

# NASIG Newsletter

Vol. 25, no. 2

May 2010

eISSN 1542-3417

## Other NASIG News

### Committee Annual Reports

#### Nominations & Elections

**May 1, 2010 (Final/Corrected 5/5/10)**

Chair:

June Garner (Mississippi State University), 08/10

Vice Chair:

Eleanor Cook (East Carolina University), 09/11

Members:

Norene Allen (Swets Information Services), 08/10

Joe Badics (Eastern Michigan University), 08/10

Ann Ercelawn (Vanderbilt University), 09/11

Rene Erlandson (University of Nebraska Omaha), 09/11

Betty Landesman (National Institutes of Health), 08/10

Meg Mering (University of Nebraska Lincoln), 09/11

Alison Roth (YBP Library Services), 08/10

Jacquie Samples (North Carolina State University),  
09/11

Joyce Tenney (University of Maryland, Baltimore  
County), 09/11

Board Liaison:

Jill Emery (University of Texas at Austin)

### 2009/2010 Activities That Support the NASIG Strategic Plan

#### Nomination and Election Process:

**July 2009:** A call for nominations for the 2010 election went out to active NASIG members on July 13 via an email blast. An announcement was also posted on the "What's New" portion of the NASIG web site. Note: a call for nominations, in paper form, was also distributed at the NASIG conference in June as part of the conference packet. Email blasts were sent as reminders about nominations through October 2009.

Nominations were taken for vice president/president-elect and three positions for member-at-large. All nominations were due by October 12, 2009.

**August 2009:** N&E Committee received board support to ask nominees to submit a head shot/photo as part of their profile packet. This was suggested as a voluntary submission. (Note: all candidates submitted photos this year.) Relevant nominee profile documents were revised to reflect this addition to the profile packets.

We submitted a summary of the brainstorming session held during the annual conference to the NASIG online forum. NASIG members were asked to share their comments and concerns on 1) the type of information and structure presented in the nominee profile packets, 2) the pros and cons of an open election process versus a vetting process, 3) whether or not "petition candidate" should be delineated on the ballot, and 4) should the call for petition candidates be made earlier



in the election cycle. The initial email blast announcing the forum discussion was sent to members on August 6.

We received board permission to pursue amending the bylaws to change the election voting period from 30 days to 10 working days as a result of online voting. We worked with the Bylaws Committee to write the amendment and posted the proposal for the required 30 days review for Bylaw changes. Implementation of this amended voting period, if passed, would be effective with the 2010 election. An email blast announcing the survey/vote was distributed to active members in October. This Bylaws change was approved by the membership. The amendment passed 162 (Yes) to 13 (No). There were 762 active members, therefore 23% of the membership voted.

Based on the survey results, the N&E Committee also decided to pursue the process of amending the NASIG bylaws to modify the vetting and election process. We planned the timeline to include writing the amendment in conjunction with the Bylaws Committee with voting to be held before the end of 2009. Implementation, if passed, would have started with the 2011 election. The modification in question centers on discussions held during the brainstorming session at the June 2009 annual conference. The amendments proposed would allow members to vote on their preference of 1) keep the current vetting and petition process as it now exists; 2) do away with vetting completely and institute an open election where all nominees stand for election; 3) institute a hybrid system where VP/PE and treasurer nominees would be vetted while the secretary and member-at-large nominees would go through an open election. Work was begun on drafting the amendments and the election cycle calendars associated with each option. However, as the committee's work increased to meet its obligations for the 2010 election, time became short and these proposed amendments were set aside. This issue needs to be taken back up and put to the membership to decide. [Goal for coming year]

**September 2009:** We received permission from the board to develop a website listing terms of past

officers. This was started but never completed. [Goal for coming year]

We asked the board for interpretation on when dues should be renewed in order to meet nominee requirements. Board response: "When starting the vetting process, all potential candidates' membership status should be checked to make sure the nomination is for a member in good standing. If not in good standing, when the nominee is contacted and told about their nomination, the person should be told if they're willing to run, they need to become a member in good standing immediately. At the point of formulating the ballot, the candidate's membership status should be checked again and any person who is not a member in good standing should be told to renew immediately or not get slated on the ballot (allow 2 weeks for the renewal to happen). Nominees are a "member in good standing" as long as their dues do not expire before the actual election takes place. If a nominee's dues expire after the election and they are elected, then he/she will need to renew at that time." [Note: During the vetting period, any member in good standing should be allowed to renew when their cycle normally comes due, and they do not need to try to renew early.]

We received permission from the board to survey the membership regarding their preferences on the mechanism used in evaluating nominees during the election process. A survey was drafted and revised in conjunction with the Evaluation & Assessment Committee. The survey asked members to indicate their preference of 1) standardized profile, 2) resume-based profile, or 3) a hybrid system where nominees would submit a resume for the vetting process and those who are slated would then submit a standardized profile. The survey was announced via email blast on September 28 (reminder blast sent October 9) with a deadline of October 13. The outcome: 118 responses were received; 36% (43) voted for the standardized profile; 15% (18) voted for the resume-based profile; 48% (57) voted for the hybrid method. Results were announced to the membership via email blast on October 14. All relevant profile-related documents

were updated. All nominees were notified that, if they were slated, they would need to submit two types of profile documents, i.e., the “hybrid” system.

As the committee worked to revise the standardized and resume-based profile forms, the issue of references as part of the vetting process was discussed. Committee members decided to allow nominees to submit the names of three OR four references. Two of the references must be NASIG related and be able to speak toward the nominee’s accomplishments in NASIG. The two remaining references may be from non-NASIG venues including work-related references (whether from a library or commercial source).

All nomination-related forms were revised to read that nominees would be contacted by phone in January as to status (slated or not slated). Final confirmation would be sent via e-mail. The chair and vice chair made phone contacts with email confirmations sent by committee members.

We set up nomination and vetting files in Google Docs. A secure login and password have been created so that all committee members can access this. Committee members can enter nominee rating scores in appropriate files.

A PBwiki site was also established but snafus were encountered. Although the wiki site still exists, the committee is not using it anymore and all documents have been moved to Google Docs or the N&E web space on the NASIG site. [Goal for coming year: take down the wiki]

**October 2009:** The nomination deadline was October 12. We worked with the NASIG treasurer to ascertain that all nominees were active members. We received 18 nominations for vice president/president-elect (17 unique names) and a total of 32 nominations for MAL (25 unique names). We contacted nominees and ascertained their interest in accepting nomination.

The committee held a conference call on October 19. Committee members were assigned individual

nominees to contact and ascertain their willingness to accept nomination. Nominees were told of upcoming deadlines and the information to include in their profile packets. Deadline to accept/decline nomination was October 27.

Due to so few members accepting nomination for VP/PE, the N&E members drafted a list of 30 additional names. The committee narrowed the list to the top seven and contacted these individuals to consider standing for VP/PE. This process was completed October 23-27. One additional candidate was garnered from this effort. In the end, 15 people agreed to stand for MAL nomination and 3 agreed for VP/PE.

**November 2009:** The deadline to submit resume-based profile packets was November 16. All relevant documents and templates necessary to complete the profile packets were available on the NASIG website. Documents were also sent via email to each nominee who accepted nomination.

We used MeetingWizard to schedule the December conference call.

We actually received nomination packets from 11 MAL nominees and 3 VP/PE nominees by the November 16 deadline. Four MAL nominees withdrew from the process prior to submitting their packets. Final confirmation from those nominees who did not submit packets was made by the respective committee member. The chair confirmed receipt of packets individually with each nominee via email. Messages were copied to the committee member who contacted the nominee. Packets were posted on the Google Docs committee space. Committee members evaluated nominees using a committee evaluation form. Committee members entered their ratings into the “ratings” spreadsheet via Google Docs.

**December 2009:** The committee members completed nominee ratings and entered their scores into Google Docs. The vice chair led the conference call where opinions about each of the nominees were shared. The

committee decided to check references for the nominees who agreed to be slated.

The vice chair assigned each committee member specific references to contact. Committee members sent reports from references to the vice chair.

**January 2010:** Reference checks were completed by January 11. A conference call was held to discuss references and to set the final slate. The chair and vice chair notified the candidates by phone of their status (slated vs. not slated).

The slate was sent to the board as a courtesy prior to the midwinter board meeting. Each slated candidate was contacted by a committee member via e-mail to confirm their status and to alert the candidates of the next deadline. The slate was announced to the membership on January 27 via email blast and a posting on "What's New."

**February 2010:** The call for petition candidates was made via email blast on February 2 and a posting on "What's New." The chair and vice chair began working with ECC (Beth Ashmore) to create the ballot. N&E committee members agreed that the ballot would not denote petition candidates.

Slated candidates had until February 10 to complete the standardized profile. Candidates who were nominated for both MAL and VP were allowed to revise their position statement so that the final office could be addressed more completely in the statement. The vice chair worked with Beth Ashmore (ECC) to load the profile packets and photos to the voting section of the NASIG website. The committee reviewed and tested a draft of the ballot and viewed candidate documentation online via a private space on the NASIG website. Each candidate was sent a link so that they could review their documents online. After a few small revisions (correcting typos, etc., and loading the correct version of a position statement), all documents and the ballot were ready to "go live."

Documentation regarding petition candidates was posted on the Elections Process page of the NASIG website. The petition candidate profile form was updated to reflect the revised forms used during the nomination phase and to include a mention of the voluntary headshot. The deadline to receive petition candidate documentation was midnight on February 18. No petition candidates were received this year.

#### **Balloting:**

**February 2010:** Online voting was opened on February 22. Deadline for voting was March 5. An announcement was sent via email blast to the NASIG membership and posted on "What's New."

**March 2010:** Technical problems were encountered on March 8 when the chair and vice chair attempted to view the election results. We could see a list of names of who voted, but the actual voting results were not recorded in either an aggregate or an individual form. We contacted Beth Ashmore, ECC chair, and she verified the same results. Buddy Pennington, ArcStone Liaison, was consulted. Via his contact at ArcStone it was determined that the link between the ballot "question" and response was broken. The data could probably be retrieved but the results may not be reliable. There would be a programming fee charged to NASIG as well. ArcStone recommended either starting over with a clean ballot and running the election again or pay to have the data dug out. Jill consulted with the board and decided that the election should be run again. Bylaws state that the election must be completed 60 days prior to the conference. Running the election again was the preferred solution compared to waiting for ArcStone to dig out the data. Appropriate email blasts were distributed explaining the problem and solution.

Procedures will need to be written to handle technical difficulties for future elections. Procedures also need to be clarified as to how the ballot should be created (ballot is created by ECC). N&E needs to incorporate a check process into the voting process to ensure that

votes are indeed being captured. [Goals for the coming year]

N&E co-chairs in conjunction with the board decided to use SurveyMonkey for the new ballot. Beth Ashmore of ECC set up the ballot in SM. The N&E Committee members tested the new ballot and results were retrieved. The proper levels of security were set up: 1) members must login to NASIG, 2) enter URL for the SM ballot, 3) enter special ballot password and enter their e-mail address, 4) vote. E-mail addresses were only to be used to weed out possible duplicate votes and votes from non-members. The election reopened on Tuesday morning March 16 with the deadline of midnight on Monday March 29. An Email blast was sent out along with an announcement on "What's New."

### **Election Results:**

**March-April 2010:** Election results were compiled/viewed in SurveyMonkey by the chair and vice chair. They confirmed with Beth A. that there were no duplicate votes cast nor were there any votes cast by people who are not active members of NASIG. The SurveyMonkey aggregate tallies were downloaded and stored in a secure place for the designated period of time after the election in case any election results were contested. The chair contacted candidates by phone, notifying them of the election results. The vice chair followed up via email to each candidate confirming the results. After each candidate was contacted privately, the N&E vice chair notified the NASIG president of the election results. NASIG members were notified of the results via an email blast and a "What's New" posting on April 1. The following members were elected:

### **Vice President/President-Elect:**

Steve Shadle

### **Members-at-Large:**

Clint Chamberlain  
Buddy Pennington  
Jenni Wilson

### **Any Changes or Exceptions to the Budget**

With online voting in place and online document sharing, the only costs incurred by the committee were the conference calls held during the year.

### **Statistical Information**

Eighty (80) nominations for 72 individuals were submitted, (this included nominations solicited by the N&E Committee to broaden the pool for the VP/PE position with some individuals receiving multiple nominations and some nominated for more than one position).

- 32 nominations for 25 individuals - Member-at-Large
- 48 nominations for 47 individuals - Vice President/President Elect

Eighteen (18) candidates accepted the review process. In the end, 16 candidates actually submitted their profile documents by the deadline, one candidate was not slated and 4 people withdrew their names before the election. The final slate consisted of:

- 3 slated for Vice President/President Elect
- 8 slated for three Member-at-Large positions

A total of 235 members out of 712 active members voted in the second and final election, which represents 33% of the members.

### **Questions for Board**

None, except feedback on this annual report and goals for the coming year

### **Recommendations to Board (and Goals for the Upcoming Year)**

- Officially decide whether or not to have open elections
- Establish formal contingency plans to handle technical difficulties that may arise with the online voting process

- Develop a list of past officers and their respective terms
- Devise a method to ensure that individual voting results are anonymous
- Move documentation to a secure location and close out the PBwiki

### **Feedback on New Website**

What have been your experiences in using the new NASIG website?

A lot of frustration, basically. From a back-end point of view, that is. The public interface is OK, although it has quirks also. The election failure was obviously an example. It does not seem we are getting our money's worth from ArcStone.

What suggestions do you have for developments and improvements in the website and back-end uses?

This is a complex question - seems like NASIG needs to look for a different provider, although since so much work was poured into the new site, we probably need to use it long enough to get some return on the investment before moving on.

What other technologies are you using in your committee communications, or what other technologies have you explored?

We have successfully used Meeting Wizard (free) to set-up conference calls and we are using Google Docs (free) for nominee ranking and document development and storage. Both of these applications have been very helpful. We also used SurveyMonkey (free) to re-run the election.

In closing, the chair would like to thank the vice chair and committee members for all their time and hard work. Members spent extra time evaluating profile packets, working with Google Docs, soliciting nominations for VP/PE, and testing online ballots. Special thanks to Jill Emery, board liaison, and Beth Ashmore, ECC chair, for their guidance and diligent work during the technical problems with the online ballot. Great job everyone!

June Garner, Chair  
Eleanor Cook, Co-Chair