC, so that these individuals don’t have to be out of pocket for MLA travel; McBride will notify the Freeman Committee of this change.

05. Past President’s Report. Ruthann McTyre

All files not sent to President McBride have been sent to the Archives.

I will be attending the SEMLA meeting at Chapel Hill in October.

I am looking forward to focusing my MLA attentions towards Membership and will be working alongside Jerry McBride and Development Officer Jim Cassaro to rev up this endeavor. Immediate focus will be fall chapter meetings and working with the local chapters to spread the word beyond the walls of our music libraries. It is vital that we work towards increasing the relevance and visibility of the organization OUTSIDE the usual MLA membership circle (and my thanks to Jim Cassaro for a helpful brainstorming session about this):

- State Library Associations (some chapters are already exhibiting at the SLA level but we need to do more)
- Library Schools – for example the Midwest Chapter has had a long-standing program that involves a rep in each state who serves as liaison to the library schools. I would like to look at this model and see how we can boost it up and get it going in other chapters. This would give us the opportunity to highlight the ARL/MLA Diversity Scholarships and to reach out to those interested in Humanities-centered librarianship and not just music librarianship. We also need to highlight our involvement with IAML and music librarianship on the global level (here and in all areas, of course)
- Theater and Dance Librarians in our areas; musicians and music organizations beyond our “comfortable” borders.
- PLA/ALA/ACRL – getting more EOP program sessions/pre-conferences on their annual meeting programs. RDA could definitely be a very positive foot in the door, as an example.
- Work with Advertising Manager to get the word out with electronic ads or other means.

The key thing with all this kind of advertising/encouraging membership is this: What does MLA have to offer these various groups of people?

Lots to do but it is an exciting project, I think, and I appreciate Jerry’s asking me to work on it. I’ll take any and all recommendations and ideas!

It is amazing to think that I have just one more board meeting after this one in Boston. It has been a privilege to get to know so many amazing people and to work with a continually creative group. I’m already looking forward to seeing how the next batch of board members continues the work of the Association.

06. President’s Report. Jerry McBride

Much of the work since the spring Board meeting has centered on the merger of MLA and IAML-US and planning for the implementation of the strategic plan. On July 1 the operations of IAML-US and MLA were combined. Changes were needed to the web site in order to prepare for the annual membership renewal cycle. Numerous people in MLA worked to insure that the website was ready for July 1. The final paperwork making the merger official and the combination of assets is still pending, but operationally the two organizations are now merged. As President of MLA, I attended the IAML conference in Dublin, Ireland and represented MLA as the United States branch of IAML at the Council and General Assembly meetings for the first time. The news of the merger of IAML-US and MLA was warmly received by the officers of IAML and the other representatives of the national branches. There were about 330 music librarians in attendance from every continent in the world. We have interesting things to learn from our international colleagues, but in many ways they look to the United States for innovative ideas and leadership in many areas. The full merger of IAML-US and MLA now allows us to represent the full spectrum of music librarianship in the United States and to participate as partners and equals with the other national branches of IAML. Special thanks are due to Ruthann McTyre, Past President, Judy Tsou,
President of IAML-US, and the many other people who contributed to resolving this long standing issue and bringing about the merger.

The work of the strategic planning task force was completed this summer. Now comes the work of reviewing the plan and planning for implementation. An implementation plan was drafted and submitted to the Board for comment. This plan included the formation of a strategic planning steering committee composed of members of the Board and members of MLA. Informational documents were compiled from the strategic planning task force, the Business Office, and the Development Officer for review and discussion by the steering committee, which will meet the day prior to the fall Board meeting. The implementation plan also calls for input from the membership through the establishment of six committees corresponding to each of the major areas identified in the plan.

Progress on publishing the Basic Music Library, 4th edition has been quite slow. I wrote a letter to the editor of ALA Editions, copied to the President of ALA, seeking their suggestions on how to publish the book in a timely manner. The letter appears to have had the desired effect, and there is now a plan in place with a proposed April 2012 completion date.

Several appointments were made including a search committee for the Assistant Administrative Officer chaired by Eunice Schroeder. Sara Manus and Rebecca Koblick were appointed to the Instruction Subcommittee. Andy Toulas replaces Georg Bozwick as chair of the MLA/MPA/MOLA Joint Committee with Karen Burke joining the committee as a member. Beth Iseminger was appointed to succeed Kathy Glennan as chair of the Bibliographic Control Committee following the Dallas meeting in February.

07. Editors’ Reports.
The following reports were submitted for review by the Board. When the editor requested no action from the Board, the publication and editor’s name is merely listed. In the case in which Board action is requested, a fuller discussion follows. In all cases, the Board sincerely thanks the editors for their efforts.

a. Basic Manual Series (Jean Morrow)
The current editor’s term ends at the Dallas meeting; see 09.q.iii, Publications Committee.

b. Basic Music Library (Daniel Boomhower)
ALA received the manuscript for Basic Music Library two years ago, but has yet to publish it. MLA requested and received permission from ALA to update the content by November 2011, and ALA has promised to publish Basic Music Library in April 2012. It is recommended to include clear publication deadlines in the contract for any future publication ventures with ALA.

It was moved by Susannah Cleveland, seconded by Liza Vick, and passed unanimously to reappoint the editor of the Basic Music Library.

c. Copyright Web Site (Tammy Ravas)
It was moved by Kirstin Dougan, seconded by Liza Vick, and passed unanimously to reappoint the Copyright Web Site Editor.

d. Index and Bibliography Series (Mark Palkovic)
The current editor’s term ends as of September 2011, but will remain as editor until a new editor is appointed. It was moved by Susannah Cleveland, seconded by Ruthann McTyre, and passed unanimously to appoint a search committee for the editor of the Index and Bibliography Series. McBride will provide Publications Committee chairs Linda Blotner and Phil Vandermeer with Board recommendations for search committee members.

e. Music Cataloging Bulletin (Alan Ringwood)
Ringwood was appointed in February 2011, and is not up for reappointment at this time.

f. Newsletter (Misti Shaw)
It was moved by Susannah Cleveland, seconded by Daniel Boomhower, and passed unanimously to reappoint the editor of the MLA Newsletter.

g. Notes (Jane Gottlieb)
i. Notes Editor.
It was moved by Laurie Sampsel, seconded by Liza Vick, and passed unanimously to reappoint the Notes Editor.

ii. Royalties Task Force

h. Technical Reports (Mark McKnight)
McKnight was appointed in February 2011, and is not up for reappointment at this time.

i. Web Editor (Jon Haupt)
It was moved by Daniel Boomhower, seconded by Susannah Cleveland, and passed unanimously to reappoint the Web Editor.

At its next meeting, the Planning Committee will clarify the term limits for the Web Editors, and notify the editors in advance when their terms will expire.

08. Special Officers’ Reports

The following reports were submitted for review by the Board. In the case in which the officer requested no action from the Board, the officer’s name and their title is merely listed. In the case in which Board action is requested, a fuller discussion follows. In all cases, the Board greatly appreciates the officer’s contributions to the organization.

McBride requested that the parliamentarians research why special officer reappointments are made at the fall Board meeting.

a. Advertising Manager (Anne Shelley)

Anne Shelley was appointed in 2011, and is not due for reappointment this year.

The Advertising Manager put forward four proposals to create additional advertising revenue for MLA:

1) offer advertising on the MLA site. The Board discussed the option of giving corporate members and patrons advertising priority, in price, ad placement, and length of ad run. MLA could advertise on its own site when filler is needed, but the emphasis should be on outside advertisers. Ads don’t need to displace MLA content; there are grey bars at the sides and bottom of each screen that could be used for advertising.

2) create a new web page for advertisers, with information on rates and advertising options. The Board agreed that Shelley could proceed with this now; Web Editor Jon Haupt will need to create specs for advertisers.

3) offer advertising in the MLA Newsletter, with specific recommendations tabled until the newsletter finishes changes to its format. The Board discussed issues such the possible need for a page view analysis of the newsletter; the difficulty of inserting ads into HTML vs. PDF versions; whether to give advertisers the option to place an article next to given articles; the expense of adding images to typeset pages, online or print.

4) offer clients options for tiered advertising packages. The Board needs to know what specific web site advertising options are being offered via the packages.

McBride will ask Shelley and Haupt to create mockups of what advertising would look like to present at the Dallas meeting, including ad specs and detailed pricing, for advertising on several MLA site pages: Home, Employment and education, About, Publications, Member resources, and Awards and grants; and, to create mockups and specs for the MLA Newsletter as well. Shelley will address the Board’s questions regarding ads placed by corporate patrons and members, check with A-R regarding the costs of inserting ads into the newsletter layout, and proceed with creating a page with information for advertisers, with ad specs from Haupt, after specifying what ad options a client will get in a package.

Advertising in the program booklet has been a traditional source of revenue for MLA; if the program booklet goes online only, or is provided on a flash drive, MLA could lose this revenue. McBride will ask Stephanie Bonjack to consider an online program booklet for San Jose, and to come up with a proposal by working with Shelley.

b. Convention Manager (Bonna Boettcher)

The following vote took place on June 24, 2011, between Board meetings: It was passed by majority vote to approve the convention managers recommendation to engage Sandy DiMinno of Helms-Briscoe to work with MLA: 1) to select a city and hotel for the 2014 meeting, and 2) to accept ATC’s offer to set up an air travel booking application for the 2012 meeting in Dallas.

Following execution of a hotel contract for 2014 and after gauging member response to the travel booking option for Dallas, the convention managers will send a review of the performance of Helms-Briscoe and ATC to the MLA Board.

It was moved by Susannah Cleveland, seconded by Cheryl Taranto, and passed unanimously to initiate a search for Assistant Convention Manager. McBride had recommendations for the search committee chair and membership, and welcomed suggestions.

i. 2014 meeting

Boettcher will attend the Southeast Chapter meeting in October, along with Ruthann McTyre, and will report back then on plans for the 2014 conference. McBride will confirm that the convention
managers plan to write an article for the MLA Newsletter regarding MLA’s use of professional convention management services, possibly for the November newsletter. McTyre will present at least a preliminary version of MLA’s new model for site selection at the chapter chairs meeting in Dallas.

If MLA continues to use a professional convention management firm, Helms-Briscoe, to assist with site selection, MLA will need to develop procedures in the near future how to work with chapters regarding site selection, and what kinds of assistance is needed from local arrangements committees. The procedures used for the 2014 model worked well: identify a willing chapter, work with Helms-Briscoe to find good sites in their area, and get back to the chapter for its help and cooperation. Another approach would be to consider accepting proposals from chapters for their entire areas rather than for a specific city. In the view of the convention managers, the essential LAC task is registration, even more than fund-raising. Board consensus was that McTyre will convene an ad hoc working group including the convention managers and Cassaro to discuss modifications to procedures on site selection and chapters, to review the functions of LACs, and to address fund-raising issues. McBride will contact Pat Stroh regarding coordinating fund-raising for San Jose, 2013 with the Development Officer.

ii. 2015 meeting
McBride will get back to the potential sites for the 2015 meeting, and will ask Boettcher to request Helms-Briscoe investigate these sites. In general, the convention managers need to have a conversation with Helms-Briscoe about their respective roles: given MLA’s history and practice in site selection, and given that MLA wants to streamline and find savings, how can Helms-Briscoe best work with MLA? As MLA has possible proposals for 2015, what type of services and support could Helms-Briscoe provide in these two venues? Overall, how can Helms-Briscoe work with MLA as a partner in convention planning?

b. Development (Jim Cassaro)
It was moved by Ruthann McTyre, seconded by Daniel Boomhower, and passed unanimously by the Board to reappoint the Development Officer.
Future initiatives include investigating more options for diversity scholarships, possibly in partnership with other library organizations, and creating, implementing, and promoting planned/legacy giving. Current initiatives include maintaining the rubric to assign revenue to Bradley, Hill, and O’Meara awards so that they become self-sustaining; increasing membership in Ostinato Club and Orpheus Society, and increasing the number of MLA’s sustaining members; continuing with LAC fund-raising for Dallas; investigating selling MLA Shop items online, possibly with a flat shipping fee with Mary DuMont, Promotional Sales Subcommittee Chair. The Board thanked Cassaro warmly for his excellent work, particularly for developing a broad donor base among MLA members, invaluable for grant proposals.

d. Placement Officer (Alisa Rata Stutzbach)
It was moved by Susannah Cleveland, seconded by Liza Vick, and passed unanimously to reappoint Alisa Rata Stutzbach as Placement Officer.

e. Publicity and Outreach (Renee McBride)
i. Search Committee
It was moved by Daniel Boomhower, seconded by Cheryl Taranto, and passed unanimously to initiate a search for Publicity and Outreach Officer. President McBride recommended a search committee chair, who had several suggestions for the remainder of the search committee.

f. Management Services (Jim Zychowicz)

09. Committee Reports
The following reports were submitted for review by the Board. In the case in which the chair requested no action from the Board, the committee and the chair’s name is merely listed. In the case in which Board action is requested, a fuller discussion follows. In all cases, the Board greatly appreciates the committees’ contributions to the organization.

a. Awards (Various)
Mark McKnight (Dena Epstein Award Committee), Kristen Castellana (Publication Awards Committee), Linda Blair (Best of Chapters Committee), Christopher Mehrens (Walter Gerboth Award Committee), Linda Mack (Carol June Bradley Award)
i. Epstein Award Recommendation
It was moved by Daniel Boomhower, seconded by Susannah Cleveland, and passed unanimously to approve the recommendation of the Dena Epstein Award Committee.

ii. Epstein definition of American
It was moved by Liza Vick, seconded by Cheryl Taranto, and passed unanimously to approve the recommendation of the Dena Epstein Award Committee that, for the purposes of the award, “American music” is defined as music directly relating to or that has some direct connection with the United States of America. The Board agreed that the Committee could adjust the required number of letters of recommendation at their discretion; McBride will notify McKnight.

iii. Duckles, Hill, O’Meara
It was moved by Pamela Bristah, seconded by Kirstin Dougan, and passed unanimously to approve the recommendation of the Publication Awards Committee for the Duckles, Hill, and O’Meara awards.

iv. Appoint Lenore Coral IAML Travel Award Committee
McBride made recommendations for members of the awards committee.

v. Best of Chapters
The Best of Chapters’ winners do not require Board approval, and were awarded in July 2011 by the Best of Chapters Awards Committee.

vi. Gerboth
It was moved by Cheryl Taranto, seconded by Liza Vick, and passed unanimously to approve the recommendation of the Walter Gerboth Award Committee.

vii. Bradley
It was moved by Pamela Bristah, seconded by Ruthann McTyre, and passed unanimously to approve the recommendation of the Bradley Award Committee. Cassaro recommended the Bradley family be notified of recipients of the award; McBride will follow up.

b. Bibliographic Control (Kathy Glennan)
The Library of Congress has asked for MLA participation in two task forces relating to RDA and music. The first is a joint task force to recommend changes in RDA for music for consideration by the steering committee in charge of RDA. It will have three members from MLA, along with representation from ALA, CCC, CAML, and LC. Board consensus was to put this joint task force under the BCC in the Administrative Structure. The second task force is an MLA group which will deal with the implementation of RDA for music. This second task force has a very short timeline and will begin work immediately. McBride made recommendations for members of both task forces.

c. Career Development and Services (Alan Ringwood)
No report submitted.

i. New Members’ Forum

ii. MLSG

d. Development (see 8.c)

e. Education (Abigail Cross)
No report submitted.

f. Emerging Technologies and Services (Grace Fitzgerald/Gerry Szymanski)
The following vote took place on June 15, 2011, between Board meetings: It was passed by majority vote to approve and support the Music Discovery Requirements group’s creation of a "Music Discovery Requirements" document, including a commitment to, pending final review and approval, lend official support and endorsement to the document and support its subsequent distribution to a wider audience through means to be determined but possibly including placement on the MLA web site and publication in Notes.

The terms of both co-chairs are expiring in February 2012; the Committee proposed extending Gerry Szymanski’s co-chairmanship two additional years, until 2014, creating a staggered co-chair appointment schedule. Board consensus was that this committee may not need co-chairs; historically, the committee was originally set up with co-chairs so that one came from the public services side and one from technical services, to blend the work of the two groups being merged to form the committee. But, this balance could be achieved by good representation in the membership of the committee, and by alternating the chairmanship between technical and public service librarians. The wealth of experience among the committee’s many members provides many good possibilities for chair. The present leadership dates to before this group became a committee, and generally, it’s good to give as many MLA
members as possible the opportunity to serve as chair. The Board recommendation is to ask the committee what form of chairmanship they need to do their work, in light of their charge, particularly on the technical services side. McBride solicited suggestions for chair from the Board.

It was moved by Susannah Cleveland and seconded by Kirstin Dougan to approve the recommendation of the Emerging Technologies and Services Committee that Gerry Szymanski remain as co-chair for another two years, until 2014, so that the terms of the co-chairs are staggered. The motion did not pass.

g. Finance/Investments (Cheryl Taranto)

With the dissolution of the Archive Subcommittee and with the work of the Archives Task Force in progress, MLA’s annual subvention to the University of Maryland Archives was omitted from the F2011-12 budget. The Administrative and Fiscal Officers will ask Vincent Novara at the University of Maryland to make such budget requests in the future, and the Fiscal Officer will amend the Fiscal Handbook to reflect this new procedure. It was passed unanimously to accept the Finance Committee recommendation that the FY11-12 budget be amended to include a $500 processing subvention to the University of Maryland in budget line 8.012, as a one time amendment to correct an oversight.

It was passed unanimously to accept the Finance Committee recommendation that the award amounts for FY12-13 be set as follows:

- Ducks: $500
- Hill: $250
- O’Meara: $100
- Freeman: $3750
- Gerboth: $1000
- Epstein: $2000
- Bradley: $1000
- Coral Travel: $750

Under the present terms of their contracts, authors are paid at the time of publication, while editors are paid when royalties are paid to MLA by A-R; both receive a flat fee as an honorarium, not a royalty or percentage of sales. McBride will ask if A-R could amend the agreements so that both editors and authors are paid at the point of publication. In order to do this, A-R would advance author and editor payments against future royalties to MLA, as a prepayment against projected income. This will not affect author and editor royalties from Scarecrow, which are grandfathered.

Fidelity and Calvert now manage MLA investments, automatically balancing them to match MLA’s risk profile, leaving the Investment Subcommittee little to do. It was passed unanimously to accept the Finance Committee recommendation that the Investment Subcommittee be dissolved, to be replaced by an ad hoc committee that will evaluate the Association’s investment account performance and risk profile every four years beginning in the Fall 2013. The membership of the ad hoc committee will consist of the Finance Committee augmented by the Development Officer, a representative of the Association’s business office, and a member from the MLA membership at the discretion of the President.

MLA’s counsel, Katherine Goldman, indicated that the risk in reclassifying permanently restricted (PR) assets to temporarily restricted (TR) assets is low. McBride and Rogan will contact Michael Ochs and Dena Epstein’s power of attorney to request reclassifying these assets. MLA will document the reasons for making this change, as per advice from MLA’s auditors. If past donors request their funds be restored as permanently restricted funds, the documentation will include a process to do so. If no past donor comes forward, the statute of limitations will take effect after three years (the statute of limitations in Washington DC, where MLA is incorporated). It was passed unanimously to accept the Finance Committee recommendation that the President and the Assistant Administrative Officer pursue reclassifying permanently restricted investments to temporarily restricted investments.

There were additional expenses this year to bring Strategic Planning Steering Committee members to Boston, requiring approval to designate funding from the MLA Fund as Board Designated Assets, with the understanding that any unused funds revert to the MLA Fund. It was moved by Daniel Boomhower, seconded by Kirstin Dougan, and passed unanimously to designate $5,000 from the MLA Fund as Board Designated Assets in support of strategic planning implementation.

The Finance Committee raised two issues: whether MLA should build a contingency fund into the budget as a regular, recurring part of the budget; and, as strategic planning moves forward, whether it should include financial strategic planning. The convention budget includes a small contingency budget,
which has proved helpful. Having a contingency line in the regular budget would mean that money would come from the operating budget for unexpected expenses, rather than coming from other assets, and would make developing the operating budget more challenging.

Much of the Fiscal Policy Handbook is outdated, documenting past fiscal policies and procedures, and needs replacement. The Fiscal Officer, working with the administrative officers and president, plans to revise the handbook from scratch. Rogan will check with the auditors re: what they need and expect from the handbook, since a copy goes to them. The handbook needs to be coordinated with the Administrative Handbook and other handbooks. Taranto will look at other models of fiscal handbooks and hopes to have an outline for the Dallas Board meeting. McTyre requested keeping the history of MLA fiscal policy in a separate document, as it’s useful to MLA presidents.

**h. Legislation (Eric Harbeson)**

The following vote took place on June 10, 2011, between Board meetings: **It was moved by Cheryl Taranto, seconded by Kirstin Dougan, and passed by majority vote to approve the Music Library Association joining as a signatory to the amicus brief written for the Conductors’ Guild by Steven A. Hirsch of Keker & Van Nest in the case of Golan vs. Holder before the U.S. Supreme Court supporting the position of Lawrence Golan concerning Section 514 of the Uruguay Round Table Agreements Act of 1994 that amended the U.S. Copyright Act, and thus removed many landmark works of twentieth-century music from the public domain.**

**i. Nominating (Linda Fairtile)**

**It was moved by Susannah Cleveland and seconded by Ruthann McTyre that the Board accept the ballot presented by the Nominating Committee.** The motion did not pass.

**It was moved by Jerry McBride and seconded by Ruthann McTyre to accept the Nominating Committee’s recommendation of the first candidate for the MLA Citation.** The motion did not pass.

**It was moved by Daniel Boomhower and seconded by Liza Vick to approve the Nominating Committee’s recommendation for the second candidate for the MLA Citation.** The motion did not pass.

The Board discussed the Nominating Committee’s suggestion, given the difficulty of finding candidates to run against an incumbent Recording Secretary, to revise the term of the Recording Secretary to four years, with the incumbent not allowed to succeed him/herself. Board consensus was that it could be difficult to get anyone to run for a required four-year term, and that since making these changes would require a constitutional amendment, to keep the present imperfect arrangement.

McBride will check with A-R regarding the deadline for the ballot.

**j. Oral History (Therese Dickman)**

**k. Outreach (Andrew Justice)**

No report submitted.

**l. Planning (Liza Vick)**

**i. EOP as Subcommittee/Administrative Structure**

Rogan will add Judy Tsou to the Board on the Administrative Structure. The Music Librarian Educators group decided to become a roundtable; Vick will remind John Wagstaff that six letters of support must be sent to the MLA President. The Educational Outreach Program (EOP) requested to be made a subcommittee of the Education Committee, with staggered four-year terms for two co-chairs. **It was passed unanimously to approve the Planning Committee recommendation that the EOP be made a subcommittee of the Education Committee.**

McBride will confer with the Virtual EOP Task Force and the Education Committee chair for recommendations to implement the recommendations of the task force, and for personnel to work on implementation.

**ii. MLA Committee Handbook Template**

The Board revised the template to both make it clear that committees are encouraged to work online between meetings as much as possible to help reduce the conference footprint, but that if committees are meeting at the conference, it’s important that committee and subcommittee chairs attend the annual conference in order to lead their meetings and to communicate with other chairs.

The template will live on the MLA site, embedded as a link in the committee section of the Administrative Handbook. Once committees have created their committee handbook, it’s not likely they will go back to the original template, so maintaining and updating the template is not so much an issue as
clarifying which sections of the template, i.e., which MLA expectations for committee work, are required and which are up to committee discretion.

It was passed unanimously to accept the Planning Committee’s recommendation to approve implementation of the Committee Handbook Template. The Committee did not ask the Board to approve the template itself as it is a working document, subject to change. The Board now needs to communicate that handbooks are now part of the expectations for committees. Cleveland will embed a link to the template in the committee section of the Administrative Handbook. The template will be sent to the committee chairs listserv with a cover memo drafted by Vick and Dougan, and reviewed by McBride and the rest of the Planning Committee. The cover memo should explain the requirement to produce a handbook and the purpose of the template: to have a set of common expectations for committee work, facilitate continuity through changes in chair and committee personnel, and provide committees with tools (sample appointment requests, for example) to make their work easier. The cover memo may possibly identify mandatory vs. optional template points. It will also direct questions to Vick, the Planning Officer, and request that committees complete their handbooks by Aug. 1, 2012. The cover memo will encourage and invite committees to incorporate their own documentation into their handbook, for example, information on individual committee procedures and practices. The cover memo will also encourage committees to put their handbooks on the MLA site as public documents, for the information of potential committee members, for association-wide transparency, and so that committees can learn from each other.

iii. Guidelines for MLA-Approved Surveys/Posting Survey Results on the MLA Site

The web editors can download survey results from Survey Monkey and strip out technical data so that results from MLA-approved surveys may be posted on the MLA site. But before survey results can be publicly posted, the association must get permission from respondents. Before, during, or soon after the Dallas meeting, the Planning Committee will draft a boilerplate consent form to go out with future surveys.

iv. Strategic Plan

The Committee presented changes and additions to the Strategic Planning Steering Committee’s SWOT document and to its suggested actions for a 2012-13 operational plan. The Board reviewed both revised documents, and made additional changes:

The Board added language to the SWOT analysis on getting more and better contributions to Notes and other MLA publications via a forum at the annual meeting, where editors could present on what kinds of article they were looking for, and criteria and standards for accepting articles. Experienced MLA authors could also mentor less experienced authors; a list could be compiled of members able and willing to do this kind of mentoring. There may be a perception among authors that Notes doesn’t publish articles on professional issues.

Paraprofessionals also need practical advice on how to do their jobs, like that provided by the MOUG Newsletter, possibly in a forum on the MLA site. The MLA Newsletter could be a forum for practical information, but a searchable blog would be better, something along the lines of LibAnswers.

The Board added the list of suggested actions for a 2012-13 operational plan: opening program submissions to non-members and allowing such presenters to join with their first year of dues waived; the option for members to sponsor either membership or conference registration for new members; and the suggestion that chapters could be the best forum to involve public librarians; for example, chapters could hold meetings in public libraries, and not just major ones.

The Planning Committee sought clarification from the Board that the Education Committee’s contributions to the LE@D program, as described in the committee’s annual report, wouldn’t conflict with MLA’s goal to create revenue-producing, similar types of online content. MLA needs to keep information affordable, and as broadly available as possible. A Strategic Planning Steering Committee member will be in contact with the Education Committee during implementation planning to coordinate goals.

It was passed unanimously to accept an amended Planning Committee recommendation that the Board first rename the two Strategic Plan documents (currently 2011-2015 and 2011-2020), to reflect their true nature (internal: Strategic Plan 2011--Suggested Targets and Measures of Success and external: Strategic Plan 2011), accept the plan, and then publish the external version on MLA website.

McBride also recommended changing the heading at the beginning of both documents to 2011-2020. He reviewed the implementation timeline for the strategic plan, and implementation to date: the
Steering Committee has met once, on Sept. 20, to begin developing an operational plan for 2012-13, based on the Strategic Plan. The Steering Committee looked at MLA’s financial and membership history, reviewed the Strategic Plan, went through a SWOT analysis based on the SWOT exercise done by the Strategic Planning Task Force, and brain-stormed suggested actions for the operational plan. McBride will get back to the Steering Committee with the Planning Committee and Board revisions to the SWOT analysis and suggested actions for the operational plan.

Each Steering Committee member is responsible for one of the six major areas in the Strategic Plan (Organizational Excellence, Value of the Profession, Advocacy, Membership, Education, Technology, with Membership clearly identified as a top priority) and will form a 3-4 person team, drawn from members of related MLA committees, to create operational objectives for that goal area by December. The Steering Committee will prioritize the operational objectives in January and draft an operational plan for the Dallas Board meeting. In Dallas, the Board will review the operational objectives, incorporating ideas from the Hot Topics meeting into the plan, and identifying objectives with budget implications. The operational and business plans will go to the Board and to the Fiscal Officer in early April to incorporate into next year’s budget, for consideration at the spring Board meeting as part of MLA’s operational budget for 2012-13.

Rogan is the Steering Committee liaison to MLA committee chairs and special officers, and will send them the internal version of the Strategic Plan, first adding blank spaces to encourage their ideas and responses; McTyre will send it to chapter chairs. Chairs and officers will be asked to provide their related goals to the appropriate Steering Committee member, so that the communication goes both ways.

As far as communicating the strategic plan to members and getting responses from them, there were suggestions at the spring Board meeting to have a Hot Topics meeting in Dallas, and to distribute the plan and use crowd-sourcing software such as Quora to collect responses, October 2011-January 2012. Another suggestion was to get the plan on the agenda at chapter meetings, or for Board members to present the plan at chapter meetings they attend during their business meetings, or in informal discussions. The shorter version of the plan will go on the MLA site, with notification on mla-l and in the MLA Newsletter, along with information on implementation. McBride and Vick will work further on publicizing the plan.

v. Appointment Process
To encourage more participation in MLA committees, the Planning Officer will send out a unified call for new committee members starting this fall: Vick will poll the committee chair listserv , compile the openings, and post them on MLA-L, so that members can contact the respective committee chairs and apply to be a member. McBride needs assistance sending out appointment letters after the conference; Vick contacted Jim Zychowicz, who said A-R can set up a database to generate form letters, similar to what is done to acknowledge donations. Vick will send McBride more information.

vi. Open Board Meetings/Transparency
The Committee will draft a set of guidelines and procedures regarding open Board meetings by Thanksgiving, and will present a final version to for Board review at the Dallas meeting.

vii. Guidelines for Chapter Grants
At the June 2011 Board meeting, the Committee was charged to create guidelines for tracking use of chapter grants and for better reporting procedures. The Committee will work on this once finished with drafting guidelines for open Board meetings.

viii. Get Involved Sessions
The concept for last year’s Get Involved session in Philadelphia originated with the Board, but it’s now a member-proposed program from Vick and Cleveland. If it continues to be a successful program, they’d prefer it come under a committee or other official MLA entity to allow for succession planning, continuity, and a reporting structure. The Committee recommended repeating the program for a second year at the Dallas meeting before asking the Board to decide, to get more responses regarding the program’s effectiveness and to determine whether to hold it annually or every other year. The Career Development and Services or Outreach Committees, or the New Members Forum are possible homes for the program. Putting it under the aegis of the New Members Forum would, obviously, be a very effective way to involve new members, but it would need to make clear that Get Involved is for all members, new and old. Other possibilities are to reconstitute the Membership Committee, or to fold Get Involved into a suite of programs presented at the conference for members, also including conference mentoring and a new members’ forum. McBride would also like to see what comes out of membership initiatives from the
Strategic Plan process; it’s clear that MLA needs an ongoing means to continually work on membership, either via an existing committee or a new group.

ix. Other Business

1. Roundtables

The new program policy of requiring roundtables to present either a program session or meeting, but not both, seems to be working well, and should continue for the San Jose conference; Dougan will review and discuss this policy with San Jose program chair Stephanie Bonjack at the Program Committee meeting in Dallas.

The Administrative Handbook section on roundtables needs clarification, in particular in regard to budgets and money; this could be ready by the Dallas meeting. The Committee and Board agreed that the next handbook template to be developed will be for roundtables.

2. Technology

The Committee will wait for the outcome of the Information Technology Task Force before doing more planning around technology. Until then, committee and chapter chairs can use GoogleApps if they wish by requesting an account from the web editors. Dougan will get answers to MLA’s issues on GoogleApps licensing issues to pass along to the IT TF and the web editors, for their plate of information.

3. Program Committee Survey Task Force

This new task force, chaired by Laura Gayle Green, is tasked with reviewing regular conference surveys. Green will copy Vick on the task force report.

m. Preservation (Sandi-Jo Malmon)

No report submitted.

n. Program

i. Program (Morris Levy)

The Board reviewed the proposed 2012 Dallas program, and requested changes:

- the Hot Topics session on the Strategic Plan conflicts with a BCC business meeting, and overlaps with other business meetings; McBride will request Levy find a Saturday morning or afternoon slot for Hot Topics without conflicts, or create a new Town Hall session without conflicts for member feedback on the Strategic Plan, possibly Saturday morning, leaving Hot Topics as an open, unprogrammed session.

- a number of events are not yet in the schedule: Roundtable Coordinators and Committee Chairs coordinating meeting; Development Committee business meeting, or any other business meetings usually held on Wednesday afternoon; Chapter Chairs meeting; Editors meeting.

- if possible, consolidate several of the 30-minute sessions to free up blocks of time for the above.

- there are two business meetings scheduled for Music Treasures, an informal group not in the Administrative Structure; such groups need to meet informally, without room assignments.

It was moved by Laurie Sampsel, seconded by Daniel Boomhower, and passed unanimously to approve the preliminary Dallas 2012 program, with requested changes.

ii. Local Arrangements (Tina Murdock and Michelle Hahn)

o. Public Libraries (David King)

p. Public Services (Jim Farrington)

i. Reference Access Services Subcommittee

ii. Instruction

No report submitted.

q. Publications (Linda Solow Blotner and Philip Vandermeer)

i. E-Publications Subcommittee

The Committee recommended creating an e-publication subcommittee. Board consensus was that the Publications Committee is the best forum for defining what series and publications would be best for e-publication, and for developing a business plan regarding pricing and costs to move current publications online. There was also concern that a separate subcommittee would silo-ize online publications, rather than integrating them with MLA’s publications as a whole. And, there are several facets of this issue represented in the Strategic Plan; when the Publications Committee responds to the plan, they can address questions about focus and planning, and what MLA as an organization should be
publishing online. McBride will notify the Committee that a subcommittee is not the answer at this time, but instead ask the Committee to respond to the issue in light of the Strategic Plan, and to draft goals and objectives that relate to e-publication.

ii. Web Staffing

The Committee requested additional staffing for the MLA web site, and a redefinition of the Web Editor’s responsibilities. The Board response was that the Information Technology Task Force is working on this issue and will address it very soon, with RFPs due from online services companies by the Dallas meeting. The Web Editors may always request additional funding for special projects as part of the regular budget process. Both needs are intimately related to MLA’s comprehensive approach to support IT needs; the Publications Committee is encouraged to send staffing needs, in as detailed a fashion as possible, to the Information Technology Task Force. McBride will notify Jon Haupt and the Publications Committee.

iii. Basic Manual Series—Co-Editors Appointment

As the present editor’s term as editor ends at the Dallas meeting, she has made a recommendation to appoint two co-editors. The Board agreed, with the proviso that they will be one-year, temporary appointments, from the Dallas through the San Jose meetings. The appointments will be made with the understanding that the Basic Manual and Technical Reports series need review by the Publications Committee to define and clarify the publication focus of each series, and possibly to re-define them; and with the understanding that if the Basic Manual series continues in one form or another, there will be a search for a permanent editor next year. There are four signed contracts at present, two of which will be published in the series, and two others which may be reassigned. Honoraria will be assigned to an editor who completes a given book. McBride will notify Phil Vandermeer, incoming chair of the Publications Committee.

iv. Scarecrow

Given Scarecrow’s unwillingness to work with MLA, and given the age of Scarecrow’s MLA publications, they will no longer be advertised and will be considered out of print as far as MLA is concerned, although Scarecrow may continue to sell them, or may print them on demand. The Publications Committee will review these titles to decide which could be brought out in revised editions, or be revised as new publications. McBride will notify the Publications Committee chairs and the Publicity and Outreach Officer.

r. Resource Sharing and Collection Development (Keith Cochran)

i. Digital Audio Collections Task Force (Daniel Boomhower)

The task force was constituted two years ago to diagnose and to seek remedies to the problems libraries face in continuing to shape and preserve collections of digital content, since the ability to acquire such content is increasingly hampered both by license agreements with intermediary content aggregators and by restrictive language in end-user license agreements. The task force proposed a coordinated, multi-faceted approach in concert with other organizations and individuals, via four proposals of possible actions.

1. Instigate development of a JSTOR model: nonprofit, subscription-based archival repository
2. Instigate establishment of a Portico or CLOCKSS-like deep archive
3. Encourage individual institutions to seek solutions independently
4. Pursue association-wide-legal (including legislative and judicial) efforts

The four proposals are not mutually exclusive. The task force was charged with planning; another group will need to be convened to implement any or all of the above actions.

Tsou reported that the University of Washington has received an NEH grant for similar kinds of planning, and is preparing a grant application to IMLS for implementation, with John Vallier, Head of Media Distributed Services, as the point person. MLA could partner with the University of Washington on the IMLS grant, as NEH strongly recommended, with MLA as the primary grantee.

McBride thought that more information is needed about the IMLS grant first, and that a grant to underwrite a formal white paper studying the entire issue for libraries is what is called for, such as some of the studies published by CLIR. Boomhower said the task force considered this option, which presented two issues: the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) is in the middle of this issue, so such a report could be duplicative (CLIR is publishing the NHPRC reports); and, MLA’s issue is one piece of the larger puzzle of digital scholarship in music. He favored instead a grant to fund a study of the entire issue, covering a wide range of questions such as: what is the entire digital ecosystem.
for music scholarship; how, for example, does the Sheet Music Consortium and library digitization relate to ebooks and digital audio files and Grove music; what are the financial implications for libraries of sustaining resources for the scholarly community; how much do libraries spend on all these resources, and how are they going to sustain this spending. Boomhower recommended writing a grant to hire a knowledgeable analyst to collaborate with the principal investigator in developing this study.

McBride thanked the task force for their work on dealing with this very complex issue, and stressed the importance of MLA taking a leadership role on this particular issue. He will discuss the IMLS grant with Vallier to see how MLA can approach it.

10. Joint Committees
The following reports were submitted for review by the Board. In the case in which the chair requested no action (or only budget action) from the Board, the committee and chair’s name is merely listed. In the case in which Board action is requested, a fuller discussion follows. In all cases, the Board greatly appreciates the committee’s contributions to the organization.
   a. AMS, Joint Committee on RISM (Darwin Scott)
   b. MPA/MOLA Joint Committee (George Boziwick)
   c. U.S. RILM Office (Sarah Adams)

11. IAML

12. Representatives to Other Organizations
The following reports were submitted for review by the Board. In the case in which the representative requested no action from the Board, the organization and the representative’s name is merely listed. In the case in which Board action is requested, a fuller discussion follows. In all cases, the Board greatly appreciates the representative’s contributions to the organization.
   a. ALA (Stephanie Bonjack)
      No report submitted.
   b. NISO (Mark McKnight)
      No report submitted.
   c. MOUG (Damian Iseminger)

13. Old Business
   a. Branch Libraries Task Force
   b. Archives Policies Task Force
      No report submitted.
   c. Strategic Plan 2011-2015, see Planning Committee, 09.l.iv
   d. Strategic Plan 2011-2020, see Planning Committee, 09.l.iv

14. New Business
   a. Annual Meeting Survey Task Force
      No report submitted. See Planning Committee, 09.l.ix.3
   b. Information Technology Task Force (Michael Rogan)
      The task force presented its preliminary report to the Board for feedback. The task force surveyed the administrative structure—committee chairs, chapter chairs, roundtable coordinators, special officers, and editors—on what technology they are currently using, what their points of frustration are in terms of getting their work done, and what they’d like to see in a better support model. From this, the group proposed an ideal future state in order to draft an RFP that includes lists of functionality. On advice from staff involved with RFP processes at Tufts, the RFP will not go out to a web design firm, as charged. In order to encompass fully the level of functionality MLA needs, the RFP will go out to a variety of types of technology firms, including firms for web development, to associations which have tools such as ALA Connect, identity management, learning management providers, and client management/fund raising systems. This should provide the Board with a range of responses to consider at the Dallas meeting; the task force wants to make sure MLA is asking for the right things.
      These feature two major changes: a single, uniform set of technological tools for MLA work, including a centralized web site infrastructure used by all MLA entities; and incorporating chapter membership renewal and information into one deep data pool, centralized either at A-R or elsewhere.
Based on responses to the RFP, the task force will recommend specific firms to the Board, but will also provide summaries of all proposals for Board consideration. The end result will likely be collaboration between A-R and other firms/systems, as that’s what MLA can afford. Part of the RFP criteria is that MLA’s systems must be affordable and sustainable.

Centralizing chapter websites and membership information is intended to offer additional services and infrastructure to chapters, not removing authority over content. The task force is not proposing that chapter have their financial assets held or administered centrally, but if a chapter wishes to have a relationship with A-R like MLA’s with funds maintained by the business office, that would be an option.

When the Midwest Chapter used A-R for conference registration, it proved expensive. There could be resistance to chapters using A-R in general because of their prices; chapter dues have traditionally been very low. It’s possible that MLA’s contract would cover the switchover for chapters. The presumption is an economy of scale; centralized systems will work best once all chapters use them. Eventually, the goal is to have each chapter site hosted by MLA, along with local arrangement sites, and to have chapter and national members in one database. MLA may have to proceed chapter by chapter, but the end game is that we are one association, with one repository for membership information.

Chapter membership would increase if it were offered on the national membership renewal form, just as there’s been an increase in IAML membership now that it’s an option on MLA’s renewal form. Moving to a centralized web site infrastructure would provide additional services and tools, chiefly the ability to work collaboratively across the association, using blogs, wikis, or whatever mechanisms chapters want to adopt. It also would provide a common set of tools for committees across the organization, so that work and information could be shared easily. It would relieve chapter officers from management work and give them more time to focus on content.

The Board endorsed the preliminary report of the task force, and looks forward to the final report, including responses to the RFP, in Dallas.

c. Chapter Elections by Survey Monkey

The Midwest Chapter is using Survey Monkey for this year’s chapter elections.

15. Adjournment

It was moved by Daniel Boomhower, seconded by Kirstin Dougan, and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 4:50pm.