Beta Phi Mu Executive Board Meeting
Board Meeting Minutes 6/28/08
10:30 AM – 12:30 PM @ Anaheim Hilton Oceanside

Present: Nancy Zimmerman, Christie Koontz, Anna Perrault, Eloise May, Sue Stroyan, Blanche Woolls, Dave Whisenant, Kathy Strauss, Ron Miller.

Absent: Sue Searing, Mark Wendt, Marie Radford (excused for a presentation conflict)

Others Present: Norman Horrocks, John Paul Walters, Program Director

Proceedings: Meeting called to order at 10:45 AM by Zimmerman.

1. 2008 Mid-Winter Minutes Approved.

2. Agenda Approved.

Zimmerman proposes putting Mary Jo Lynch Distinguished Lecture Award under New Business.

Officer Reports

3. a. Executive Director's Report *(Christie Koontz)* Koontz compliments Walters' efforts and encourages Board members to read his attached report. She is concerned about the viability of web content – had assumed it was correct but some of it is not, specifically the active chapter list. Suggests hiring someone in the LIS system a few hours a week to market BPM to chapters and possibly work on the corrections of the database (comparing paper and digital files.)

Discussion: Suggestions were made by Searing, May and Woolls to use LIS listservs to 'awaken' people to the BPM website. It was also suggested that the archives be reviewed at the University of Illinois to procure more information on chapters that have closed and other pertinent information to facilitate understanding of BPM records and history, ultimately strengthening communication with members and chapters.

Action Taken: Horrocks will write this discussion – "Beta Phi Mu Wants To Hear From You!" for *Library Hotline*. Zimmerman asks that any suggestions be sent to her and Koontz.

3. b. President's Report *(Nancy Zimmerman)* Zimmerman commends Walters for look of newsletter and commends Koontz and Walters for cleaning up the records and hard work on the G-ALA. Notes that publicity for awards and scholarships is much better this year. Excited about VSU – first new chapter in 20 years! Priority now is chapter communications and getting consistent records from chapters.

Zimmerman asks for input from the Board re: suggestions for replacement of Art Young as Monograph Editor. Need to thank John Budd for his contribution via profits from his books.

Stroyan asks if BPM has funds to continue Monographs? Is that just something BPM should continue, or is this a good time to discuss something different?

Zimmerman tables discussion until after Treasurer's Report.

3. c. Treasurer's Report (Dave *Whisenant).* For an organization this size, thinks BPM is doing fiscally well. When he was appointed a year ago, he wasn't familiar with how the organization kept track of its finances. This year he has set up some guidelines and is now using Quicken/Quick Books to make the accountant's job easier. Looking at the data, everyone seems to have gotten the word about paying $100 per member and getting a 15% rebate in July. Accountant advises leaving CD the way it is.

DISCUSSION: Rebates -- Perrault suggests visiting the minutes on that.

ACTION TAKEN: Because of the focus of the Board on improving chapter relations, Zimmerman recommends leaving the chapter rebates as they are until some future point in time.

4. Subcommittee Reports

4. a. Scholarships & Grants Committee Report *(Ron Miller)* Miller reports that, despite the large number of candidates this year, using Global Docs enabled the committee to come to a quick agreement on all scholarships.

Strauss states that in the three years that she has been on the Board, this has been the most enjoyable task she has had to do. Suggests looking into online processes and, since the committees' members were in agreement that the process worked well, Miller indicated that he will supply in writing the procedures used by this year's committees.

ACTION TAKEN: To streamline process and save paper, Zimmerman directs staff to check into using online resources for next year.

4. b. Monograph Series. The monograph discussion was tabled until the Midwinter meeting so Board can spend substantive time discussing monograph series viability.

4. c. Nomination Committee Report *(Anna Perrault*) Perrault reviewed the history of the process. There are eight directors, two of whom are elected at large every other year. By-laws state that every other year someone is nominated. Accordingly, people were nominated to run for the Director at Large slots – occurs every other year.

Perrault notes that Mark Wendt and Kathy Strauss were elected in 2005 so their terms expired in 2008; Ron Miller and Blanche Woolls were elected in 2006 so their terms will expire in 2009; Marie Radford and Sue Searing were elected in 2007 and will serve until 2009; Eloise May was elected in 2007 and her term expires in 2010.

Two directors, not one, should have been elected to a three-year term to expire in 2010, but since only one was elected in error, the nominating chair (Perrault) recommended to the board that the error be corrected by electing at the election to be held at the Assembly meeting one director for a two-year term in addition to the two directors to be elected for the regular three-year terms to expire in 2001. The Board unanimously approved this recommendation.

Two directors are to be elected at large next year – don't need to do anything about that now. The problem is that when those two directors are elected, it is for three terms, so must keep adjusting.

Perrault proposes two-year terms and eligibility to serve a second term for a total of four years. Also suggests trying electing one each time (instead of two each time) if that is something the Board wants to do. It would need to be voted on as this is in the by-laws. The Board will take action on this recommendation as part of the discussion on the total by-laws review.

DISCUSSION

4. d. BPM/ALA Distinguished Lecture Series. It was noted that Zimmerman, Koontz, and Walters will attend a meeting on Sunday morning, January 29th at 8:00 a.m.

5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5. a. Discussion of the Mary Jo Lynch Distinguished Lecture Award

5. b. Revision of By-Laws Report (Norman Horrocks) Horrocks explains that he is just doing a walk through to make some observations and then Board can decide. Written observations will be distributed to the Board for future reference. **(see attached)**

DISCUSSION

6. NEW BUSINESS

6. a. 60th Celebration G-ALA. A game plan was devised for leadership of the G-ALA.

6. b. ASIS&T. Zimmerman will attend fall ASIS&T meeting and gather information. The purpose of the meeting is to consider information science curriculums for ALA accreditation.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 12:30 PM.

Minutes submitted by JP Walters

Attachment: Bylaws Report (Norman Horrocks)

Horrocks said that he had identified a number of places for consideration by the Board where revisions might be made. Once the Board had considered them then he would be happy to work with the Board in drawing up appropriate wording.

The text he was working from was that included on the BPM site under the heading of By Laws (sic) and described as "The most recent revision of the By-Laws (sic), dated June 23,2007." This June 2007 version is included in the Beta Phi Mu Handbook, also available on the BPM Site, but dated May(sic) 2007.

A. Use Bylaws throughout.

B. Article II. PURPOSES. Section 1. uses "...librarianship, information studies or library education" when defining the purposes of BPM. ACHS uses "library and information studies and information technology" as the sub-title of BPM. Elsewhere in these Bylaws there are references to "Library and Information Studies Schools", and different terminology can be found in Chapter names. Can terminology be standardised ?

C. Article III. MEMBERSHIP Section 1 a reads "Candidates at any college or university where the American Library Association has accredited a professional degree program, all other programs offered under the direction of the same faculty and who fulfill the following requirements :..." Clarify "all other programs offered under the direction of the same faculty" .

D. Section 4. Doesn't have to be in the Bylaws but where are the Procedures and Rituals for honorary membership to be found ?

E. Article IV. ELECTED OFFICERS. Section 2. The Vice-President shall make an annual report to the members of the Society at its annual meeting." Why the Vice-President but not the President?

F. Section 5. Should provision be made for the introduction of electronic voting on the ballot ? See sub-section 4 which says "It may be a separate ballot but may be mailed wih the newsletter."

G. Article V. APPOINTED OFFICERS. Section 1 says "The appointed officers shall be Executive Director and Treasurer." but cf. Section 4 : Archivist.

H. Article VII. EXECUTIVE BOARD. Section 3. Qualifications - need to be re-examined ?

I. Article IX. ASSEMBLY. Section 2 line 2 " ... shall by bly urged ..." Check for typo.

J. Article X. MEMBERSHIP MEETINGS. Section 2. Votes by mail - see item F above.

K. Article XI. CHAPTERS. Section 5. Is this "within 50 miles" requirement to be maintained ?

L. Article XIV. NON-DISCRIMINATION. Is this Article still needed given that all BPM members graduate from non-discriminatory programs?

M. Article XVI AMENDMENTS. Again, there is mention here of mailed ballots - see earlier comments in F and J above.

N. Article XVII. PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY. Recommend replacing Robert's with Sturgis which is used by ALA, ALISE and CLA.

Addendum: Scholarships & Grants Process *(Ron Miller)*

With respect to my committee on scholarships and grants I would outline the process as:

1. Using Google Docs free online service, I created a spreadsheet with all applicants in a column subdivided by the scholarship for which they were applying. Next to each applicant name I created a column for each of the committee members to caste a vote, labeled with the member's initials. I asked committee members to vote 1-5 for each applicant with 5 being the highest recommendation.

2. I emailed all committee members a copy of the spreadsheet, using the Google Docs facility to email and specifying all committee members as authorized contributors to that document with permission to edit it. That allowed all members to see all of the votes from each member for each applicant.

3. In the email, I asked each committee member to join Gmail (it's free and necessary in order to use this free service).

4. All members had been sent the paper applications by land mail.

5. I had planned a phone conference to discuss the final decision, but when everyone had entered their votes it turned out that there was only one candidate for each scholarship that received a "5" from all committee members.

6. In an email to all committee members, I proposed to the committee that we agree that the candidates who received the "5" level votes from all of us unanimously should be the scholarship winners. The committee members all agreed.

7. I submitted our decision, by email, to the National Office.

The entire process was conducted by email without the benefit of a single phone call or site visit.

Ron