MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors
Online Meeting, November 14, 2011
Dallas, Texas, February 13-15, 18, 19, 2012

Monday 14 November, 1:00pm-1:34pm; Monday 13 February, 1:07pm-5:20pm (Finance and Planning Committees);
Tuesday 14 February 9:04am-5:42pm; Wednesday, 15 February 9:04am-12:11am; Saturday 18 February 10:30am-
11:27am; Sunday 19 February 9:02am-11:30am

Present: Linda Blair, Daniel Boomhower, Pamela Bristah (recording), Susannah Cleveland, Kirstin Dougan (all but
09.a.iii), Jerry McBride (presiding), Ruthann McTyre, Laurie Sampsel, Cheryl Taranto, Judy Tsou (all but 09.r.i and
09.r.ii), Liza Vick

Absent: Michael Rogan (all but November 14)

Guests: Bonna Boettcher (08.b, 13.f, 14.e), Paul Cary (all but 09.r.i and 09.r.ii), James Cassaro (all but 09.r.i and
09.r.ii), Michael Colby (all), Eric Feidner (14.e), Pat Fiskian (09.r.ii), Laura Gayle Green (08.b, 13.f, 14.e), Paula
Hickner (all but 09.r.ii), Stephen Landstreet (all but 09.r.i and 09.r.ii), Nancy Nuzzo (13.a), Mark Scharff (all but
09.r.i and 09.r.ii)

The meeting was called to order by Jerry McBride.

01. Approval of Agenda
   It was moved by Ruthann McTyre, seconded by Daniel Boomhower, and carried unanimously that
   the agenda be approved as amended.
   It was subsequently moved by Pamela Bristah, seconded by Daniel Boomhower, and carried
   unanimously to add discussion of the Digital Audio Task Force to the agenda as item number 13.f.

02. Recording Secretary’s Report. Pamela Bristah
   It was moved by Susannah Cleveland, seconded by Ruthann McTyre, and carried unanimously that
   the minutes of the Board meeting held in Boston, Massachusetts, September 21-23, 2011 be approved as
   corrected.

03. Parliamentarian’s Report. Susannah Cleveland
   Cleveland made numerous changes to the Administrative Handbook due to the Constitutional changes
   voted in by the membership. These changes were voted on by the Board.
   Previously, the Administrative Handbook covered editors only in the Publications Committee section, but
   editors report to the Board and President, and the Assistant Web Editor is not a member of the Publications
   Committee. Cleveland created a section for Publications, derived from the section for Special Officers. Board
   minutes, and job descriptions. Determine term limits for the web editors; McBride will follow up. The Board
   requested specifying that this section applies to series editors, as opposed to monographic editors or authors. The
   addition of this section requires renumbering of the Administrative Handbook, and the Committee Handbook
   template. It was passed unanimously to approve the addition of a Publications section (V) to the
   Administrative Handbook, as amended.
   The Handbook contained ambiguous instructions to Round tables regarding projects. It was passed
   unanimously to approve conditional language added to the Round table section (old VI.D., current VII.D).
   Cleveland created guidelines on parliamentary procedure, clarifying what constitutes a motion vs. a Board-
   action-required (BAR), and how to handle each. It was approved unanimously to approve the addition of “Notes
   on Parliamentary Practice in the MLA Board” as Appendix A in the Administrative Handbook.
   Cleveland edited the Handbook based on Board decisions to:
   • define the U.S. focus of the Epstein Award
   • move vendor returns of MLA publications from Administrative Officer section to the Publications
     section
   • remove language about Emerging Technologies Committee maintaining digest of MLA-L
   • delete references to the Investments Subcommittee
• remove references to convention budgets in the fall
• make updates to the BCC section requested by the committee (making editor of MCB non-voting and updating language to reflect changes to names of outside organizations BCC reps report from)
• eliminate a sentence in the section on the ALA liaison about registration for Midwinter (it indicated that it was conditional when the rest of the paragraph indicated that MLA provides financial support)

**It was passed unanimously to approve other edits to the Administrative Handbook.**

The new version of the Handbook, which will be easier to revise and maintain, should be on the MLA site soon. The Board applauded Cleveland for her terrific work as Parliamentarian over the past two years.

04. **Administrative Officer’s Report.** Linda Blair

A. Q3 to date budget report
   a. Income
      1.01.1 Dues income is at $144,862.00 or 104.22% of the budget projected
      All categories exceeded projections with the exception of:
      1.0121 IAML Institutional members: $9870 or 75.2%. These are continuing to arrive, because most renewals were sent out in January
      1.013 Student members: $5330 or 88.48%
      Categories which did exceptionally well:
      1.011 IAML Individual members: $8050 or 164.29%
      1.015 Sustaining members: $14,740 or 111.67%
      1.017 Corporate patrons: $5340 or 138.7%
      2.0 Sales income stands at $47,642.91, or 32.13% of the budget
      2.0112 Institutional Notes subscriptions: $24,328.70 or 92.51%
      2.012 Notes advertising: $6262.50 or 31.31%. Currently only one issue seems to be reflected in this total
      2.014 Notes royalties: $4932.36 or 5.48%. This is not unusual for this time of year. The majority of royalty income arrives in March and April
      2.05 Monographic series royalties typically arrive in March and April also
      Total income as of Feb. 2, 2012: $313,611.36, or 71.13% of the budgeted projection
   b. Expenses
      At this point a number of our once-yearly expenses have been paid, such as awards, subsidies and chapter support
      6.0122 Web design and development is currently at $3450, or 118.97%. Overage to approve: $550
      6.0192 Legal fees, currently at $2720.10 or 181.34%. This is a result of our ongoing efforts to complete our merger with IAML-US – half of these fees are to be paid from IAML funds
      Total expenses as of Feb. 2, 2012: $179,337.63 or 37.92% of budget

B. Investments

The total value of our investment accounts as of Feb. 3, 2012 was $858,206.50, of which $659,508.78 was held in the Fidelity accounts and $198,697.72 in socially responsible accounts at Calvert. During November and December, $2833.08 was moved from the Board Designated Assets account at Fidelity to checking to cover Strategic Planning travel expenses and $8150 to cover the payment of awards. As of Feb. 3, $2167.19 of the $5000 allocated for Strategic Planning remained in the BDA account.

C. Election 2011

756 ballots were sent out for the Fall 2011 election. Of these, 466 were returned, with 20 invalid, for a return rate of 61.64%—not quite as high as last year, but still a much higher percentage than ever reached with paper ballots. Paper ballots are still being mailed to those who opt out of SurveyMonkey, or who prefer to vote by this method.

D. Membership

Overall, ca. 10% behind where we were at the end of 2010-2011.
• 15% decrease in Notes subscribers
• 6% decrease in Individual members in most classes
• 28% decrease in Student members
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership type</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012 to 1/31/12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual-US</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual-Non US</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAML Individual</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAML Institutional</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional-US</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional-Non US</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-US</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Non US</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired-US</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired-Non US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining-US</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</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-Non US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Member-US</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessional-US</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessional-Non US</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes Institutional-US sub</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes Institutional-Non US</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals excluding IAML</strong></td>
<td><strong>1365</strong></td>
<td><strong>1236</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAML Individual</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAML Institutional</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Publications

In calendar year 2011, a total of 265 units were sold in the remaining monographs co-published by Scarecrow. This represents a 60% increase over the 2010 total of 166 units. We have not yet received the royalty statements, so the actual figure for royalties paid to MLA is not yet known, but based on last year’s figures I would estimate it to be about $1600 with approximately $645 of this to be paid to individual authors and editors.

For our A-R Editions titles, we sold a total of 498 units in 2011, earning royalties of $3678.35. Royalties were paid to Jerry McBride and Mark Palkovic in the amount of $850 at the end of FY 10-11. The total number of units sold in 2011, through Scarecrow and A-R Editions combined, is 763.

F. Other activities

- E-postcard 990 forms were filed with the IRS on behalf of our chapters
- Form 1099 earnings statements were mailed to all members earning honoraria and royalties which exceeded the IRS guidelines for reporting
- Accounts were set up with Adobe Connect and GoToMeeting to allow the Board to experiment with video conferencing. The account with GoToMeeting was cancelled because the service did not meet our needs. Since November, a series of tests have been conducted using Adobe Connect, with increasingly successful results.
- Our Board account with ATC Travel Concepts has been used by Board Members, Strategic Planning Task Force members, and various committee members since the account was opened in Aug. 2011. There have been a total of 12 bookings, with an average fare of $334. Taking into account the service fee, the average booking has cost $366.

McBride noted that the Bradley Award doesn’t yet have a separate account at Fidelity. Its funds are tracked by A-R and are presently in a cash account; Patrick Wall will deposit Bradley funds into a Fidelity investment account, and will make quarterly deposits in future.

IAML memberships run on a calendar year, where MLA memberships run on a fiscal year; Tsou requested the new, proposed membership chart reflect this difference. IAML institutional memberships are down this year; Jim Zychowicz is working with subscription vendors to move subscriptions to an early renewal cycle, starting in July,
not January. IAML’s portion of the membership dues paid to MLA for IAML memberships is due to IAML in March; Linda Blair will discuss details with the IAML treasurer and work out procedures for payment.

MLA has a large number of American Express points which Board members can use for free travel to Board meetings, saving MLA travel costs.

05. **Past President’s Report.** Ruthann McTyre

My time during this last quarter of my term on the board has been spent working with the Membership portion of the Strategic Plan, consulting with Jerry as needed, and weaning myself away from board discussions as I thought appropriate, which you will note was most of the time. (ha)

I will continue to serve on the Strategic Plan Implementation Team, focusing my energies on Membership. Otherwise, I think it is time to step back for a bit and simply be available for moral support and encouragement to a board that has a very full plate set before it.

I applaud all of you for the work you have done, will continue to do, and the manner in which you have and will conduct yourselves even in the midst of very difficult discussions. Working with all of you, and the previous board members too, has been one of the joys and privileges of my life. Thanks for being the wonderful colleagues you are.

Don’t be surprised if you see my face in the windows in Middleton in a few months. Withdrawal will be tough!

06. **President’s Report.** Jerry McBride

The strategic plan was the focus of much of the work of this fall. Four implementation teams were appointed to join the existing IT implementation team and the steering committee. The implementation teams were charged to complete their tasks by December 15. In January, the reports of the implementation teams were prepared for and mounted on the website with a space for member comments. As of this writing (9 February), there have been only two comments: One on the possible use of social media and on a possible stronger policy support for music branch libraries. I worked with a subgroup of the steering committee to draft the action steps related to organizational excellence. Arrangements were made with the Program Committee and with Tom Caw for the “Hot Topics” session to be held at the conference on the strategic plan. I have also been thinking about and doing some research on policies for endowment funds and how that might apply to our use of the MLA Fund.

The saga of the MLA/IAML merger continues. I am still working with our counsel to get the final documents accepted. The corporation laws of the District of Columbia changed again on 1 January 2012. MLA was incorporated under the law that was in effect prior to the law that was in effect in 2011. MLA now has to update its corporate standing to the 2012 law before the merger documents will be accepted. To come into compliance, HIQ Corporate Services, Inc. was engaged to serve as our resident agent in the District of Columbia for the purpose for filing our corporate documentation every two years. Hopefully, all of this will be resolved soon.

Suzanne Epstein, Dena and Mort Epstein’s daughter, was contacted to receive permission to change the Epstein Fund from permanently restricted to temporarily restricted. She asked to see the original fund guidelines. It was not an easy matter to locate this 1995 document in the MLA Archives, but it was eventually found in the papers of President Jane Gottlieb. The document states that the guidelines must be passed down to every president. There are also other provisions of the original agreement that we need to adhere to closely. Based on her reading of the document, Ms. Epstein did not feel that her permission was required and counsel confirmed this.

The Advertising Manager and Website Editor were asked to prepare mockups of advertising for the website for the Board to review. The 2013 Program Chair was asked to work with the convention managers on a proposal for an electronic program booklet. An amended publication agreement was drafted and signed between MLA and A-R editions simplifying and clarifying the payment process for editors and authors in the monographic series. A letter was sent to the President of the University of Hartford urging him to reconsider a plan to close the performing arts library at the Hartt School of Music and integrating the staff and collections into the main library.

Appointments:

- **Search Committees**
  - Assistant Convention Manager chaired by Paula Hickner
  - Publicity and Outreach Officer chaired by Patricia Fisk
  - Index and Bibliography Series Editor chaired by Jean Morrow (position filled by Richard Griscom)

- ** Committees**
  - Lenore Coral IAML Travel Grant Committee chaired by Linda Solow Blotner
  - Subject Access Subcommittee: Kevin Kishimoto mid-year appointment
Committee Chairs
- Descriptive Cataloging Subcommittee: Tracey Snyder
- Emerging Technologies Committee: Stephen Henry
- Education Committee: to be determined
- 2014 Local Arrangements Committee: Kevin Fleming and Shelley Smith
- 2014 Program Committee: Gerry Szymanski

Positions
- SACO Funnel Coordinator: Nancy Lorimer
- Public Libraries Association Liaison: Kristie Nelsen

Task Forces
- Virtual EOP Task Force chaired by Veronica Wells
- RDA Music Revisions Facilitation Task Force: 3 members (a joint committee with LC, ALA, CCC, and CAML)
- RDA Music Implementation Task Force chaired by Casey Mullin

The Digital Audio Task Force has not yet been appointed as the charge of this group remains elusive. Hopefully, the task force can be appointed and charged shortly following the conference.

The Board decided fiscal guidelines in the Epstein Award documentation will be added to the Fiscal Policy Handbook by Boomhower, and other Epstein Award guidelines will be added to the Administrative Handbook by Sampsel. McBride will keep copies of all existing gift records at A-R, as well as in his presidential files, and copies of existing gift letters will go to Cassaro. The Board recommend retrieving and filing documentation for Wicker, Ochs (established 2002), and Freeman (est. 1995) funds as was done for Epstein; McBride will follow up.

The Board discussed offering a Presidential letter of support when a music branch library may be closed; the Board will consider this when reviewing the Branch Libraries Task Force report.

Stephanie Bonjack, Chair of the 2013 San Jose Program Committee, recommended members for the committee; they will be appointed shortly. McBride will work with Gerry Szymanski, Chair of the 2014 Atlanta Program Committee, to appoint its members.

The Music Librarianship Educators Round Table has been established, John Wagstaff, coordinator. The Technical Services Round Table was renewed.

Susannah Cleveland will chair the Nominating Committee.

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

a. Basic Manual Series (Jean Morrow)
b. Basic Music Library (Daniel Boomhower)
c. Copyright Web Site (Tammy Ravas)
d. Index and Bibliography Series (Mark Palkovic)
e. Music Cataloging Bulletin (Alan Ringwood)
f. Newsletter (Misti Shaw)
g. Notes (Jane Gottlieb)
   i. Editor
   ii. Notes Royalties Task Force
      see 13.d
h. Technical Reports (Mark McMiknight)
i. Web Editor (Jon Haupt)

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.

a. Advertising Manager (Anne Shelley)
The following vote took place via email on November 29, 2011, between Board meetings: It was moved by Susannah Cleveland and seconded by Daniel Boomhower to accept the Advertising Manager's proposal to increase advertising rates by approximately 10 percent, and to maintain
the Corporate Patron and Corporate Member discounts at 20% and 10%, respectively. The motion passed unanimously.

At the Board meeting in Dallas, the Board reviewed Shelley’s proposed mockups for advertising on the MLA site, and suggested that vendor links open in a new window or tab, so as not take the viewer away from the MLA site. The Board had several questions and recommendations for Shelley: what would the actual advertisements look like—logos, or full-fledged ads? Ads will link to the advertiser’s site; the Board recommended the link be set up so the advertiser knows the viewer came from the MLA site. How much of a page would be used for ads, and would there be specific areas set aside for ads? What effect would advertising have on MLA’s non-profit status? How much ad revenue could MLA generate without endangering its not-for-profit status?

The Board didn’t support advertising on MLA-L, in part because MLA doesn’t own or moderate the list, in part because advertising doesn’t fit into the culture of an open, non-commercial listserv. But, the Newsletter would be a good location for advertising. Ad rates would be different from those for MLA site ads; both would be online, but newsletter ads would be permanent. Newsletter ad revenue may help replace ad revenue lost by Notes going online.

The Copyright page editors are concerned regarding the prospect of anti-copyright ads on their page. The Copyright page was not among the six MLA site pages identified for advertising at the fall 2011 Boston Board meeting. They were: Home page; Employment and education; About MLA; Publications; Member resources; and Awards and grants. McBride observed that MLA doesn’t have to accept all ads, and that advertising doesn’t constitute endorsement.

Bohmhower, Cleveland, and others suggested allowing ads on the Current openings/Job openings page as well, and to charge employers to place ads, as was done when the Job List appeared in print, with free or reduced rate listings for institutional members or subscribers. ALA charges for job listings, and has useful guidelines for charges, length of ad run, and other specifics.

The Board okayed moving ahead with advertising on the MLA site, after Blair gets an answer from MLA’s accountant about the implications of selling ads on MLA’s non-profit status, and maximum permissible ad revenue, and requested that Shelley add to the informational page for advertisers, which MLA pages are available for ads: Home; Employment and education; About MLA; Publications; Member resources; and Awards and grants, with the possible addition of the Current openings/Job openings page. The Board does not want advertising on the Copyright page, for the time being. McBride will notify Shelley of Board decisions, and get answers to Board questions. McBride requested Blair also ask MLA’s accountant about the implications of advertising on a listserv.

The Board may need to discuss online advertising at its online meeting, possibly in March, so that Shelley can start selling ads on July 1.

b. Convention Manager (Bonna Boettcher)

The following vote took place via email on December 15-16, 2011, between Board meetings: It was moved by Laurie Sampsel and seconded by Susannah Cleveland to accept the recommendation of the Convention Managers to accept the contract offered by the Grand Hyatt Atlanta for the MLA annual meeting to be held 23 February through 2 March 2014. Boettcher clarified that the 2014 catering minimum includes all catered MLA events (not just the banquet), that MLA’s tax exempt status applies to federal taxes, but not to state taxes, and that service charges are standard and usually non-negotiable. The Board expressed concern that a major reason to work with professional conference management, and particularly starting with their recommendation of location and planning from there, was to increase hotel options in a given city; the more hotel options, the more bargaining power MLA has for room rates and hotel fees. Boettcher clarified that Atlanta hotel options were limited chiefly due to getting a late start, after Nashville fell through, and that HelmsBriscoe successfully negotiated a lower room rate, a good catering minimum, no meeting room fees, and free Internet in guest rooms and meeting rooms in Atlanta. Boettcher also clarified that MLA needs to begin looking at hotels three to four years before each meeting for optimum results. In negotiations, the convention managers emphasize saving attendees money—via lower room rates, and concessions for Internet access, catering, and a/v to keep registration rates as low as possible—vs. focusing on saving the association money; Boettcher recommended further discussion on this. The motion passed unanimously.

The remainder of the Convention Manager presentation, discussion, and votes took place at the Dallas Board meeting.

Dallas 2012: these are preliminary, not final, figures, valid as of February 9, 2012.

Registration overview
### Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Projected number/amount</th>
<th>Actual as of 2/9/2012 number/amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early, member</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>300/$72,000</td>
<td>285/$68,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early, 1st 3 years</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>45/$8,100</td>
<td>36/$6,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early, non-member</td>
<td>$340</td>
<td>16/$5,440</td>
<td>3/$1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced for work</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>13/$1,690</td>
<td>13/$1,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular, member</td>
<td>$340</td>
<td>5/$1,700</td>
<td>9/$3,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular, non-member</td>
<td>$440</td>
<td>0/$0</td>
<td>2/$880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>50/$4,750</td>
<td>32/$2,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single day</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>25/$3,125</td>
<td>8/$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying person</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>10/$1,250</td>
<td>2/$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>464/$98,055</td>
<td>390/$85,390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Projected number/amount</th>
<th>Actual as of 2/9/2012 number/amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extra banquet tickets</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>10/$950</td>
<td>21/$1,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit fees</td>
<td>$550/base</td>
<td>60/$26,070</td>
<td>38 paid/$19,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>$10.150</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program advertising</td>
<td>$200-$400</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$5,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packet inserts</td>
<td>$100-$300</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUG</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$44,670</td>
<td>$32,815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOUG numbers will be available after the meeting. Obviously, registration and exhibits did not meet preliminary estimates, nor did contributions; advertising exceeded projections. Overall, income was less than projected. The good side is that some expenses can be reduced accordingly.

Expenses are always a moving target, but a/v expenses will be lower than projected, as the program ended up calling for three rooms with a/v setups vs. the original four, and MLA received a 22% discount from the a/v company, PSAV, and a very good price on the open wireless in the hotel.

This year’s meeting included several experiments that the convention managers would like feedback on: open wireless in the main ballroom; using half the main ballroom for plenaries, and half for exhibits; multiple groups meeting simultaneously in the plenary half of the ballroom; and, one large breakout room set up classroom style, with tables and 110 seats.

Other groups meeting during the conference are MOUG, the James Adrian Board, and a small private reception. MLA will bill the parties involved.

Dallas exhibitors: there are generally more exhibitors at east coast meetings, the economy had an effect on numbers, and not every exhibitor comes every year. Some exhibitors registered late this year; there will be a new online registration process for exhibitors next year, which should streamline the registration process. New exhibitors in Dallas were Galant Masters Project, Libra Books, and SingersBabel.

The convention managers are now required to re-file master account paperwork with hotels each January as it expires after one year, as per the Sarbanes-Oxley act.

San Jose 2013: the hotel is again a Fairmont, 27 February – 3 March, 2013. MLA members who have joined Fairmont’s Presidents Club, which is free, will again get free wireless in their hotel room. The Board having voted on speaker fees and a/v fees (cf. Finance Committee, 09.g), Boettcher will notify Program Chair Stephanie Bonjack of the approved fees; the a/v fee will cover two rooms, as recommended by the convention managers, down from three. Boettcher will work with the hotel regarding room block requirements.

**It was moved by the convention managers and seconded by Ruthann McTyre to implement online registration for exhibitors, starting with the 2013 San Jose conference.** The motion passed unanimously.

---

1 There were 8 gratis tables. This number reflects paid exhibitor tables.
Atlanta 2014: HelmsBriscoe made Green’s site visit easy, provided a great checklist for hotel visits, and were extremely helpful in site selection. MLA will meet 26 February – 2 March, 2014 at the Grand Hyatt in Buckhead, an Atlanta neighborhood with many dining and shopping options. The hotel is lovely, provides complimentary Internet in hotel rooms, and is 1.5 blocks to a mass transit station.

2015: the convention managers were very impressed with the Salt Lake City proposal from the Mountain-Plains Chapter. The Board was similarly impressed, and hopes that Salt Lake works out as the site for the 2015 conference. HelmsBriscoe is looking into hotels in Salt Lake City, but there are only two viable options. In case neither is available or meets MLA’s needs and rates, the convention managers have asked HelmsBriscoe to investigate hotel options in other mid-country locations: Denver, St. Louis, and Chicago. Denver was the second choice of the Chapter, and Phoenix third, with nearby locations also an option, such as Tempe. Boettcher will ask HelmsBriscoe to investigate options in and nearby Phoenix as well, with the caveat that Phoenix can be an expensive destination in winter.

Scharff asked if there was local interest in hosting a MLA conference in these particular cities. Boettcher said that, to give HelmsBriscoe negotiating room, MLA indicates a preferred city while giving HelmsBriscoe latitude to investigate other cities in the surrounding region; this keeps MLA meetings in regional rotation while not locking MLA down to a specific city. The model for site selection is morphing; instead of starting with a chapter proposal to the Board, the Board and convention managers make a proposal to a chapter—and not for a specific city, but for a to-be-determined city in its geographic area. McTyre agreed to talk to the chapter chairs in Dallas regarding this new approach. MLA will continue to hold meetings in a three-year geographic rotation, and will not return to one location every other year; this was proposed as a cost-saving move but in fact will not reduce meeting costs. As per Sandy DiMinno at HelmsBriscoe, a two-year contract with a hotel chain might result in cost savings, but not a longer agreement.

Overall, MLA needs more analysis of the conference budget. The convention budget needs to be $20,000-40,000 less than the present budget. How do we get there? How are we going to lower convention costs? The convention will not likely get more attendees in future, costs will continue to increase, and conferences will continue not to pay for themselves, requiring a subsidy from MLA operating funds. The two largest costs are catering and a/v. High catering minimums keep room rates down, saving individuals money, but costing the association as reflected in registration rates. What kind of room rate does MLA want? For a/v, MLA usually must work with the hotel’s preferred provider, as additional hotel charges for using a less-expensive outside provider typically result in the same total cost. Cutting a/v would cut costs; how much less a/v can MLA use without putting sessions and presenters at a disadvantage? Boettcher will send the 2011 and 2012 convention budgets to Sandy DiMinno so she can review them for areas to trim.

The convention managers moved and Daniel Boomhower seconded the Board accept the invitation to Salt Lake City for 2015, pending successful hotel negotiations. If hotels aren’t interested, authorize the convention managers to work with HelmsBriscoe to identify other possible locations. The motion passed unanimously.

The convention managers moved and Ruthann McTyre seconded that MLA continue our working relationships with both ATC and HelmsBriscoe, at least through the 2013 meeting and 2015 site selection. McBride asked when would be the appropriate time to evaluate their services, and what kind of information could MLA get in order to do this? Boettcher responded that once the 2014 and 2015 hotel negotiations are done, MLA will have two different cities, two contracts, and two different situations handled by HelmsBriscoe. As far as evaluating the fiscal impact, the convention manager or other person with contract expertise could compare the 2014 and 2015 contracts negotiated by HelmsBriscoe, once the 2015 contract is finished, possibly 6 months from now, with the 2011-2013 contracts negotiated by MLA, comparing the contracts point by point for what is and isn’t included in each one. McBride asked if there are other services HelmsBriscoe provides that MLA needs? Green responded that HB can provide staff to work on-site, handling the conference registration table for instance, or can run an online portal, including online registration, but she doesn’t recommend either service at this time. The convention managers can ask Sandy DiMinno about possible services. Boettcher and Green stated that HB saved an overwhelming amount of time and work for the convention managers in quickly evaluating and identifying an alternate site for 2014 after Nashville fell through; also by quickly providing clear, detailed Atlanta hotel comparisons, and in expediting contract negotiations for 2014. HB will also save time in Salt Lake hotel selection by narrowing down the finalists to only those hotels that will work for MLA’s meeting. The more MLA works with HB, the more they understand what MLA needs. Since HB is paid only by commission
by the hotel—MLA pays nothing for their services—it is to their advantage to successfully negotiate a contract. The motion passed unanimously.

The Board warmly applauded the convention managers for their work, and for moving MLA into a new relationship with a convention management company.

The Board conducted a post-conference review of the Dallas convention on the last day of the Board meeting. Many attendees reported to McBride that the program was exceptionally good. He proposed a task force to assess how MLA schedules conference programming, include the possibility of shifting internal, MLA-focused sessions earlier in the conference, and making Saturday a program-rich day, in order to attract more local, one-day attendees. This could include shortening the business meeting by moving awards to the banquet, moving the banquet to Thursday or Friday night, and reviewing user group sessions. At the Dallas Town Hall meeting, Dougan was struck by the number of requests for conference sessions on broad, current professional development topics, and would like to encourage the 2013 Program Committee to review submissions with this in mind; McBride had already encouraged Stephanie Bonjack to have the Program Committee create and commission program ideas. Cary and other Board members suggested moving business meetings to evenings, or schedule early in the day.

The 2012 Get Involved Session received very good feedback. The Board agreed to add questions re: Get Involved to the post-conference survey. Round tables received larger responses than other groups. The Board may need to consider how to capitalize on this interest, whether MLA needs to give round tables more prominence, and whether MLA’s administrative structure is the one to bring MLA forward. McTyre suggested BCC present at Hot Topics re: RDA and metadata; she’s interested in more cross-pollination between technical and public services.

c. Development Officer (James Cassaro)
   see Development Committee, 09.d

d. Placement Officer (Alisa Rata Stutzbach)

e. Publicity and Outreach Officer (Renee McBride)

f. Management Services (Patrick Wall and James 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 committee’s contributions to the organization.

a. Awards (Various)
   i. Best of Chapters (Linda Blair)
   ii. Bradley Award (Linda Mack)
   iii. Lenore Coral IAML Travel Grant (Linda Blotner)

   The Board moved into executive session to discuss the Outreach Committee (see 14.b), and to discuss the recommendation of the Lenore Coral IAML Travel Grant Committee. Ruthann McTyre moved and Daniel Boomhower seconded that the Board move into executive session. The motion passed unanimously. McBride asked Dougan to leave the room.

   Pamela Bristah moved and Cheryl Taranto seconded that the Board accept the recommendation of the Lenore Coral IAML Travel Grant Committee. The motion passed unanimously.

   Daniel Boomhower moved and Liza Vick seconded that the Board move out of executive session. The motion passed unanimously. McBride asked Dougan to re-enter the room.

   iv. Epstein (Mark McKnight)
   v. Gerboth (Chris Mehrens)
   vi. Publications (Kristen Castellana)
   vii. Freeman (Sarah Dorsey) The following vote took place via email on November 1, 2011, between Board meetings: Cheryl Taranto moved and Daniel Boomhower seconded the motion that the Board accept the recommendations of the Freeman Award Committee for the 2012 annual meeting in Dallas. The motion passed by majority vote.

b. Bibliographic Control (Kathy Glennan)

c. Career Development and Services (Alan Ringwood)
   i. New Members’ Forum (Patricia Fisken and Suzanne Eggleston Lovejoy)
The Finances Committee recommended that the current campaigns to fully endow the MLA award funds are going well and may take less time than projected. Future priorities include continuing the ARL/MLA diversity scholarship once the IMLS grant money is spent; the ARL Board is interested in continuing the scholarship, so MLA needs to communicate to ARL that we are also interested.

The Development Committee will hear a presentation from Geico, the insurance company, at the Dallas meeting regarding a possible marketing program for MLA members. Ashgate Publishing also approached MLA, proposing to pay MLA for a portal on the MLA site that would provide discounts on their publications to MLA members.

The Committee is writing a policy for establishing an endowment fund, to present to the Board at the spring or fall meeting.

Cassaro has adjusted the schedule for letters of acknowledgment for regular and frequent contributors to one letter at the outset, and one letter acknowledging the cumulative donation total at the end of each year. A continuing issue is the way in which donations are reported to the Development Officer and the President; it can be difficult to know the total of a gift, or to know who is in a particular giving circle. Reporting has improved, but still needs to be tweaked.

The Board warmly thanked Cassaro for his efforts. Cassaro observed that it is heart-warming to witness the continuing generosity of MLA members. He plans to approach more corporate vendors to donate to MLA, particularly to cover conference costs. McBride observed that it was gratifying to see that donations remain steady at about $20,000 per year, and asked how long it would take to fully endow the awards funds. O’Meara/Hill may take 3-5 years, and Bradley 6-7 years, depending on donations at annual meetings, and the continued allocation of money from the MLA Shop, Silent Auction and unrestricted donations. Cassaro would also like to rethink MLA Shop offerings, including an MLA Big Band calendar.

It was moved by Daniel Boomhower and seconded by Susannah Cleveland to allocate proceeds from the 2012 Silent Auction to the Carol Bradley Fund. The Board recommended revisiting this decision annually in light of the larger budget picture, and in conjunction with the rest of the budget process. Part of the proceeds could cover costs of the Silent Auction table, for example. If the funds are used elsewhere in future, make sure to publicize this thoroughly and to revise existing publicity, as MLA members now associate Silent Auction proceeds with the Bradley Fund. The motion passed unanimously.

It was moved by the Development Officer and seconded by Ruthann McTyre to allocate proceeds from 2012 MLA Shop sales and unrestricted donations from the 2012 conference to the O’Meara/Hill fund. The motion passed unanimously.

The following vote took place via email on December 1, 2011, between Board meetings: The Board directs that any remaining assets from IAML-US not invested for Awards funds be designated "Unrestricted, Board Designated" for support of IAML-US merger and national branch activities. As background, this motion was requested by MLA’s auditors so they would have a paper trail and a Board vote to document MLA’s existing practice regarding IAML-US assets; the motion does not represent a change in how IAML-US assets are handled, but a verification. Rogan clarified that merger expenses will be shared by MLA and IAML-US. The motion passed unanimously.

The remainder of the Finance Committee actions took place at the Dallas Board meeting.

The Finance Committee recommended that $650 from the Wicker Fund be used to support the First-Time Attendees event at the 2012 MLA Convention in Dallas. The motion passed unanimously.
The Finance Committee recommended that the Board approve an overage expenditure of $550 in line 6.0122 of the budget (Management Services, Web Design and Development). The motion passed unanimously.

The Finance Committee recommended that $1,500 be approved for the programming of the online exhibitors’ registration form, to be charged to line 6.0122 of the budget (Management Services, Web Design and Development). The motion passed unanimously.

The Finance Committee recommended that the A-V costs for program sessions for the 2013 MLA convention in San Jose should be set at $22,000. The motion passed unanimously.

The Finance Committee recommended that $1,500 be approved for the programming of the online exhibitors’ registration form, to be charged to line 6.0122 of the budget (Management Services, Web Design and Development). The motion passed unanimously.

The Finance Committee recommended that speaker fees for the 2013 MLA convention in San Jose should be set at $5,000. Daniel Boomhower moved and Laurie Sampsel seconded a friendly amendment to set 2013 speaker fees at $5,000. The motion passed unanimously, as amended.

The Finance Committee recommended that the rental fee for the email address list of conference attendees be set at $200. The list will be rented for a one-time use; the convention managers will establish the terms of rental with A-R, and will market the list to vendors. The motion passed unanimously.

The Finance Committee recommended that the C.J. Bradley Award for fiscal year 2012/2013 be set at $1,000. The motion passed unanimously.

The Finance Committee recommended that the Gerboth Award for fiscal year 2012/2013 be set at $1,000. The motion passed unanimously.

The Finance Committee recommended that the Publications Awards for fiscal year 2012/2013 be set as follows:

- Vincent Duckles Book Award: $500
- Eva Judd O’Meara Review Award: $250
- Richard S. Hill Article Award: $350

These are slightly reduced from previous years, because the funds don’t create enough income to support the previous awards, and because the prestige of MLA publication awards is more important than the dollar amount. Once the campaigns for the Hill and O’Meara awards are completed, the awards can be increased. The motion passed unanimously.

The Finance Committee recommended that the Epstein Award for fiscal year 2012/2013 be set at $1,000 with $800 coming from the earnings of the Epstein Fund and $200 coming from unrestricted donations during fiscal year 2011/2012. This is also reduced from previous years, based on the income the fund generates, and the requirement in the Epstein Award guidelines to spend at least 75% of annual earnings from the Epstein fund for the award; the award is not based on annual donations, which are required to be added to the fund’s principle. The Epstein Fund earned $881 this year. The motion passed unanimously.

The Finance Committee recommended that research award amounts be set at the winter Board meeting and all other award amounts be set at the spring Board meeting. Only the research awards need to be set early; the other awards can be set in May-June. The motion passed unanimously.

The Finance Committee recommended that all permanently restricted investments be reclassified as temporarily restricted investments. MLA’s auditor and legal counsel have given their approval to make this change, which will allow the principle in award funds to fluctuate. Keeping award money in permanently restricted funds required MLA to keep the principle in each fund intact. In a year when the stock market went down, MLA had to pay monies from the MLA Fund into the award funds to maintain the principle of each fund at its original level. With temporarily restricted funds, the principle can fluctuate. The motion passed unanimously.

The Finance Committee recommended that the Mayo Endowment be eliminated and the funds added to the Wicker Endowment. It has not been possible to contact the original donor, the amount in the fund is very small, and MLA has not been able to use the fund. The motion passed unanimously.

The Finance Committee discussed selling other mailing lists, but has deferred a decision until a policy can be put in place. The Committee had a preliminary discussion on honoraria, based on last year’s significant, voluntary reduction by several MLA Special Officers; the consensus was to review and balance honoraria across all categories of MLA Special Officers at the spring Board meeting, as part of the annual budget approval process.

Blair expressed condolences and warmest thanks to outgoing Assistant Administrative Officer Michael Rogan, and welcomed Paul Cary as the new Assistant Administrative Officer.

Legislation (Eric Harbeson)
i. Oral History (Therese Dickman)

j. Outreach (Andrew Justice)
k. Planning (Liza Vick)

The committee focused on three main areas: Open meeting guidelines for Board meetings, Round Tables, and a newly created chart of member types and rights.

i. Open meeting guidelines for Board meetings

The committee was charged in 2011 to create open meeting guidelines for Board meetings, including virtual meetings and email votes, so that MLA members know that Board meetings are open meetings, and so that the Board has procedures for holding open meetings. The Committee presented a draft of the guidelines to the Board for review.

The Board reviewed the five sections of the open meeting guidelines:

- Notification of Meetings

  The Board discussed where the guidelines could be posted: either publicly via MLA-L for maximum openness, or to the members-only email list maintained by A-R; the MLA Newsletter, as a matter of record; the Board page on the MLA site, with a link from the featured content box on the main page, including dates for upcoming meetings; as a link in the President’s announcement of forthcoming meetings, posted 6-8 weeks before each meeting. Tsou suggested the Newsletter article tie the guidelines to greater organizational transparency and accountability, as per the Strategic Plan. Blair and McBride will establish specific calendar details, and responsibility for notifications, and establish who will write the introduction/context for the guidelines in the Newsletter.

- Technical Infrastructure (Sharing Public Documents)

  Committee, officer, and other reports to the Board would be public, excluding reports identified in the executive session guidelines. Public reports could be shared via a separate, public folder in Dropbox. The Board may share its online meetings via Adobe Connect once the software can handle larger groups, or it may be possible to broadcast meetings from Adobe Connect. It isn’t possible to store documents in Adobe Connect, but only to share them during the meeting. Another option for sharing documents and meetings is Canvas, an open-source course management system; Canvas may have the same limitations on numbers of users as Adobe Connect.

- Executive Sessions and Documents

  The following will be added to the guidelines: Executive session will be used as sparingly as possible. Any voting Board member can move that the Board go into executive session. In executive session, only voting members and invitees may stay in attendance. The public minutes from an executive session will record the outcome of the session, such as voting results and decisions. When deemed necessary for the historical record to document the rationale for a decision, the Board reserves the right to create and maintain private minutes of executive session, recording discussion and debate, for Board use only; this would be decided on an as-needed basis, and the records would be kept as paper files in the records of the President and Recording Secretary.

- Handling Attendance

  McBride suggested the guideline requiring members to notify the President if they wish to attend Board meetings should instead simply say that members are free to observe Board meetings. Members who wish to speak, participate in discussion, or present to the Board must make a request to the President two weeks in advance of the meeting, in order to be included on the agenda. Non-Board attendees are responsible for their travel expenses and technological setup.

- Defining What Auditing Means

  Dougan will finalize the guidelines for Board approval at the March online Board meeting, and the Board will pilot the guidelines and technology for sharing documents at the spring meeting in Middleton.

  Sharing virtual meetings will likely have to wait until there is more robust virtual meeting software, allowing easy connections to large groups.

  The committee also discussed Board voting by email, and meeting online. The Committee recommended voting at the Board’s newly-scheduled monthly online meetings, vs. voting by email. As much as possible, restrict email voting and discussion to executive session matters. McBride agreed that when voting by email, it isn’t possible to know which Board members are available for discussion and
voting, and that email discussions can be disjointed and incomplete. His preference is hold votes in face to face or online meetings as much as possible, for better discussion. As a last resort, there is still the option for votes that are genuine emergencies—not simply unplanned—to be handled as in the past, by emergency vote of the President, Vice President/Past President, and Recording Secretary, and subsequently ratified by the Board.

The Board will trial online meetings this spring, with monthly meetings from March through May, and will decide at the spring meeting whether it can meet online for the full Board meeting in the fall, or hold a shortened fall meeting, or adopt other meeting patterns. Replacing face-to-face meetings with online meetings will help balance the budget.

ii. Round Tables

The Committee discussed a conference scheduling proposal and a handbook template proposal for round tables.

Conference scheduling: Cleveland drafted a scheduling proposal requesting MLA’s 19 round tables to consider conducting their discussion/business meetings off the meeting grid, to contribute towards reducing the conference footprint and costs. Other organizations such as LITA regularly organize “Networking Dinners,” where members interested in a particular topic can sign up for an informal supper with like-minded people. The Committee thought it was worthwhile to explore the idea of moving some of MLA’s round table meetings out of the regular meeting grid and into social time.

One way to do this could be to move round tables out of the daytime schedule and put them into more flexible evening blocks that coincide with social time, such as meals and/or happy hours, and to schedule them in local restaurants or bars. If a round table opted to move an informal meeting out of the daytime conference schedule, it might still be possible for that round table to have presentation time during the meeting, thus not having to choose one activity or another, while not putting additional strain on the conference schedule. Round tables would get assistance from the Program Committee to have scheduled slots, and help from the Local Arrangements Committee to find alternate locations outside the hotel.

Other possibilities include:

- simultaneous meetings in one large meeting space, with several time slots so that only a few round tables would meet at the same time, allowing attendees to go to different round table meetings. These could happen at lunchtime with grab and go sandwiches, or after 5PM, possibly with a cash bar
- a reporting back session for all round tables, held during the conference so that attendees who were not able to go to a RT meeting could hear a summary of the meeting
- meeting every other year
- encouraging RTs to conduct business online between meetings, and to use Facebook or other social media tools to conduct discussions between meetings

The Board discussed the overall importance of round tables, asking how they fill roles not filled by committees. Ultimately, MLA will need to decide what role round tables play, what their value is, and how to support them. As MLA looks to expand membership, round tables can be a way for new members to find their place in MLA, make contacts, and to get involved. Cleveland’s proposal is designed to address the social aspect of round tables.

Handbook template: Since the Administrative Handbook specifies that there be a minimum of 10 attendees at round table meetings, Dougan will collect RT attendance sheets from the 2012 meeting, and ask RT coordinators to turn them in, in future; Vick immediately sent a message to the RT listserv to take attendance at their Dallas meetings. McBride will ask the Education Committee and BCC regarding how their interests and issues may overlap with the Music Librarianship Educators RT and Technical Services RT, respectively.

The Planning Committee proposes it create guidelines for Round Table coordinators, to communicate current expectations of round tables in MLA. The guidelines would pull together current policies, and would be available on the MLA Round Tables page. As one example, round tables wishing to present programs at the MLA conference would go through the same process as other entities: submitting a proposal to the Program Committee for its approval. The motion passed unanimously.

iii. Member Type and Rights Chart

Sampsel compiled a chart on member types and rights as a quick reference to specific membership rights, to go up on MLA’s membership page. The Planning Committee proposes that the Board accept the Membership Types and Rights Chart and update the Administrative Handbook as necessary. The
motion passed unanimously. Sampsel will send the chart to the Web Editors and update the Administrative Handbook as needed.

l. Preservation (Sandi-Jo Malmon)
m. Program
   i. Program, Dallas 2012 (Morris Levy)
   ii. Local Arrangements Committee, San Jose 2013 (Patricia Stroh)
n. Public Libraries (David King)
o. Public Services (Jim Farrington)
p. Publications (Phil Vandermeer/Linda Blotner)
q. Resource Sharing and Collection Development (Keith Cochran)
r. Searches
   It was moved by Kirstin Dougan and seconded by Daniel Boomhower to move into executive session. The motion passed unanimously. The Board moved into executive session in order to discuss search committee recommendations.
i. Assistant Convention Manager (Paula Hickner)
   It was moved by Ruthann McTyre and seconded by Cheryl Taranto to accept the Search Committee’s recommendation for Assistant Convention Manager. The motion passed unanimously.
ii. Publicity and Outreach Officer (Patricia Fisken)
   It was moved by Kirstin Dougan and seconded by Daniel Boomhower to accept the Search Committee’s recommendation for Publicity and Outreach Officer. The motion passed unanimously.
   It was moved by Pamela Bristah and seconded by Cheryl Taranto to move out of executive session. The motion passed unanimously.
iii. Assistant Administrative Officer (Eunice Schroeder)
   The following vote took place via email on September 30, 2011, between Board meetings:
   It was moved by Liza Vick and seconded by Daniel Boomhower to accept the Search Committee’s recommendation for Assistant Administrative Officer. The motion passed by majority vote. The Board warmly thanked the search committee for its work.
iv. Index and Bibliography Series Editor (Jean Morrow)
   The following vote took place via email on January 11, 2012, between Board meetings:
   It was moved by Ruthann McTyre and seconded by Laurie Sampsel to accept the recommendation of the Search Committee for the position of the Index and Bibliography Series Editor. The motion passed by majority vote.
s. Nominating Committee (Linda Fairtile)
   The following discussion and vote was held in executive session by teleconference on Google Plus on October 13, 2011: Ruthann McTyre moved and Susannah Cleveland seconded that the Board accept the ballot presented by the Nominating Committee. The motion passed by majority vote. The Board expressed its gratitude for the hard work of the committee.
   The following discussion and vote was held in executive session by teleconference on Adobe Connect on November 14, 2011: Liza Vick moved and Daniel Boomhower seconded that the Board accept the resolution of the Nominating Committee honoring one of MLA’s members, as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

10. Joint Committees
   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 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. US RILM Office (Sarah Adams)

11. IAML
   The IAML Donated Materials Program has been run in the United States by Marjorie Hassen. Her position, and the US arm of the program, need to be incorporated into MLA’s administrative structure, while retaining its
international emphasis. During the Dallas meeting, McBride asked the Resource Sharing and Collection Development Committee to consider taking on this project and to add the position to their group, as a standard, voting, four-year member. Keith Cochran, the committee chair, agreed. Kirstin Dougan moved and Ruthann McTyre seconded that the IAML Donated Materials Program be handled by the Resource Sharing and Collection Development Committee. The motion passed unanimously.

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)
b. MOUG (Damian Iseminger)
c. NISO (Mark McKnight)

13. Old Business

a. Archives Policies Task Force (Nancy Nuzzo)

The task force was charged to address eleven points; their progress report for Dallas addressed the majority of them, with the rest due at the spring Board meeting. McBride met with the task force during the Dallas meeting, and the Board discussed the task force report in advance of Nuzzo’s presentation to the Board at the meeting. The Board questioned whether a processing fee in the report was in addition to the usual annual fee, whether it would cover processing the backlog or new material, who will bill MLA, and how MLA will know what work has been done. The Board noted that the report mentioned a development in the University of Maryland’s acceptance of electronic records: they presently accept electronic records provided on compact disc, in physical form, but still do not accept electronic records in virtual file formats. The list of operating documents in the report doesn’t include items such as reports to the Board, minutes of the annual MLA business meeting, task force reports, reports of search, nominating, and other ad hoc committees, and other documents, and needs to agree with the longer list contained in the guidelines for transfer of official documents to the archives.

Board consensus was to appoint a subgroup of the Board (one each: Reports Officer, Parliamentarian, Administrative Officer) to review the task force progress report recommendations and guidelines for transfer line by line, and to make recommendations to the Board. The task force recommended appointing a subsequent task force, including the University of Maryland curator, Vincent Novara, in January 2013 to establish an MLA policy for archiving electronic documents, by which time the University of Maryland may have a new policy in place. The Board questioned why operational documents should be submitted in print, as well as on CD. It discussed what kinds of chapter records should be in the MLA Archives; consensus was to keep a small, manageable amount at the Archives, with the bulk of documents kept at the chapter level.

On the last day of the Board meeting, Nuzzo presented the task force’s progress report to the Board. McBride requested she review where the task force is, vis-à-vis completing its charge, and what the next steps are, and to clarify whether the task force is charged with setting up policies, or implementing them.

The task force reviewed and updated existing documentation relating to archive policies, and identified issues with MLA’s documentation. The chief issue with MLA’s archive policies is educating members so that MLA entities know what to do re: submitting records to the Archives and whom to ask when they have questions. When the task force is finished, there should be a clear set of guidelines to follow, especially for financial and business records.

The task force reviewed a documents retention schedule and guidelines recommended by SVA, MLA’s accountant, and customized it for MLA. The schedule should reduce the bulk of financial documents that need to go to the Archives. The group recommended giving the MLA Archives more presence on the MLA site, and adding the revised guidelines to the Archives page, consolidated with other documents such as the retention schedule and committee handbook template, among others. The entire collection also needs a reappraisal to reduce duplicates and documents defined as unnecessary by the accountant’s retention schedule.

Nuzzo clarified that the processing archivist called for in the report would be a hired student, supervised by the University of Maryland curator, and that the $300 requested for the processing archivist
is to cover processing of current submissions, not the backlog. The backlog could be addressed incrementally with an additional annual subvention; the issue of the backlog will be addressed in the task force’s completed report and recommendations. The annual subvention in the past has been $500, but has rarely been expended; the task force estimate is $300 to process new materials each year.

The initial role of the MLA Archivist, as the task force sees it, would be to educate MLA about the Archives, the need for submitting documents, and policies around submitting documents. The Archivist would also be the “Reminder-in-Chief,” sending period reminders for MLA entities to submit documents to the Archives. McBride requested the task force write a job description for the MLA Archivist and to clarify the exact expectations of the curator at the University of Maryland, as an addition to their charge. The Archivist could be a Special Officer, or be folded into a Board member-at-large position, possibly the Planning and Reports Officer, at least the “Reminder at large” function; this person would send out a regular call to submit materials to the Archives.

On the importance of weeding unnecessary documents vs. methodically collecting new documents, the task force recommended that only records of permanent value, meant to be kept indefinitely, be sent to the Archives; for example, no financial records with a seven-year life span. Those kinds of records would stay with the office that generated them, or go to a central location, and be destroyed after a given period. Most such documents are at the business office, and can be handled by A-R. But committee chairs and officers may not be able to make these judgments; it might be advisable, when in doubt, to have them send documents and have the curator make retention decisions, or the processing archivist under the curator’s direction.

The Board discussed various options re: calls for submissions and follow up for materials not submitted: the MLA Archivist, Vincent Novara, or the processing archivist could follow up, based on a checklist of documents; developing a finding aid and identifying older gaps could require someone to spend six months, half time, immersed in the Archive; the resulting checklist, with deadlines, would need to be very detailed. With committee chairs, officers, and others having their terms of office end at different points during the year, deadlines for submitting documents would need to be tied to terms of office, vs. a simple annual deadline; at the end of his term, as the chair or officer prepares to turn documents over to his successor, he would send older records to the Archives. The task force suggested Novara be added to the committee chair and special officer listservs so he can send out annual reminders, and that the President add a reminder to his end-of-term thank-you letter to committee chairs and officers. McBride recommended Novara provide a report at the spring Board meeting regarding what has been received and what is lacking, at which point a Board member would send a request for missing documents, and that Novara provide a follow up annual report to the Board in August. Archive submission deadlines could be added to the MLA calendar, which can be set up to send reminders to chairs and officers.

The task force will make a recommendation re: re-organizing and weeding the Archives in its completed report, at the spring Board meeting. Boomhower might be able to provide Library of Congress staff for a limited period of time, to assist in the Archives. The Board warmly thanked Nuzzo and the task force for their work, with applause.

b. **Branch Libraries Task Force (Linda Fairtile)**

The task force was charged to investigate the issues and strategies of centralizing versus decentralizing academic music collections, from small liberal arts colleges through large research institutions. Their report featured case studies, a bibliography, and recommendations.

The Board discussed whether MLA should create a position statement, or provide a list of talking points, or whether it would be more helpful to provide documentation on how to collect empirical data demonstrating the influence of branch libraries and librarians on student use and learning, vs. anecdotal or emotion-based arguments. Possibly what is needed is scholarship, vs. a position statement. One Board member offered that MLA should be arguing for the importance of the subject specialist, vs. library space; that every library is different and has different needs, making generalizations about space less than useful.

The Board considered four ideas: a toolkit to provide objective resources; a research article, with data, on branch libraries, and another on subject specialists; and follow-up case studies on merged libraries.

In order to provide resources as soon as possible, Board consensus was to put the task force report online now, and to request that the task force create a toolkit to provide objective information and data regarding subject-based branch libraries, with information on known issues, guidelines on what core data to collect so as to document branch library usage (such as: number of reference questions and where asked—service desk, reference desk, office, stacks, etc; instruction assessment based on student bibliographies), benchmark data from branch libraries and merged libraries, a bibliography, and other resources. Articles in
the task force report bibliography may be a source for data. The toolkit could be maintained in future by the Career Development and Services Committee.

Ideally, MLA would commission a white paper on branch libraries. More likely, the task force could write a research article on subject-based branch libraries and merged libraries, with data, and submit it to *Notes* or another publication, so there is scholarship for librarians to refer to in future. The Board also would like to see an article, with data, demonstrating the essential importance of the subject specialist.

McBride will propose the toolkit idea to the task force, and will talk to Career Development as well. He welcomed ideas for collecting hard data on branch and merged libraries.

c. **Information Technology Task Force (Michael Rogan)**

The following vote took place via email on January 10, 2012, between Board meetings: It was moved by Laurie Sampsel and seconded by Daniel Boomhower to approve the recommendation of the Information Technology Task Force that the revised Request for Proposal be sent to consultants and vendors to propose a solution for creating and managing a coherent information technology infrastructure enabling the operations of the Association, including identity management, member communication and collaboration, web conferencing, and web content creation and publication. The motion passed by majority vote.

d. **Notes Royalties Task Force (Paul Cary)**

It was moved by Cheryl Taranto, seconded by Ruthann McTyre seconded, and carried unanimously to move to executive session. The Board moved into executive session in order to discuss vendor contracts and royalties for *Notes* online.

The outcome of the executive session was Board agreement to establish a follow-up task force, or a subset of the Publications Committee, which would create a plan re: how to address and implement the recommendations in the *Notes* Royalties Task Force report. McBride said that self-publication probably shouldn’t be a focus now, as most libraries are already locked into packages, and wouldn’t subscribe to *Notes* as an independent online publication. Cary recommended the Board focus the charge of the new task force as much as possible; for example, take self-publishing off the table for a year or two. Rights management and e-publications are additional huge issues; Cary recommended the new task force focus on existing vendor contracts, excluding for now issues around e-publications, self-publication, and open access, and that the Board would need to set priorities for these contracts. Cary said that MLA doesn’t need task force to decide the mechanism to negotiate; instead, assign a small group of people to help with negotiations. McBride will talk with Phil Vandermeer, Jane Gottlieb, and Tracey Rudnick for their thoughts regarding a new working group.

The Task Force recommended, and Ruthann McTyre seconded, that the Board authorize changing the moving wall for *Notes* in JSTOR from five years to three years. The motion did not pass.

Susannah Cleveland moved and Daniel Boomhower seconded that the Board leave executive session. The motion passed unanimously.

e. **Strategic Plan Review (Jerry McBride)**

Next steps: the Strategic Plan Steering committee will review the notes from the Dallas Town Hall meeting on the strategic plan. The Steering Committee will prioritize these and the other recommendations; each Steering Committee member will select one short-term action step, and one long-term action step from his area. Those steps will make up MLA’s action plan; the Steering Committee will review these actions as a whole to see how they can be coordinated, as there needs to be one, coherent strategic plan. Steering Committee members will also make recommendations as to who will do the work.

The plan will then go to the Board for approval by April 1 for the Board’s April 11 online meeting. It will then go to the committees or individuals who will implement the plan for their sign-off on the proposed actions, and to add to their budget requests, due to the Fiscal Officer by April 27.

McBride observed that there will be major budgetary implications. The need for additional resources will need to be balanced against the Board’s decision not to continue deficit spending; the Board will need to redirect money. The cost of the RFPs coming from the Information Technology Task Force will have a major impact on the budget.

f. **Digital Audio Task Force**

Following up on the work of the earlier Digital Audio Collections Task Force, the Board proposed at the fall meeting to create a task force to work with the University of Washington on a grant proposal to the NEH. McBride has proposed task force members and chair, and has drafted a charge, which begins: “Develop a grant proposal for a planning grant to convene a conference of nationally-representative experts for the purpose of outlining the technical infrastructure and purchase licensing for a database, or databases,
from which libraries could legally acquire, preserve, and/or provide their patrons access to commercially available and out-of-print digital audio files.”

The Board identified critical issues in establishing such a database of online recordings: content, control of content, preservation, technical infrastructure, and metadata. A JSTOR/subscription model for digital audio is one possibility, but only one; purchase should also be an option. OhioLink has a gold-standard agreement for libraries: a purchase agreement with a perpetual license for use.

McBride requested Board approval for the task force membership, chair, and charge. Boomhower suggested adding the conference/summit event to the MLA conference, perhaps as the opening plenary session, or scheduled just before MLA’s conference, to present a report at the conference. McBride also wants a formal report on record, as a deliverable. Dougan said the key issue is online recordings that are only available to consumers, not available in any form to libraries. McBride will discuss Board conclusions with John Vallier.

g. Annual Meeting Survey

Sampsel edited the annual meeting survey down to 20 questions, and wants to reduce it further to ten questions. The Board recommended adding questions for respondents who didn’t attend the conference, so that MLA can determine why people don’t attend. McBride requested the Planning Committee finish the survey, run it past Morris Levy, 2012 Program Chair, and get it out to the membership by March 2 at the latest. The survey should include notification that MLA plans to publish survey results online, minus personal identification. Dougan will set up the survey in SurveyMonkey and send it out under the Planning Committee name; McBride will notify the Annual Meeting Survey Task Force of these plans.

14. New Business

a. Membership Committee (Ruthann McTyre)

McTyre chaired the Membership Implementation Team, one of six groups appointed to develop operational goals for the Strategic Plan. Given declining membership and the critical need to keep members and attract new ones, the Committee determined that MLA should re-establish its Membership Committee, and as soon as possible. Working at the chapter level is key to recruiting new national members; chapters are where MLA can reach a wide range of potential members: paraprofessionals, members from sister associations, archivists who work with music materials, and so on. Possible strategies include inviting guests to chapter receptions, identifying and contacting pockets of chapter members and local library staff to encourage them to join MLA, tapping chapter membership committees for their recruitment ideas and prospects, and assigning national Membership Committee members to liaise with chapters. Other sources for members include the 640 NASM-accredited schools in the United States, only 170 of which are MLA members, state library associations, the CMS directory, Society of American Archivists members, and working with the Development Committee to attract new corporate members. The committee may propose additional membership categories: Blair suggested creating a membership category for librarians whose responsibilities include music but who are not full-time music librarians, at lower cost; McTyre suggested another category for those not currently employed. MLA could offer a discount to members of related organizations, and the wider range of professionals in MLA could add valuable presentations and content to the MLA conference, attracting more new members.

MLA and the Membership Committee need to be able to articulate the benefits of MLA membership to a wide range of music information professionals, and the MLA site should feature a list of membership benefits, such as the right to make conference presentations. As archivists, paraprofessionals, and others who work with music information make more presentations at the MLA conference, MLA can attract more members from those related fields. Members of the committee could be drawn from the Strategic Plan group, and from the Outreach Committee.

Ruthann McTyre moved and Susannah Cleveland seconded that the Board create a Membership Committee. The Implementation Team drafted a charge, which will be finalized with McBride, along with the committee membership. The motion passed unanimously.

b. Outreach Committee

The Board moved into executive session to discuss the Outreach Committee, and to discuss the recommendation of the Lenore Coral IAML Travel Grant Committee (see 09.a.iii). Ruthann McTyre moved and Daniel Boomhower seconded that the Board move into executive session. The motion passed unanimously.

Laurie Sampsel moved and Daniel Boomhower seconded that the Outreach Committee be dissolved. The motion passed unanimously. McBride will notify the committee during the Dallas conference.
Daniel Boomhower moved and Liza Vick seconded that the Board move out of executive session. The motion passed unanimously.

c. Regular Review Process for Business Office

It was moved by Daniel Boomhower and seconded by Pamela Bristah to move into executive session. The motion passed unanimously. The Board moved into executive session in order to discuss the Business Office.

Ruthann McTyre moved and Daniel Boomhower seconded that MLA move out of executive session. The motion passed unanimously.

d. ArchivMusic Presentation (Eric Feidner)

ArchivMusic President Eric Feidner requested to speak to the Board on several subjects:

ArchivMusic’s recent integration of MLSC into their operations, metadata at ArchivMusic and how libraries can benefit, a possible collaboration to provide out-of-print recordings, including those in A Basic Music Library, and the issue of online recordings not available to libraries.

ArchivMusic has a program to produce CDs on demand. The company holds blanket licenses with many of the major labels, and currently offers about 10,000 CD titles on demand. They produce physical CDs from digital recordings, including reproductions of covers and booklets. ArchivMusic intends to market physical CDs, both commercially produced and on-demand, leaving online digital audio sales to the major labels and online audio distributors.

The major issue for ArchivMusic is what titles to include in its on-demand title list; the company would like to work with libraries to explore options. The initial focus was on CDs getting the most airplay at classical radio stations. The Board recommended ArchivMusic establish a library advisory group, similar to what Alexander Street Press and Naxos have, for content expertise, and technological advice should ArchivMusic in future consider offering a streaming service. Boettcher and Dougan emphasized that libraries want to provide audio online as much as possible, vs. CDs; and that the key issue at present is that libraries want to be able to offer online recordings currently restricted to individual consumers.

McBride asked if ArchivMusic would create an online request form for out-of-print CDs for consideration in the on-demand program; Feidner responded favorably. McBride also suggested that ArchivMusic consider using library collections for source recordings; as many major labels have de-emphasized or lost track of their archives, music libraries can fill in. ArchivMusic can find holders of recordings via OCLC.

McBride asked about metadata, suggesting that the library advisory board work on Archiv’s providing catalog data, as book and score vendors do. Feidner stated that ArchivMusic is working on automating the MLSC process to provide metadata, and that they hope to do more.

Boomhower asked about long-term preservation of sound recordings, and the library’s role in hosting online recordings. There is currently no mechanism for libraries to archive and distribute digital recordings, even via streaming, which ensures long-term preservation of the content. There aren’t many libraries that at present have the digital infrastructure, a data migration program, and staff to host digital recordings, but it’s important to allow for the possibility. And, all libraries digitize clips for course reserves; the issue is that there’s no standard for licensing content in a way that allows libraries to do more than hide audio course reserves behind three layers of password protection, and take them down at the end of each semester.

McBride asked if ArchivMusic has considered adding other genres, such as jazz; Feidner responded that the company will remain a vendor of classical music, with a separate site for show tunes and song standards, but does sell other genres to institutions via MLSC. The MLSC offerings for institutional sale will be integrated into another separate ArchivMusic site, projected for this spring.

ArchivMusic is redesigning its site, in part to integrate the institutional sales services offered by MLSC, and would like music librarians’ ideas and advice as to what’s most important. The Board recommended drawing on the advisory group here.

15. Adjournment

The Board scheduled online meetings for March 7, April 11, and May 9, from 2-3:30pm eastern time, and scheduled the Board spring meeting in Middletown, Wisconsin for May 30-June 1, 2012. The Board said a heartfelt thank you and goodbye to Ruthann McTyre, Susannah Cleveland, Liza Vick, Cheryl Taranto, and Michael Rogan.

It was moved by Cheryl Taranto and seconded by Laurie Sampsel to adjourn the meeting at 11:30am. The motion passed unanimously.