



# NASIG

# Newsletter

Vol. 20, no. 4

December

2005

eISSN 1542-3417

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRESIDENT'S CORNER	1
EXECUTIVE BOARD MINUTES	3
TREASURER'S REPORT	15
CALL FOR EDITORS	
<i>PROCEEDINGS &amp; NEWSLETTER</i>	16
21 <sup>ST</sup> ANNUAL CONFERENCE (2006)	
CPC UPDATE	17
PPC UPDATE	18
20 <sup>TH</sup> ANNUAL CONFERENCE (2005)	
CPC WRAP UP	18
EVALUATION SUMMARY	23
PROFILES	
ADAM CHESLER	25
AWARDS & RECOGNITION COMMITTEE	27
OTHER NASIG NEWS	
AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENTS	29
COMMITTEE UPDATES	29
ERRATA	32
TITLE CHANGES	32
CALENDAR	34
VOLUNTEER FOR NASIG!	34

## PRESIDENT'S CORNER

Mary Page, NASIG President

The NASIG Executive Board traditionally holds its fall meeting at the site of the upcoming annual conference, so a few weeks ago, the Board met at the Marriott City Center in Denver. I am very glad to report that all indicators are good for the 2006 conference. The conference facilities are excellent, as are the hotel services. Another plus is the hotel's layout, which makes it easy to move from room to room and between floors. For coffee lovers, there's a Starbucks onsite, and the lower level bar is the perfect spot for late-night socials. There is also an outdoor courtyard, where we could have lunches and breaks (if the weather cooperates) and enjoy those gorgeous Colorado blue skies.

The Board also experienced some of what this wonderful city has to offer, and we all wished we had more time to explore. The free shuttle bus makes it easy to get around the downtown area. Many of us took advantage of the free ride to visit the legendary Tattered Cover Book Store and the stunning Denver Public Library. This year, we will again offer post-conference tours, and conference attendees will have a variety of options to sightsee Denver and surrounding Rocky Mountain destinations.

Not that we spent all our time as tourists (though that would have been fun). The Board, along with the CPC and PPC co-chairs, hunkered down to business during two days of meetings. I am very pleased to report that our wonderful program planners have great sessions in development for next May, and our conference planners have the logistics under control. Thanks to our amazing CPC chairs, Wendy

Highby and Paul Moeller, the evening event for Thursday, May 4<sup>th</sup> at Red Rocks is definitely on! Make sure your travel plans get you to Denver early in the day, because you do not want to miss this natural wonder. Check it out at: <http://www.redrocksonline.com/>.

The full minutes of the Board meeting are included in this issue of the *Newsletter*, so I won't repeat what you will find there. I would like to mention that one of the highlights for me was learning that the 2005 conference was rated either a 4 or 5 by 96% of attendees. That makes Minneapolis one of our most highly regarded conferences ever! All the credit goes to the miracle workers who served as Conference Planning Co-Chairs, Linda Hulbert and Sue Zuriff, and to the creative geniuses who were our Program Planning Co-Chairs, Marilyn Geller and Emily McElroy, not to mention their hard-working CPC and PPC committee members. To make this good news about the conference even better, we earned some money, too. As a non-profit group, all earnings are plowed back into the organization in the form of programming, technical infrastructure, support for scholarships, etc. NASIG has always been fiscally responsible (cheap, some might say), and we have an excellent financial track record. Nonetheless, it is always good news to confirm that we are on the plus side of the ledger.

As you all know, NASIG dues have increased substantially for the coming renewal cycle. Many have questioned why we decided to increase dues so dramatically, from \$25 to \$75. The Board consulted widely on this issue, and we learned that for most non-profits, it is best to raise dues to what the organization really needs in one fell swoop. When organizations raise dues incrementally, according to the experts, it seems like dues increases are never-ending, and people tend to forget why their dues are being increased every year. NASIG's annual operating expenses are roughly \$85,000, and the new dues structure should cover this amount, which will allow us to invest any earnings from the conference in a contingency fund and in organizational development. Through the process of developing NASIG's financial plan, we learned that a non-profit organization such as NASIG should have at least one year's operating budget in a contingency fund. Instead of running the organization with what we earned at the conference each year, the new dues structure

will allow us to invest all profits into our contingency fund. And ultimately, this plan will result in a solid financial future for NASIG.

With all that said, I am thrilled to report that renewals are pretty much on pace with previous years. This is a testament to the value of NASIG to its members, and I am grateful for your confidence in this wonderful community of serialists. If you have not yet renewed your membership, please take a moment to do so. Our incredible Database and *Directory* Committee, led by Jo McClamroch, has done an amazing job with the development of our online renewal services. (Step Schmitt gets a tip o'the hat here as well.) To renew your NASIG membership right now, please go to <http://www.nasig.org/forms/membership/>.

### *THE ONLY CONSTANT IS CHANGE*

I've been making Thanksgiving dishes today, which I love to do. This is my favorite holiday: food focused, with relatively minimal consumerism. While I was stirring the cranberries as they morphed from bitter to sweet, I thought about how much the subscription renewal process has changed since I began working with serials so many years ago. Remember twenty-pound renewal lists? (In triplicate, no less.) While eliminating the massive paper output has been a major change for many of us, the more transformative changes can be found in the fact that subject specialists are now more likely to evaluate journal packages than individual titles (some say they've lost control of their collections; others marvel at the vast number of titles they now have access to). Print/online bundles have made cancellation projects a different animal altogether. Licensing, for better or worse, has made us take a hard look at our organizational policies and practices.

Scholarly publishing was at one time the domain of academics and intellectuals; now, it's a multi-billion dollar industry. In my library, it was not uncommon to make million dollar deals on a handshake. These days, an RFP and a formal process that involves our purchasing department are more typical. Vendors and publishers are often a subgroup of a larger corporate structure. A common theme for all of us – publishers, vendors, and librarians – is that our organizations have become more businesslike.

And so, we have all had to work through our discomfort zones in recent years. And it's not over. Issues such as open access, digital rights, escalating prices, new service fees, and new service models will continue to challenge all of us who work with scholarly publications.

NASIG was founded with the idea of bringing all parts of the industry together to wrestle with the challenges we shared. And twenty years later, this is still what makes NASIG more relevant

than ever. The only constant we can count on is change.

That said, I repeat, please do not forget to renew your NASIG membership today!  
<http://www.nasig.org/forms/membership/>.

I hope you all had a wonderful Thanksgiving, and here's to a safe and happy winter holiday season!

## NASIG EXECUTIVE BOARD MINUTES

Elizabeth Parang, NASIG Secretary

Date: Oct. 29-30, 2005  
Place: Molly Brown Room of the Denver Marriott City Center

Attending:  
Mary Page, President  
Steve Savage, Past President  
Denise Novak, Vice President/President-Elect  
Rose Robischon, Treasurer  
Elizabeth Parang, Secretary

Members-at-Large:  
Adam Chesler  
Jill Emery  
Katy Ginanni  
Kim Maxwell  
Kevin Randall  
Joyce Tenney

Ex-Officio member:  
Char Simser, NASIG Newsletter Editor-in-Chief

Guests:  
June Garner, Co-Chair, 2006 Program Planning Committee  
Tonia Graves, Co-Chair, 2006 Program Planning Committee  
Wendy Highby, Co-Chair, 2006 Conference Planning Committee  
Paul Moeller, Co-Chair, 2006 Conference Planning Committee

### 1.0 Welcome (Page)

Page called the meeting to order at 8:15 a.m., welcomed Board members and guests, and asked that each person introduce himself or herself. Page reminded those present that

because Board members have read all reports before the start of the meeting, only those reports requiring action will be discussed in the meeting. Page noted that the Board meetings are public with published agenda and minutes.

### 2.0 Secretary's Report (Parang)

#### 2.1 Board Actions Since May 18, 2005 Meeting

6/18/05 Board endorsed the Conference Planning Committee/Program Planning Committee theme for the 2006 conference: Mile High Views: Surveying the Serials Vista.

7/15/05 Board reached consensus on the desirability of supplying the Continuing Education Committee co-chairs with a list of the top rated conference programs. CEC would investigate the possibility of presenting some of these sessions 'on-the-road'.

7/18/05 Board endorsed idea of holding Thursday evening event at Red Rocks for the 2006 conference in Denver.

8/2/05 Board endorsed logo selected by Conference Planning Committee for the 2006 conference.

9/6/05 Board unanimously approved selection of Bob Alan as Continuing Education Committee Co-Chair for a term of two years, replacing Beverley Geer.

9/14/05 Board voted to keep members affected by Hurricane Katrina on the membership roster through June 30, 2006. All affected members

will be eligible to register for the conference at the member rate. They should renew their memberships at the full annual rate by June 30th.

9/15/05 Board agreed to continue the Mexico Student Grant award for 2006 emphasizing that the time-line developed by the Awards & Recognition Committee must be closely followed.

10/13/05 Board agreed to accept the Awards & Recognition Committee's suggestion to reword the eligibility requirements for the Fritz Schwartz Serials Education Scholarship to emphasize the location of the library school rather than the home country of the student. The announcement must indicate that travel expenses would only be paid within North America.

## 2.2 Pending Action items from past meetings

Tenney would like to know if committee chairs find the Chairs Manual to be useful and if they have any suggestions to make it more useful.

**ACTION:** Liaisons will ask committee chairs about the usefulness of the Chairs Manual and report comments to Tenney

**DATE:** By Jan. Board meeting

Ginanni reported that the Awards & Recognition Committee requested a change in deadline for reworking the Champion award to be a nomination rather than an application. This task will be completed by the annual conference in May.

Emery moved and Ginanni seconded accepting for NASIG use the Creative Commons language located at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/2.5/>. The proposal passed unanimously. Emery will send the information to the webmaster to add to the NASIG Web site. This is a "no derivative works license" that restricts the ability for someone to take something like a NASIGuide and then turn it into an article, book, video, etc. on the basis of the material presented on the NASIG web site. Copyright would still remain with the author of the work

Novak stated that the search for a qualified consultant, whose specialty is nonprofits, would be handled as part of the financial plan.

Novak reported that stopping payment on checks with dates older than 2003 would not be cost effective. Carrying the checks forward would be less costly, and it was agreed that uncashed checks would simply remain on the books. .

Naming conventions for conference programs remains a problem. Effective naming conventions help both speakers and attendees determine the nature of sessions. The action item concerning PPC discussion of naming conventions is ongoing. It was agreed that the terminology for program types – vision, workshop, or tactics sessions – was primarily to help speakers develop presentations in the appropriate format.

Page indicated that the action item concerning a possible ALCTS/Synergies Task Force should be dropped because of the difficulty in artificially forcing a relationship.

Chesler reported not getting a lot of responses from liaisons to other groups when he requested items for the *NASIG Newsletter*.

## 2.3 Board Items Status List

The Board was reminded to periodically check the Board Items Status List in the Board Web space.

2.4 Revision of NASIG brochures. Conversion to PDF for web site.

Dues amounts have been changed in the brochures but other rewriting needs to be done. In the past the Regional Councils were responsible for this task. The new Membership committee will assume responsibility for rewriting and reformatting NASIG brochures.

## 3.0 Treasurer's Report (Robischon)

### 3.1 Report from treasurer

Robischon reported dealing on a case-by-case basis with people paying the old rate for membership dues. Charles Schwab had initially sent the wrong form to update officer's signatures but this has finally been straightened out. Robischon is working with Novak to investigate other financial firms to handle investment accounts. She noted that the

organization should not have to use the Treasurer's social security number.

The plan to have the treasurers' terms overlap has been shown to be extremely valuable. The next treasurer will be elected in 2007 for a three year term, the first of which will overlap with the last year of the current treasurer's term as a training year.

### 3.2 2005 budget and expenditures to date

The total amount budgeted for FY2005 was \$85,850.00; the actual total amount spent was \$56,360.09 (as of the Oct. Board meeting).

### 3.3 2005 Conference Report

Robischon reported that the 2005 Conference did make a surplus. She recently received an additional bill from St. Thomas University for copying. The Conference Planning Committee has agreed to use Kinkos for all copying for the 2006 conference

### 3.4 2006 Proposed budget

The entries for Conference Planning budget for 2006 and Conference Planning Committee budget should be consolidated.

Finance refers to the Treasurer, not to a committee, which was eliminated as part of implementing the Financial Plan. All agreed this budget line should be called Financial Administration.

The Bylaws Committee asked for money in case a ballot measure needs to be created and mailed. Savage questioned the necessity of allocating this money when ballot measures are seldom voted on separately from the N&E ballots. Savage moved (Robischon seconded) that the Bylaws allocation be changed to \$500 and if a ballot is needed an additional allocation can be approved. The motion passed unanimously.

The Database & *Directory* Committee's only printing and postage costs should be for this year's renewal letters. A problem has existed with forwarding mail from the P.O. Box in Georgia. The Database & *Directory* budget must be examined to eliminate the directory printing costs and determine a realistic postage amount.

Evaluation & Assessment cut back on their budget; they had a larger budget last year in order to purchase Apian software.

In the Electronic Communications request, \$7900 is for the Bee-net contract; it has an annual fee of \$699 for software plus \$600 per month. Step Schmitt, the Chief Technology Coordinator, is evaluating the services. Page will work with Schmitt on an RFP to look at other services. The forthcoming Technology Plan will address these issues.

The Publicist's budget was reduced to \$100 at the request of Savage.

Novak noted that the Financial Plan does include a contingency fund of \$5000. Parang moved (Tenney seconded) to place all amounts cut from individual accounts into a contingency account. The motion passed unanimously

All financial reports from 1997 to date are in the current version of Quicken. Robischon will look for an updated version of Quicken that could make reporting easier. Administrative costs for NASIG are less than 30%, which is very low for a non-profit of NASIG's size. At present the deposit for the conference event at Red Rocks is in the Administrative account but it will be moved to the 2006 Conference account. This will reduce the Administrative expenses to 22% of the total budget.

## 4.0 Communication among board members (Page)

### 4.1 Conference calls

Maxwell stated email is somewhat impersonal and occasional conference calls could help move projects forward. Chesler suggested setting action points to discuss each month; conference calls must have a definite point. Emery stated software exists for tracking topics, for example, a Wiki allowing all to see documents or instant messaging could be used; she thought the Wiki was a free service. Ginanni noted some web conferencing software is very effective. Page noted that WebEx had been investigated but was too expensive; she asked about the learning curve for wikis. Ginanni thought that NetMeetings might be free software. Novak stated that NetSpoke offers some form of web conferencing and a trial could be requested.

**ACTION:** Robischon will request a trial of web conferencing software through NetSpoke.

**DATE:** Report at January meeting.

Board members living in differing time zones and with variable schedules must be considered in conference calls or web conferencing. Savage suggested asking past Board members to investigate possibilities. AOL Instant Messenger could have security problems for some Board members.

Page summarized: When the Board has an agenda item to discuss, it will try to use some form of conferencing rather than waiting until the next meeting.

Maxwell noted that the time between the May and the fall Board meetings is very long. Chesler asked why the Board meets in October. Novak explained the history of meeting at the same time as other events was initially a cost-saving measure. Savage reminded the Board of a planned fourth virtual meeting that could be held during the summer. The Board members are polled as to the best weekend to meet during the fall but in order to examine preliminary conference program information the meeting needs to be later in the fall.

#### 4.2 Board mentor/mentee relationships

These relationships were established last year on a casual basis. The group discussed whether this should be made more formal. Ginanni felt it was helpful to know someone was available to answer questions, while Maxwell mentioned a weekly 'checkin' email would be helpful. Tenney suggested the new members could create a checklist of useful information. Ginanni felt that Savage's welcoming emails were very useful; Savage explained he planned to create an orientation manual for new Board members. Ginanni volunteered to help Savage.

**ACTION:** Savage and Ginanni will create a checklist for Board mentor/mentee relationships.

**DATE:** By May meeting

#### 5.0 New Committees

##### 5.1 Future of the Publications Committee (Page)

What should NASIG be publishing? More and more publications have gone online but the Electronic Communications Committee should

not be responsible for content. Savage reviewed the background of the Publications Committee: the committee was intended to facilitate publications not write them. Many difficulties resulted in the committee being unable to produce anything. Emery questioned if the provision against committee members writing publications should be dropped. UKSG has no provision against committee self-publishing; their publications committee has produced white papers. Savage noted that the prohibition on committee members writing publications was an attempt to avoid the appearance of favoritism or unethical use by committee members for personal gain.

Page commented the *Proceedings* and *Newsletter* are the only regular publications. Emery recalled that in 1995/96 a document was published titled *Serials 101*. Frieda Rosenberg's publication on serials holdings took a long time to write but is useful outside of NASIG.

Page wondered where ideas for useful publications originate and where should they be channeled. Emery questioned whether a publicity committee should be created to not only put out announcements but also to pursue publications. Simser suggested we could try to get conference presenters to produce publications based on presentations; these would need to be more specific than the write-up that appears in the *Proceedings*. Randall suggested poster sessions as possible sources of publications; these might need editorial support. Savage noted that member support for the NASIGuides has been overwhelming. Emery commented that some people want very basic information.

Savage explained that the Publications Committee's charge was clear: solicit ideas, find authors, and facilitate publications—not author publications. Emery felt that the charge needed to emphasize the editorial role. The Executive Board creates committee charges; Page asked for volunteers to rewrite the Publications Committee charge.

Tenney reported many people had asked about the mounting of the conference handouts. This activity is part of the Electronic Communications Committee charge.

**ACTION:** Page will contact the former member of the Publications Committee who handled

mounting the conference handouts for possible help with mounting the 2005 handouts.

**DATE:** ASAP

Tenney moved (Novak seconded) to create a pilot publications/public relations committee with the Publicist as liaison for the next year. Ten members voted in favor; two abstained.

**ACTION:** Novak, Savage & Emery will create a charge for the pilot publications/public relations committee

**DATE:** By Jan. meeting

5.2 Membership Committee, Library School Outreach and Continuing Education Committee (Maxwell, Emery)

Maxwell will be the liaison to the Membership Committee. Savage wrote the draft charge for the committee using information from the financial plan. Maxwell will consider creating a spreadsheet showing where members come from, different sectors represented, how the membership has changed over time, etc.

Savage reported that last year the Database & *Directory* Committee had suggested that management of the membership directory be moved to this new committee; if this is done, what would then be the responsibility of the D&D committee?

A better name for the committee would be Membership Development Committee. There is a definite synergy between this committee and the D&D committee.

**ACTION:** Maxwell will develop the charge for the Membership Development Committee, including the proposed three-year review and noting the synergy between committees.

**DATE:** By Jan. meeting

**ACTION:** Page and Maxwell will appoint members to the Membership Development Committee for an 18-month appointment in order to get the committee started; future appointments will be for the normal two-year term.

**DATE:** By Jan. 1

Emery suggested the MDC could work with the Continuing Education Committee to garner new members at sponsored programs. Tenney pointed out the need to invite nonmembers who

attend a conference; the Regional Councils used to send letters to these people. The Conference Planning Committee will have the statistics on the number of nonmembers attending. The MDC could still invite attendees from both Milwaukee and Minneapolis. The letter should come from President Page.

Ginanni reported that the ALCTS membership committee sent thank you letters to every new person who joins ALCTS and inquiry letters to every person who doesn't renew their membership. NASIG's Database & *Directory* committee does email new members.

Tenney suggested an Informal Discussion Group meeting during the conference for new NASIG members and Non Members of NASIG to discuss what NASIG can do to attract and maintain members.

Maxwell inquired about the purpose of library school outreach other than to increase the visibility of NASIG. Board members indicated three purposes: recruit new members, partner with library schools on programs, and publicize student grant awards. Thus, library school outreach deals with the work of three committees and definitely must partner with the Publicity Committee. The Awards & Recognition Committee's Library School Ambassador proposal is great and will be included in an overall plan. The new Membership Development Committee will determine what other committees should be involved and will determine an appropriate structure. Savage stated the complexity indicates an independent group is needed. Maxwell suggested a task force of four people, one from each concerned committee. Novak requested a specific timeline, end date (the May meeting), charge stating what should be accomplished. The four people should be Maxwell plus representatives from Awards & Recognition, Continuing Education and Membership Development. Some working documents already exist. Savage moved (Parang seconded) to create such a task force with Maxwell as the Board liaison with a start date of Jan. 2006 and report due in May 2006; the Board unanimously approved the motion.

**ACTION:** Maxwell will work with Emery and Ginanni to appoint members to the Library School Outreach Task Force, with preference given to current or former members of the A&R and CEC committees.

**DATE:** By January

Chesler suggested having vendors lecture at library schools and stress NASIG; he has done this in the past. Emery pointed out the Human Resources Directory that lists potential speakers was maintained by the Publications Committee but is currently out-of-date and has technical problems that the Electronic Communications Committee must correct.

NASIG members should be encouraged to ask their vendors to join NASIG.

### 5.3 Development Committee (Novak, Savage)

The draft charge for this committee is still in a draft stage. Board members were reminded of the background for this committee, the desire to create endowments for recurring budget items like grants and awards. The options to get money for endowments include various types of fundraising. The financial consultant for the initial financial plan stressed the necessity for hiring a financial consultant with experience working with non-profits. Separate management plans are needed for each endowment, each with its own charge. Tenney commented the Board should consider a three-year review built into the charge; this worked effectively for another organization she's work with in the past.

**ACTION:** Board members email ideas about the draft charge for the Development Committee to Savage and Novak.

**DATE:** ASAP

**ACTION:** Board members email ideas about possible Development Committee members to Page; Page will also send a special call for volunteers to NASIG-L.

**DATE:** ASAP

Ginanni reported receiving an inquiry concerning what happened with the ideas generated at the Portland Town Hall. The membership needs to be informed that the success of the Town Hall resulted in the brainstorming session in Milwaukee and ultimately in the Financial Plan. Establishment of the Development Committee was included in the financial plan.

Both new committees need to be added to the budget. Novak stated that contingency funds could be used this year and the committees

could be included in the regular budget next year.

### 6.0 Pre-conferences, ALA and NASIG.

#### 6.1 Co-sponsorship with ALCTS SS preconference on ERMS at ALA Annual 2006 (Page)

Cindy Hepfer and Sandy Srivastava contacted Page asking NASIG to co-sponsor a pre-conference at ALA Annual 2006. NASIG would have no financial commitment but will need to publicize the pre-conference on NASIG-L. The NASIG name will be on the handouts. Page will ask to have the NASIG logo included and for the banner to be displayed. Novak mentioned the need to be certain this is not the same topic that has been proposed for NASIG pre-conferences. Novak moved (Emery seconded) that NASIG co-sponsor the ALCTS SS pre-conference on ERMS at ALA Annual 2006 if the topic and speakers differ from the proposed NASIG pre-conference.

#### 6.2 Preconferences and Continuing Education Committee programming (Emery)

Emery commented that proposed programs are generally bigger moneymakers for NASIG as pre-conferences than they are as CEC programs. Perhaps CEC should be looking at programs held elsewhere that could be re-staged as pre-conferences in order to make money. CEC could encourage presenters but also forward program ideas to the Program Planning Committee. Emery will notify CEC of the Board's enthusiasm for this suggestion.

### 7.0 Financial Plan (Savage)

Savage stressed the importance of finding a qualified financial consultant. The Board needs to get more involved in managing the finances of NASIG. The Financial Plan lists additional reports that could track spending throughout the year and track longer patterns of spending. This would require restructuring the accounts in Quicken. The Treasurer needs to provide more information to the committee chairs to help in budgeting.

**ACTION:** Savage will revise the chronology of the Financial Plan to make it more realistic.

**DATE:** By May meeting



Each Board member should take the initiative to make the Plan work: read the plan and the summary as a starting point.

One of the peripheral concerns mentioned on p. 15 of the Financial Plan was not to overburden the Treasurer. Having a Treasurer-in-training for one year should help, plus the immediate past-Treasurer should be available to answer questions. Another concern was to have a systematic, regularly scheduled review of all NASIG's committees. Page emphasized that a lot of time and energy was spent on creating the plan and the Board must be certain this review happens. Savage noted that establishing two new committees this year would count as part of this review. He also noted that the Plan could be modified as needed.

#### 8.0 Technology plan (Page)

Page described the tasks of a Chief Technology Officer. This year is a trial with Step Schmitt acting as the CTO. Technology for NASIG work should be coordinated among committees or tasks can be neglected, e.g., mounting of the conference handouts on the Web site. The work of the Database & *Directory* Committee in handling new members is dependent on the capabilities of the committee members. Item B (Succession Planning) under Heading III (Current Technology Needs) emphasizes the need for training for individuals assuming technology duties in order to assure continuity of services. Training should be done at the annual conference. Page noted that Schmitt had done an outstanding job analyzing the current technical infrastructure.

Maxwell inquired if more conference activities scheduled on Thursdays would help members justify the expense of arriving early. Randall responded that if people are active in the association, should they be asked to give up program attendance as happens in ALA? Tenney wondered if this year training could be offered on Sunday afternoon, probably from 1-3 p.m. The call for volunteers needs to go out earlier and appointments need to be made sooner so that committee members can make appropriate travel plans. The call for volunteers needs to indicate which committees could involve training.

**ACTION:** Page, Tenney, Randall & Novak will determine how to accommodate more thorough committee meetings and training at conferences.  
**DATE:** Report at Jan. meeting

Schmitt asked for feedback in order to provide a more detailed plan for the January Board meeting. The Board had some feedback on the technology charts provided by Schmitt:

Chart no. 1: Committee chairs do not always have a clear idea as to what other committee chairs do.

Chart no. 2 appears to knock liaisons out of the picture. Chief Technology Officer seems too large a task for a volunteer; the Board needs to start thinking about outsourcing some technology tasks. Novak commented that as more tasks go online, outsourcing seems a necessity but a designated person will still be needed to interface with these tasks.

Page summarized: Schmitt's recommendations provide an excellent starting point. Instead of investing more technology dollars in developing programs, NASIG should consider more outsourcing. Don't outsource list management but outsource online registration, SQL database tasks, etc.

Bee-net is handling only the web and lists; it's basically storage. Currently NASIG has volunteers with technology skills but this may not always be true; plus, jobs may become more demanding and members won't have available time to volunteer. Maxwell noted that we should be asking volunteers to deal with content not necessarily with technology.

Savage mentioned the Financial Plan would require the transfer of some current resources to pay for outsourcing. Tenney pointed out that time will be needed to investigate possible companies and next year's budget would be the one affected. Novak stated that a task force, including Schmitt, would be needed to write an rfp for tasks to be outsourced. Savage brought up the difficulty in finding volunteers with appropriate technology skills for such a task force. The Board's only reservation was the ability to fund outsourcing.

Page stated that instead of asking Schmitt to develop one of the three proposed models further, the Board should ask her to work with someone on developing rfps for the various functions. A starting point could be to have a

group consisting of one person from each affected area discuss what functions could be outsourced, determining how many and what kind of functions. We need to identify which functions require handoffs between committees to make sure tasks are performed. Emery moved (Chesler seconded) that the Board would set up a task force to investigate and create rfps for outsourcing technology tasks.

**ACTION:** Page will appoint a task force to investigate outsourcing technology tasks  
**DATE:** By Jan.

**ACTION:** The Technology Outsourcing Task Force will identify what should be outsourced by May and have rfps written and ready by Aug. 2006 so the rfps can be discussed as the subject of a Board conference call in Sept. 2006

9.0 2005 Minneapolis Conference (All) Evaluations, Conference Planning Committee report, lessons learned

The evaluations gave the Minneapolis conference a very high overall rating: 96% of respondents gave the hotel setting a 4 or 5 rating. Respondents did ask for more digital and electronic oriented sessions.

The Program Planning Committee is getting proposals on the list of requested topics included in the last call for programs. However, they may not have enough 'visionary' proposals. The Board discussed whether the conference needed three big talks or would two be sufficient. A vision session could feature more than one speaker or a debate on some issue such as open access. To do this, the program would need people who can speak on their feet, are energetic, and have previous similar conference experience. The Board would prefer a new voice or, if a repeat speaker, a new topic. Several specific speakers and topics were discussed.

A new conference dealing with electronic resources has been announced. The Board discussed whether this has been proposed because NASIG isn't offering enough relevant sessions. Emery noted this new conference is appealing to a niche.

A conference blog reporting on programs of interest was supported. Workstations near the registrar could be available for blogging. The

Horizon winner(s) could be asked to post to the blog. The blog must be advertised ahead of time to encourage attendees to bring their laptops and blog.

**ACTION:** Novak will inquire if the Minneapolis hotel has information on how many attendees had internet service in their rooms  
**DATE:** By Jan. meeting

10.0 Program Planning (Garner, Graves, Novak)

10.1 Draft schedule

The Board discussed the length of pre-conferences, two day, one day and half day and noted the necessity to watch the ending time of the Thursday pre-conferences.

Chesler noted that programs should not be geared towards vendors; they want open-ended discussions where they can participate and also hear the user/librarian perspective.

The Board inquired if the First Timers reception could be held at the Red Rocks location. Because Awards & Recognition is in charge of mentoring, they should decide.

10.2 Draft program

As a first step, the Program Planning Committee must determine the Vision speakers and then the Conference Planning Committee will determine the opening session.

Attendees still ask about the difference between vision, strategy, and tactic sessions; these labels are primarily to guide speakers in program preparation.

The poster sessions must be down by 2 p.m. on Saturday but could be up Thursday through Saturday morning.

Possible topics for a brainstorming session include laying the groundwork for technological change or NASIG and online communities. The Brainstorming session is scheduled for the middle of the conference.

Possible topics for the vendor demo session include institutional repositories or link resolvers.

The user groups should be opened up to more than ILS groups. For example, the suggested theme of "Let NASIG be your library advisory board" could be the basis of a meeting. Chesler will work with the Program Planning Committee on this proposal. He noted it is important how the session is framed; the aim is to encourage smaller publishers to attend. Other topics would include: come and share your ideas about how to improve scholarly communication.

#### 11.0 Conference Planning Committee (Highby, Moeller, Tenney)

##### 11.1 Schedule, events, venues

The Conference Planning Committee needs to start emailing NASIG-L about the big event being held Thursday night. The buses for the Red Rocks event are contracted for five hours. There will be places for people to sit outside and indoors. Low-key background music can be provided. The Web site needs to emphasize the 5 p.m. departure for Red Rocks.

Friday night is open museum night in Denver. A bowling alley is located nearby, which some might enjoy as a group activity. There will be expanded dine-arounds.

##### 11.2 Conference budget

The budget numbers were based on the Minneapolis conference budget. The artwork has been paid. The food is contractually obligated.

The tax situation for the Red Rocks event must be resolved. The tax certificate from the Boulder conference may still be valid. The committee must determine exactly what is tax exempt. Colorado has state, city, and county taxes and NASIG will probably have to pay city and county taxes. The bottom line of the budget is very close to last year.

The amount allocated for speakers must include travel, food, and honorariums.

Post-conference tours, operated by professional tour guides, seem feasible because of the low number of participants required. Some attendees did not stay on Sunday last year due to a lack of tours. Denver is more of a tourist destination.

Emery moved (Novak seconded) approval of the conference budget of \$188,593.00. The motion passed unanimously.

The Conference Planning Committee and the Program Planning Committee received thanks from the Board for doing a great job.

The meeting adjourned for the day at 4:45 p.m. and resumed the next morning, Sunday, Oct. 30, 2005, at 8:30 a.m.

#### 13.0 Committee Reports

Highlights of Committee Reports will be published in the *Newsletter*

##### 13.1 Archivist (Parang)

The Archivist should take digital photos of all memorabilia and then dispose of all items. If the past Archivist manual cannot be located, a new one should be created.

Task force on archive policy (Page, Parang, Simser) will continue to work on determining exactly what should be retained.

##### 13.2 Awards & Recognition (Ginanni)

Mexican Student Grant – The purpose of the timeline for this award is to avoid outrageous expenses, for example, last minute plane ticket purchases.

The Fritz Schwartz scholarship amount was increased as part of the budget approval.

For Recommendation no. 1, possibly the membership could be surveyed to see if sponsorship should be sought for the Champion Award; the Development Committee will be involved in this type of activity. For recommendation no. 2, the Committee recommended naming the Paraprofessional Award after a deceased person who has been active in NASIG. Recommendation no. 3 was discussed as part of Library School Outreach. Recommendation no. 4 brings up the question as to whether NASIG includes the Carribean; Ginanni will research further and the Board will vote by email.

### 13.3 Bylaws (Maxwell)

The Bylaws state that the Board agendas should be 'mailed' 30 days prior to a meeting. Page asked that the committee scan the Bylaws to locate such wording that can be interpreted to read "communicate to members". At some point in the future when a substantial bylaws change is needed, these minor wording changes can be added.

### 13.4 Continuing Education (Emery)

Emery reported that the ERM workshop in Pennsylvania will not take place.

### 13.5 Database and *Directory* (Page)

Page reported Jo McClamroch has done a terrific job. Some difficulties were encountered generating the renewal letters from the database. The committee members' names need to be included in all reports. The Board wanted clarification as to whether both new and renewal online membership was fully functional. McClamroch should send out an announcement to NASIG-L to renew online. Page should send out an announcement in December reminding members to renew in order to get the member rate for the conference. Chesler asked if the technology worked to allow people to join at the same time as they register for the conference.

### 13.6 Electronic Communications (Page)

Page reported that the division of labor is working well between the list and web teams. Two separate Board lists have been created that will recycle to be odd and even years.

The Membership Development Committee will rewrite the brochure and then the ECC will mount it on the Web site.

The footer on NASIG-L [The focus of the discussion list is NASIG organizational issues. Persons wishing to participate in a serials content forum and/or to address matters of general interest to serialists should find another forum. For more information about NASIG-L, email the NASIG list manager:] should be limited to the first and last sentences.

The Web spinner must have a backup.

Rather than adjusting the calendar every year to fit a June or a May conference, there should be a note that committee should update their schedule to fit the date of the conference. Emery mentioned that calendar software or outsourcing could be helpful.

### 13.7 Evaluation and Assessment (Page)

The 2005 conference evaluation reports were very well organized and easy to understand. Board members asked if comments could be listed by category of membership: academic, publisher, vendor. The Board discussed the possibility of a return to labeling programs by audience. The titles should reflect the content; Novak will discuss this point with the Program Planning Committee chairs.

Adding the abstract from the program to the Evaluation would be helpful. The pre-conferences did not have many evaluations because the forms weren't in the packets. The Conference Planning Committee must receive the conference evaluation form by March 1.

### 13.8 *Newsletter* (Simser)

Process and timeline for recruiting new editor (Simser, Novak, Page)

A new Editor-in-Chief needs to be in place to work with Simser on the May issue.

Review draft position description at <http://nasig.org/newsed/positions/editor.in.chief.html>. Skills and knowledge related to HTML are very important because of conversion issues from Word to FrontPage.

**ACTION:** Simser & Novak will create a call for the Editor-in-Chief

**DATE:** For publication on NASIG-L and in the Dec. *Newsletter* issue

**ACTION:** Savage, Simser & Novak will constitute the search committee

**DATE:** When applications are received following publication of the call in the Dec. *Newsletter*

### 13.9 Nominations and Elections (Savage)

Anne McKee was unanimously appointed chair of the N&E committee.

### 13.10 *Proceedings* (Randall)

In the future, *Proceedings* editors should ask authors to supply keywords. This year the *Proceedings* editors should ask this year's indexer to supply keywords for each paper and report.

Haworth is willing to supply NASIG free of charge a PDF version of the *Proceedings* to mount on NASIG's Web site. The Board asked if the PDF would be searchable and indexable. If so, the HTML would not be needed.

**ACTION:** Randall will ask if older editions of the *Proceedings* are also available and, if so, request the ECC to mount them on the Web site  
**DATE:** By Jan. meeting

**ACTION:** Randall will write a call for *Proceedings* editors for next year, emphasizing the need for someone with editorial experience.  
**DATE:** By Nov. 21

**ACTION:** Randall and the editors of the current *Proceedings* will serve as a search committee to select a new editor(s).  
**DATE:** By Jan. meeting

### 13.10 Professional Liaisons (Chesler)

Chesler and Schmitt are still working on establishing guidelines and expectations for the content of liaison reports. The frequency has been changed to be in sync with the *Newsletter* deadlines. The online form has been modified accordingly. Chesler noted he was not getting a lot of communications from liaisons.

Maxwell asked if there was a technological way to harvest news from other organizations. Chesler suggested a blog might serve this purpose. Savage reminded the Board that we are asking people to report informally on another organization's activities; the information reported doesn't necessarily reflect the information that organization wants disseminated. Randall wondered if we should stick with a page of links to other organizations. Savage indicated the Publicist could group email all the public relations people at other organizations asking if they wish to send information to NASIG.

**ACTION:** Chesler will look through the list of professional groups and identify those with Web

sites of educational interest and send the information to Page who will have ECC set up a page of links on NASIGweb.

**DATE:** By Jan. meeting.

### 13.12 Publicist (Savage)

Savage reported receiving no brochure requests; he sent out two calls for the Program Planning Committee.

### 14.0 Site Selection 2007 (Novak, Page, Tenney)

Tenney reported that Louisville is willing to meet the same concessions as Richmond. The hotels available there would be the Gault House and the Marriott. Possible dates would include May 7-12, a Tues. through Sat. conference. This is the week after the Kentucky Derby and Derby-related activities may still be happening. Richmond will benefit from 2007 being the anniversary year of the founding of Virginia. We will negotiate with both cities and get the best contract for NASIG for a 2007 conference.

The Board needs a faster schedule for selecting cities for future meetings. Now is the time to start the cycle for the 2008 and 2009 conferences in order to get a better choice of dates. Canada poses problems because passports will be required for re-entry to the U.S. starting in 2007.

### 15.0 2006 Conference registration fee (Novak, Tenney, Page)

Tenney stated the Board should wait to set the fee until the tax situation is known. The budgeted expenses should probably be divided by 500 paying attendees to find the fee.

### 16.0 NASIG and advocacy (All)

Traditionally NASIG has not taken a stand on issues; however, the Strategic Plan states that NASIG will be the voice of serials.

### 16.1 DLF report on e-journal preservation (Emery)

Emery reported DLF did want to hear from other groups. LITA and WebforLibs have had discussions asking, "What is wanted?" Should NASIG state: We agree preservation of

electronic journals is important and should be aggressively pursued.

Chesler asked how NASIG would take a stand: should the Board act unilaterally or present a proposal for the membership to vote. Page noted that no precedent exists. NASIG wants to have a higher profile but is uncertain as how to achieve this goal. For example, Project Counter had no NASIG representation. How would representatives be selected and funded?

NASIG's original mission was as a forum with a level playing field for all participants. As an advocate, NASIG would be expected to take a position. As an alternative, NASIG could sponsor summits for various people to meet and discuss important serials' issues or hold informal discussion groups. Such groups would need an appropriate facilitator. The Board could express support for continuing discussion by inviting people from the affected groups to lead discussions.

Another possibility is continued development of the 'hot topics' session at the conference. We would need an expert facilitator who would establish the framework and then lead the discussion.

**ACTION:** Novak will ask the Program Planning Committee to include a 'hot topic' program to be selected close to conference.

**DATE:** ASAP

At some point the Board may wish to survey the membership as to whether they would attend an additional day of conference activities.

The Board could sponsor programs but must emphasize that the program is a 'discussion.' This type of program would need to be advertised extensively but could lead to a more dynamic conference experience. Novak will present these concepts to PPC. What does 'advocacy' in the strategic plan really mean? How should it be incorporated?

## 16.2 Institutional registry (Chesler)

Chesler summarized the institutional registry discussion he had attended.

Unfinished business.

**ACTION:** Set a date for a Sept. 2006 conference call to review the Technology rfp

**DATE:** At same time the Board is polled to determine the date for the Fall Board meeting.

There being no further business, Page adjourned the meeting at 11:55 am.

## TREASURER'S REPORT

### TREASURER'S REPORT

Rose Robischon, NASIG Treasurer

NASIG remains in good fiscal condition. As of 10/25/05, we have over \$212,000.00 in assets.

The balance sheet below reflects our income and assets as of October 25, 2005.

**Balance Sheet 10/25/05  
(Includes unrealized gains)  
As of 10/25/05**

**ASSETS**

Cash and Bank Accounts	
Charles Schwab-Cash	\$ 31760.02
CHECKING-264	68048.56
SAVINGS-267	83890.47
TOTAL Cash & Bank Accounts	\$183699.05

Investments	
Charles Schwab	\$ 28522.72
TOTAL Investments	\$ 28522.72

TOTAL ASSETS	\$ 212221.77
--------------	--------------

**LIABILITIES & EQUITY**

LIABILITIES	\$ 0.00
EQUITY	\$ 212221.77

TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY	\$ 212221.77
----------------------------	--------------

All of the conference invoices have been received and paid.

**2005 Minneapolis Conference  
Summary Report  
1/1/05 Through 10/25/05**

**INCOME**

Conference Registration	\$ 187729.52
Preconference Income	8648.90
Conference – Extra Meals & Souvenirs	3398.00
TOTAL INCOME	\$ 199776.42

**EXPENSES**

Credit Card Charges	\$ 1200.37
Conference: Equipment Rental (includes AV)	21887.54
Conference: University of St Thomas School Of Law Room Rental	300.00
Conference: Meals	150374.45
Conference: Entertainment	1500.00
Conference: Souvenirs	704.00
Conference: Photocopying and Printing	614.82
Conference: Postage	827.74
Conference: Supplies	743.59
Conference: Speakers	9107.93
Conference: Shuttle	373.75
Conference: Other	804.05
Conference: Refund	3012.85
Conference: Marquette Hotel Anniversary Bash	27,824.90
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ 167415.05

TOTAL INCOME-EXPENSES	\$ 32351.37
-----------------------	-------------

With two months remaining in the fiscal year, the 2005 budget is on track. Committees are doing a very good job of watching expenses.

**NASIG Budget Expenditures  
1/1/05 Through 7/28/05**

Admin Board Expenses	\$-20,125.00
Awards & Recognition	-7,284.85
By-Laws	-334.76
Continuing Education	-1717.43
Conference Planning	-521.45
Conference Site	-612.00
Database & Directory	-537.00
Electronic Communications	-6699.00
Evaluation	-83.23
Finance	-3040.00
Nominations & Elections	-982.02
Program Planning Committee	-44.25
Publicist	-7.55
OVERALL TOTAL	-\$41,988.84

**CALL FOR EDITORS**

**NASIG *PROCEEDINGS* EDITORS WANTED**

NASIG is seeking a team of two or three co-editors for its *2006 Conference Proceedings*. This is a great opportunity for NASIG members who want to become actively involved in one of the best conferences in our field. We are seeking excellent writers who have editing experience and are able to work under tight deadlines. The editors will together form a team to prepare both the print and electronic editions of the *Proceedings*.

The *Proceedings* editors will recruit, select and organize volunteers who will take detailed notes at each program. A major responsibility will be communicating the requirements for the published *Proceedings* to conference speakers. Before the conference, speakers will be advised on submission formats, deadlines, and copyright restrictions. After the conference, the editors will work with speakers on revisions. The editors must be diplomatic but firm about NASIG's requirements.

The editors will work under the general direction of the NASIG Executive Board Liaison.

Specific qualifications include, but are not limited to, the following:

- NASIG membership and previous conference attendance

- Attendance at the NASIG Conference in Denver in May 2006
- Demonstrated writing ability
- Prior editing/publishing experience
- Expertise with standard word processing programs
- Ability to send and receive attachments via e-mail
- Ability to complete editorial work between June and October 2006

To apply, submit a letter outlining specific qualifications and experience. Include current resumes and writing samples. Preference will be given to those applicants who address the specific qualifications listed above. Appointment is subject to approval by the NASIG Executive Board.

Submit all application materials (application letter, resumes, and writing samples) in electronic format via e-mail by Dec. 16, 2005 to Kevin Randall at: [kmr@northwestern.edu](mailto:kmr@northwestern.edu).

For further information, contact:

Kevin M. Randall  
Head of Serials Cataloging  
Northwestern University Library  
Email: [kmr@northwestern.edu](mailto:kmr@northwestern.edu)  
Phone: 847-491-2939  
Fax: 847-491-4345



## **CALL FOR APPLICATIONS**

### *NASIG NEWSLETTER – EDITOR IN CHIEF*

NASIG is seeking an individual to serve as NASIG *Newsletter* editor-in-chief for a term beginning in May 2006. This is a great opportunity for a NASIG member who wants to become actively involved in one of the best organizations in our field.

The editor-in-chief works closely with the *Newsletter* Editorial Board members, the NASIG President and Board, and other NASIG committee chairs and members, to ensure timely and effective production of the NASIG *Newsletter*, and to develop and implement improvements for its process, policies, content, structure, and appearance. The editor-in-chief serves as an ex-officio on the NASIG Board and is expected to attend three board meetings per year.

Specific qualifications include, but are not limited to, the following:

- NASIG membership
- Attendance at the NASIG Conference in Denver in May 2006 and subsequent conferences while serving as editor-in chief
- Prior editing experience
- Demonstrated writing ability; demonstrated organizational skills

- Ability to work under tight deadlines with a geographically dispersed editorial board
- Expertise with standard word processing programs
- Ability to send and receive attachments via e-mail
- Familiarity with MS FrontPage desirable
- Extensive knowledge of HTML markup
- Knowledge of PDF production

See the complete position description at:  
<http://nasig.org/newsed/positions/editor.in.chief.html>.

To apply, submit a letter outlining specific qualifications and experience. Include current resume and writing/editing samples. Preference will be given to those applicants who address the specific qualifications listed on the full position description. Appointment is subject to approval by the NASIG Executive Board. The editor-in-chief serves a two year term at the pleasure of the NASIG Board and may be reappointed for one additional two year term.

Submit all application materials (application letter, resumes, and writing samples) in electronic format via e-mail by Dec. 31, 2005 to Denise Novak, [dn22@andrew.cmu.edu](mailto:dn22@andrew.cmu.edu)

## **21<sup>ST</sup> ANNUAL CONFERENCE (2006)**

### **CPC UPDATE**

Wendy Highby and Paul Moeller, Co-Chairs

Preparations for the 21st annual conference are coming together. We have reserved the truly lovely Red Rocks Visitor Center for the Thursday evening opening event. Red Rocks Visitor Center is located in the foothills of the Rocky Mountains west of Denver, in the midst of an 816-acre park. Panoramic views of the mile-high city abound and we will be treated to videos of noteworthy musical performances at the famous Red Rocks Amphitheatre. Go to the Web site for more information: [http://www.redrocksonline.com/03\\_meetings/03\\_meetings.html](http://www.redrocksonline.com/03_meetings/03_meetings.html). Be sure to get to Denver in time for this event. The conference will be held at the

Marriott City Center which is just a hop and skip from the many exciting cultural and entertainment opportunities that beautiful downtown Denver has to offer. We're still in the preliminary stages of planning independent evening activities but they are sure to include dine-arounds and baseball fans will be happy to hear that the Houston Astros will be in town taking on our Denver Rockies. More details about these and other activities will be on our soon-to-go-live Conference Web site. The Conference Planning Committee looks forward to seeing you from May 4-7, 2006 at NASIG's annual convention.

## PPC UPDATE

Rachel Frick, June Garner, Tonia Graves, PPC Co-Chairs

The NASIG 2006 Program Planning Committee has spent the past few weeks reviewing proposals and scouting out topics and speakers. As we write this, the committee will soon begin the very difficult job of making final decisions about which proposals to accept. We hope to confirm all of our speakers by mid-December 2005.

We received 40 proposals and ideas in the first call that closed September 1, 2005. Committee members ranked these proposals in order to identify what was missing from a perfect conference schedule. The result was a targeted final call for proposals which generated several more proposals for us to consider. The final deadline for proposals was November 4, 2005.

PPC made use of the Web form for proposal submissions. The completed form is sent to the "prog-plan" mailbox and delivers proposals in a standard format to the co-chairs. Each proposal is then inserted into a spreadsheet that is disseminated to the PPC membership.

PPC is pleased to announce that we have designed a "no conflict" schedule. There will be no overlap between strategy and tactics programs. We will offer a number of pre-conferences as well. PPC has formed subcommittees to organize the sessions you have enjoyed at past conferences, such as the focused vendor demos, informal discussion groups, poster sessions, and user groups. We will be sure to let everyone know about the conference schedule once things become finalized.

We suggest that you plan to arrive early and to stay late as you will not want to miss any of the inspiring programming opportunities that PPC has planned. We look forward to seeing everyone in Denver.

Special thanks to each PPC member, the NASIG Board and especially our Board liaison, Denise Novak.

## 20<sup>TH</sup> ANNUAL CONFERENCE (2005)

### CONFERENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE WRAP-UP REPORT

Sue Zuriff, Linda Hulbert, co-chairs

[Ed. note: submitted as a final report for the fall Board meeting.]

The 2005 CPC celebrated an outstanding conference with very few glitches for the attendees and surprisingly few during the course of preparing for the conference. Using the process that we used to handle meetings, the following describes the work of the committee. Please see the conference planning manual, newly revised, for time lines.

#### ADVERTISING

As the first order of business we arranged for a logo to be designed. There were several revisions. The design depicted a celebratory 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary. By January we had approved the postcard and sent it to the printers. The deadline for renewal was January 31 so we waited until after that to request labels for

mailing the postcards. We made about 600 extra postcards to hand out to ACRL attendees because ACRL was in Minneapolis the month before NASIG. We also sent postcards to the local public libraries, St. Catherine's School of Library and Information Science and to local periodical publishers who had a circulation in excess of 50,000 – that was about 50 postcards. We requested mailing labels from Database and *Directory*. Later we found some verbiage that suggested they will send the file for local creation. We were happy to have someone else do it. We waited until the website was up and running to send them. We announced the live site and sent out the postcards about two weeks later. We made announcements using NASIG-L about the conference or activities which had shaped up in the interim. Our announcements were usually sent later in the week. When the hotel registration went live, we announced that. NASIG-L served as our primary method of

advertising and the web site. We mailed through the University of St. Thomas mail room which franked the postage and billed the Library which billed NASIG. Night students applied the labels. One person was assigned to manage the logo creation, design the postcard, the bags and the souvenirs that used the conference logo.

**COST:** The total cost for advertising was \$1,189 including the logo design, postcard printing and mailings.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Look at the evaluations to see if there were comments about the postcard and its mailing date.

### *AV*

This is among the most difficult areas over which to have responsibility. Two members of the committee started out working on this, but one saw it through to its conclusion. She managed the bid process by getting bids from both the hotel endorsed vendor and 3 others. They ranged in amount from \$38,000 to \$10,000. The hotel ultimately matched the second to lowest bid. We could have gone back to each bidder to see if they would match the best bid, which would have gleaned us the \$10,000 bid. But we stopped when the hotel went about \$13,000. That bid included staff and full set ups in each room: LCD, screen and lap top. Everything went very smoothly. Despite asking the final key note speaker what he needed, he never revealed to either PPC or us that he had a brand new MAC and the connections we had available would not work with a newer MAC. Other than that we never heard of any problems with the AV equipment. The staff was attentive and available to handle little problems that arose with people using a piece of equipment they had not used before. On the conference days the CPC member was available and checked on the set up in each room. Due to the high hotel cost (\$500 per connection per day) for internet connectivity, we did not have live connections.

**COST:** \$13,532 was the final cost.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** (1) Bid the job with at least three AV services. (2) Go back to each one after the least expensive bid is received, but know that dealing with an in-house firm is definitely the most convenient way to do it. (3) Set each room the same for both bidding

purposes and final arrangements. (Appendix B is the AV use)

### *CONFERENCE PACKETS*

Several people took on the responsibility for various parts of the conference packet. One person ordered the folders; one person managed the contents in terms of what needed to be there; several of us took responsibility for either developing the documents that went in or getting others to do so. (Appendix D). One person managed the printing of what needed to be in the packet and pre-arranged the conference session handouts. Again, we bid out the printing and used the University of St. Thomas printing shop for the packet and anything we printed prior to the meeting. Follow up materials were to be done at Kinkos as needed. However, PPC was marvelous in making it clear to anyone who missed our deadline for printing, they were on their own. Students applied logoed labels to the portfolio.

**COST:** \$4,328 for all things associated with the packet, including badges, badge holders, lanyards, folders, ribbons and copying.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** The badge holders from the previous year are pretty grungy. However, the 2005 CPC member went through the badges and weeded out the grungy ones. Because many were new this year, we were able to pass on many to the 2006 crew.

### *FOOD*

Food decisions were the purview of the two chairs. The hotel costs for three breakfasts, two lunches, one reception (mentor) and one dinner should have been about \$114,000 which includes tax and tip. Minnesota would not exempt us from most taxes. We made every effort to accommodate most food needs including vegan choices, vegetarian choices and a variety of interesting foods. Food was plentiful and nicely labeled at the opening night event so there was no doubt as to what was vegetarian, vegan, etc. Two vegans served on the CPC. The hotel provided water on the tables at the back of every meeting room refreshed after each meeting. Therefore, NASIG did not provide bottled water (\$3 per bottle).

COST: \$114,000? We did not see the final accounting for this. It went directly to the treasurer.

RECOMMENDATIONS: (1) The signs were a big hit as to the content of the food. (2) Include vegan and vegetarian choices.

#### *FUN RUN*

One person managed the advertising, mapping and treating the runners/walkers. It was very successful.

COST: \$50.

#### *HOTEL ARRANGEMENTS*

One person was our primary contact with the Hilton during the planning process (excluding food arrangements). During the conference, the two chairs worked with the Hilton staff. Hilton provided a link for the hotel registration. They had told us to expect a nominal charge, but there was none. The hotel staff was accommodating and pleasant to work with. I would recommend the Hilton in Minneapolis happily. The staff was solicitous to the CPC workers regularly stopping by and asking if there was anything they could do to help. We had a hotel room at a greatly discounted rate. It worked out very well for local people to crash for a while, spend the night, drop their luggage on Sunday (as the room was still ours until checkout time on Monday) and use the computer for NASIG business. That room got the internet connection.

COST: \$165.

RECOMMENDATIONS: (1) Get a room, it's a good idea. (2) Two people who are working together is a good thing and the hotel adapted to getting instructions from either of us. We worked particularly well together with a shared vision.

#### *LIBRARY TOURS*

We arranged with a few libraries within walking distance to be available for tours on Thursday May 19 from 1-4 (UST Schoenecker Law Library; UST Charles Keffer Library, and the Minneapolis Community and Technical College. In addition, Greg Campbell of Campbell Logan bindery hosted tours for the conference attendees who made their way over to the

bindery. We provided information on the bindery, making arrangements and maps and transportation options available. We asked people to make contact with Greg so that he knew how many to expect and when. We added a link on the website to the ACRL article on local libraries.

COST: \$0 (minimal printing costs)

RECOMMENDATIONS: Read the evaluations to see if people appreciated them.

#### *MENTORING RECEPTION*

The food for this event was included in the food costs for the hotel. This was lovely and very well attended.

COST: Included in food costs for the hotel.

#### *NON-NASIG SPONSORED EVENTS*

We investigated many options. In the end we offered dine-arounds like Milwaukee. They were very successful. Almost all of them exceeded the number of places for which we had planned. We offered many options on the web site for activities in Minneapolis.

COST: \$50.

RECOMMENDATIONS: These were very successful.

#### *ONLINE REGISTRATIONS*

ORT did an astonishing job. The registrar, a CPC member, had among the hardest jobs on CPC. CPC evaluated the form and tested the system. We did not provide a link for hotel registration on the conference registration page but instead had a link to our hotel page from the conference registration page and a conference registration link from the hotel registration site. The online registration worked with few problems. Most of those were related to when someone had or had not registered as a member. We had several registrants who ended up being bogus, scam artists attempting to come into this country under false pretenses.

COST: \$0.

RECOMMENDATIONS: (1) Registrants be allowed to join the association as they register

for the conference as with other associations. (2) CPC Registrar clears the list of bogus attendees prior to counting for conference events. (However, care must be taken because one foreign sounding name was legit.) Coordination is required between the treasurer who identifies the bogus registrants because of false credit card payments (or no payments). (3) State more clearly on the registration form what a SIGNER is. We had three people check that box who did not need the service. If you need one, the person will need to know library jargon. (4) Preparing the list of special needs requests for the whole CPC committee regularly throughout the planning process. (5) Schedule to close and then close online registration a few days prior to the opening of the conference. This allows for the receipt of checks, and obviates the problem of "the check is in the mail" at the registration desk.

*OFF-HOTEL EVENT:  
ANNIVERSARY BASH, IT'S A PARTY*

The big event for the weekend was a party at the tallest building in Minnesota. The food was good and again included vegan and vegetarian choices and a fabulous view. The museums in Minneapolis were extremely expensive before even a morsel of food was served. And they would have required costly bus transportation. We had a single shuttle going between the hotel and the Marquette for less than \$400. We had a band snafu at the last minute where the contracted band (although they failed to sign the contract), needed way more space than we could provide. Due to the ingenuity of one of the CPC members, a replacement was found in 48 hours. The Anniversary Task force had skits about the association. CPC was called upon extensively to bring props for the skits. We went out on bid for the decorated cakes. The Marquette would have charged over \$2,200. Byerly's bakery charged \$1740 including delivery (and the hotel's \$2.00 per slice cutting fee).

COST: \$30,745

RECOMMENDATIONS: Go out on bid for venues.

*ON-SITE REGISTRATION*

Appendix E includes all of the things that we found useful to have at the registration/souvenir

sale site. The space provided by the hotel was fantastic. It was large enough to be able to have routine meetings there during the conference days so we could inform each other of issues or problems.

COST: \$134 supplies

RECOMMENDATIONS: (1) share cell phone numbers. (2) There was good synergy to having both souvenirs and registration together. (3) Keep the money separate. (4) Close registration/souvenirs during the opening and vision sessions and put that into the schedule. This will allow CPC members who attend next to nothing for the whole conference attend these valuable sessions.

*OPENING SESSION*

Welcomes by: Mayor Rybak's office who provided a letter of welcome; Kit Hadly, Director, Minneapolis Public library; Peggy Johnson, AUL Access Services University of Minnesota, the Cities, confirmed but was replaced by Linda DeBeau-Melting, AUL Organizational Development at the U; Dan Gjelten, director UST. The speaker, Larry Millett did a great job. The room set up (albeit, too few chairs which hotel staff attempted to correct) actually worked well allowing people who wanted a more quiet space to go to the halls and those who wanted to be up close and personal to hang with the band.

COST: Honorarium of \$250, band \$700.

RECOMMENDATION: Keep it really short!

*POST CONFERENCE TOURS*

Due to prior year losses, we did not provide post-conference tours but instead had links to interesting opportunities on our web site.

RECOMMENDATION: Look at evaluations to determine whether our membership missed these opportunities.

*POSTER SESSION*

The poster sessions were set up in the break area and got great and continuous attendance. It was a pain to store them over night in the CPC area, but the hotel staff was very accommodating by moving them in and out.

COST: The poster board, delivery and set up were \$340.

#### *PRECONFERENCE*

We used the University of St. Thomas School of Law which is in walking distance to the hotel. We offered to drive anyone who couldn't make the two block walk, but that was not necessary. We provided breakfast for all of the attendees, but no morning break. The University charged about \$6.00 per person for breakfast and leftovers were available at the break time, but no additional food was brought out. Box lunches were provided only for those who were attending the fabulously successful all day session. That session had a 14 person wait list only one of whom we could accommodate.

COST: The costs were about \$2,000 including food, copying materials for the SCCTP workshop including binders and space. Income was close to \$7,500.

RECOMMENDATION: The SCCTP workshop program is very attractive. Perhaps two of those would be appropriate.

#### *ROOM MONITORS*

This was managed by one person on the CPC. We used a spread sheet to guide the Room monitors using a master list described in space allocation. That spread sheet included the event, the room, and whether handouts were awaiting pickup.

COST: \$0

#### *SOUVENIERS*

We sold all of the merchandise from the previous year at discounted prices. Income exceeded \$3300 and expenses were about \$2500. The t-shirts sold for \$15.00 and cost us about \$5.50. The clip boards sold for \$5 and cost us \$3.50. There were two boxes of clip boards left and some t-shirts. We sold 124 of the 180 shirts to be sold; we sold 95 of the 200 clipboards to be sold. Among other things we sold paper pads, pens, caps, 2004 T-shirts and the cross stitch patterns. In addition we sold 495 quilt raffle tickets and 621 conference raffle tickets. Further, we sold extra meal tickets.

COST: About \$2500; All income sources \$4,330. (Appendix H).

RECOMMENDATION: (1) Be sure to order mostly large and extra large sizes with some XXL and XXXL. 2005 experience: 200 t-shirts ordered should have been: 30 medium, 80 large, 60 extra large, 20 XXL, 10 XXXL.

#### *SPACE ALLOCATION*

Upon receipt of a sizeable number of registrants, the CPC met at the hotel and looked at the space available. The numbers in the hotel map did not match the room. The configuration of classroom was not adequately allocated. Rooms were assigned and reassigned as close to the printing date (one month prior) using the registrations. Knowing that attendees do not have to attend what they signed up for, at least it was a guide to general interest. It may be that registrants, now knowing they do not have to follow the provided itinerary, may not choose carefully. However, there were no complaints about not getting into chosen places.

COST: \$0

RECOMMENDATION: (1) Allot adequate space for speaker's breakfast: attendees include the board, members of the incoming *and* outgoing PPC, speakers, all introducers and all recorders. (2) Vendor demo should just use the main hall.

#### *SPECIAL IDEAS*

Leif Utne (one of the speakers) of the UTNE Reader provided us with 600 copies of a current issue. They were delivered to the Library where we packed the packets and then we put one in each bag. NWA signed the contract for the free seats and a discount for our flying attendees. They included a code for our members to use. We were not informed as to how many free seats resulted from this arrangement.

RECOMMENDATION: This should be negotiated with the airlines that serve the host city for the conference year assuming it also will serve the next year's conference city. That is when NASIG would take advantage of the free flights.

### *CEREAL COMPANY WELCOMES SERIALISTS*

General Mills provided a small box of cereal for each conference attendee. We printed off labels saying "Happy 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary to NASIG Serialists from the Twin Cities Cerealists, General Mills. Cheerios® to literacy!! A great success.

COST: \$0 (minor printing costs) covered by UST.

RECOMMENDATION: Blogging.

### *SUPPLIES*

COST: \$134 on supplies including pens, pencils, post it notes, staples, scissors.

### *TRANSPORTATION*

We contracted with SuperShuttle which supplied an ADA jitney to go between the hotel and the venue. We also recommended this company for attendees to take from the airport. Further, we comped parking for all volunteers who worked for CPC including members of the CPC.

COST: \$370. We did not see the hotel parking charges, but they should have been around \$360.

### *VOLUNTEERS*

We solicited help from all of our libraries and the Library school. While we had excellent turnout for volunteers prior to the conference, including skit preparation, we had fewer volunteers than other conferences during the conference. Several local NASIG attendees did offer to help. We followed the policy for volunteers, indicating that they could attend a couple of sessions on the days that they worked. We gave them bags and folders because we had an adequate supply.

COST: \$0

RECOMMENDATION: State clearly what the policy is and that presenters cannot be volunteers, they must be attendees. (Yes, someone tried to be a volunteer.)

### *WEB PAGE*

The web page developed over time. Our web master was excellent and the page was clear and filled with useful information. Instead of creating a brochure, we developed several documents to support both the decision to come and the attendees including several formats and views of the program, FAQ and virtually every document going into the packet. We got an OK to use ACRL link with attribution for things to do in Minneapolis.

COST: \$0

## **CONFERENCE EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT**

Stephanie Schmitt, chair Evaluation & Assessment Committee

NASIG's 20th Annual Conference was held completely within the Minneapolis, MN Hilton, building on the previous year's successful hotel experience. The program format continued with the vision, strategic and tactics sessions structure. In celebration of our 20th annual meeting, the conference included special programming, a special event with skits and a fabulous feast.

Two hundred and sixty-eight conference attendees completed and turned in evaluation forms for this conference. University libraries continue to provide the largest number of respondents, up two percentage points from last year to 61.4%. College libraries members are the second most represented group, this year

providing 9.2% of the completed surveys. Community college libraries were represented by less than 1% of the respondents, bringing the total percentage for academic libraries to approximately 71%. This representation is typical of previous NASIG conferences.

Medical libraries continued to rank third in attendance, accounting for 5.6% of respondents. This number is also typical of prior years. Subscription vendor attendance dropped slightly from 4.1% to 3.6%. Government, national, or state library representation also dropped slightly to 3.6% (down from 4.1% last year). Public Library attendees increased from 2.2% to 3.6%. Law Libraries and Special and corporate libraries were next, accounting for 3.2% of

returned surveys which was no significant change from last year. Publishers provided 1.6% of responses, and library networks, consortiums, or utilities decreased slightly to .08% (down from 1.2% last year). Database producers were represented by less than 1% of respondents, and 1.6% chose the category "Other."

The number of survey respondents with over 10 years of serials-related experience increased to 56.9% (up from 54.6% last year). Approximately 13% of responses were provided by attendees with 1-3 years of experience. Those with 4-6 increased to 16.1% (up from 13.3%) and 7-10 years of experience dropped to 10.1% (down from 13.3%). Attendees with less than one year experience provided 4% of the completed surveys (up from 3.3% last year). 41.8% of respondents had attended 1-5 previous NASIG conferences, and 16.5%, which was a significant drop from last year, were first-timers. 23.3% had attended 6-10 conferences, 10.4% had attended 11-15 conferences, and 8% had attended 16-18 conferences.

57.8% of survey respondents identified themselves as serials librarians (not a significant change from last year). Electronic resources librarians provided 41% of this year's completed surveys (also no change from last year), and for the third year in a row, this was the most frequently chosen category after that of serials librarian. Acquisitions and catalog librarians share the third category group at 34% each. Collection development librarians representation dropped to 23.8% (compared to 26.1% last year), and reference librarian representation also dropped to 17.6% (down from 19.4%). Processing and binding unit staff attendance showed no change at 14.3%. Each of the rest of the categories applied to less than 10% of respondents. This includes training and development staff representation, which showed a slight increase 8.2%. Automation/Systems librarians were at 5.7% each, customer relations and paraprofessional attendees were both at 4.9%. Sales attendees were at 3.7%. Assistant/Associate Directors, Interlibrary Loans and Marketing attendees were each at 2.5%. As usual, many respondents identified themselves with multiple categories, showing once again the variety of discrete roles filled by those working with serials.

On a scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the highest), survey respondents gave the 2005 conference a mean

rating of 4.46. This was the second time NASIG used a conference hotel for both housing and nearly all conference events, and survey respondents rated the overall experience with this setup at 4.54.

The conference's geographic location rated 4.34, with most respondents thinking Minneapolis was a great place to meet. The hotel rooms rated 4.59, which was up slightly from last year. Cleanliness and the friendly hotel staff generated the most positive comments, while negative comments generally focused on the need to have more opportunities to gather outside. Meeting rooms received a rating of 4.35, also a slight improvement. Meals and breaks got ratings of were both up respectively at 4.06 and 4.05. Social events received a lower rating of 4.02, compared to last year's mean of 4.42. This year's business/town hall meeting was moderately well received with a rating of 3.64, down from 4.23 from last year. Several comments about the business/town hall expressed disappointment that so few were in attendance.

For the second year, conference sessions were organized as vision, strategy, and tactics sessions taking the place of the plenary, concurrent and workshop sessions. Vision Session 1, "Chaotic Transitions: How Today's Trends Will Affect Tomorrow's Libraries", drew rave reviews of Marshall Keys and the program content giving it a rating of 4.87. Vision Session 2, "20th Anniversary Special Program," generated a rating of 3.77, and Vision Session 3, "Painting America Purple: Media Democracy and the Red/Blue Divide", was also well received with a rating of 4.28. The program format, with vision, strategy, and tactics sessions, was generally well received in its second year, although some said that the overlapping schedule continues to be confusing and frustrating.

Strategy sessions generated ratings from 3.72 to 4.44, with 9 of the 10 sessions rating over 4.00. The highest session rating for the conference as a whole went to the strategy session "Access to Scholarly Literature: Publishing for an Extended Readership," with John Cox. The strategy session with the second highest rating was "Negotiation for the Rest of Us". This program had a rating of 4.39 and was presented by Joan Conger.



There were 18 tactics sessions offered this year. Ratings ranged from 3.44 to 4.62, with 12 sessions rated at 4.00 or higher. The highest rated tactics session was "Challenges of Off-Site Library Storage Facilities: Cataloging, Access and Management of Off-Site Serials" presented by Sarah Corvene, Susan Currie, and Zoe Stewart-Marshall. It carried a rating mean of 4.62. The second highest rated program, "Do you see RSS in your future?" presented by Araby Greene and Paoshan W. Yue, received a rating of 4.58.

The overall rating for this year's poster sessions was 4.50, up from last year's rating of 4.12. Ratings of individual posters ranged from 4.0 to 4.54, with the highest rating going to Maggie Wineburgh-Freed's poster, "Developing a Customized Database System for Managing Electronic Resources". Respondents were pleased with having the poster sessions in a central area. Most felt that the scheduling on both days was very good. General comments were positive with many respondents wanting to see the session documents made available online.

This was the second NASIG conference that included focused vendor demos. This session rated well at 4.12. 82.9% of respondents wanted the focused vendor demos to continue. 14.4% were uncertain and only 2.7% did not find them worth continuing. Several respondents stated that these sessions were a good way to get

vendors involved in the conference and that a commercial presence at NASIG is needed.

There were three pre-conferences offered this year and all were well received, though there were not enough respondents to accurately determine any findings. The Evaluation and Assessment committee highly recommends that conference attendees take time to fill out all of the relevant evaluation forms and make them available for review and assessment.

The evaluation survey is produced by members of the Evaluation and Assessment Committee and we welcome suggestions and feedback regarding the survey form and the conference. Please address questions, comments, or suggestions to Stephanie Schmitt, stephanie.schmitt@yale.edu. All suggestions are forwarded to the appropriate Board and/or committee members.

As always, "thank you" to everyone who took the time to fill out and return the evaluation survey. Your contributions are important to NASIG's continued focus on providing the best possible conference experience.

2005 Evaluation and Assessment Committee:  
Stephanie Schmitt (Chair), Marla Baden, Joe Badics, Carole Bell, Sandy Folsom, Leanne Hillery, Elizabeth Lowe, Lori Terrill, Veronica Walker, Mary Page (Board Liaison)

## PROFILES

### ADAM CHESLER

Reported by Maggie Rioux

It seems like this column is having a run on Bronx natives who grew up in New Jersey and remain die-hard Yankees fans. This month's profile is new Executive Board member Adam Chesler who shares the above background with NASIG President Mary Page, the subject of last issue's profile. Their lives diverge sharply, however, once you get past this beginning.

Adam is non-library-based, working for a society publisher, and he didn't stay in New Jersey after high school. After graduation in 1980, Adam enrolled in Brandeis University in Waltham, Mass., which is a western suburb of Boston.

Four years later he graduated with a bachelor's degree in English and American literature (hmm, sounds like some librarians I know). Adam is a runner and while in college he was a member of Brandeis' indoor track, outdoor track and cross-country teams. He says he chose Brandeis because it was far enough from home to feel independent from mom and dad, but close enough to sneak home with his dirty laundry when necessary.

After graduation, Adam moved to a small apartment in Boston and then realized he'd better get a job if he was going to continue

eating. A stint in a stationery supplies warehouse tided him over until he landed a job at Kluwer Academic Publishers. This seems to have been a happy arrangement – Adam stayed with Kluwer in various capacities for almost eighteen years. He spent several years in product-level marketing, starting in life sciences and moving on to computer sciences. In 1997 he began working with the electronic content program, which became Kluwer Online. From this point, his CV begins to include a number of presentations on Kluwer Online and various aspects of e-journals. Venues include the Charleston Conference, ALA, the North Carolina Serials Conference and even NASIG.

In 2002 Adam left Kluwer and, after a short stint at Ingenta, landed firmly on his feet at the American Chemical Society in February 2004 as Assistant Director of Sales and Library Relations. He had been working in library sales and relations at Kluwer during his last year there and also at Ingenta, so the position is a natural for him. He gets to represent ACS at conferences, give presentations at some of them, work on pricing models, licensing and business policies for electronic projects and generally build relationships with the library/customer/author/trading partner community. Sounds like fun to me – and they even pay him to do it!



Adam Chesler smiling because a) he is finished moving to DC, b) his wife has a job, or c) he is so jetlagged from ACS and NASIG travel obligations he has no idea what day it is.

Somewhere along the line the library relations turned personal. Adam's lovely wife Marla is a librarian and he met her through his job. Adam and Marla spent this past fall moving from Boston to Washington, D.C., where ACS is headquartered. Marla, who was then Collection Development Librarian at Northeastern University, began a casual job search in the DC area and received a job offer at FLICC/FedLINK. After some serious discussion with their two cats, Adam and Marla moved to Alexandria, Virginia, in September.

Adam says that while he misses Boston, as a die-hard Yankee fan, he doesn't miss Red Sox Nation. However, in his email to me, he said that Boston may have done him some good after all: "Living in the Boston area all those years, especially after the Red Sox beat the Yankees in the play-offs last year, certainly helped inure me to anything the library community could throw when price increases came up for discussion." I hate to have to tell you this Adam, but DC has a baseball team again, although they probably won't be playing the Yankees any time soon – wrong league.

Our Adam still runs, but he says he's slowed down both speed- and distance-wise from his college days. No marathons, but he still can turn in a good five miles. We have a nice 7.1 mile road race here in Falmouth and I'm hoping I'll see him there someday (well, maybe I hope I won't, since I'm a regular medical volunteer). At least he can be a star of the NASIG conference fun runs.

In closing, since he is firmly embedded in the publisher side of the serials community, but has long been engaged with the rest of the serials chain, I asked Adam for his thoughts on the relationship between publishers and librarians and where he thinks things are going in the future. His answer was so well written and right on the NASIG ideal, that I thought it worth quoting in full. So, Adam, here's your chance to have your say:

How one assesses the relationship between publishers and librarians – my home life aside -- is a function of how involved one is. Those who simply read email lists and rely on anecdote probably think "irreconcilable differences" is the most polite way to describe it. Those who are inside probably are more willing to recognize

the many common interests in play and the opportunities to collaborate on resolving important issues: broadening access to scholarly content, assisting and streamlining the peer-review process, improving services and features to reduce administrative burdens, finding sustainable business models to allow for the long-term survival of high-quality content. I started working with the library community in 1998, and during that time technology has taken a publicly visible role and given everyone a sense of expanded possibilities. It's healthy for subscribers to look at the resources available and push for modifications; I just hope there's mutual understanding of the underpinnings and requirements of each party, and recognition of the value of working together to effect positive changes. I don't believe that the answers lie in the extremes as propounded by the most militant advocates (no matter how sincere their beliefs and exhortations), but rather in the somewhat quieter recesses where

stakeholders of all kinds look for best-case scenarios and then co-operate to achieve them. Project COUNTER is a good example of that. I recently attended a meeting about establishing institutional registries that was attended by publishers, technology partners, librarians, and subscription agents. Not a big blip on the radar, but a practical topic and a group of interested parties seeking a ways to make things work better. We need those discussions, and those collaborative approaches. That's one more way NASIG can play an important role in the dynamic: continuing to provide an environment that encourages and endorses co-operation and understanding.

Personally, I think we're fortunate to have Adam on the NASIG Board. He brings with him a broad perspective and a willingness to think and to explore issues which will help him make a strong contribution to NASIG operations, especially now that the baseball season is over for a few months.

## **AWARDS & RECOGNITION COMMITTEE**

Quick – name a NASIG committee that carries out one of the fundamental purposes of the organization and gets a lot of publicity, but only for the objects of their work, not for themselves. Did you guess Awards & Recognition? If so, give yourself a pat on the back.

Yes, A&R gets publicity in and for NASIG, but only for the award winners, not for themselves. As a committee, they labor behind the scenes publicizing awards, reviewing applications, ordering plaques, making travel arrangements, mentoring award winners, and numerous other tasks. All this to fulfill one of the basic purposes behind NASIG – getting new folks interested in the serials field and recognizing those who have done great things within the field.

A&R has been around since way back in 1987 when it was formed as the Library Science Student Grant Committee in order to select six library science students for grants to attend the third NASIG Conference in Atlanta. Over the years it has always been responsible for the student grants, but has added to its responsibilities with the Fritz Schwartz Scholarship (an additional student grant with

scholarship money attached), the Horizon Award (a grant to attend NASIG for someone already working in the serials field), the Mexico Student Grant (a grant to attend NASIG which is targeted at library science students in Mexico), the Marcia Tuttle International Award (to help support research involving international travel) and the NASIG Champion Award (for outstanding contributions to serials and/or NASIG). In addition, the committee is responsible for ordering the thank-you gifts given to retiring Executive Board members, Committee chairs and others chosen for recognition by the Board.

Although committee procedures for the different awards vary, the student grants, Horizon and Fritz Schwartz awards are quite similar. It all begins with publicity – a few months before applications are due, A&R, with the Publicist's help, sends out announcements to all the major library & serials email lists and also to all the accredited library schools in the US and Canada. Applications are received and all identifying information is stripped by the committee co-chairs before they are put up in a secure spot on the committee's web space.

Committee members then review and score each application based on a set of appropriate criteria. This blinded review helps assure objectivity in evaluating the applicants (sort of like peer review of journal manuscripts). The grant winners are determined by their score, the number of grant winners being set by the budget for the year. The Mexico Student Grant is handled differently. The grant is publicized in the library schools in Mexico and the applicants screened and evaluated by a group of Mexican library school faculty in consultation with the Committee. The Tuttle Award is not awarded on a set schedule, but depends on appropriate applications being received. The Champion Award, initiated for NASIG's 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary this past year, will continue to be awarded every five years and depends on nominations from committee and Board members as well as from NASIG members.

Once the grant winners have been decided upon, the winners and the Executive Board members are notified, the announcement is made to the various email lists (including NASIG-L), and then the rest of the work begins. The Tuttle and Champion awards are easy – order the plaque, arrange for the monetary award and then make the presentation at the conference. The awards which include conference attendance are a lot more fun.

You know how hard it is to get your whole family organized for a vacation trip? Well imagine that project, only worse. A&R gets to arrange for several folks from all over North America (or world – the Horizon winner a few years ago was from New Zealand) to travel to the conference city on time, conveniently and with all registrations, including hotel, properly taken care of. Each winner is assigned a committee member as liaison, shepherd, big sister/brother and things usually work out okay. After all these winners are all intelligent and sensible people – their being interested in NASIG demonstrates that. There are occasionally some glitches, however. The Mexico Student Grant winner was a couple of days late arriving for the 2002 conference in Williamsburg due to a newly-complex and time-consuming visa procedure instituted by the US after 9/11. By 2003, A&R was prepared and all went smoothly.

And is it all worth it? You bet. The Champion Award gives recognition and says thank you to someone who has made a major contribution to NASIG and the serials field, always something

that is worthwhile. The Tuttle Award provides support to a NASIGer to carry out professional research, which again helps the serials field. And the conference attendance grants turn new folks onto NASIG and, of course, to serials. My profile column in the June 2004 issue of the *NASIG Newsletter*, for which I tracked down all ten grant winners from 1999 demonstrates this. Although only a few are still NASIG members, most of them are still working somewhere in the information chain, and all of them said that their experience at the NASIG conference was informative and rewarding. In some cases it helped their careers and in all cases it gave them a great appreciation for the serials field. The 2005 grant winners' reports in the September 2005 *Newsletter* issue also reinforce this.

If you look at any aspect of NASIG – conference presenters, committee members, Board members, officers – you'll find any number of folks who got their start in NASIG as a grant winning conference attendee. This year you don't have to look any farther than the Awards and Recognition Committee itself – all three of the co-chairs are former grant winners. Jessica Gibson was a student grant winner in 2000, Jeff Slagell was Horizon winner in 2001 and Sarah Sutton was Horizon award winner in 2003. Also committee member Susan Chioranksy was a student grant winner in 1993 and Fang Gao was a student grant winner in 2003. All of these folks were impressed enough with the organization and their experiences that they wanted to help others follow in their footsteps. That, to me, is a ringing endorsement of the program.

And, in closing, I want to mention an A&R committee member who was not a NASIG grant winner of any kind. That's because she joined NASIG in the very beginning, way before there were any student or Horizon grants to be awarded and also well after her eligibility for same had expired. However, Susan Davis (one of the NASIG Everytimers mentioned in my May 2005 column) wants me to tell you that she is pleased to be on A&R, something she has always wanted to do, but never was able to before. She never even got to be their Board Liaison. She says, "I love working with the award winners to instill that special NASIG personal touch with their first experience with our group." Also Susan wants me to be sure to mention that she was the one who submitted the nomination for the person who ultimately won the first NASIG Champion Award – Tina Feick (who also

never won a student grant or Horizon award, for the same reasons that Susan was denied the honor).

So what can you, the average NASIG member, do to help A&R do their work? There are a couple of things. First, talk up the various awards with your serials colleagues and anyone

you know in a library school. Second, when you see the little flock of winners at the NASIG conference, say hello and tell them you're glad they're with us. And finally, when you run across a member of A&R in your wanderings about the world, say hello to them too and tell them thank you for a job well done in making NASIG and serials more visible to the world.

## OTHER NASIG NEWS

### AWARDS ANNOUNCEMENTS

Jessica Gibson, Jeff Slagell, and Sarah Sutton, co-chairs

The Awards and Recognition Committee is pleased to announce the beginning of its application cycle for NASIG's 2006 grants, awards, and scholarships. All awards will be presented at the 21<sup>st</sup> Annual Conference in Denver, Colorado. NASIG has a rich history of fostering interaction among all members of the serials information chain. The organization has also established an extremely successful awards and recognition program that engages those new to the profession and recognizes others who have made substantial contributions.

Every year, NASIG awards several student travel grants, awards for promising serialists, scholarships for library school students, and an international award to aid in serials research.

Since 1988, NASIG has granted over 126 student grant awards—including 5 grants for Mexican students— 5 Marcia Tuttle Awards for international serials research, 8 Fritz Schwartz educational scholarships, and 21 Horizon awards to recognize up-and-coming members of the profession.

This year, a new award will be offered to acknowledge the contributions of a paraprofessional in the serials field. The Serials Specialist Award will provide the recipient with conference registration, three nights lodging, and travel costs to NASIG's annual conference. For more awards information, please visit the NASIG Awards Web page at <http://www.nasig.org/awards/>.

### COMMITTEE UPDATES

[Ed note: adapted from committees' fall reports to the NASIG Board.]

#### AWARDS & RECOGNITION (A&R)

Jessica Gibson, Jeff Slagell, Sarah Sutton, Co-chairs

##### ACTIVITIES

- A & R has been reviewing and revising all award and procedural documents (i.e., announcements, applications, FAQ's etc.) where necessary. All award due dates have been altered to account for the earlier conference schedule. Updated documents have been posted to the internal committee Web page along with other supporting material.
- A & R's library school contact list has been updated and posted to the internal committee Web page.

- A & R will continue to work with the Mentor/Mentee committee to facilitate mentor assignments for award winners and ask that interested A&R committee members receive first consideration.

##### RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee made several recommendations to the Board including procedures regarding the NASIG Champion Award, renaming the proposed Paraprofessional Award to NASIG Serials Specialist Award.

## 2005 AWARDS

A & R previously submitted a timeline to the Board that provided additional time for the

Mexico Award winner to obtain a visa and secure reasonable air fare. The recommendation has already received Board approval.

## BYLAWS

Adolfo R. Tarango, chair

I am pleased to submit the progress report of the Bylaws Committee for May 21, 2005-October 19, 2005.

The Committee held its annual meeting at the NASIG annual conference in Minneapolis, MN, on May 21, 2005, at 7:30 am. David Bynog volunteered to be the Committee's web liaison. The Committee reviewed its past year's work, its charge, annual report, and committee guidelines.

There was some discussion as to whether clarification was needed, either in the NASIG bylaws or the Committee's guidelines, regarding the Committee holding responsibility for coordinating and balloting of issues such as the recently passed dues change. That proposal

was not a revision to the Bylaws, so possibly not under the purview of the Committee, but was referred to the Committee by the NASIG Board explicitly. The Committee will discuss via e-mail at a later date.

As a result of last year's ballot, the Committee created a tabulator's report. D. Bynog was asked to contact the NASIG webmaster about having it mounted on the NASIG Web site off the Bylaws Committee's page.

During this report period, the Committee received no questions/proposals.

In other business, the Committee revised its calendar and submitted its budget requests for 2005/2006.

## CONTINUING EDUCATION (CEC)

Robert Alan & Nathan Rupp, co-chairs

### ANNUAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

Following up on a request that Nathan Rupp and Bob Alan received toward the end of the 2004/05 fiscal year, we opened a discussion on how CEC can partner with library schools. Kim Maxwell, formerly of the CEC and now a NASIG Board member, and Deberah England had submitted a revision of the Library School Outreach program to the NASIG Board for its consideration in Minneapolis. We briefly discussed what CEC's role would be in maintaining NASIG relationships with library schools. In a conversation after the meeting, Jill Emery, CEC's Board liaison, informed Nathan that the Library School Outreach proposal was still being considered by the board and that a separate task force might be drafted to do this.

### 2005 PROGRAMS AND BUDGET

To date, CEC supported nine programs or conferences, beginning in February. [See CEC's annual report in the summer business issue.] One additional program, an ERM workshop in

Pennsylvania, will take place this fall. \$8,480 of the NASIG CEC budget for 2005 (\$9,305) has been committed.

CEC has begun to explore partnering with other organizations to support programs. These partnerships enable CEC to market NASIG without the full expense of supporting programs. CEC will look to continue to these partnerships in 2006 as it works with other groups on such efforts as designing programs connected with the NASIG annual conference.

### 2006 BUDGET AND PROGRAMS

As the case in 2005, the 2006 co-chairs approached members for programming ideas and firm proposals. Several proposals and ideas were received that have been incorporated in the 2006 budget proposal. Proposals for Hawaii and continuing support for the Caribbean, Puerto Rico, and Mexico has been included. Funds have also been requested for continued investigation into distance education models.

## **DATABASE & DIRECTORY (D&D)**

Jo McClamroch, chair

### *HIGHLIGHTS SINCE THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE*

A new web-based interface for the online *Membership Directory* has permitted greater task sharing among all committee members. Routine tasks have been distributed amongst all members of the committee. The chair focused a good deal of effort providing virtual training for committee members and developed "cheat sheets" to assist them in their work. New workflows have been developed covering areas such as record keeping, database queries, communication with ECC, the *Newsletter* and the treasurer.

Technology limitations of the Members Database Access File have been addressed by delegating access to three committee members who volunteered their expertise (Lisa Blackwell, Heather Cannon, Buddy Pennington).

Many thanks to Stephanie Schmitt, who performed database queries for generating membership renewal letters. Letters were scheduled to be sent on Monday October 24, 2005. Step's assistance has been invaluable and is to be applauded.

## **EVALUATION & ASSESSMENT (E&A)**

Stephanie Schmitt, chair

### *ACCOMPLISHMENTS*

E&A completed the evaluation summary for the 20<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference and presented it to the Board. The decision to distribute the report electronically has resulted in budgetary savings in the form of reproduction and mailing costs. Recommended changes to the type of data reported were incorporated into this year's summary.

The committee will update its manual and revise content now available online. In addition, the committee will burn the files to CD-ROM as well as store previous versions of the manual and other documents in the E&A web space for security and archival purposes. This will relieve the E&A chairs of the need to store and protect all of the historical files previously stored on floppy disks locally.

### *PROCEDURAL CHANGES*

Transfer of data files, previously managed via snail-mailed floppy disks, is now managed electronically via email.

### *RECOMMENDATIONS*

E&A recommends that a task force be appointed and charged with exploring online evaluations, surveys and evaluation and assessment software.

## **NASIG NEWSLETTER**

Char Simser, editor-in chief

### *PRODUCTION SCHEDULE*

Two issues have been published since my annual report in June.

### *OTHER*

A new format/layout was introduced with the special summer issue. The format replaces the sidebar menu (which meant less room for article text) with the issue navigation menu spanning the page horizontally below the header but before the article text.

### *SPECIAL BUSINESS ISSUE*

The special business issue, added as a 5<sup>th</sup> issue for the year, was published in mid-July 2005. The issue provided timely publication of Committee Annual Reports. The supplement also featured a summary of board activities from Past President Steve Savage, 2005/2006 Committee and Board rosters, Board Liaisons, and some 2006 Conference-related articles.

### *NEW ITEMS FOR THE FALL BOARD MEETING*

The board should initiate the call for a new editor-in-chief before the end of the year. (The term for the current EiC ends in May 2006.) Simser has reviewed and updated the position description.

## PROCEEDINGS

Elna Saxton & Meg Mering, co-editors

The 2005 *Conference Proceedings* manuscript is almost ready to be shipped to Haworth Press. It is due the week of October 31.

Mering visited Haworth on September 21-22. The visit, which included meeting many of the people the co-editors work with throughout the year, was very worthwhile.

### ACTION ITEMS NEEDING BOARD ACTION

Among items the co-editors would like direction on from the board: Should presenters provide keywords for their presentations? Since Haworth will provide a PDF version of the *Proceedings* for NASIG Web, should the HTML version continue to be produced? A search committee needs to be formed for next year's *Proceedings* editors.

## SITE SELECTION

Denise Novak, Mary Page, Joyce Tenney, co-chairs

Proposals were received and evaluated from the following locations:

- Charlotte, North Carolina
- New Orleans, Louisiana
- Louisville, Kentucky
- Richmond, Virginia
- Saratoga Springs, New York
- Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
- Hunt Valley, Maryland
- Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
- Washington D.C.
- Alexandria, Virginia
- Several Canadian Locations
- Rochester, New York
- Niagara Falls, New York

As per vote at May Executive Board meeting, the Site Selection Committee arranged site visits for Richmond, Virginia and New Orleans, Louisiana. In August, we participated in a site visit with Richmond which is a viable site for the conference. We were set for a site visit to New Orleans in September but due to the destruction caused by Hurricane Katrina, the committee has put that location on hold. Options for a second site were reviewed and Louisville, Kentucky was selected for a site visit conducted in mid October. Contingent upon favorable contract terms, the committee expects to have a firm decision sometime in December.

## ERRATA

Michael Bradford noticed that his "title change" information, which appeared in the September issue of the *Newsletter*, contained a typo. The URL for his blog, The Library Despot, was not

complete. It should be <http://librarydespot.weblogs.us>. This has been corrected in the HTML version of the *Newsletter*.

## TITLE CHANGES

[Note: Please report promotions, awards, new degrees, new positions, and other significant professional milestones. You may submit items about yourself or other members to Susan Andrews ([Susan\\_Andrews@tamu-commerce.edu](mailto:Susan_Andrews@tamu-commerce.edu)). Contributions on behalf of fellow members will be cleared with the person mentioned in the news item before they are printed. Please include your e-mail address or phone number.]

**MICHAEL A. EDWARDS** took time out of his Italian vacation to let his NASIG colleagues know "My wife Laura and I moved to Massachusetts the day after I left the Pentagon, then before we could unpack the boxes we left for two weeks in Italy. I will start my new job (with jetlag) on Monday, Nov. 7th after returning from Italy the evening of the 6th." Michael was

Technical Services Librarian at the Pentagon Library. His new title is Databases and Serials Librarian at Hampshire College's Johnson Library. His phone and fax number were not yet available, but otherwise he can be reached at:

Johnson Library  
Hampshire College



893 West Street  
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002  
E-mail: maedwards@hampshire.edu

NASIG Board Member-at-Large, **KATY GINANNI** not only changed titles, but she also changed continents. She e-mailed "Here's a change! After 5 years as a training specialist at EBSCO international headquarters in Birmingham, I've moved to the EBSCO regional office in Johannesburg, South Africa. Here I'll be the Sales Manager, managing the sales activities for the southern Africa region, and serving as the sales representative to academic libraries in that area. EBSCO has let me continue to serve on the NASIG board, so I'll be back in the U.S. for the board meetings and conference, too!" Katy's e-mail address is unchanged, but her new address is:

EBSCO Information Services-Southern Africa  
Phone: +27 (011) 678-4416

The former Acquisitions/Serials Librarian at Mansfield University, **ELIZABETH C. HENRY** is now Technical Services Librarian and Assistant Professor at Saint Leo University's Library. She wrote about her new job "I started my new job on the 2nd of May of this year. I received my MLS from the University of South Florida, so coming to Saint Leo, located in west central Florida, is coming home. I have a truly enjoyable variety of job responsibilities, including acquisitions, cataloging and serials. The diversity of the work, the friendliness of the people, and the palm lined entrance to the campus overlooking Lake Jovita make coming to work a pleasure!" Beth may now be reached at:

Saint Leo University  
Cannon Memorial Library-MC2128  
P.O. Box 6665  
Saint Leo, Florida 33574-6665  
Phone: (352) 588-8265  
Fax: (352) 588-8484  
E-mail: elizabeth.henry@saintleo.edu

**LAURA MORRISON**, former Library Specialist I at Clemson University Libraries took time out, while settling into her new job, to let her NASIG colleagues know "I started with Spartanburg County Public Library in July of this year. This is a major step for me as it is my first professional position since graduation. I catalog a variety of materials and formats. I have transitioned from the academic/scholarly world to the current 'pop

culture' realm. In my new position, the amount of serials encountered has been drastically reduced, but I do have a few come across my desk. It is enough to keep my interest in the serial field alive." Laura's new job title is Catalog Librarian and her contact information is now:

Spartanburg County Public Libraries  
151 South Church Street  
Spartanburg, South Carolina 29306  
Phone: (864) 596-3500 ext. 1282  
Fax: (864) 596-3518  
E-mail: lauram@infodepot.org

**CHAR SIMSER** became Head of Cataloging & Serials in July 2005 after serving for 2.5 years as Interim Asst. Dean for Technical Services/Digital Libraries at Kansas State University Libraries. Char writes that "one goal for KSUL after our new dean came on board in Aug. 2004 was to revisit the organizational structure. After months of meetings with library faculty and staff, the "design team" came up with their solution. The former Technical Services Dept. was split into a Cataloging & Serials Dept. and a Collection Services Dept. (Acquisitions, Binding, Preservation & ILS). I decided to return to my roots (in serials) and applied for the department head position in Cataloging & Serials. Life is not yet returning to normal. The new structure, with several new dept. heads, is having growing pains. We've also added a number of new positions, so we're doing some heavy-duty recruiting! It's keeping us extremely busy, which is the way I like it (most of the time)!" Char's addresses remain the same.

2004 Horizon Award winner, **C. ROCHELLE (ROCKI) STRADER**, was happy to announce that "As of May 2, I am now Assistant Professor and Catalog Librarian at Ohio State. My primary responsibilities are cataloging electronic theses and dissertations, and also print masters theses (soon to be electronic as well), plus some foreign language materials, and special projects as assigned." Rocki was previously their Electronic Resources Manager. Her contact information is:

The Ohio State University Libraries  
1858 Neil Avenue Mall, 030  
Columbus, Ohio 43210  
Phone: (614) 688-8091  
Fax: (614) 292-2015  
E-mail: strader.2@osu.edu

## CALENDAR

Lillian N. DeBlois

[Please submit announcements for upcoming meetings, conferences, workshops and other events of interest to your NASIG colleagues to Lillian DeBlois, [lillian@ahsl.arizona.edu](mailto:lillian@ahsl.arizona.edu).]

January 19, 2006

*NASIG*

Executive Board Meeting

San Antonio, Texas

May 3, 2006

*NASIG*

Executive Board Meeting

Denver, Colorado

January 20-25, 2006

*American Library Association (ALA)*

Midwinter Meeting

San Antonio, Texas

<http://www.ala.org/ala/eventsandconferences/midwinter/2006/home.htm>

May 4-7, 2006

*NASIG*

21<sup>ST</sup> Annual Conference

“Mile High Views: Surveying the Serials Vista”

Denver, Colorado

<http://www.nasig.org/conference/2006/>

March 20-25, 2006

*Public Library Association (PLA)*

11<sup>th</sup> National Conference

Boston, Massachusetts

[http://www.placonference.org/registration\\_fees.cfm](http://www.placonference.org/registration_fees.cfm)

May 19-24, 2006

*Medical Library Association (MLA)*

Annual Meeting

Phoenix, Arizona

<http://www.mlanet.org/am/am2006/index.html>

March 23-26, 2006

Electronic Resources & Libraries

Atlanta, Georgia

<http://www.electroniclibrarian.com/conf2006/conf2006.htm>

June 11-14, 2006

*Special Library Association (SLA)*

Annual Conference

Baltimore, Maryland

<http://www.sla.org/content/Events/conference/ac2006/index.cfm>

March 24-26, 2006

Computers in Libraries

Washington, D.C.

<http://www.infotoday.com/cil2006/>

June 22-28, 2006

*American Library Association (ALA)*

Annual Conference

New Orleans, Louisiana

March 30-31, 2006

North Carolina Serials Conference

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

See also the *American Libraries* “Datebook.”

## VOLUNTEER FOR NASIG!

### **OPPORTUNITIES ABOUND!!!**

Positions on numerous committees, task forces, editorial boards, and other positions will be available beginning with the May 2006 conference.

To volunteer, please complete a form available at:

<http://www.nasig.org/forms/volunteer.html>

## COPYRIGHT AND MASTHEAD

The *NASIG Newsletter* is copyright by the North American Serials Interest Group and NASIG encourages its widest use. In accordance with the U.S. Copyright Act's Fair Use provisions, readers may make a single copy of any of the work for reading, education, study, or research purposes. In addition, NASIG permits copying and circulation in any manner, provided that such circulation is done for free and the items are not re-sold in any way, whether for-profit or not-for-profit. Any reproduction for sale may only be done with the permission of the NASIG Board, with a request submitted to the current President of NASIG, under terms which will be set by the Board.

---

The *NASIG Newsletter* (ISSN: e1542-3417) is published 4-5 times per year for the members of the North American Serials Interest Group, Inc. Members of the Editorial Board of the *Newsletter* are:

Editor-in-Chief:	Charlene N. Simser, Kansas State University
Copy Editor:	Kathy Kobyljanec, John Carroll University
Columns Editor:	Susan Andrews, Texas A&M-Commerce
Columns Editor:	Sharon Heminger, JSTOR
Conference/Calendar Editor:	Lillian DeBlois, Arizona Health Sciences Library
Submissions Editor:	Beth Bernhardt, University of North Carolina—Greensboro
Profiles Editor:	Maggie Rioux, MBLWHOI
HTML Production Editor:	Mykie Howard, National Agricultural Library
PDF Production Editor:	James Michael, University of South Florida
Board Liaison:	Joyce Tenney, University of Maryland, Baltimore County

In 2005, the *Newsletter* is published in March, May, September, and December and a special issue in July. Submission deadlines for the regular issues (February 1, April 1, August 1, and November 1) are 4 weeks prior to the publication date. The submission deadline for the next issue is:

### **FEBRUARY 1, 2006 NO LATE SUBMISSIONS WILL BE ACCEPTED**

Send submissions and editorial comments to:  
Charlene Simser  
Kansas State University  
137 Hale Library  
Manhattan, KS 66506-1200  
Phone: (785) 532-7444  
Fax: (785) 532-7644  
Email: csimser@ksu.edu

Send all items for "Title Changes" to:  
Susan Andrews  
Phone: (903) 886-5733  
Fax: (508) 999-9142  
Email: Susan\_Andrews@tamu-commerce.edu

Send all items for the Calendar to:  
Lillian DeBlois  
Email: lillian@ahsl.arizona.edu

Send inquiries concerning the NASIG organization, membership, and change of address information to:  
Elizabeth Parang  
Pepperdine University  
Payson Library  
Malibu, CA 90263  
Phone: (310) 506-4046  
Fax: (310) 506-4117  
Email: Elizabeth.parang@pepperdine.edu

NASIG address:  
NASIG, Inc.  
PMB 214  
2103 North Decatur Road  
Decatur, GA (USA) 30033-5305  
URL: <http://www.nasig.org>

