

**Minutes of RBMS Executive Committee Meeting
ALA Midwinter Meeting, 2003
Philadelphia, PA**

Monday, January 27, 2003

8:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.

Hawthorn Suites – Franklin A

Present: Daniel Slive (UCLA), Chair; Margaret Nichols (Cornell University), Vice-Chair/Chair Elect; Suzy Taraba (Wesleyan University), Past Chair; Cynthia Burgess (Baylor University), Secretary; Mary Lacy (Library of Congress), Member-at-Large; Katherine Reagan (Cornell University), Member-at-Large; Isaac Gewirtz (New York Public Library), Member-at-Large.

Guests: Terry Belanger (University of Virginia); Lois Fischer Black (North Carolina State University); Julia Blakely (Society of the Cincinnati Library); Alvan Bregman (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign); Charlotte Brown (UCLA); John Cullars (University of Illinois at Chicago); Deborah Dancik (University of Alberta/ACRL); Mark Dimunation (Library of Congress); Jackie Dooley (University of California – Irvine); Christian Dupont (Syracuse University); Caroline Duroselle-Melish (Harvard University); Ellen Ellickson (Yale University); Ray English (Oberlin College); Jain Fletcher (UCLA); Claudia Funke (Columbia University); Jane Gillis (Yale University); Bette Gorden (University of Missouri, St. Louis); Julie Grob (University of Houston); Eric Holzenberg (Grolier Club); Rachel Howarth (Harvard University); Elizabeth Johnson (Indiana University); Mike Kelly (New York University); Anne Marie Lane (University of Wyoming); Deborah Leslie (Folger Library); Jeffrey Makala (Wesleyan University); Richard Noble (Brown University); Richard Oram (University of Texas); Susan Szasz Palmer (University of Louisville); Gregory Pass (Saint Louis University); Barbara Paulson (National Endowment for the Humanities); Henry Raine (New York University/New York Historical Society); Judy Harvey Sahak (Claremont Colleges); Jennifer Schaffner (UCLA); E. C. Schroeder (Yale University); Stephen Skuce (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Elaine Smyth (Louisiana State University); Abby Tallmer (Americana Exchange); Marvin Taylor (New York University); Margaret Tenney (University of Texas); Jerry Wager (Library of Congress); Everett Wilkie.

Daniel Slive called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. He asked that everyone in the room introduce themselves, beginning with the members of the Executive Committee [referred to as Exec in the remainder of the minutes] and continuing with guests.

1. REVIEW AND FINALIZE AGENDA – (Slive)

Slive noted the following changes to the agenda as distributed: a break would be inserted at around 9:30 a.m.; Ray English, chair of the ACRL Scholarly Communications Committee, would speak for approximately fifteen minutes before the ACRL meeting reports; ACRL Scholarship Committee for 2003 Toronto Preconference (originally New Business 12.a) would be dealt with as an action item in the Membership and Professional Development Committee report by Henry Raine; the future status of the Curators and Conservators Discussion Group (12.b) and Future status of the proposed Collection

Development Group (12.c) would be changed to 12.a, Future Status of RBMS Discussion Group; and Suzy Taraba added a new business item, Guidelines for ACRL Liaisons, which would be 12.b. Exec agreed to the agenda as amended.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM ANNUAL – (Slive)

Taraba moved that the minutes of the RBMS Exec meeting held at the 2002 ALA Annual Conference be approved with minor corrections submitted before the meeting began; Margaret Nichols seconded the motion. The minutes, with the noted corrections, were approved unanimously.

3. REMINDERS FOR COMMITTEE CHAIRS – (Slive)

Slive reminded committee chairs of the following: Attend all committee meetings, come prepared and urge committee members to do the same; Minutes should be sent to the RBMS secretary within one month of the meeting, the secretary will forward them to ACRL; Chairs (as well as discussion group leaders and liaisons) are expected to give a report at Information Exchange or, if unable to attend, to appoint someone to be there as a representative; Chairs are expected to attend the Exec meeting, especially when there are action items to be brought before the committee; Chairs should also attend the preconference orientation session and generally support the work of the section.

Slive introduced Ray English, Director of Libraries at Oberlin College and chair of the ACRL Scholarly Communications Committee. English explained he wanted to tell Exec and others attending the meeting about ACRL’s scholarly communications initiative, to open the floor for any discussion and to receive feedback. He reported the purpose of the year-old initiative is to make ACRL much more active in dealing with scholarly communications issues and to work with scholarly disciplinary groups and others to bring about change in the current system of scholarly communication. He noted that if change is to happen, it must be broad-based.

English stated ACRL has formed a new discussion group, the Scholarly Communications Discussion Group and has hired Sue Martin to serve as ACRL’s Visiting Program Officer for scholarly communications issues. He noted Martin will be involved in carrying out the scholarly communications agenda that was developed by the Scholarly Communications Committee and approved by the ACRL Board. He described the following four priority areas of the agenda:

1. Educational programming. Educational efforts will be designed to increase knowledge, raise awareness, and encourage action on the part of academic librarians and faculty as well as higher education administrators.
2. Coalition building. The overall strategy will be to build on ACRL’s existing partnerships and liaison relationships in order to advance change in the system of scholarly communications.
3. Advocacy of various kinds. ACRL’s legislative network can be improved to better respond to scholarly communications issues. Contacts will be developed with groups working on issues that are

closely related to scholarly communications concerns, such as SPARC [Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition].

4. Research. This component will serve to document the effects of the scholarly communications crisis on university, college, and community college libraries as a whole.

When English asked for questions or comments, Taraba inquired if members of Exec or others in the group should e-mail him if they had faculty members in mind that would be interested in the work of the initiative. He responded he or Sue Martin would welcome such information and would be happy to help in any way they can. He gave his e-mail address (Ray.English@Oberlin.edu) and asked to be contacted if we know of groups they should be working with or existing relationships they could build on.

Charlotte Brown asked if scholarly publications produced by the campus and that are freely available is another route to go, mentioning that she knows of a number of scholarly journals that are already out. English responded they would be interested in seeing various things happen—with editors on your campuses, commercial journals, non-profit journals. He stated over time the academy has given way too much control to commercial interests; this initiative wants to get everyone thinking about how we can assert more control over the things we produce, particularly the business practices involved.

Slive thanked English for his presentation.

4. ACRL MEETING REPORTS

a) ACRL Board II, 2002 Annual – (Taraba)

Taraba reported the board was very pleased by the RBMS statement on diversity she read during the board meeting. She noted there was a discussion of ACRL standards and guidelines being translated into Spanish and up to nine or possibly ten languages, but the guidelines currently in the process would not be delayed by this.

Taraba further reported ACRL voted to give \$32,500 to the Spectrum Scholarship program for minority librarians, and said they are putting together a task force on mentoring for scholarship recipients, with the plan that each will have a mentor. She reported ACRL board member Teresa Byrd, Library Director at Ohio Wesleyan, is looking for fifty volunteers to mentor these Spectrum scholars.

b) ACRL Board I, 2003 Midwinter – (Slive/Nichols)

Slive reported he and Taraba attended this meeting where there was much concern over the budget situation, especially with the 2004 budget which is expected to have a five percent decrease. He stated the board approved the St. Louis venue for the 2005 RBMS Preconference and noted the ACRL 2005 conference will be in Minneapolis. He also reported RBMS received \$3,000 in the fall from ACRL to be used for 2003 Preconference scholarships and thanked Rachael Howarth, Mary Lacy, Richard Oram, Deborah Dancik, and Mike Kelly for their help with getting the scholarship money.

c) ACRL Section Leadership – (Slive/Nichols)

Margaret Nichols reported the ACRL theme for 2003 selected by ACRL President Helen Spalding is “New Realities, New Relationships.” She said ACRL is creating a tool kit for marketing academic library services; if you attend the ACRL national conference, April 10-13, you can get a free kit. She noted the following items of business discussed at the meeting: ACRL is looking to increase funding for sections and for programs, which they hope to get through ALA; ACRL will revise its strategic plan in 2003; the ACRL web site will be migrating and may disappear briefly in the process; ALA/APA is working on the promotion of professional development and improved salaries for library workers and will also address the area of certification of library professionals and is asking for input on these issues; ACRL is crafting a resolution in response to the Patriot Act and is working on a joint effort to protect privacy rights; a legislative update was given with emphasis on the Supreme Court ruling on copyright.

Nichols mentioned the rest of the program was taken up with talks about marketing, with lots of tips given. She noted one speaker pointed out that cost containment can involve not only cutting back, but also increasing revenue.

d) ACRL Sections Council – (Slive/Nichols)

Same as reported at Information Exchange.

5. STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES REVISIONS / TASK FORCES**a) *Guidelines for Borrowing and Loaning Special Collections Materials for Exhibition* – (Lee)**

As Jennifer Lee was not present at the meeting, Everett Wilkie, who attended the SAC [ACRL Standards and Accreditation Committee] meeting, was asked to give an informal report on the reception of the guidelines. Wilkie reported the guidelines were rejected and SAC wanted them rewritten.

Slive noted this was a good opportunity to remind those who are dealing with standards and guidelines to check the ACRL web site in order to follow through on getting standards and guidelines approved. He suggested working with Paul Beavers, chair of SAC (aa6536@wayne.edu). Taraba added Exec would help with the process; one should check with their member-at-large.

Christian Dupont asked if the previous version of the guidelines are still in effect; he was told they were. Terry Belanger asked about the concerns of the ACRL committee rejecting the guidelines. Wilkie responded they did not like the way it was written, they felt it was too detailed, and did not like either the editorial or philosophical changes made to the document. He noted, in addition, they wanted the document run past a museum organization. Wilkie indicated he had several pages of notes concerning the discussion about the document, and said he felt the document was salvageable. When Eric Holzenberg asked if it was a fairly radical revision, Wilkie responded he did not know.

A discussion then ensued concerning whether the committee that drafted the revised guidelines was discharged [Jennifer Lee (chair), Lisa Browar, Timothy Murray, and Michael North]. Holzenberg suggested the committee should not be discharged until the guidelines have been approved. Taraba explained the reason such committees have been discharged at the point when RBMS Exec accepts the guidelines, is there is not normally

more work for the committee to do, only additional work for the chair. She added in recent memory all RBMS guidelines have gone through smoothly or with very few revisions. Taraba also noted the ad hoc committee had been around for a long time; no one on Exec now appointed it. Slive suggested appointing a new committee. Isaac Gewirtz responded the present committee members probably have the best knowledge of the issues in the guidelines, noting the problems were in the presentation. He asked if Slive could discuss the matter with the committee members and see if they are willing to go back to it. Taraba suggested Slive get the detailed information from Wilkie and ask the committee if they would like to go forward or have the committee reconstituted. Slive said he would touch base with Lee and pursue the matter further. Belanger commented the current RBMS chair has the authority to appoint a new committee chair.

Brown said she could provide contact information for the AAM [Association of American Museums].

Although Slive called for a motion, one was not forthcoming. Instead, Mary Lacy said she wanted to address the question of making sure this does not happen again. Belanger stated the document should have been read by Exec and typos should have been caught. Slive stressed again that the chairs of these committees need to realize their work is not done once RBMS Exec has approved the document; they need to follow through with the list posted on the ACRL web site and be in contact with their SAC representative. However, he said the work of the committee itself has been done at that point. Nichols noted it is written into the *RBMS Manual* that the chair of the task force must be prepared to follow through.

Julie Grob asked if it would not be helpful to send an e-mail addressing required duties whenever a committee chair is appointed, and a discussion on this matter ensued. Taraba noted it is the assumption of Exec that the committee chair will study the *RBMS Manual*. Nichols said the responsibility of studying the manual could be added to reminders for committee chairs. Lacy suggested that the manual should be double checked to make sure the duties are clear for ad hoc chairs. Mike Kelly suggested that the fact that the manual governs the section could be addressed at new member orientation. Raine responded that, of course, we should read the manual, but felt, in our attempt to make this section more welcoming, we should probably be more explicit than asking new members to read it. Holzenberg noted it is a long and daunting document.

Taraba said she would suggest two things: First, that Slive delegate some member or members of Exec to work on indoctrination of new committee chairs, and secondly, that Slive talk to Lee and others on the committee in question to decide what to do next. Slive repeated he would be glad to talk to Lee about this matter. He said he would receive Wilkie's notes on the rejection of the document, talk to the other members of the committee, and would then be in touch with Exec with an update. He noted if members of the former committee are not interested in continuing their work on the document, he would put together a new committee to work on the revision.

Nichols volunteered to work on indoctrination of new committee chairs; Taraba offered to help work up some kind of plan for such indoctrination.

At 9:30 a.m. Slive suggested a ten-minute break was in order. The motion was made and seconded, a vote was taken and all approved.

Slive called the meeting to order again at 9:40 a.m.

b) *Guidelines for the Interlibrary Loan of Rare and Unique Materials* – (Micham)

Jennifer Schaffner, reporting for Laura Micham, said that Micham attended the meeting of the committee and reported they have begun their assignment and hope to have a report at the Exec meeting held during the 2003 ALA Annual Conference [referred to as Annual in the remainder of the minutes]. Slive asked if Micham wanted a hearing on the document at Annual. A guest [unidentified] said a questionnaire would be sent out about current practice and asked that members please respond. Slive said he assumed Micham would post the guidelines to the RBMS list for review, noting that generally in preparation for a hearing such documents have been posted. The guest said he thought that was the committee's intention. Wilkie stated you have to print in *C&RL News* before a hearing can be held. Slive asked if there is only one hearing required, or two. Wilkie responded that only one is required. Taraba pointed out that before there is a hearing, Exec sees the document. She noted a hearing has to be scheduled and scheduling has already been done for Annual, therefore it is probably premature for this committee to expect a formal hearing at Annual. She said they might have a discussion during their meeting about the document.

Schaffner was asked to relay this discussion to Micham.

c) *Guidelines Regarding Thefts in Libraries* – (Wilkie)

Wilkie reported he attended the SAC meeting and the guidelines, as published, were approved with only a couple of minor changes in wording. He noted the most significant change regarded keeping registration paperwork permanently, rather than for five years.

Slive thanked Wilkie for shepherding the document through, as well as the others who worked on the guidelines.

d) *Standards for Ethical Conduct* – (Oram)

Richard Oram reported the reconstituted committee had a productive meeting and is working in the direction of finishing a draft by mid-spring. He asked, since scheduling for Annual had already taken place, if it would be impossible to schedule a hearing during Annual. Slive said he would look into it, noting the committee has a scheduled slot at Annual, but he was not sure if it has to be declared a hearing. Wilkie said he thought it has to be called a hearing.

Oram mentioned he needed to remind Paul Beavers [chair, ACRL Standards and Accreditation Committee] this is no longer a section guideline with the five-year renewal process. He asked how "official" such a hearing would have to be, stating his understanding is this would be an RBMS document, but would ultimately have to receive the approval of the ACRL Board. Gewirtz asked if there is nothing that governs such a document in RBMS itself. Jackie Dooley said if taken out of the standards process, it probably would not officially need a hearing, but RBMS would want one. Belanger said Exec should approve the document first; Dooley responded it could still be called a hearing. Slive asked Oram if the committee would be ready for that at Annual; Oram responded that is the committee's hope. Slive asked if it could be posted on the RBMS web site by April 15. Oram responded it could, but asked why it was needed by that date. Slive responded that Exec would need to see the document before a hearing.

Holzenberg suggested a hearing on the document could be treated as a seminar during the RBMS Preconference in Toronto. Taraba cautioned against scheduling a hearing of such an important document at the Preconference, as we would want really wide input.

Dooley asked Oram if people who were not on the committee were discouraged from attending the Midwinter Meeting, noting people had told her this was their impression. When Oram responded this was not the case, Dooley asked how people got that impression. Wilkie read an e-mail about the meeting that described it as an open meeting, but generally a working session, and which asked that comments be sent at a later date. Dooley asked that we try to avoid this inadvertent misunderstanding in the future, and not discourage people from attending open ALA meetings, which, she commented, are all working meetings.

Slive said since a meeting is already scheduled for this committee at Annual, he would check with Mary Jane Petrowski of ACRL to see if there is any difficulty in renaming that slot a hearing. He said if that is not possible, he would ask about scheduling a separate hearing if ACRL needs one.

Oram asked exactly what ACRL's role in the approval process would be, noting they haven't officially stated this. He said his assumption is that the ACRL Board wants to approve this even though it is a section document. He asked if he should check with Deborah Dancik, ACRL representative to RBMS. Slive asked if Oram was willing to follow this document through for approval with both RBMS and ACRL. Oram agreed.

e) Diversity – (Grob)

Grob reported this committee is making good progress on an action plan, and should have it ready by the end of their year's appointment. She asked if it would then go to Exec. Slive asked if they would have it ready for Annual; Grob said they would. Taraba noted Exec would need to see it well in advance. When Grob asked how soon Exec would need to see it, Slive responded by May 1 or May 15.

6. PROGRAMMING

a) 2003 Preconference (Toronto) – (Claassen/Slive/Dondertman)

Slive said things were moving along very well and there were no action items.

b) 2003 Conference (Toronto) – (Donnelly/Slive)

Slive reported the RBMS program in Toronto would be a session on the history of the book in Canada ["True North: A Canadian Approach to National Book History: The History of the Book in Canada]. He said speakers were lined up and there were no action items.

c) 2003 ACRL Conference (Charlotte) – (Holzenberg/Smyth)

Holzenberg had no action items.

d) 2004 Preconference (New Haven) – (Bouche/Gillis/Nichols)

Jane Gillis reported everything was running very smoothly and she had no action items.

e) 2004 Conference (Orlando) – (Claassen/Nichols)

Nichols had nothing to report.

f) 2005 Preconference – (Holzenberg/Smyth/Slive)

Slive reported the 2005 Preconference would be in St. Louis; he had no action items.

7. PUBLICATIONS

a) Publications Committee – (Tallmer)

Abby Tallmer said she had one action item regarding the RBMS listserv that Wilkie moderates. She made a motion that anyone who wants to contact the entire membership at large needs to go through Everett Wilkie.

Discussion of the motion ensued. Wilkie explained that all this does is make sure no one can see the list unless he sends it to him or her. Tallmer noted there is a great deal of interest in obtaining this list. Dupont reported he has had requests for the membership list but he has refused, telling people they can buy lists from ALA. He said the lists you can purchase from ALA do not have e-mail addresses or phone numbers, but that may be done in the future. Belanger said we are able to check a box requesting that this information not be sent out.

Alvan Bregman noted the committee rosters on the RBMS web site have e-mail addresses. Nichols suggested the use of a graphic rather than a hot link would help shut up the spam. Dupont responded that would be hard. Nichols then suggested just using text rather than a hot link. Tallmer said they were discussing two separate issues—the committee roster list and the review command option on the listserv.

Wilkie noted if you are on the list and you ask him for a membership list, he would send it. Belanger asked that he remind them that the list is intended for RBMS business. Dupont suggested that the membership list not be sent, but to suggest instead that they do a posting to the list. Belanger asked if it would not be appropriate for the chair of the section to approve such requests, asking what appropriate reason there could be to request the list of e-mails.

Tallmer amended the motion as follows: The review function on the listserv should be turned off and that in no case should someone be provided with the RBMS e-mail information without permission of the RBMS chair for purposes of section business only. No second was needed; the motion was approved unanimously. Wilkie asked if Tallmer wanted this done now. She responded she would like it done as soon as it is convenient. Slive thanked Tallmer for bringing the matter before Exec.

b) *RBM* – (Taylor/Browar)

Marvin Taylor said he had no action items. Slive asked if he had any information to report about the new editor of *RBM*. Taylor responded he hoped the announcement would be made later that week, noting the appointment has to be approved by the ACRL Board.

c) *RBMS Newsletter* – (Makala)

Jeffrey Makala said he had no action items. He noted the fall issue would be the first to have the RBMS logo. He said March 3, 2003 was the deadline for spring submissions.

8. COMMITTEES

a) Archivist/Records Manager – (Bregman)

Bregman noted at the meeting of Exec in Atlanta there was a discussion about ways to encourage deposits into the archive. He said he sent a letter to the chairs of RBMS committees and received only one submission. He said he would proceed with a review of the record series and the individual contact of chairs.

b) Bibliographic Standards – (Leslie)

Deborah Leslie reported an information item for the record of the section—an invitational working conference to revise the rare book cataloging rules [DCRM (Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials) Conference]. She passed out an information sheet regarding the conference. She said the idea was mentioned in June 2002 at the end of the ALA Annual Conference, funding was secured from Yale University's Beinecke Library, almost everyone on the invitation list agreed to attend, and it has become an official RBMS Bibliographic Standards event. She noted all members of the committee plan to attend the conference that would be held in March 2003 at Yale.

Slive thanked Leslie for moving this idea forward and organizing the conference. Dupont asked if Leslie wanted to request that the document be posted on the RBMS web site. Leslie responded, "Yes, if you like." She asked that the record reflect that although the conference itself is invitational, they are encouraging wide comments and discussion both before and after the conference. Slive expressed thanks to Yale University and Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library for funding and hosting the conference.

c) Budget and Development – (Oram)

Oram reported that although the last Preconference broke even and had no surplus to be used for scholarships, RBMS received \$3,000 from ACRL for that purpose. He moved that Exec approve the use of the money for three full scholarships and four partial scholarships to attend the 2003 RBMS Preconference. He stated he wanted to thank ACRL's Margot Sutton Conahan, Mary Jane Petrowski, and Mary Ellen Davis and commend them for cooperation and helpfulness.

Gerwitz asked for a clarification of the difference between full and partial scholarships. Oram responded a full scholarship is \$695, with the understanding that \$195 will be for registration; a partial scholarship is \$195. The motion, which required no second, was approved unanimously.

Oram introduced Deborah Dancik and extended his thanks for her assistance in reviewing the proposals that were put forward to the ACRL Board.

d) Conference Development – (Holzenberg/Smyth)

Holzenberg reported part of the charge of the Conference Development Committee is to develop programs for the ACRL Conference. He said the committee discussed how that might best be done and determined the best route would be to create a sub-committee that would have as its job developing ACRL Conference programs. He said the committee is considering proposing an amendment to the committee's formal charge or a comment in the charge about this responsibility. He asked if approval is needed from Exec to form a

sub-committee and was told it is not. He said the committee would probably be bringing some proposed changes to the wording of the charge to Exec at Annual.

Taraba asked if the sub-committee would need a separate meeting slot; Holzenberg responded he thought the work could be done without one and noted they would be reporting to the larger committee. Slive said he would like to see this responsibility very clearly stated in the charge to make sure it gets institutionalized.

Taylor added he learned recently of a planned ACRL conference session on providing appropriate access, and mentioned that Tim Young (Yale University) is on the panel. He said RBMS might be able to tag onto the panel, possibly creating a sponsorship for RBMS.

e) Exhibition Awards – (Funke)

[This report was given following 5.d, Oram's report on the *Standards for Ethical Conduct*.] Funke said the committee had its judging session on Saturday morning and wanted to thank Slive for his help with set-up. She explained this closed meeting was originally scheduled in an open room in the convention center and Slive was able to get it changed to an appropriate venue with equipment that worked.

She reported at the business meeting on Sunday the committee agreed upon a motion to be submitted to Exec for formal approval—to add Electronic Exhibitions as Division Five of the Leab awards. She noted this motion had been circulated earlier to Exec along with an appendix with electronic exhibition criteria to let Exec know the committee had thought long and hard about these issues. Funke then read the motion:

The Exhibition Awards Committee moves that Electronic Exhibitions be added as Division Five of The Katharine Kyes Leab & Daniel J. Leab *American Book Prices Current* Exhibition Awards presented by the Exhibition Awards Committee of the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of ACRL/ALA. As with printed submissions for the Leab Award, electronic exhibitions must be sponsored by library or archival institutions or consortia of such institutions. The Committee will explore the creation of subdivisions within electronic exhibitions as appropriate. Eligibility is extended both to electronic exhibitions created as representations of physically existing exhibitions, as well as to “virtual” exhibitions existing only in electronic format. While it is sufficient for institutions to submit urls of the electronic exhibitions for judging, they are also encouraged to submit the exhibitions in CD format for archiving at the depositories. There is, however, no commitment on the part of RBMS/EAC or the depositories to migrate these formats.

The floor was opened to discussion of the motion. Funke explained the committee's discussions about the possibility of creating subdivisions. Dooley asked if we have to go through the ALA Awards Committee. Funke responded she has documents from Michael Joseph [a former chair of the committee] communicating with Althea Jenkins, asking if we could add electronic exhibitions, and they seemed to not want to be bothered. Funke said she did not feel this was a problem, and indicated Dan Leab says this is the right direction to go.

Wilkie asked if an institution could win for a printed catalog and an electronic exhibition of the same exhibition. Funke said the electronic exhibition criteria indicate they would have to be doing something different, but noted it could happen.

Taraba commended the committee for its work, especially in light of the huge volume of electronic exhibitions and catalogs they looked at. Slive indicated no second was needed for the motion. There were no further questions or discussion; a vote was taken and the motion was approved unanimously. Funke was thanked for her work.

Funke then reported that work was moving forward on the online exhibition of the first ten years of Leab award winners, began under Joseph's chairmanship, noting it was not completed previously because people underestimated the requirements in technology. She said John Pull is working on it and should have it ready by March 2003 for the committee's review. Slive asked that it be ready for Exec to look at in April or May in preparation for presentation at Annual.

Finally, Funke reported she had good news regarding the Leab account. She said she, Slive, and Taraba met with Mary Ellen Davis during the Midwinter Meeting to work out a basic schedule for when the chair of the Exhibition Awards Committee would receive reports on the Leab account. Taraba and Slive said they would like to thank Davis for coming forward, noting she was concerned and scheduled the meeting.

Funke said they were never able to reconcile the receipts from the last year of Diane Shaw's chairmanship of the committee, indicating they would work from last year when Davis took over. She said the big question was about the bank fee/service charge, which is really an investment management fee, further stating Davis confirmed, through Stephanie Sherrod, that it is approximately one percent. Funke indicated she wants to know exactly what the charge is and how it is calculated, noting past records have shown an estimated bank service fee that was clearly more than one percent. She said the account went down from about \$23,000 to \$20,000 last year, and reported Davis is going to try to get further information about the bank fee/service fee.

Funke also reported we were only about \$6.00 in the hole from last year, and this year we have \$193.00 plus the dividends. She said she did not see that we would be eating into the principal, but noted the Leabs feel it is fine to do so if needed. She said she feels the account is in good shape, even if we need to take something from the principal one year.

Dooley commented it is an absurd saga, and asked if it would be appropriate for Slive to write a letter to the president of the ACRL Board to applaud Davis' actions. Dimunation said a letter to ACRL could unfold the entire long history of the problem, and would play even stronger if it was pointed out that we have only encountered silence in the past.

Belanger noted the Leabs have always said we can go back to them for more money, if it is necessary. Taylor commented the Leabs have added to the principal in the past. Funke replied she did not want to ask for additional money now, but that in the future it may be necessary, noting we may want to bring in special speakers or have additional funds for secretarial work.

Slive thanked Funke for her work with the account and asked for a round of applause.

f) Membership and Professional Development – (Raine)

Raine said he wanted to bring an action item before Exec, a recommendation for an ACRL Scholarship Committee for the 2003 Toronto Preconference. He said for the past three years the scholarship program has been managed by the Membership and Professional Development Committee, the Budget and Development Committee and Exec. He reported his committee would like to recommend that the process of managing this program be formalized and, although they hesitate to move to create another ad hoc committee, they feel it would be good to have some official representation for this function.

Taraba asked when such an ad hoc committee would need to meet. Raine said the work could be done via e-mail, so there would be no need for an official meeting. He continued by stating we need a group of people to manage the scholarships this year and indicated he believed Lacy is willing to continue from Exec. Lacy reported she became involved when she came on Exec as a first year member-at-large and suggested that the first year member-at-large be given this responsibility to give continuity.

Raine asked if there should not be some representation from the Diversity Task Force this year while it is meeting. Grob asked what the role of the Diversity group would be; Dooley responded that it could add that perspective.

Slive noted, as no scheduling is needed, it seems we could create an ad hoc committee. Rachel Howarth suggested the chairs of each of the committees might find someone to serve. Nichols asked, if the point is to make this an ongoing group, if we really want a task force that has to be renewed each year. Slive asked if it could be a recurring ad hoc committee.

Taraba suggested we follow Howarth's suggestion, that the four groups find people willing to be involved, then have a formal motion for the institutionalizing of this at Annual. She added we might want to consult with our parent body about this, because in a certain way it is a virtual committee, and they are working on guidelines for virtual committees.

Slive asked Dancik if she had any comments. She asked if the scholarship recommendations would not go to Exec. Taraba said they have come to the standing chairs, who have approved the recommendations and offered the scholarships from the chair. Dancik said she did not see any problem with going ahead. Taraba asked if she recommended formally appointing people. Dancik suggested using those who are willing now, and formally appoint later. Raine proposed this be done informally and Slive agreed, stating the issue would be revisited in a more formal way at Annual.

Then Slive asked Dancik if RBMS could go back for more scholarship money next year. Dancik replied the ACRL Board would rather RBMS use its ability to make money, noting ACRL is looking at a deficit this year. She restated the Board would prefer that you make the money, but this is not to say that you cannot ask for more.

These comments opened a new line of discussion. Dooley asked if the ACRL Board realizes how difficult it is to predict if a preconference will make money. When Dancik replied they did, Dooley noted she was just commenting on the suggestion that it is within the power of RBMS to project income coming out of a preconference. She asked, "How would we budget for scholarship revenue?" Dancik responded that the idea is that you look and, if over a year or two or three, you are not making money, you might look at what you are charging and what you are spending. Dimunation stated RBMS cannot budget for ACRL charges, noting we already plan our budget to have more, but we have

no way of knowing what ACRL is going to do with our budget after we turn it in. Dooley added it is completely unpredictable and asked how we can account for that. Dimunation stated we are incredibly careful on what we spend, but these ACRL charges seem to come out of the blue, noting we were hit with the ALA tax.

Dancik asked if RBMS receives an accounting. Dooley said that sometimes the figures are extremely weird. Dancik said if you are not comfortable with the knowledge provided, you should get in touch with Mary Ellen Davis. Dancik stated further she would have a conversation with Mary Jane Petrowski and Davis to work with RBMS to better anticipate ACRL charges.

g) Nominating – (Holzenberg)

The slate of candidates for the 2003 elections submitted by the Nominating Committee [Dimunation, chair; Raine; Micham] was presented: Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect—Mary Lacy and Elaine Smyth; Member-at-Large—Julia Blakely and Rachel Howarth; Secretary—John Cullars and Gregory Pass.

h) Security – (Wilkie)

Wilkie reported the Security Committee is in the process of trying to write a book about rare book and manuscript security. He explained it would be more comprehensive than the publications of the SAA [Society of American Archivists]. He asked if the committee needs Exec’s approval to proceed.

Belanger asked who would publish the book. Wilkie responded ALA or ACRL. Dooley asked if a publication proposal had been submitted. Wilkie said he had talked to them, but had not yet submitted a proposal.

Slive asked if this would be an RBMS publication; Wilkie responded it would. Slive said in that case it would have to be approved by Exec. Belanger noted either Exec or the RBMS Publications Committee must approve such a project, commenting it would simplify the process if the Publications Committee recommended it to Exec. Taylor said this is what the Publications Committee was created to do and added the next step should be to go to that committee. Leslie mentioned the Bibliographic Standards Committee did not ask permission of Exec for Pass to write the recently published AMREMM document [*Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early Modern Manuscripts*].

Taraba said she wanted either the Publications Committee or Exec to see a written proposal. Tallmer suggested Wilkie send a written proposal via e-mail to her that she could distribute to members of the Publications Committee. She explained members could either vote yes or explain any reservations or suggestions. Slive asked that Wilkie forward the proposal to Exec at the same time the proposal is sent to Tallmer.

i) Seminars – (Johnson)

No action items

Slive suggested a five-minute break at 11:40. He called the meeting back to order at 11:45 a.m.

9. DISCUSSION GROUPS

a) Curators and Conservators – (Lane)

Slive thanked Anne Marie Lane for taking on the responsibility for running this group at the Midwinter Meeting. He stated he also wanted to thank Virginia Bartow who handled the responsibility for many years.

Lane handed out a list of the topics discussed at the Curators and Conservators Discussion Group meetings for the last several years; copies of the page from the *RBMS Manual* concerning discussion groups; and copies of two e-mails and a typed summary of a phone conversation from individuals from Duke University unable to attend the Midwinter Meeting. She mentioned the three people from Duke who contacted her were very supportive of the Curators and Conservators Discussion Group continuing.

Lane reported the group's discussion held at this Midwinter Meeting went well. She noted there was great flexibility expressed by those attending regarding the future of the group, but one concern—that the group not lose contact because they all learn a lot from each other. She closed her report by stating she would be willing to serve in whatever capacity might be needed.

Slive again expressed his thanks to Lane.

b) Manuscripts and Other Formats – (Melvin/Murray)

Nothing to report.

c) MARC FOR special Collections – (Schroeder)

Nothing to report.

d) Public Services – (Howarth/Kelly)

Nothing to report.

10. LIAISONS

a) ACRL Board – (Slive/Nichols)

Nothing to report.

b) ACRL Sections Council – (Slive/Nichols)

Nothing to report.

c) ACRL Budget and Finance – (Allen)

Nothing to report.

d) ACRL Membership – (Szasz Palmer)

Susan Szasz Palmer reported the Membership Committee would be submitting a Membership Business Plan to the ACRL Board during the Midwinter Meeting that involves working with an outside firm to conduct, as a pilot program, a telemarketing campaign focusing on deactivated members. She noted those making calls would ask about section membership as well. In addition, she reported there was a proposal to make chairs of the sections, or their liaisons, official members of the ACRL Membership Committee, plus one representative from Chapters Council. She commented although this would greatly increase the size of the committee (perhaps to an unmanageable

degree), the desire is to increase communication between section chairs and the committee.

Szasz Palmer stressed the most important thing to report was that Mary Jane Petrowski wants to know what kinds of efforts the section membership committees are doing to increase membership. She also mentioned there will be a program at the ACRL Convention in Charlotte similar to an RBMS orientation; it will take place on Thursday afternoon.

e) ACRL Professional Development – (Ellickson)

Nothing to report.

f) ACRL Publications – (Tallmer)

No action items.

g) ALCTS/PARS – (Brown/Paulson)

Nothing to report.

h) ARL Task Force on Special Collections – (Jones)

Report given at information exchange.

i) GODORT/MAGERT – (Gillis)

Nothing to report.

j) IFLA Rare Books and Manuscripts – (Allen)

Nothing to report.

k) SHARP – (Ashton)

Judy Harvey Sahak, reporting for Ashton, said the SHARP conference would be held July 9-12 in Claremont, California, noting the papers have presenters that deal with library history. Slive added he would be moderating one session that will be sponsored by the BSA [Bibliographic Society of America] and will deal with three major bibliographic projects. He noted presenters would be Melissa Conway, John Goldfinch and John Bloomberg-Rissman.

11. OLD BUSINESS

a) *RBMS Manual* – (Taraba)

Taraba reported it is time to update the *RBMS Manual* once again, noting that as Past Chair, she has that responsibility. She said she would be putting out a call for additional things that need to be updated and asked that members be looking for those.

b) IMLS Initiative for Librarian Recruitment (see <http://www.ims.gov/whatsnew/current/011002-1.htm>) -- (Dimunation)

Slive reported the two meetings scheduled with Bob Martin were canceled, so Dimunation will report to Exec at Annual on this issue.

c) CLIP Note on Special Collections – (Brown)

Brown reported the College Library Section has CLIP notes on various topics and last year approached RBMS requesting someone to volunteer to help advise them on a CLIP notes survey on special collections. Brown, who volunteered to help, said the survey will target liberal arts colleges in the U.S. She added the survey goes out to everyone, but is voluntary and mentioned it has gone through six different variations. Brown said she is working with Elizabeth Sudduth (University of South Carolina), who has been in touch with the people conducting the ARL Special Collections Task Force statistics questionnaire. She concluded by saying the CLIP note editorial board meeting would be held today and that they are anticipating having the survey out by February 2003 and hope to have results ready and published for Annual.

12. NEW BUSINESS

a) Future status of RBMS Discussion Group

Howarth reported the discussion group chairs met informally during the Midwinter Meeting, are going to meet again at Annual and will actively keep in touch. Reagan said they had an action item to bring before Exec, actually a revision of a formally tabled motion—to revise the title and charge of the Curator and Conservators Discussion Group to create a single new discussion group that will incorporate collection development interests.

Discussion ensued with Lacy stating she did not see the logical connection between this group and collection development. Reagan responded that the Curators and Conservators Discussion Group does deal with collections, and this group was also considered because it had several years of low attendance. Taraba added another reason the Curators and Conservators Discussion Group was up for discussion was because there has been a huge proliferation of PARS [Preservation and Reformatting Section, Association for Library Collections & Technical Services] meetings and we have heard that those people RBMS used to attract with this discussion group are now only attending the PARS meetings. Reagan noted there was a strong feeling from the people who did attend the meeting this year that RBMS needs to maintain a home for conservation somewhere, but added there was an 11 to 1 vote for expanding the focus of the group to include collection development.

Brown said she agreed that the group should combine the two interests, adding there is a constituency out there of conservators and archivists who join us. She stated she hopes the name “Preservation” could somehow be used in the new name for the group, noting she felt it would be easy to overwhelm the agenda with collection development issues. Jackie Dooley said she felt that was a great idea and Reagan agreed it was a good point to make sure that the representation of preservation remains.

When the idea of having combined meetings of two or more of the RBMS discussion groups was brought up, Taraba asked if is realistic to think that the groups can keep in contact. Howarth asked if there was some other way of regularizing this responsibility without creating another meeting. Taraba suggested perhaps setting up some schedule or formal rotation, planned a couple of years out. Slive noted it would be the responsibility of the discussion group chairs to be in touch with the RBMS chair, letting him or her know after Annual the plans for the next two meetings. Howarth said there are plans to

discuss these possibilities at another meeting. Reagan noted the idea of aiming for possibly only three discussion group meetings might be helpful. Lacy suggested that Sunday from 11:30-12:30 could possibly be used as a no-conflict-time to meet.

The discussion ended with the request that Lane, Caroline Duroselle-Melish and Bregman come back to Exec at Annual with a revised charge for a new discussion group that will incorporate preservation and collection development interests.

b) Guidelines for ACRL Liaisons – (Taraba)

Taraba reported at the ACRL Board I meeting there was discussion of ACRL looking into penning down the responsibility of their liaisons to various group. She said RBMS does not really have any guidelines for liaisons, stating there is no term appointment, for instance, and no very clear mechanism for selection. She proposed that RBMS keep in sync with ACRL evaluation of liaisons and develop RBMS liaison guidelines that would include term of appointment, selection process, etc.

After there were no comments or discussion, Slive asked how she would suggest proceeding. Taraba suggested waiting until ACRL has done more and revisiting the idea at Annual.

No additional new business was brought forward. Nichols motioned to adjourn the meeting; Taraba seconded the motion. Slive called the meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Cynthia A. Burgess, Secretary