Invigorating Fall

Two months ago, my fiancé and I worked on clearing out the summer garden remnants in our backyard plot and starting planting the fall/winter garden. This growing season is going much better for us in central Texas and we’re observing the daily growth of spinach, kale, and chard, and there are even a few jalapeno peppers to be picked soon. One of the things we’re most excited by is that both the cilantro and basil have self-set and are producing new plants in what we thought was a somewhat barren area of the plot. We’re looking forward to being able to share some of the harvest come Thanksgiving. In NASIG news, the board has held both our fall board meeting and just completed our follow-up phone call. There is quite a bit underway with the organization as you can see from this issue of Newsletter, so let me focus on some of the things that are starting to flourish and not being reported elsewhere in the Newsletter or Newsletter blog.

Updates

Given the ongoing worldwide economic downturn, the board has asked the Administrative Support Task Force to focus on an administrative support position that would be half-time and that would be responsible for four primary areas of support management for the organization. In a future NASIG Newsletter, we will present their detailed document regarding this position and the responsibilities this role could play in the future.

In the meantime, the board voted unanimously to appoint a conference coordinator consultant position and we are very pleased to announce that Joyce Tenney will become the new conference coordinator in 2009.
and serve a two year term in this position. Joyce has been indefatigable when it comes to conference planning and has helped find some amazing sites/venues for NASIG to hold their conferences and, more importantly, has truly worked wonders in order to keep housing costs and site costs to a bare minimum for the organization. We are very excited by this development and know Joyce will continue to work tirelessly to bring NASIG the best opportunities available to us.

The speaker reimbursement policy has been revised thanks to the dedicated work of CPC, PPC, and Dan Tonkery. This was completed in time for PPC to start working with the speakers for the 2009 conference. The new policy can be seen here: [http://www.nasig.org/conference_compensation.cfm](http://www.nasig.org/conference_compensation.cfm).

The Financial Development Committee has been holding calls and exchanging emails on possible revenue-generating ideas and the board is expecting an outline on one possible concept by the January 2009 meeting.

ECC continues to work on documentation regarding the management of the new NASIG website/content management system and documentation outlining processes and procedures will be forthcoming.

**Planes and Automobiles**

The fall board meeting went really well with board members and CPC and PPC co-chairs convening in Asheville from a myriad of destinations. Rick Anderson, Char Simser, Virginia Taffurelli and I all met up in Charlotte. Despite rainy weather in much of the Midwest, none of our travel schedules were disrupted by much and Virginia and I had a wonderful time catching up in the Charlotte airport while Char and Rick arrived. For those of you who don’t know this, Charlotte has numerous seating areas with rockers available that allow you to watch other travelers and the world pass by. Charlotte also offers free public Wi-Fi, so if you don’t have good company close at hand, you do have readily accessible internet connections.

The four of us then proceeded to the baggage claim and the rental car agency and scored a very spiffy minivan that Rick drove expertly to Asheville. Despite the post-hurricane fuel cost hike, this did end up being cheaper than all four of us flying into Asheville, and in some cases was much easier to do. All in all, it was a very pleasant experience and one we would encourage for the annual conference. Kim Maxwell and Bob Boissy also flew into Charlotte and rented a car which worked out extremely well for them since they were able to share the same flight from Boston. Turns out they ran into Sarah George Wessel at a pit stop along the way to Asheville! Peter Whiting and Jeff Slagell did fly directly into Asheville and found that the elevated fuel prices due to the production shut-down in the Gulf of Mexico had resulted in higher shuttle prices than anticipated. However, we are all optimistic that with full production restored in the Gulf region and with the drop overall in gas prices that shuttle costs will self-regulate. CPC has a travel website up now, please refer to it here: [http://www.nasig.org/2009_conference_travel.cfm](http://www.nasig.org/2009_conference_travel.cfm).

**Board Conference Call**

As previously mentioned, we’ve just completed the board fall conference call to double check where we are with the strategic plan action list and the board is really pleased to announce that all of the items are underway and truly in action. Different action items will be brought out in the forthcoming months but all the committees involved have been great to work with on the action items and dedicated to keeping this process on track.

**Teasers**

The Program Planning Committee is doing their amazing work and there are some really exciting vision speakers and programs on the docket for this year’s conference. Stay tuned for further announcements as I think the membership is going to be pleased with the selection lined up!

In addition, CPC has been hard at work with the local arrangements for the 2009 conference and I think
attendees at this conference will enjoy the fruits of all the hard work this group has undertaken!

Continuing Education is also working on an “unconference” in March 2009. Keep checking here for more information: http://www.nasig.org/activities_calendar.cfm?action=detail&rec=44.

Lastly, keep an eye out for a new award to be forthcoming from the Awards & Recognition Committee. We appreciate the support of Swets in helping NASIG inaugurate this new offering. More information will be forthcoming on the Newsletter blog.

I wish everyone the best over the holiday season and hope all NASIG members continue to prosper in 2009. If anyone has any questions or concerns, please feel free to email me at: jill.emerytx@gmail.com.

NASIG Executive Board Minutes
Joyce Tenney, NASIG Secretary

Date, Time: September 17, 2008; 8:36 a.m. - 4:09 p.m.
Place: Renaissance Hotel, Asheville, North Carolina

Attending:
Jill Emery, President
Rick Anderson, Vice President/President-Elect
Peter Whiting, Treasurer
Char Simser, Past President
Joyce Tenney, Secretary

Members-At-Large:
Bob Boissy
Anna Creech
Kim Maxwell
Jeff Slagell
Virginia Taffurelli
Sarah Wessel

Ex-Officio Member:
Kathryn Wesley, NASIG Newsletter, Editor-in-Chief

Guests:
Eleanor Cook, Co-Chair, 2009 Conference Planning Committee
Steve Kelley, Co-Chair, 2009 Conference Planning Committee
Erika Ripley, Co-Chair, 2009 Program Planning Committee
Morag Boyd, Co-Chair, 2009 Program Planning Committee

1.0 Welcome (Emery)

Emery called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m. She welcomed all to the meeting and reviewed the rules of order.

2.0 Conference Planning Committee (Cook, Kelley, Wessel)

Report delayed until after Program Planning Committee report.

3.0 Program Planning Committee report (Boyd, Ripley, Anderson)

Ripley reported that PPC has reviewed the report from Evaluation & Assessment on the most popular program topics and will be using that information in determining programming for the upcoming conference. She reported that Survey Monkey was used this year for the submission of programs. She noted that there is a problem with keeping information confidential in Survey Monkey if several committees are sharing the same account. Boyd and Ripley asked that the Electronic Communications Committee investigate having individual accounts for committees that require confidentiality in their work. Overall, they noted that Survey Monkey worked well for their committee.
**ACTION ITEM:** Creech will ask ECC to investigate the costs of providing additional Survey Monkey accounts.

Ripley reported that they currently have 32 proposals and the second call for proposals will be going out at the end of September. The same format as last year will be followed with the non-repeat of sessions. They hope to have the final slate of programs to the board by late November. PPC will work with the CPC to finalize scheduling of sessions and activities. They noted that there needs to be a clear understanding of how publicity for the conference will be organized and who will be responsible for issuing the publicity. PPC was thanked for all of their work on conference programming.

### 3.1 Preconference planning/registration thresholds

After discussion on ensuring that preconferences were profitable, it was agreed that the conference website would have a statement for the preconferences that noted that the programs were contingent on sufficient registration numbers to make the program self-supporting. Preconference speakers would be notified in initial contacts that the program would only be held if registration numbers supported the program. The thresholds to proceed with the programs will be determined at the January board meeting.

**ACTION ITEM:** PPC will add the notice of preconferences needing to have a certain registration level before they can become a final part of the program into the initial discussion with possible preconference speakers.

**ACTION ITEM:** Executive Board will set threshold registration levels for preconferences at January board meeting.

### 3.2 Scheduling of a.m. sessions and lunch-around idea

Emery proposed an idea to reduce conference costs and still offer the conference at approximately the same member fee. The idea of starting the conference a little later in the morning, say 9 a.m, instead of 8 a.m. This would reduce the need for a morning break, as we serve a full breakfast. Also, as Asheville has a number of restaurants within walking distance of the hotels, we could have a “lunch-around” one day and not offer one lunch as part of the full conference package. Ideas around these proposals were discussed and discussion will continue over the CPC, PPC, and board lists.

### 3.3 Travel stipend proposal

The proposal from the Travel Stipend Task Force was accepted. It was agreed that the overall number of speakers needed for the conference would be recommended by PPC, but the board will need to approve the final program.

### 3.4 NASIG/SSP programming

Emery discussed the proposal to have a conflict-free time in the conference schedule for SSP to offer a slot to SSP members to discuss issues such as new business models and projects, etc. This could be offered over a box lunch hour. After discussion it was agreed that this could foster a more collaborative relationship with SSP, but it would need to be developed on the model of a library advisory board. A possible idea would be to have half of the time devoted to presentation and half of the time for feedback from audience. It was noted that we would need a very clear set of guidelines for the program. PPC will outline a draft proposal for Emery to take to SSP. Ripley noted that there would need to be a very clear understanding of what each organization was responsible for.

**ACTION ITEM:** Anderson will work with PPC to develop a draft proposal for this program.

### 4.0 Conference Planning Committee (Cook, Kelley, Wessel)

Cook reported that planning for the 2009 conference is progressing. She noted the draft website for the conference is ready and can soon be released to the public. The CPC manual is still in draft stage, the group looking at the revisions to the manual need to be
convened to move the process along. It was noted that there need to be multiple sources of publicity for the conference.

4.1 Biltmore event update

Cook and Kelley discussed the costs and options involved in having the major conference special event at the Biltmore. While it is a lovely venue, it was agreed that the costs were prohibitive. It will be offered as an optional event. Cook and Kelley will work on logistics for an optional offering. Kelley presented an option of having a special event at the Crest Center. After discussion it was agreed that this would be the location of the conference special event. It will be on Saturday evening.

**ACTION ITEM:** Cook and Kelley will make arrangements for the conference special event at the Crest Center.

4.2 Transportation to Asheville follow-up

CPC is investigating several options from local transportation companies to get shuttles from the airport to the hotel. Also, the city bus may be an option and they will work with the Convention & Visitors Bureau to get the information. Simser asked CPC to assign a committee member to monitor the discussion forums and blogs to answer questions that may arise about the conference. CPC was thanked for all of their work on the conference logistics.

**ACTION ITEM:** CPC will assign a committee member to monitor the NASIG discussion forms and blogs to keep members informed about conference information and happenings.

4.3 Room block at overflow hotel

Tenney reported that at a meeting planners meeting recently, it was noted that due to the economic woes of the country, general conference attendance was down approximately 30%. This was true for the 2008 NASIG annual conference and we can probably expect the same for the 2009 conference. After discussion, it was agreed that the room block for the overflow hotel would be lowered to reduce the risk of NASIG paying a penalty for not meeting the room block commitment.

Anderson moved that Tenney contact the Sheraton and reduce the room block for the 2009 NASIG annual conference to a level that would be more in line with likely attendance. Simser seconded. A unanimous vote followed.

**ACTION ITEM:** Tenney will contact the Sheraton and lower the room block.

5.0 Secretary’s report (Tenney)

5.1 Approval of board actions since June meeting

Tenney presented the board actions list for approval. NASIG Executive Board meeting minutes approved 7/11/08. NASIG business meeting minutes approved 7/19/08. Recommendations from the Travel Reimbursement Task Force accepted.

Anderson moved to accept the board action list as presented. Simser seconded. The vote was unanimous.

5.2 Action items from June meeting

Tenney asked board members to send her any updates for the action items listing.

6.0 Treasurer’s report (Whiting)

6.1 Report

Whiting reported that memberships continue to be processed by the Database & Directory Committee. He is working with D&D to fine-tune workflow with the new website and membership renewal system. Whiting noted that donations are down as checks have been the only way to renew and members seem less inclined to donate when using checks, as opposed to the online credit card system. Whiting reported that the credit card rate was reduced to 2.3%. He is working on
updating the treasurer’s manual and working on a
training program for the incoming treasurer. He hopes
to have information on the web and deposit a copy of
the manual in the NASIG archives once it is finished.

6.2 2009 budget and expenditures to date

Whiting presented the budget requests from
committees for 2009 and after discussion of various
issues, Whiting and board liaisons will work with the
committees to fine-tune their requests. Whiting noted
that we are doing fine for 2008 expenditures and that
we are in good financial standing.

**ACTION ITEM:** Whiting and board liaisons will work the
committees to fine-tune budget requests.

6.3 Conflict of interest statement

Whiting reported that our accountant has noted that
the officers may need to sign a conflict of interest
statement to maintain our 501(C) 3 status. He will
investigate and report the findings.

7.0 Consent agenda (All)

Simser moved to accept the following reports with
special thanks to all of the committees for their efforts
over the last months. Taffurelli seconded the motion.
The vote was unanimous.

7.1 Archivist

In response to questions from archivist report, it was
noted that contracts can be scanned and mounted on
the website in a secure location, as well as having a
print copy in the archives.

7.2 Bylaws

7.3 Continuing Education Committee

7.4 Database & Directory

7.5 Evaluation & Assessment

7.6 Electronic Communications Committee

7.7 Financial Development Committee

7.8 Library School Outreach Committee

7.9 Membership Development Committee

Maxwell noted that MDC has great statistical
information and they might do an online forum on the
information they have available that might help other
committees in their work.

**ACTION ITEM:** Boissy will discuss with MDC the
possibility of having a forum on the information that
they have compiled on NASIG membership information.

7.10 Mentoring

7.11 Publications/PR

7.12 Translators Resource Team - No report

8.0 A&R proposals (Boissy, Emery)

8.1 Proposed revision to the criteria used to evaluate
applicants for the Serials Specialist Award

Boissy presented the proposal from A&R to place less
weight on the academic background of the candidates
for the Serials Specialist Award. After discussion,
Creech moved to accept the recommendation of the
A&R Committee to change the wording in the criteria
section of the Serials Specialist Award. Anderson
seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in
favor of the motion.

8.2 Creation of a need-based award

Boissy presented the A&R proposal to create a need-
based award called the Rose Robischon Award. After
discussion, it was agreed that the wording would be
slightly revised to delete the requirement for the
employer policy regarding reimbursement for the costs
of attending a professional conference. This would
become optional.
Boissy moved to accept the proposal from the A&R Committee to create a need-based award called the Rose Robischon Award with the change agreed to concerning the employer policy requirement. This award would be contingent on the availability of sufficient budget to cover the addition of this award. This will be determined at the January board meeting. Taffurelli seconded the motion, and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

**ACTION ITEM:** Boissy will discuss the proposed changes with A&R. He will ask A&R to have a description of the award ready in December.

### 8.3 John Merriman Award

Emery discussed the proposal from UKSG on the John Merriman Award. UKSG is working on getting support for this award, so financing would not come from NASIG. It would be a joint award with one person from UKSG and one from NASIG being chosen to attend the other’s conference, and then work with them for one week at their home institution as a kind of study abroad type of program. It was noted that the NASIG winner should submit an article for the *NASIG Newsletter* and perhaps blog about their experiences. The award would be administered through A&R, but final approval of award would be in conjunction with the NASIG Executive Board. It was agreed that the award language should be very specific about time commitment and possible location commitment. English should be listed as the working language for this award. The board approved the award in principle, and Emery will continue to work with the UKSG in the development of this award.

**ACTION ITEM:** Emery will work with UKSG on development of the Merriman Award.

### 9.0 Conference Proceedings (Anderson, Emery, Taffurelli)

#### 9.1 Publication schedule of conference Proceedings

Emery reported that there have been discussions with Taylor & Francis on how to divide up the *NASIG Proceedings* and what impact that would have on current workflows. It was agreed that this issue would be discussed via email once all of the relevant facts were known. Emery will continue discussions with Taylor & Francis and information will be shared with *Proceedings* editors for a review of how this will impact their current workflows. Taffurelli will share information with *Proceedings* editors and obtain their view of how these possible changes will impact workflows in the current process. Email discussions on the board list will determine final outcome.

**9.2 Recruitment of Proceedings editors (Emery)**

Emery and Anderson explained the possible options in moving forward with offering access to *The Serials Librarian* as a NASIG member benefit. With a one year embargo, it will probably be possible to offer access to this through the NASIG website. A variety of options for the future publication of the *NASIG Proceedings* will be reviewed. It was agreed that for 2009 Emery would notify Taylor & Francis that we would be doing the *NASIG Proceedings* with them. For the publication of the 2010 *NASIG Proceedings*, an RFP would be written by the Publications/PR Committee and the *Proceedings* editors. It is possible that in future years the *Proceedings* editors may become editors of *The Serials Librarian*. However, the recruitment for the 2009 editor will be for the same position as the 2008. The board discussed possible timelines and will continue to examine the issue as more information becomes available.

**ACTION ITEM:** Taffurelli will post a call for nominations for a *Proceedings* editor. New editor should be in place by January 2009. If there is no response from the solicitation within 30 days, Taffurelli will notify the board for additional action.

**ACTION ITEM:** Emery and Anderson will continue working on timeline and keep board informed, for decision at January board meeting.
10.0 E&A additional documents (Creech)

Creech presented proposals from the E&A report on the use of Survey Monkey. After discussion it was agreed that there does need to be a confidentiality statement for committees using Survey Monkey.

**ACTION ITEM:** Creech will draft confidentiality statement to be reviewed by board.

Slagell noted that he will pass the E&A report on most popular programs from past NASIG conferences on to the Continuing Education Committee.

11.0 N&E open recruitment document (Simser)

Simser presented the N&E report to the board on the concept of open elections. After discussion it was agreed that the elections would proceed without change this year, as proposed by N&E.

**ACTION ITEM:** Simser will ask N&E to recast their report into a form useable for a report to the membership. Maxwell suggested that in the document there should be links to the N&E documents already posted on the NASIG website.

12.0 Administrative Task Force update (Simser)

Simser reported that she did not receive the formal report from the task group. However, they have been surveying other organizations to obtain position descriptions and are working on crafting a position description for a possible administrative staff position. After discussion it was agreed that the board needs the full report to review and prioritize needs. The board will need to be as conservative as possible in moving forward with this process. Options of looking at a professional staffing agency, etc., will be discussed.

**ACTION ITEM:** Simser will obtain the report and final position description from the Administrative Task Force by October 1. The board will review and discuss over board list. The November board conference call will be the time of the actual decision point.

13.0 Site Selection (Anderson, Emery, Tenney)

The committee discussed the site visits conducted over the summer. As instructed by the board, the Site Selection Committee did site reviews of Palm Springs and Las Vegas. In Palm Springs, seven properties and two special venue locations were within our price range and were reviewed. In Las Vegas, three properties were within our price range and were reviewed. They reported that all of the sites and locations were very gracious and eager to work with us. There was extensive discussion of the costs and issues involved in each location. Creech moved that the Site Selection Committee pursue a contract with a Palm Springs location for the 2010 NASIG conference. Simser seconded. The vote was unanimous in favor of the resolution.

**ACTION ITEM:** The Site Selection Committee will pursue a favorable contract for a Palm Springs property for the 2010 NASIG Conference.

14.0 Membership brochure (Boissy, Wessel)

Boissy discussed the proposal from MDC to have a professional designer for the membership brochure. After discussion, it was agreed that we will stay with the tri-fold design and the brochure should detail the member benefits for joining NASIG. The designer that is currently working on the logo should be asked to bid on the project.

It was agreed that the project should be finished in time to have the brochures distributed at ALA Midwinter. Anderson moved to allot MDC a budget of $1,500.00 to have a brochure designed and produced in time for distribution at the ALA Midwinter meeting. The Translators Resource Team will be asked to do the translations in the spring, so the brochure can be produced in French and Spanish. Simser seconded and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion. It was agreed that the content would go through a quick board review before it was sent to the printer.
**ACTION ITEM:** Boissy will work with MDC to ensure that the NASIG membership brochure is finished and ready for distribution at the ALA Midwinter meeting.

### 14.1 Logo design decision

The various views of the logo were reviewed and after discussion a consensus was reached. Anderson moved that Logo #1 full text design be accepted for logo and text only and should include using the green of #3 for the website and #3 for the Newsletter with the font from #1. Simser seconded and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

### 15.0 ADA policy (Wessel)

Wessel discussed the need for the CPC to have ADA issues known as early as possible in the registration process to allow for time to investigate available options at the property or special venue location. A statement for the conference registration website was drafted to allow CPC to gain as much information as possible and to let our attendees know what they will have available at the conference. CPC will work directly with individuals needing assistance and CPC will consult with their Executive Board liaison to resolve any issues that seem problematic in any way. Maxwell moved to accept the proposed wording with the minor amendments offered. Creech seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

**ACTION ITEM:** Wessel will work with CPC to finalize the wording and have it posted on the conference registration website.

### 16.0 Arcstone discussion (All)

Emery noted that we have made good progress in updating the NASIG website, but to move ahead in both front-end and back room processes we will probably need to look for another vendor to assist us. She suggested that we look at doing an RFP by talking to other organizations our size and see if we can get copies of their technology RFPs and discuss their technology providers with them. Maxwell suggested having a member of the group that will be working on this join the Association of Associations to gain access to other associations that may assist us in this process.

**ACTION ITEM:** Anderson will convene a task group to start the process of developing an RFP for our next technology provider. One member of this group will join the Association of Associations, and NASIG will pay for the membership.

Whiting and Emery discussed the problems with sending out and processing renewals with our current system. Whiting reported that D&D had to touch each record to get a renewal to generate, so it will be time consuming this year.

**ACTION ITEM:** Whiting will ask D&D to send out blast emails to the membership to inform them that the renewal time is approaching and they will be receiving information on the process shortly.

### 17.0 Other business

Emery suggested that in order to recruit new members, MDC could be charged with investigating where electronic resources librarian positions have been advertised or are already part of the library structure and target emails to them to advertise NASIG. We need to let them know that NASIG is relevant to them. Simser suggested looking at the vision statement and adding a statement that includes the fact that we are concerned with electronic resources.

It was agreed that we did need to bring new members into the organization. Emery suggested looking at mailing lists for ALA and other organizations to use for getting the word out about NASIG. She suggested using blog entries, and other social networking sites to promote NASIG. This would market the organization outside of our normal sphere.

Emery noted that several of the committee reports had the old listing of committee members, so she asked that liaisons verify the committee rosters with chairs and update the information on the committee reports.
She also noted that committee chairs could be empowered to do publicity for their events. The publicist is still there for committees that would like to use that venue, but following the proposed template chairs could do their own publicity.

**ACTION ITEM:** Anderson will work with Publications/PR to develop a template for doing NASIG messages for external venues and outlets.

Simser reported that N&E was concerned because both co-chairs would be rotating off at the same time. They would like to have a third co-chair appointed to have them go through the process once before taking over as chair.

**ACTION ITEM:** Anderson will appoint a third co-chair to N&E, as a chair-in-training.

Simser reported that March 20, 2009, has been selected as the date for the NASIG UnConference. It will be held in Manhattan, Kansas. More information will be available later in the year.

**17.1 ANO Discussion (Wesley)**

Wesley reported that *ALCTS Online* was interested in expanding the coverage of NASIG information. It was agreed that items such as award announcements, nominations, calls and information on the annual conference and continuing education programs should be listed. It was agreed that abbreviated versions of the reports of the plenary sessions might be a possible topic of interest, but they would need to be brief.

**17.2 25th Anniversary Task Force (Emery)**

Emery suggested a scaled back version of the original plan for the 25th anniversary plan. She suggested that a publication on the history and accomplishments of NASIG be produced and Dan Tonkery could chair the group.

Maxwell will be the board liaison for the group and a variety of members will be asked to contribute.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce Tenney
NASIG Secretary

**Treasurer’s Report**

Peter Whiting, NASIG Treasurer

The tough economic climate that we facing here in the United States has not spared NASIG. We have done a good job of monitoring our expenses. NASIG currently has $318,415.69 in assets. This includes $267,611.64 in bank balances and $50,804.05 in the investment account.

**Balance Sheet**
(includes unrealized gains)
As of 11/21/08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSETS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Bank Accounts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Schwab-Cash</td>
<td>$32,460.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHECKING-264</td>
<td>$182,618.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAVINGS-267</td>
<td>$84,992.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Cash and Bank Accounts</strong></td>
<td><strong>$300,072.63</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Schwab</td>
<td>$18,343.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,343.06</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Cash and Bank Accounts</strong></td>
<td><strong>$300,072.63</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,343.06</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$318,415.69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| LIABILITIES & EQUITY                        |            |
| LIABILITIES                                 | $0.00      |
| EQUITY                                      | $318,415.69|
| **TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY**              | **$318,415.69** |
NASIG Budget Expenditures
1/1/2008 through 11/21/08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 NASIG budget expenditures as of November 21, 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration Board expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards &amp; Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database &amp; Directory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations &amp; Elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check Out NASIG’s New Look!
Sarah Wessel, Executive Board Member-at-Large

This fall, the NASIG Board selected a graphic designer, Jessica Broom of Sweet Apple Designs, to update the NASIG logo and to create two additional versions, one that is text-only and one for the NASIG Newsletter.

The new logo maintains traditional NASIG colors of blue, green, and white, and the visual representation of North America. You will soon see the logo pop up in expected locations, such as the NASIG website and the Newsletter, and in more exciting places, such as our CaféPress store merchandise.
NASIG/NISO Collaboration

Jill Emery, NASIG President

At the Charleston Conference, a NASIG supporter suggested to me that I should approach NISO (National Information Standards Organization) on promoting their webinars to NASIG members. This conversation led to a discussion with Todd Carpenter, the managing director of NISO while still in Charleston and since that time a couple of email exchanges. I’m very pleased to report that NASIG will be partnering with NISO for their series of 2009 webinar offerings.

NASIG members will be able sign up for a NISO webinar at the member rate of $79 per session instead of the $99 per non-member rate. The webinars are to be offered on the second Wednesday of each month. Each month in 2009 NASIG will provide a listing of the upcoming webinar on the announcements forum as well as on the "what's new" section of the NASIG website.

Furthermore, NISO will offer packages of buy 3-get-1 free and buy the entire package and get 6 free (12 for the price of 6). NASIG members will similarly be able to buy the packages at the NISO member rate.

NOTE: All webinars are sold on a per-site basis, so there can be multiple people watching the same feed (on a projector, for example).

Our list of program events is online at: http://www.niso.org/news/events/2009/

This is an exciting new collaboration and an added bonus to NASIG members!

24th Annual Conference (2009)

PPC Update - Peter Morville to Be 2009 Vision Speaker
Erika Ripley and Morag Boyd, Co-Chairs

The Program Planning Committee is hard at work on the program, and we’re thrilled to announce one of the vision speakers for 2009 will be Peter Morville.

Peter Morville is widely recognized as a founding father of information architecture, and he serves as a passionate advocate for the critical roles that search and findability play in defining the user experience. Peter's latest book, *Ambient Findability*, was published in 2005, and he's currently working on a new book about the future of search. He blogs at findability.org.

Peter will be sharing his thoughts on “Ambient Findability: Libraries, Serials, and the Internet of Things.” According to Peter, "At the crossroads of ubiquitous computing and the Internet, the user experience is out of control, and findability is the real story. Access changes the game. We can select our sources and choose our news. We can find who and what we need, when and where we want. Search is the new interface of culture and commerce. As society shifts from push to pull, findability shapes who we trust, how we learn, where we go, and what we buy. It also radically changes our relationships to magazines, journals, newspapers, and other periodicals."

We're looking forward to seeing everyone in Asheville in June.

CPC Update
Eleanor Cook and Steve Kelley, Co-Chairs

The Conference Planning Committee is hard at work planning some fun events to complement the interesting and informative sessions that the Program
Planning Committee will provide us daily while we are in Asheville.

Thursday night we will have a banquet/buffet at the Marriott Renaissance hotel, where we will have our opening session. As per tradition, we will have a local luminary (TBA) to describe to us fascinating and likely amusing highlights about the area to where we have all travelled.

Friday night is “on your own” with some exciting options. The Asheville Tourists baseball team will be in town, so we’ll provide information about how to get tickets. The downtown Asheville scene is mere steps away from the conference hotels and there will be plenty going on there for your exploration. In addition, we have arranged for a delightful opportunity for a dinner and evening tour of the Biltmore Estate for the first 140 attendees who wish to pay for this optional event. We were disappointed not to be able to offer this as an all-conference function, but the costs were simply beyond our budget to offer this as anything but a cost-recovery activity. The exact rate is yet to be determined, but will be announced after the January board meeting. However, we will also be offering all conference goers discounted tickets to the Biltmore for Sunday afternoon or other times you might wish to visit during your stay in Asheville.

What will $125 get you? First, a discounted entrance ticket to the estate (regular price is $59, though this varies depending on the season.) You will be able to tour the house and gardens Friday evening and then also go back on Sunday or Monday if you wish for free, if you are interested in extending your tour to other aspects of the estate (winery, etc.) Secondly, this overall fee covers your transportation by coach to and from the estate. Finally, it covers a very nice dinner at the Stable Café which is adjacent to the house, affording us the luxury of being able to dine right there at the largest single private residence in the United States. The Biltmore Estate is like nothing else you will have experienced – its historic beauty is breathtaking, and it is unique in being a living history of a period long past. The house has been in continuous operation since it opened in 1895, and remains family-owned. If you think that the Biltmore Estate is nothing but one rich family’s playground, think again – it includes a vast forest, a winery, a working farm and much, much more. For more information, check out their website: http://www.biltmore.com/.

But, wait, there’s still Saturday night to tell you about! On Saturday we will be taking everyone to the Crest Center, which is a lovely setting for an evening event for all conference-goers. We’ll travel by coach to the site, where we will be well-fed and watered and we’ll have a great view of the mountain scenery. We’ll also have live music, something thematically relevant to the area – TBA. See http://www.thecrestcenter.com for more information about the facility.

We’re looking forward to hosting this year’s conference in Asheville, and we have a great Conference Planning Committee hard at work for you.

Opportunities for Publishers to Obtain Librarian Feedback at NASIG Conference

Jill Emery, NASIG President, and Keith Seitter, Society for Scholarly Publishing

NASIG is pleased to be working with the Society for Scholarly Publishing on a new “Library Advisory Board” program at the annual NASIG conference. Normally, the NASIG conference has attendance of around 500 participants, the majority of whom are librarians. This one hour program slot is set aside as a no-conflict time by NASIG for a publisher to present new and developing aspects of their publishing program and then receive extensive feedback from the serials library community.

Publisher topics may include, but are not limited to, new business models, new product types, new web innovations, etc. Publisher presenters should plan on offering 25 to 30 minutes of update material on their publishing program, to be followed by 30 minutes of dialogue with the NASIG participants. Publisher presentations should not be construed as a hard sell of their products, but rather a chance to offer their latest publishing directions and plans, and receive feedback.
NASIG will indicate to competitor publishers attending the conference that Library Advisory Board sessions are limited to non-publisher attendees.

A limited number of NASIG Library Advisory Board slots will be available at the meeting. Publishers are invited to submit proposals for consideration. Final presentation slots will be chosen no later than February 1, 2009, based on proposals received by January 15, 2009. Publishers interested in a Library Advisory Board session should contact Keith Seitter, co-chair of the SSP Organizational Collaboration Committee (e-mail: kseitter@ametsoc.org). See http://www.nasig.org/conference_registration.cfm for more information on the NASIG conference, to be held June 4-7, 2009, in Asheville, North Carolina.

Organizational Sponsorships for the 2009 Annual Conference
Char Simser, Past President and OS Coordinator

A hearty thank you to Ebsco and SirsiDynix for being the first to complete all the paperwork—forms, logos, and checks—to provide sponsorships for NASIG’s 2009 annual conference in Asheville, North Carolina. The Conference Sponsors page, http://www.nasig.org/2009_conference_sponsors.cfm, will be updated continuously as more of our sponsors complete the process.

It is not too late to complete the organizational sponsorship form for the annual conference. The description of sponsorship opportunities is available from the annual conference homepage, which also links you to the form: http://www.nasig.org/conference_sponsorship.cfm.

Profiles

Christopher Brady
Cataloging & Government Documents Librarian
Baylor Law Library
Susan Davis, Profiles Editor

I first met Chris Brady when he was named one of the 2004 Conference Student Grant Award winners. I enjoyed our email conversations as I helped make his NASIG travel arrangements and learned he had cousins in Wisconsin that he hoped to see after the conference. I also invited him to write a report on the NASIG conference for my column in Serials Review, so I unashamedly take a little pride in watching his career unfold, particularly where NASIG is involved. I like featuring NASIG success stories in these profiles and Chris was a no-brainer selection. Chris was very generous with his responses to my questions, and I would encourage anyone who hasn’t meet Chris in person to engage him in conversation at the upcoming conference in Asheville.

As usual my line of questioning revolves around NASIG, librarianship, and personal stuff.

Chris Brady came to librarianship from international relations
Chris, you were a conference Student Grant Award winner in 2004. How did you hear about the award? What attracted you to NASIG? Clearly the organization must be doing something right because you’ve kept coming back to conferences and participated at various levels. For example, you were a recorder for the 2006 conference Proceedings. What keeps you coming back?

I learned about the Student Grant Award through a listserv announcement at school in the last year of my MLS program at Maryland. I actually heard about NASIG many years before – my first library jobs were in the periodicals and serials departments at American University (AU), and my boss, Evelyn Blaes, was active in the organization. She attended regularly and always had good things to say about NASIG. Other librarians outside of serials also spoke well of the group. Later, after Evelyn retired, her successor, Clare Dygert, was a NASIG Horizon Award winner. So you could say I had a great introduction to NASIG even before I had heard of the Student Grant Award.

I was interested in serials and knew that NASIG was the kind of professional organization I wanted to be involved with. So I applied and was quite fortunate to receive one of the Student Grant Awards. NASIG didn’t disappoint. Even though I had just completed my MLS, I learned even more through the meetings and conference sessions, plus I met so many people that week. Everyone was very encouraging and welcoming. It was like having a jump start to begin my professional library career.

What is your most memorable conference experience?

I’ve been to five conferences now, and all have been memorable in their own way. Nobody else has given me the chance to “perform” at Red Rocks (when the conference was in Denver – I was in the group egged on to sing “Happy Birthday” from the stage). But perhaps the most memorable and special experience came at my first conference when I was an award winner. After the winners had been introduced at the opening session, many came forward to congratulate us. One in particular remembered me – Marla Schwartz worked at the law library at American University and was thrilled to see an AU alum among the award winners. While I had heard of Marla, we were in different libraries on different campuses. We hadn’t worked together and I’m not sure if we’d ever met previously. But she recognized me somehow and went out of her way to enthusiastically welcome me to NASIG. We met only that one time, and sadly, Marla took ill in the next year and has now passed away. But I remember her welcome and encouragement. (For more information on Marla see “Remembering Marla Schwartz, 1949–2005” in Serials Review v.31, issue 4 (December 2005) pp.237-242.)

You’re now a member of A&R (see March 2008 profile). Is that committee the most fun or what?

Awards & Recognition is a rewarding committee to serve on. I was glad to get a chance to serve with A&R – in a sense I now get to “give back” in a way where NASIG first gave to me. Serving on A&R provides opportunities to meet and encourage new librarians coming into the field. Seeing their excitement and potential is fun – and also encouraging them as they step into the “great unknown” is rewarding. The only drawback is knowing there are so many in whom there is promise, yet there are not enough resources to extend grants and awards to everyone who could benefit. It makes me even more grateful for the award I received five years ago.

I assume you had another career before entering library school. What were you doing? What prompted you to go to library school?

I am interested in international affairs and did my undergraduate and one graduate degree in that field. I was actually at American to get an MA in international
affairs when I started working in the university library to pay the bills. I did some cool things; I had an international internship at AU where I worked at the trade promotion office at the US consulate in Frankfurt for three months. And in DC, I had another international trade job which took me to China for two weeks. However, except for those highlights, I found it very hard to break into an international relations job — and the times I did work in that field, I had a knack of choosing miserable jobs. It sounds trite, but it was true — once I unwittingly led a mass walkout from an international educational organization, and when I decided to leave the trade job that took me to China, I was surprised to find co-workers jealous that I was leaving.

The funny thing was that while I was looking for my “dream job,” I had learned a very marketable skill in cataloging, so after I left AU, I did quite a bit in the library field while I was “between things.” Eventually, even I had to admit I liked the work I was doing “between things” rather than those other jobs I was dreaming about. That’s when I decided to pursue the MLS.

I know you were a contract librarian. Please explain what that is exactly, and relate any stories, both good and bad, to give us a sense of what it’s like to work as a contractor.

I can talk about the situation I experienced in the DC area — it may be different in other parts of the country. Around Washington, there are a lot of opportunities to work as a library contractor. There are many associations, law firms, agencies, and other organizations in DC that have special libraries for their own use. Quite often their HR department is skilled at recruiting employees for their primary mission, but the skill set for their libraries is so different many rely on library staffing agencies to fill those vacancies. In addition, the federal government has classified certain professions falling outside the primary scope of an agency’s mission, including library services and information technology, to be candidates for outside contracting. Thus, contracting for library services is very active in the DC area.

When I contracted, I was an employee of my particular agency, InfoCurrent. The agency would match me to a request from a client for a particular need. Job assignments could vary from the very short term of a week or two, to longer term assignments that could last for months or even indefinitely. There are even opportunities for direct hire, though I have not taken that route. I worked on longer-term assignments that were several months to a year long.

For my own needs, I found contracting very beneficial. While I started contracting because I needed employment, eventually I realized I truly enjoyed working in libraries. I was able to work for a variety of interesting organizations in jobs I would never have learned about since they were not advertised on the open market. For example, I cataloged special collections at AARP, worked for several months at the Department of State, and processed a special gift collection of German-language materials at Wesley Seminary. Contracting allowed me to experience a variety of libraries in types and sizes. I saw how different conditions led to different approaches and processes in technical services — there is more than one way to solve the same problem. And it gave me experience in being adaptable and quick to learn different systems and processes used in different libraries.

There are some drawbacks. One fellow former contractor put it this way, “Even when you’re there, you’re not there.” While it differed among workplaces, it was true everywhere I worked. Generally, I was respected and included as a colleague almost everywhere I contracted. And sometimes my input help steer some policy decisions. But I might not have my own phone, or desk, or email account. Or I might be responsible for a vendor relationship while not having any budgetary authority. And in areas of the country where contracting is not common, people may wonder why I “jumped around so often,” rather than
recognizing that I had completed several assignments for one employer.

Then you moved to a cataloging position at Baylor. Now you’re in the law library, and working with government documents, too? Tell us about how all of those moves happened. How is life in a law library different? Or is it?

Actually, it’s funny how I got back to Baylor. Even though I’m a Maryland native, I went down to Waco, Texas, to attend college at Baylor. I enjoyed my time there, but I did go back home to the DC area after graduation. Life went on, I went to graduate school and library school around DC, and after 15 years, really thought I was settled in DC for life. But I was looking for a full-time professional library position after finishing my MLS and noticed a job opening at Baylor for a serials and electronic resources catalog librarian. Not only was the job opening at my alma mater, but it seemed like they took my technician job from AU and professionalized it. It was too tempting not to apply. One thing led to another and I moved to Waco in the summer of 2005 to start work at Baylor.

The move to the law school library was another thing that just seemed to come together. It has a sad background, though. When I had been at Baylor for a little over a year, the longtime cataloger at the law library had a serious illness and needed to take a lot of leave for medical treatments. The staff over there is very small, and there was no backup for handling cataloging. The law library director contacted the university libraries to ask for help, and I was sent over on a part-time basis to keep workflow from falling completely by the wayside. Unfortunately, the law library cataloger did succumb to her illness, and I continued working part-time at law library while they searched for a replacement, all while continuing my full-time responsibilities at the university libraries. I enjoyed the law library, and decided to apply for the position. I got that position, and have been working full-time at Baylor Law since June 2007.

My current position at the law library covers cataloging and government documents. In fact, I’m writing this while at the annual Federal Depository Library Program conference in Arlington, Virginia. While libraries may differ, I can say the experience has been very different at the law school as compared to the university libraries. User needs are more focused and deadlines are very real. The library has fewer days off at the holidays to provide access to students and lawyers trying to make their deadlines. It is an intense place.

Are you active in any other library organizations? Which and how?

NASIG has been my primary professional activity, but I do look for other venues to connect with other colleagues. In the last year, I have been attending meetings of a group of government documents librarians in North Texas called NORDOCS. Our fall meeting is in early November in Waco, so I have been busy organizing that. I’ve attended quite a few conferences for technical librarians, law librarians, and a couple of ALA meetings, but NASIG is still the organization I am most involved with.

Do you have a particular (or any) career goal(s)? What would be your ideal job if money were no object?

After spending too much time looking for a “dream job” before that really didn’t exist, I’m not sure I even want to think about a “perfect job” anymore. But there are things I would look at if I were to dream about the future. Variety would be important – I would hate to do the same thing day in and day out. I like to solve problems. That may be why I took so well to serials and cataloging. While it might just be from my contracting experience, I have enjoyed working at smaller libraries; for example, Wesley Seminary had a full-time staff of six. There seemed to be more direct contact with the other functions of a library; there certainly was no wall between technical and public services like sometimes happens in larger institutions. I would like to learn more about the other areas of technical services such as acquisitions and systems; while I have done some light duties in those areas, I could see myself delving deeper
into them. And I have enjoyed the chances to apply my “non-library” interests to my job. For example, working at the Department of State library was fascinating because of the collections – it was a perfect fit for my interests in international affairs.

Have you had any mentors along the way or “library heroes”? How have they helped you?

Wow – I have had a lot of mentors or “library heroes!” I shudder to think about naming some because I know I’ll leave someone out, but I can name some areas where I have found mentors and supporters.

The people I worked with at AU were an amazing bunch. They were very supportive and encouraging, and really laid the foundation for my career as a librarian. I had good experiences with InfoCurrent, my contracting agency. Through them and also through the people I worked with on assignments, I gained great experience and started a professional network of librarians, some of whom I still am in touch with several years later. I had a good experience in library school at the University of Maryland. During that time I found many librarians from the university libraries who took an interest in the MLS students.

And I must say NASIG has been a mother-lode for meeting and networking with other librarians. I have found many “kindred-soul” librarians in NASIG who are eager to support each other. Just as an example, when I was on vacation this summer in Chicago, I met up with a fellow NASIG member, Sarah Morris Lin, for lunch downtown. Afterwards, she toured me through her law firm’s library, and we found ourselves “talking shop” and discussed possible solutions to some technical services matters in her library. Sarah mentioned that as the only technical services librarian on site, having this kind of discussion with a fellow tech services librarian was welcome and unusual. NASIG really fosters an environment where people focus on solving problems and meeting challenges, and we like to help each other in doing so.

Personal

After living in the DC area for 15 years, what’s life been like in Waco? Besides going to church and football, what do you do for fun?

Washington and Waco are certainly different places! I grew up in Maryland just outside DC, but really didn’t go into the city much until I was at AU. Between graduate school, work, and other activities, I did spend a lot of those 15 years in the city. Coming back to Waco was a major adjustment. I sometimes joke the only thing missing from my Waco neighborhood is a conveniently located Metro station. There were a lot of adjustments: the climate (yes, 95 degrees in August can seem like a relief); local sports allegiances (Native Washingtonian in Cowboys country – need I say more?); allergies (didn’t believe in them before coming back), and so forth. But there are also advantages to being in a smaller city (Waco’s metro population is about 200,000). I can get anywhere in town in about 15 minutes by car. There is no real traffic congestion. Navigating the Waco airport is a breeze. Housing is affordable – I own a home here, which I doubt I’d be able to do in the DC area without moving to West Virginia. Everything I need and a surprising amount of what I want is available here. Waco even has the largest municipal park in Texas – Cameron Park stretches along the Brazos River and offers everything from picnic areas to wooded trails and scenic views from bluffs overlooking the river. It reminds me of Rock Creek Park in Washington. Waco is also the birthplace of Dr. Pepper (back in 1885). And Waco is centrally located in Texas. Dallas and Austin are both easy drives and when I do want a change of pace for a day or weekend, I’ll make a road trip.

Sounds like Chris may have a future with the Waco Chamber of Commerce if he ever grows bored with his library job!
Library School Outreach Committee, née Task Force
Susan Davis, Profiles Editor

The Library School Outreach Task Force was formed in 2006 as a result of suggestions from the Awards & Recognition and Membership Development Committees. The NASIG Board appointed one representative each from Awards & Recognition, Membership Development, and Continuing Education (CEC) to the original task force. The task force’s charge included increasing the visibility of NASIG to library school students, promoting serials librarianship as a career path, and providing the schools with resources and information to make them aware of the organization’s activities. NASIG has been fortunate to have provided student conference grants and a scholarship to outstanding students for many years, but with so many competing interests it seems that awareness of NASIG is not as high as the organization would like. The board and the task force agreed that a more personal approach to the library schools was warranted.

Therefore, the task force initiated a pilot project whereby original task force members (Linda Smith Griffin, Steve Oberg, Sarah Sutton, and Paoshan Yue) served as ambassadors to a small number of library schools. These “ambassadors” contacted their assigned schools and made sure each school was aware of NASIG Student Grant Awards, conference and continuing education events, and, when possible, attended social gathering at the school. The task force recommended that it be made a standing NASIG committee in April of 2007, and the board did so, creating the Library School Outreach Committee (LSOC).

Members of the LSOC for 2008-09 are: Carole Green, Kara Killough, Linda Smith Griffin, Sarah Sutton, co-chair, Marcella Lesher, co-chair, Sandy Piver, and Steve Oberg, with Jeff Slagell as board liaison.

The committee is actively trying to grow the Library School Ambassador program and invites interested NASIG members who have a connection with a library school to apply for an ambassadorial appointment. Each ambassador works with a committee liaison. At the time of this writing, ten library schools have ambassadors: Louisiana State University, University of Texas at Austin, Texas Woman’s University, Dominican University, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, San Jose State University, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Indiana University, University of Arizona, and University of Washington.

Ambassadors come from all segments of the library community and from all levels of experience. One of the ambassadors, Eugenia Beh, was a 2008 NASIG Student Grant Award recipient and is now volunteering as an ambassador to the University of Texas School of Information. Former NASIG President Steve Oberg works with two schools, Dominican University and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

The committee established a set of guidelines to help ambassadors with their charge to establish contact with their school, offer assistance in finding mentors and guest lecturers, and new this academic year, to create a bank of support material to share with the library schools and with each other. An Ambassadors’ Google Group has been established for the sharing of these materials.

LSOC was very successful in promoting the NASIG awards during 2007/08. Thirty-three percent of the student award applicants were from students at schools with ambassadors; no applicants came from those schools in 2007. This year, the committee will again work closely with A&R to promote NASIG awards. A&R suggested, and LSOC enthusiastically agreed, especially to promote the Marcia Tuttle International Award among doctoral students. LSOC hopes that other measures of success will come from feedback from schools with ambassadors as well as success stories from the ambassadors.

LSOC is also exploring the possibilities of sponsoring a time when alumni and students from the various library schools could get together at NASIG annual conferences. With the already very full conference...
schedule this may take some creative planning!!

Eugenia Beh, ambassador to the I-School at the University of Texas at Austin, arranged for the first of these get-togethers during the 2008 conference. Although it was not a huge success, LSOC learned a lot from the experience and will work with the ambassadors to improve the rate of success at the 2009 conference. Some ideas are for ambassadors to lead a dine-around for alumni and students of their particular schools or by organizing a group table(s) during lunch or breakfast. So far these activities have not needed any budgetary support, but some of the other events being explored will. LSOC will consider soliciting sponsorship and/or funding from library schools for a library school reception of some kind during an upcoming conference, or to be an organizational sponsor of NASIG.

Online discussion groups such as Serialst have occasionally addressed the question of how much serials-related education is available in library school programs. The answers usually indicate that this area of education is somewhat lacking. This topic has been addressed at NASIG conferences since the very beginning (Ed. note—I led such a discussion at NASIG 1 in 1986). The serials world has expanded from print to a very complex set of issues now encompassing the world of continuing resources (Ed. note—please no, not an organizational name change to NACRIG!) NASIG members anecdotally relate stories about the lack of time in the curriculum to focus an entire course on serials, as well as the feeling that on the job training is where one is expected to learn about serials and continuing resources. Co-chair Sarah Sutton analyzed content of library school course catalogs for a research project last spring. She learned that stand-alone courses covering continuing resources are few and far between, but that continuing resources are included as a component of broader courses. And with the expansion of online learning opportunities, particularly the WISE consortium developed by the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign and Syracuse (http://www.wiseeducation.org/), more students will have exposure to continuing resources. Library School Outreach naturally has a very close relationship with Awards & Recognition and is very excited about bridging the gap between career possibilities addressed in library schools and the career experiences of NASIG members.

I asked the committee for thoughts on what NASIG members can do to positively impact a library school student. The response from Sarah Sutton was quite interesting. “I conducted my research project specifically to cover not just serials but continuing resources in general because my personal feeling is that NASIG isn’t doing enough to present to the public the broad range of issues, functions, and resources that fall within our scope of interest. I think there is a persistent impression among non-serialists that we are only interested in serials and not electronic resources, scholarly communication, online publishing, etc., that NASIG could/should do more to change. And that is something that LSOC in particular and the NASIG membership in general could actively be doing in library schools: eliminating the ‘serials mystique.’”

It sounds like this committee has its work cut out for it, but in an exciting and rewarding way. Meeting students, potential students, and library school faculty is a great way to get the word out about NASIG and the challenging world of continuing resources.

Other NASIG News

Creating Transparency in the NASIG Election Process
Tim Hagan and Kathy Brannon, Co-Chairs Nominations & Elections Committee, with Char Simser, Past President and Board Liaison

The administration of the NASIG election process has been an ongoing concern of the membership. Some members have felt that the process is too exclusive, handled by a relatively small group of members on the Nominations & Elections Committee. Others, while
perhaps not sharing that feeling, have felt that the requirements and processes involved prohibit the general membership from even attempting to run.

The NASIG Board and the N&E Committee, recognizing these concerns, have taken steps to make the election process more transparent, more open, and less complicated for nominees.

During the brainstorming session at the Louisville conference in June of 2007, "Why is it difficult to get people to run for executive office of NASIG?" some of the difficulties and misconceptions of potential nominees were brought out. (See the September 2007 Newsletter for full report). The following month during a board conference call in July 2007, it was noted that the advent of online voting could open up the voting process and possibly allow for primary and general elections. The concept of open elections was further discussed during the January 2008 board meeting. At this time, the Nominations & Elections Committee was asked to draft recommendations for the board to review.

The N&E Committee was initially unsure whether the board had intended for the committee to propose altering the NASIG bylaws, particularly Article 5, section 2: "Any active member of NASIG shall be eligible for election to the Executive Board, except as otherwise indicated in these Bylaws." Because of a desire not to do this, the submitted recommendation contains proposals that would change the bylaws as little as possible.

The committee researched the election methods of various organizations, primarily not-for-profits. Not one was found that had a primary election to narrow a field of candidates. The work was always done by a committee in the organization (or they didn't have enough candidates for this to matter), rather than having the entire membership do this. This information certainly wasn't enough to abandon or strongly influence the committee's findings, but did raise concerns.

Discussion among the committee also brought up the concern of the potential for voter burn out. While an online election makes the process easier for voters, the addition of a primary – and the need to promote it – may result in voter apathy and fatigue. As an example, the number of member-at-large nominations received over the past four election cycles was 77, 115, 51, and 63 nominees respectively.*** In an open primary all of these nominees would appear on the ballot to be narrowed for the general election. The amount of material, resumes/CVs, position statements, etc., that voting members would have to go through would be immense.

In addition, the total votes cast in the election for 2007 were 288 and for 2008 were 283, a relatively small percentage of total members. The odds of keeping voting numbers at this level for two elections a year seem doubtful. The committee also did not envision a fair method to create a balance of librarians, vendors and publishers, etc., among the members-at-large using an open election.

Another concern was that removing the references – which are currently from former board or committee chairs - potentially removes both the knowledge of the work of the committees and the amount and type of...
work a member-at-large would encounter. An optional step in the committee’s board report was to require prior work on a NASIG committee, although some members did not feel this was necessary because anyone (with or without NASIG experience) can become a petition candidate by submitting 10 signatures of current members.

N&E did provide a formal report to the board with recommendations and options for an open primary election. That report outlined possible steps of the process, including criteria for moving candidates from the primary to the general election. N&E’s role would be: 1) to ensure that the application packets were complete for those entering the primary for member-at-large positions; 2) to work with ECC to upload all nominee information to the NASIG website; 3) to solicit candidates if fewer than 6 were seeking office; 4) to oversee the primary election; and 5) to move the 6 nominees with the most votes to the general election ballot.

The report to the board was submitted with some reluctance since there was not an authoritative consensus among the members of the committee on its final content. At least one member felt that the board should make these recommendations. It was unclear whether this represented the feeling that there was not a need for change, the charge was not precise enough, or uncertainty that the concept of an open election was workable. After some discussion it was agreed that the concept of an open election process would work for the member-at-large positions, but would require a lot more work and effort for the NASIG members who vote.

After reviewing N&E’s report, the Executive Board felt that pursuing an open primary was not in the best interest of the membership, especially in light of the number of members voting and the added burden for those voting members. N&E’s task is not a simple one, and the committee members do a careful review of nominees’ application packages before presenting a final slate to the membership. With a petition process in place, there is opportunity for every NASIG member to pursue election to the organization’s Executive Board.

Some steps have been taken towards more simplified and transparent elections.

Among these are:

1. Online voting.
2. Fuller and clearer reports to the board and Newsletter.
3. All forms - both internal and external - used by N&E are on the web (see: http://www.nasig.org/about_elections_process.cfm).
4. The nomination profile form has been revised (only resume or CV required now and position statement length is increased to 500 words).
5. The petition process is active and working (especially as we have lately seen with petition candidates both running and winning elections).

The Nominations & Elections Committee would like to further refine the election process for more transparency and welcome comments and ideas from the membership. Redefining the manner, number and types of references required is one area the committee would like to explore next.

***[Ed. note: Following publication of this article in the Newsletter blog, N&E supplied the following erratum: These figures represent the total number of nominations over the past four elections cycles, not just member-at-large nominations.

Actual member-at-large nomination numbers for these election cycles were:
2004/05 - 54 MAL nominations (23 agreed for nominee review)
2005/06 – 53 MAL nominations (26 agreed for nominee review)
2006/07 - 35 MAL nominations (14 agreed for nominee review)
2007/08 – 55 MAL nominations (24 agreed for nominee review)

Because of the lower figures, the Executive Board has recommended that N&E open a discussion forum in our members-only area to gather additional feedback from members over the next few weeks.]
The Evaluation & Assessment Committee of the North American Serials Interest Group (NASIG) recently conducted a survey to get feedback on issues related to conference attendance. Our goal was to give all members the opportunity to provide input, not just those who are able to attend the annual conference and fill out the evaluation form. The survey was announced October 27, 2008, via an e-mail message to the membership. Later, the NASIG publicist announced the survey on three discussion lists (ACQNET, SERIALST, and LIBLICENSE), expanding the pool of respondents to former and prospective members. The survey closed on November 21, 2008. The survey was started by 593 respondents, 515 of which completed the entire survey. The complete results of the survey, including graphs and open-ended comments, can be viewed online at: http://www.surveymonkey.com/sr.aspx?sm=rewNC8_2bbd77F9R9vPd8lrH_2bZKGrwHXwYsZcdiap8HS4_3d. The E&A Committee would particularly invite current and future board members and committee members to look over the open-ended comments in the survey as they contain a wealth of ideas and insights! A summary of the survey results is provided below.

**Respondent Profile**

The largest number of respondents have attended between one and five conferences (43.1%). Just under a fifth (18.3%) have not attended any NASIG conferences, while the remainder are divided among 6-10 conferences (20.1%), 11-15 (9.6%), 16-20 (5.6%), and more than 20 (3.2%). When looking at recent conference attendance, 28.4% have not attended any of the past five conferences, while 16.8% have attended all five. The remainder report attending 1 conference (17.9%), 2 (11.2%), 3 (14.2%) or 4 (11.5%). Respondents reported their years of serials or related experience. Most (19.1%) have 7-10 years of experience, while the fewest have less than one year (1.4%). Other experience ranges each were selected by 10-14% of respondents, except those with over 30 years experience who comprise only 8% of respondents.

When it comes to job responsibilities, the categories with the greatest number of responses include: electronic resources (56.9%), serials librarian (50.8%), acquisitions (46.6%), cataloging/metadata creation (43.1%), collection development (34.4%), technical services manager (24.7%), and licensing/rights management (23.7%). All other categories were selected by less than 20% of respondents. The types of institutions respondents work at are predominated by university libraries at 59%, with college libraries coming in a distant second with 11.6%. All other types of institutions came in at less than 5%.

**How Does NASIG Rate Compared to Other Conferences?**

We asked respondents to indicate the types of conferences they regularly attend, not including NASIG’s conference. The American Library Association’s Annual Conference and Midwinter Meeting was the most popular selection at 38% of respondents. Second most popular are state library association conferences (30.7%). Several conferences are attended by roughly a fifth of survey respondents. These include: the Charleston Conference (20.9%), ILS user group conferences (19.5%), state-level conferences with a topical focus (including division, section, or chapter meetings of professional groups) (19.5%), and regional conferences with a topical focus (including division, section, or chapter meetings of professional groups) (18.3%). All other conferences were selected by less than 15% of respondents. We wanted to know how NASIG’s conference ranks compared to these other conferences when respondents prioritize what events to attend. The largest number of respondents (44.7%) rate NASIG as their top priority. It is a second priority for 23.2% of respondents, third for 12.3%, and fourth or lower for just 6.1%. Unfortunately it is not a priority for 13.6% of respondents.
How Do Respondents Decide Whether or not to Attend NASIG Conferences?

We wanted to examine the factors influencing decisions both to attend and not to attend the annual conference, looking at the past five conferences. Specifically, are there things NASIG could be doing to improve attendance rates or are those decisions driven by factors out of our control? We looked at different factors that could influence the decision to attend the conference, asking respondents to rate each factor on a scale ranging from “very important” to “very unimportant.” The results were translated to a numeric scale with a rating of 4 being equivalent to “very important” and a rating of 1 as equivalent to “very unimportant.” (In other words, the higher the numeric value, the more important a factor is in the decision.) A ranked list of factors influencing the decision to attend the conference is as follows:

1. Programs offered (3.55 rating)
2. Support from employer (3.45 rating)
3. Opportunity to network with peers (3.33 rating)
4. Value related to other professional conferences (3.27 rating)
5. Travel costs (3.10 rating)
6. Hotel costs (2.97 rating)
7. Geographic location (2.90 rating)
8. Registration fee (2.87 rating)
9. Conference dates (2.86 rating)
10. Opportunity to interact with vendors/clients (2.80 rating)
11. Serving as an officer or committee member (2.75 rating)
12. Giving a presentation or poster session (2.61 rating)
13. Personal reasons (2.58 rating)
14. Required by employer to attend (2.41 rating)

A ranked list of factors influencing the decision not to attend the conference is as follows:

1. Insufficient support from employer (3.20 rating)
2. Travel costs (3.12 rating)
3. Hotel costs (2.95 rating)
4. Geographic location (2.94 rating)
5. Conference dates (2.90 rating)
6. Personal reasons/conflicts (2.89 rating)
7. Registration fee (2.75 rating)
8. Programs offered (2.59 rating)
9. Value related to other professional conferences (2.43 rating)
10. Not required by employer to attend (2.35 rating)
11. Not serving as an officer or committee member (2.19 rating)
12. Not giving a presentation or poster session (2.12 rating)

When asked for the three best things about NASIG conferences, responses echoed many of the highly-rated factors influencing the decision to attend cited above. Programming, opportunities to network, the size and culture of the conference, and locations were all commonly given as answers. Points for improvement included the desire to lower costs and a number of specific suggestions about conference programs and local arrangements. The survey garnered over twice as many kudos for what NASIG is doing best compared to comments on what could be improved.

Membership Numbers

The next few questions looked at factors that could affect NASIG membership numbers in future years, specifically retirements and career changes. Despite dire predictions for the “graying of the profession,” the largest number of respondents see their retirements or career changes as happening more than 10 years in the future (41.4%). The second highest category is for those respondents who are uncertain (19.3%). Those with more immediate plans to either retire or leave their serials or related position are comprised of smaller numbers with 18.1% projecting 6-10 years, 16% projecting 3-5 years, and just 5.1% projecting 1-2 years as the timeframe for their plans. We wondered how retirement or career changes would affect conference attendance and membership numbers. Only 6.5% of respondents plan to remain members post-retirement or after leaving their serials or related position. Larger numbers do not plan to maintain membership (38.3%) or are uncertain (55.2%). Anticipated conference
attendance is lower with only 2.4% planning continued conference attendance and 48.9% not planning continued conference attendance. Those who are uncertain comprise 48.7% of respondents.

**Future Conference Attendance**

We wanted to gauge if the current economic climate or other changing factors would alter the decision-making process regarding future conference attendance. When comparing ratings for each factor to previous decisions on whether to attend the conference, there was a slight uptick in the importance of the monetary factors of travel costs, hotel costs, and registration fees. Programs offered, support from employer, and opportunities to network will continue to be top factors in the decision-making process.

1. Programs offered (3.50 rating)
2. Support from employer (3.26 rating)
3. Opportunity to network with peers (3.23 rating)
4. Travel costs (3.13 rating)
5. Hotel costs (3.06 rating)
6. Geographic location (3.01 rating)
7. Value related to other professional conferences (3.00 rating)
8. Conference dates (2.96 rating)
9. Registration fee (2.94 rating)
10. Opportunity to interact with vendors/clients (2.76 rating)
11. Personal reasons/conflicts (2.71 rating)
12. Giving a presentation or poster session (2.42 rating)
13. Serving as an officer or committee member (2.38 rating)
14. Required by employer to attend (2.26 rating)

We asked specifically about plans to attend the next conference in Asheville, North Carolina. Those planning to attend comprise 49% of respondents, while those not planning to attend only 19.5%. About a third (31.5%) are uncertain at this time.

**Future Conference Dates and Accommodations**

The next group of questions was inspired by conversations we had heard at previous conferences, including discussions in the 2008 brainstorming session. First, we ask respondents to indicate which months in the year are acceptable for NASIG to be held. A majority of 70% found May to be an acceptable month, followed by 55.7% for June and 45.6% for April. All other months were selected as acceptable by less than 35% of respondents. Conversely we asked what months are not acceptable. Not surprisingly, 79.4% found December to be unacceptable, closely followed by January at 69.9%. Over half (53.8%) also found November to be unacceptable timing for the conference. At the other end of the spectrum, only about 10% found April or May to be unacceptable and 24.3% found June unacceptable. Based on these results, it seems that May is the preferred timing for the conference.

We also asked about what days of the week to hold the conference. The current practice of Thursday through Sunday had the greatest support with 69.2% of respondents finding it acceptable, followed by Wednesday through Saturday at 48.6%. All other day spans were selected as acceptable by between 20%-35% of respondents. Comments note that a Saturday overnight stay can result in cheaper airfares, while others don’t want to give up their weekends for work-related activities. As far as the length of the conference is concerned, the vast majority of respondents (88.3%) think that NASIG is getting it just right. A small number think it should be shorter (8.5%) and even fewer that it should be longer (3.2%).

In 2008, NASIG tried out a resort location for the conference for the first time at Tapatio Cliffs in Phoenix, Arizona. We wanted to gauge interest in resort locations versus the hotel locations. Most respondents did not express a strong opinion on the topic, with 34.9% indicating resort locations occasionally would be desirable and 36.5% reporting uncertainty or that it doesn’t matter. Those with a preference for hotels comprise 16.8% of respondents and those with a preference for resorts slightly less at 11.8% of respondents. Comments cite that cost should be the important issue in deciding on venues. Just as on this year’s conference evaluations, many noted that they
prefer locations where they can walk or find easy, affordable transportation to restaurants, shopping, and other attractions.

(Note: In 2007, NASIG’s Site Selection Committee conducted a survey which focused on aspects of site selection and accommodations not covered here. The results are available in the NASIG Newsletter, vol. 22, no. 3 (Sept 2007): http://nasignews.wordpress.com/2007/07/16/223-200709-site-selection-survey-results/)

Online Conference Options

In our increasingly wired environment, we wanted to determine the level of interest in offering some or all conference activities online. Is this something the Executive Board should begin looking into? When it comes to making the shift to an online-only conference, a strong majority of 69.2% do not see it as a suitable alternative to an in-person conference. A smaller number indicate it could be considered if travel costs rise significantly (20.2%) and just 10.6% think it is a good idea regardless of travel costs. One common theme among the comments was the importance of in-person networking that respondents do not think would translate to an online environment. Some expressed that an online conference would be better than nothing, but should only be used as a last resort. A majority of 58.2% are uncertain if they would be willing to participate in an online-only conference. Almost a quarter (23.3%) indicate they would participate, while 18.4% would not.

We also looked at interest in a hybrid model, where selected conference programs would be offered as webcasts. This idea was received more favorably with 55.4% supporting the proposal. A significant number are uncertain about the option (39.2%), but only a small number are opposed (5.4%). Support for paying a special fee for online content was somewhat less well received. Just 34.6% are in favor, while 20.7% are opposed and 44.7% are uncertain. Comments noted that this could be an important benefit to membership for those who are unable to attend annual conferences. Webcasts could also be a way to advertise the value of NASIG to attract new members and conference attendees.

Other Suggestions

We wrapped up the survey by asking participants, “What other events, activities, or services could NASIG offer to increase the value of your membership, either related to the annual conference or independent from it?” We received comments from 118 respondents. Some ideas included:

- Offering more continuing education events, including regional events and online opportunities (both live and self-paced)
- Offering certificate programs
- Expanding mentoring programs
- Issuing more publications
- Sponsoring a scholarly journal
- Proposing NASIG take a more active role in the profession/industry following the model of UKSG. We should spearhead initiatives, get involved in standards work, sponsor research, etc.
- Providing a job placement service
- Providing a service for locating external reviewers (for tenure, promotion, or other faculty reviews)
- Providing a clearinghouse for title changes and publisher changes

Conclusion

Thank you to everyone who took the time to fill out the survey and provide thoughtful input that will help NASIG with future planning. The survey highlighted some areas for growth and improvement, as well as provided a reality check on what NASIG is doing right. If you are interested in discussing some of the ideas, comments, and information presented here, members should feel free to jump over to the discussion forums at: http://www.nasig.org/members_forums.cfm.
Committee Updates

[Ed. note: The following updates are excerpted from committee reports for the September Executive Board meeting.]

Administrative Support Task Force
Katy Ginanni, Chair
June 2, 2008

After a slow start (completely the fault of the slacker chair, who was busy learning a new job and settling into a new town), the TF started by collecting job descriptions from other library organizations. The chair split up the 50 U.S. states and regional associations/consortia among the members of the committee (excluding the consultant and board liaison). Each member contacted the associations within his/her assigned states. The response was less than overwhelming, but we did receive 18 job descriptions. These have been posted in a BaseCamp site (access courtesy of GWLA), to which each member of the committee has access.

The committee will meet during NASIG in Phoenix to review the job descriptions together, and we will begin to hack out a job description for the NASIG Board to review.

The chair has also created a list of milestones in our BaseCamp site. These reflect the charge given to the committee. They are:

- Create tentative job description to provide continuity of administrative support for review by the Executive Board (by June 27, 2008).
- Receive feedback from the Executive Board (by July 31, 2008).
- Finalize job description (August 15, 2008).
- Investigate options and analyze cost (by Oct. 1, 2008).
- Serve as a search committee to hire administrative support and/or set up an RFQ for services to send to professional companies.
- Review applications or proposals (by Jan. 1, 2009).
- Make recommendation to board by Jan. 15, 2009 for review at midwinter board meeting on January 22, 2009.

Awards & Recognition
Patrick Carr and Carol Ficken, Co-Chairs
September 2008

Activities Since Last Report

- Elizabeth MacDonald and Rita Johnson conducted an online survey of 2008 award winners regarding their experiences at the 2008 NASIG annual conference. The survey aimed to assess ways in which A&R can improve the experiences of future award winners.
- Sarah Morris completed a write-up of the results of the committee’s online survey of 2008 award winners and submitted the write-up for publication in the September 2008 issue of the Newsletter.
- Yumin Jiang composed brief descriptions of each NASIG award and submitted the descriptions to the Electronic Communications Committee for publication on the main awards page of the NASIG website (http://www.nasig.org/about_awards.cfm).
- Committee reviewed and agreed with the recommendations of the NASIG Board for better spotlighting award recipients on the NASIG website and NASIG-L.
- Committee engaged in an email conversation over the summer regarding the creation of a need-based award and revisions to the criteria used to evaluate applicants for the Serials Specialist Award. As a result of this email conversation, the committee has developed proposals for the NASIG Board (see attachment).

Any Changes or Exceptions to Budget

- The budget estimate submitted to the NASIG Board projects eight recipients of the 2009 Student Grant Award. This projection reflects the number of recipients of this award that the board approved for 2008. In a previous meeting, the board had indicated that it would decide in each year’s January meeting the number of Student Grant Awards to
give at the upcoming conference. If the board decides to increase or decrease the Student Grant Awards given in 2009, the A&R budget estimate would change accordingly.

- The A&R budget would increase if the NASIG Board were to make the changes proposed in the attached document, “Proposals to the NASIG Board for the Creation of a Need-Based Award and Revisions to the Criteria Used to Evaluate Applications for the Serials Specialist Award.”

Recommendations for Board

- Building on the board’s recommendations for better spotlighting award recipients on the NASIG website and NASIG-L, A&R recommends that in the future the NASIG website and/or the NASIG Flickr site feature photographs of each new award winner attending the annual conference posing with his or her award.
- See the attached document, “Proposals to the NASIG Board for the Creation of a Need-Based Award and Revisions to the Criteria Used to Evaluate Applications for the Serials Specialist Award.”

Proposals to the NASIG Board for the Creation of a Need-Based Award and Revisions to the Criteria Used to Evaluate Applications for the Serials Specialist Award
Submitted by: NASIG Awards & Recognition Committee
Date of Proposal: 5 September 2008

Introduction

During the A&R Committee’s meeting at the 2008 NASIG annual conference, the committee’s liaison to the NASIG Board, Bob Boissy, informed A&R that the board had approved in principle the creation of a new award that would be given on the basis of financial need and that would provide the award recipient with a 50 percent stipend for the costs of attending and registering for the NASIG annual conference. Boissy informed A&R that the board wished for them to develop a proposal for such an award.

At this same meeting, A&R discussed the Serials Specialist Award. The committee noted the high number of applicants for this award and questioned whether education was an appropriate criterion for evaluating applicants.

Over the course of the summer, A&R discussed both of these topics via email messages. In considering the creation of a need-based award, A&R weighted the possibility of proposing two such awards, one for professionals and one for paraprofessionals. However, the committee ultimately determined that the best way to meet the needs of paraprofessionals was not through the creation of a new need-based award specifically for paraprofessionals but rather the revision of the Serials Specialist Award.

Accordingly, this document has two sections. The first section discusses proposed revisions to the criteria used for evaluating applicants for the Serials Specialist Award. The second section proposes the creation of a new NASIG award which would be given on a yearly basis to a serials professional with a significant financial need.

Proposed Revisions to the Criteria Used to Evaluate Applicants for the Serials Specialist Award

In previous years, applications for the Serial Specialist Award have been evaluated using five criteria:

1. Strength of academic background;
2. Library experience;
3. Statement regarding career objectives;
4. Statement regarding desire to attend NASIG conference; and
5. Recommendation provided within the application’s reference questionnaire.

A&R recommends that the first of these criteria, strength of academic background, not be used in evaluating future applications for the Serials Specialist Award.
The reason for this recommendation is the significant advantage that an MLS or other graduate degree gives to applicants. As this award is specifically geared to applicants in paraprofessional positions, A&R feels that using education as a criterion for evaluating applicants unfairly handicaps those who have significant paraprofessional experience but lack an advanced academic degree.

In addition, A&R notes that, for at least the last two years, NASIG has received more applications for the Serials Specialist Award than any other award. Given: (a) the board’s interest in provide greater support based on financial need; (b) the high number of applicants for the Serials Specialist Award; and (c) the inability that most libraries have to provide any financial support for paraprofessionals to attend NASIG conferences, A&R recommends that the board channel some of its interest in providing greater support based on financial need to increase recipients that receive the Serials Specialist Award each year.

Proposal for the Creation of a Need-Based Award

A&R proposes the creation of a new, need-based award to be given by NASIG on an annual basis. A&R further proposes that this award be titled the “Rose Robischon Scholarship” in recognition of the contributions that deceased NASIG member Rose Robischon has made to NASIG and the serials community. Recommendations regarding the scope, eligibility, and application requirements of this award are discussed below.

Scope: The purpose of this award is to provide financial support through which a serials professional lacking funds for professional travel will be able to afford attendance at the NASIG annual conference.

Eligibility: This award is open to applicants in any NASIG member country (defined for this purpose as the United States, Canada, Mexico, and Greenland). Applicants must currently be in a position of a professional nature with primary responsibilities for some aspect of serials, e.g. head of serials, serials acquisitions, serials vendor, serials publisher. Each applicant must provide information indicating that his or her institution does not offer sufficient financial support to cover the cost of attending a NASIG annual conference. While there are no eligibility requirements with respect to numbers of years of experience, preference will be given to applicants who have not previously attended a NASIG annual conference and who can demonstrate that they will significantly benefit from doing so.

Application requirements: The following materials are required to be submitted electronically either in Microsoft Word or plain text (.txt) format:

- A completed application form. This form will include questions concerning the following:
  - Estimated cost of attending the upcoming NASIG annual conference;
  - Employer’s policy regarding reimbursement for the costs of attending professional conferences;
  - The amount of professional support the applicant anticipates receiving from his or her employer in order to attend the upcoming NASIG annual conference;
  - The extent to which the award would benefit the applicant’s professional development and engagement in the serials profession.
- A reference questionnaire completed by the applicant’s current supervisor. This questionnaire will include questions allowing the supervisor to explain the nature of applicant’s financial need for attending a NASIG annual conference and describe how the applicant would benefit from attending this conference.
- A current resume or curriculum vitae.
Narrative of Activities

1. Revision of CEC charge: In June, Jeff Slagell helped start a discussion of the committee charge by suggesting draft language that would better reflect the NASIG Board’s search for new funding opportunities. The committee discussed revisions to the charge. Appendix A includes a revised charge for consideration by the Executive Board.

2. CEC manual: In June and July, Jayne Sappington & Kelli Getz evaluated documents from the previous CEC website. They determined that, while some useful information is available, the manual will largely need to be developed from scratch. They will be developing a new manual in phases, over the next 4-6 months. Jayne will be issuing periodic status reports to keep committee members apprised of progress.

3. CEC website: Apryl Price volunteered to re-develop the CEC website.

4. Review of UKSG syllabi, etc.: Clint Chamberlain volunteered to review the syllabi for possible topics for events.

5. NASIG membership assessment: To better understand the distribution of NASIG members (and to identify gaps in membership), Steve Shadle proposed a membership assessment. In July, he tested the concept using a subset from the membership Directory (see Appendix B). He has submitted a request for a data set in order to complete the assessment.

6. Liaisons for NASIG-sponsored events approved 2007/2008: the two hosts for upcoming events are now set up with liaisons Clint Chamberlain (NETSL, Dodie Gaudet) and Jill Grogg (for Patrick Carr)


Appendix A: Revised Charge

The NASIG Continuing Education Committee is charged with providing serials education opportunities to its membership as well as (to) the serials community as a whole. In this regard, the committee will develop, encourage, and/or administer high quality programs that can be offered on a regional basis to members and potential members in all parts of North America. The content of these programs will be diverse in order to reach as many segments of the serials community as possible, and will include a range of topics, including general, specific, theoretical, and practical aspects of serials work.

The committee works with the Program Planning Committee and the Electronic Communications Committee to identify programs and other activities, areas of interest, sites, and speakers that would be suitable for programs, joint conferences, occasional publication(s), and electronic forums. The committee works with the treasurer [and administrative support staff] to carry out its activities. The committee establishes links with library, information science, and academic publishing programs to cooperate on serials education programs and identify potential speakers from outside NASIG for programs and events. The committee also provides information to the Evaluation & Assessment Committee. You may contact the Continuing Education Committee by email: cec@list.nasig.org

Appendix B: Membership Assessment (Test of Concept)

Note: This test is based on a 200-member subset of the NASIG Directory.

NASIG Membership (U.S. only)
Conference Planning
Steve Kelley and Eleanor Cook, Co-Chairs
September 2008

Narrative of Activities So Far

1. **Theme for 2009 Conference**
The CPC and PPC collaborated and came up with the theme “Riding the Rapids through a Mountain of Change.”

2. **Logo for 2009 Conference**
The CPC worked with Craig Fansler, a librarian at Wake Forest University and occasional graphic designer, to develop a logo design fitting the theme. At the time of this writing, the logo is being reviewed by the board.

3. **Materials received from previous CPC chairs**
Five boxes of CPC materials were received by the current co-chairs in July.

4. **Meeting with staff at Renaissance Hotel**
Eleanor, Steve, Laurie Edwards and Nancy Newsome met with staff at the Renaissance Hotel in July. Heather Smith, the sales manager, was quite helpful and should be easy to work with. The Top of the Plaza, a penthouse ballroom with a spectacular view, appears to be a good location for holding our opening night reception. We also obtained the name of a local author and historian, Ken Richards, who would be a good choice for our opening session/welcome speaker.

5. **Evening event**
The CPC has been negotiating with Biltmore Estate to see about holding an evening event there. Due to scheduling conflicts with the Biltmore, we are looking at an event on Friday, June 5. The prices initially quoted were prohibitively high, in the area of $100 to $120 per person, while our initial budget will only allow up to $60 per person with 500 people attending. Eleanor and Steve have brought in Joyce Tenney to negotiate with them. Our current plans are to reduce the amount of food to try to swing the event, because Biltmore House is very impressive and there were many requests for an event at Biltmore at the 2008 conference in Phoenix. However, if we just cannot come to terms with Biltmore, we are also looking at the Crest Center for an evening event. (The above comments reflect the situation at the time the report was being written. By the time the meeting comes around, we should have a more definite answer.)

6. **Transportation to evening event**
Because of the unusual setting of the Biltmore Estate, it was suggested to us that we should arrange for enough buses to take everyone to the house in one trip, rather than staggering buses. If we should be at the Biltmore, and use this approach, only one bus company, Young, will be able to accommodate us with the nine buses required, at a cost of $7,650. If we have to fall back to the Crest Center, we can probably use fewer buses and have them run in shifts.

7. **Transportation to Asheville**
Because the Asheville Airport is fairly small, the CPC has been looking at options for people flying into Charlotte or Greenville, South Carolina, and using shuttle buses, rental cars, etc., to reach Asheville. Nancy Newsome has been contacting companies and compiling the information, which will be (or may already be by the time of the meeting) added to the conference website.

8. **Conference website**
The first information we have ready to go up on the conference website is related to travel advisory and can be viewed at http://www.nasig.org/2009_conference_travel.cfm

9. **Registration**
Mary Bailey, the 2008 conference registrar, has agreed to stay on as registrar for the 2009 conference. She already knows what she has to do, and is ready to start rolling out the registration once the prices are fixed.

10. **Local activities**
The Grey Line Trolley tours of Asheville look like a good option for independent tourism by attendees. The Renaissance Hotel is one of the stops on the tour, it only costs $20, and riders have unlimited hop on-hop off privileges. If Biltmore Estate does not work out for an evening event, we will see about arranging for a group discount for independent touring.
Activities

- Lisa has been in contact with Sampson at ArcStone regarding specific reports that we are not able to run. Currently, we are unable to run a report to list paid memberships. Peter Whiting is consulting with Sampson to be able to run that report.
- We are also unable to identify members who have not renewed within the past 3 years. That will probably not be possible unless we can find a way to compare data from the archival database with data in the new database. Lisa will be exploring that option.
- Lisa, Bob, and Ann are currently working on standardizing documentation for organization affiliations and abbreviations.
- Templates for using the blast system to welcome new members and confirm membership renewal have been created. All members of the committee have been learning how to use the blast system.
- Committee documentation is being created and will be posted to the committee space (when Lisa is able to access the committee space!) Jia is working with the programmers to determine why some parts of the administrative side are inaccessible to those individuals who have permissions in place. It is of extreme importance that this issue be resolved as soon as possible as it is impeding the progress of formalizing new procedures for D&D and making them clear to committee members.
- It quickly became apparent that the only way a previous member could renew if they were unable to log in was to go in through the “Join” button. This creates duplicate records that must be handled by D&D and has the potential to wipe out any record of an individual’s length of membership in NASIG. Lisa worked with Peter and Sampson to add a mechanism to the NASIG page that will allow inactive NASIG members to renew without creating new member records for themselves.

Membership

Active members: ~790 (there may be a few test records showing up in the contact report)
Corresponding members: 2
Gratis members: 8
Pending members: 19
Regular member records: 1671
Total member records in database: 1909
Inactive member records: 1119

These figures are indicative of some of the discrepancies that still exist in the database. There are at least 1100 inactive member records. The 238 record discrepancy means that those records were not coded when they were imported into the database. D&D will need to find a way to identify those records and adjust or delete them. Lisa continues to occasionally consult with Sampson at ArcStone whenever a report that we must be able to run has not been made possible. The ability to run an “inactive members” report is a recent example.

Database recommendation: Ask ArcStone to perform a one-time purge of the database removing inactive member records permanently, not just suppressing those records from public display. This would allow us to begin to maintain the membership database with active members and those members who have not renewed for 3 years from the day of the purge forward. The purge should be scheduled to coincide with the end of 2008 to allow as many opportunities for renewal for those members who have not yet chosen to renew and may still be under the assumption that we are calling for renewals on a calendar year cycle. An archival copy of the membership database in the final incarnation prior to uploading to the ArcStone database has been saved. It will be uploaded to the NASIG website in the near future for permanent reference.

Immediate Action Items

- Previous year’s award winners records marked.
• Lisa: begin posting committee documents to committee website space.
• Bob: compile a list of standardized reports to be run on a schedule for archiving.
• Lisa: begin running reports for board as identified.

Evaluation & Assessment
Fall 2008

This report covers committee activities since the last report submitted for the June 2008 board meeting.

For the first time, conference evaluations were available online only. Conference attendees were reminded about the online evaluations several times during the conference and via messages posted to NASIG-L, SERIALST, and a blast message sent to non-member attendees via the ArcStone admin module. As a special incentive to fill out the evaluation forms, a free conference registration was given away. The winner was selected in a random drawing and the results of the drawing were announced in the NASIG Newsletter and via the NASIG discussion forums in mid-July. The confidential report of the conference evaluation results was sent to the Executive Board and to PPC and CPC co-chairs on August 1, 2008. An abridged version of the report was submitted for publication in the NASIG Newsletter.

At the committee’s meeting at the annual conference we were asked to prepare a ranked list of the last two years’ most popular themes and programs, based on conference evaluation results, for use by CEC and PPC. The report on our findings has been completed and was submitted to CEC and PPC on August 29th.

In early spring, the committee presented to the board the idea of using Survey Monkey to query members who did not attend the annual conference to find out why not. Board members suggested expanding the survey to all members about why people do or do not attend. The committee briefly discussed this new survey at the annual conference meeting. Issues such as the impending waves of retirements and predicted significant hikes in travel costs as impacting conference attendance were discussed. The committee will think broadly when we design the survey this fall and will present a draft of it to the board for approval prior to sending it to the membership.

ACTION ITEM: The Evaluation & Assessment Committee recommends that the board establish a formal policy on use of the Survey Monkey account. Such policy would be incorporated into the E&A Committee manual and shared with other committees.

Electronic Communications
Dalene Hawthorne and Jia Mi, Co-Chairs
August 2008

Listserv Activities

The new listserv software has been set up and all of the committee memberships have been reviewed. ECC will be adding information to the website about all of the committee listservs. The old listserv addresses will be retired soon. The manual will be updated.

Nancy Beals set up a Google Group for the committee to experiment with to determine whether this might be an alternative to the listservs.

Website Activities

ECC committee assisted Donnice Cochenour with the content migration and site testing after the migration to the ArcStone site.

In July, Anna sent detailed notes about the inadequacies of the survey software that came with the ArcStone website to Samson. Samson’s response was that they would have to build everything from scratch and that they cannot add features to their survey software without rewriting the entire system. They suggested NASIG utilize third party survey tools instead.
Statistical Information

Website Statistics (May 2007 – April 2008)

- Average hits on the site per month: 353,055
- Average hits on the home page per month: 5,662
- Average page views per month: 161,748
- Average visitor sessions per month: 71,352
- Average one-time visitors per month: 13,309
- Average returning visitors per month: 5,667
- Conference blog and website statistics are not currently available.

List Statistics as of 8/12/08

NASIG has 29 lists, 2 of which are currently inactive (test lists). This is down from the 42 lists we had prior to the conversion to new listserv software. There are 32 active forwarding addresses. NASIG-L has been retired.

Financial Development
Denise Novak, Chair
September 3, 2008

The members of the FDC participated in a conference call August 13, to discuss the financial plan in general and answer questions regarding the financial picture of NASIG. A snapshot of the current NASIG budget was requested. Peter responded that he would send us a report through email.

Ideas were thrown out about all sorts of things:

- Ideas for online training and trainers
  - One day intensive workshops
  - One day conferences
- Organizational sponsorship and the need to begin contacting organizations ASAP
- Endowment – sending targeted letters to past award winners soliciting funds for the endowment to further increase the number of scholarships awarded each year
- Building relationships with like-minded organizations:
  - National and international
  - State library associations

Then we discussed the types of programs which could be taken on the road:

- Skills inventory for the 21st century
- What it takes to manage e-journal collections

Library School Outreach
Marcella Lesher and Sarah Sutton, Co-Chairs
September, 2008

Narrative of Activities Since Last Report

Recruited library school ambassadors:
Eugenia Beh, University of Texas at Austin
Cynthia Porter, University of Arizona
Alita Pierson, University of Washington
Angela Dresselhaus, Indiana University
Emma Cryer, University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill

Developed supervisory relationships between LSO Committee members and ambassadors. Each experienced committee member is paired with a new committee member for guidance. Each committee member is responsible for recruiting and guiding one or two ambassadors.

Created a new Google Group for library school ambassadors where they can communicate with each other and with the committee, including creating an information page for their school that contains contact information, alumni who are NASIG members, recent NASIG award recipients from the school, and where they can share ideas for promoting NASIG and NASIG events.

The committee worked to make ambassadors “visible” at the 2008 conference in Phoenix with a sticker or ribbon for their name badges. This stirred some inquiries about the ambassador program and increased interest among NASIG members about serving as ambassadors. We also scheduled our first library school get-together during the conference. It was not well attended (although we did not expect a large turnout). We attribute the lack of participation mainly to the timing of the event which occurred just as the dine-arounds were leaving. We attempted to schedule the
event prior to the dine-around departure but they were rescheduled for earlier departures. Next year we plan to schedule library school get-togethers at a time that will be more convenient for potential attendees.

During the fall, we plan to work with Awards & Recognition to promote NASIG awards at our ambassadors’ library schools by marketing the Student Grant Award to master’s level students and the Marcia Tuttle Award to doctoral students. We also plan to continue to recruit ambassadors for the University of North Texas and San Jose State and University and two additional schools in order to meet our goal of having 15 ambassadors by the end of the year.

Membership Development
Alice Rhoades and Marla Chesler, Co-Chairs
September 2008

Narrative of Activities Since Last Report on May 2008

- Jenni Wilson and Christine Stamison re-edited the [membership] brochure. It was agreed that the brochure would benefit from a professional designer. A budget and proposal for a design upgrade and printing expenses were submitted to the board and we are waiting for a response.
- Marla Chesler is in the process of obtaining updated membership and conference attendance data from Database & Directory. We need to work with that committee to see if we can get better exported data on current members and their affiliations/job descriptions.
- Once the updated data is obtained, we plan to do a promotion to non-member conference attendees, as well as continue with the membership renewal project.
- The renewal reminder email has been drafted and is ready to send out once we have obtained an accurate list.
- With an updated membership list, we will be able to update our annual statistics.
- Tina Feick is working on an analysis of the membership, a project previously started by Bob Boissy.

- The Mentoring Program took place successfully at the conference in June and a number of MDC members again participated.
- It was suggested that we contact the Mexican Award winner in order to get suggestions for increasing the membership from Mexico.
- We plan to continue work on the Membership Development Committee guideline document and to update the committee webpage.

Nominations & Elections
Kathy Brannon and Tim Hagan, Co-Chairs
September 2008

Continuing and Completed Activities

At the annual conference in Phoenix, the committee was given the approval to have nominees send in a CV rather than requiring them to write NASIG activities, other professional activities, and publications/presentations onto the nominee profile form. These changes initiated a review of all forms associated with nominations.

- The N&E members concluded there should be a choice of resume or curriculum vitae to be used by nominees in order to make the process as effortless and inclusive as possible.
- The nomination profile form and other documents have been re-written to reflect these changes.
- An online nomination form is being created and should be available shortly. This form will allow for anonymous voting. The first call for nominations went out September 4, 2008, in the Newsletter and has been posted on the “What’s New” area of the NASIG website. There is a nomination form posted in the “Elections Process” area which can be used but is not anonymous. We are working with ECC to make the anonymous online nominations form available as quickly as possible. The deadline for nominations is October 12, 2008. There is a concern with the absence of NASIG-L that we will not be able to get reminders out to members as affectively and are looking at alternatives.
The N&E Committee was also charged this year with developing "nominations criteria for member-at-large in an open election system that does not involve extensive committee vetting. Allowing any willing member to be on the primary ballot or a general election. Need to develop process for run-off elections and thresholds required to make it to a general election." Tim Hagan, the N&E co-chair, has taken on the task of coordinating and soliciting input from N&E members. Although the committee got off to a slow start due to vacations, etc... there has been very little input from the committee on how and what this criteria and process would entail. Using the input received, along with research of not-for-profit organizations which hold similar nominating processes, an outline of our criteria will be sent to the board (via the liaison) prior to the September 14 meeting.

- Some concerns identified by committee members so far are as follows:
  
  o The process has been hampered by the bylaws as they are currently written, especially the bylaw that states "any active member of NASIG shall be eligible for election to the Executive Board except as otherwise indicated in these Bylaws." The committee is a bit unsure if we are to have been working within all current bylaws or possibly proposing revisions of them.

  o The Committee was also unsure if the proposal being written will be solely for members-at-large or if some aspects of a new process would be expanded to the election of administrative board members.

2009 Program Related Activities

Please note that the earlier board meeting means that we do not have as complete a draft schedule or as many details about programming as have been available at the fall board meeting in past years. We have been and will continue to work with our board liaison as additional components come together.

3. Theme for 2009 Conference

Following the Phoenix conference, we solicited input from the PPC members and worked with CPC to propose themes for the 2009 conference in Asheville North Carolina. “Riding the Rapids through a Mountain of Change” was selected.

4. Call for Proposals

The call for proposals was distributed on Friday, August 1 to all individuals in the NASIG database and all lists and individuals noted in the Publicist Manual, with the addition of the CONSER lists. A reminder was sent to the NASIG membership and Serialst on August 28.

5. Responses to Call for Proposals

The co-chairs have developed a system for confirmation of proposal receipt with an email that reiterates the timeline for review. As of September 2, we have only received 4 program proposals. Committee members were asked to encourage colleagues to submit programs. We have had several email inquiries, so we are hopeful a few more proposals will come in. We are not sure why we have seen a low response rate. Possible factors may be...
travel budgets at the institutions of potential proposers, lack of information about reimbursement or that the timeline for acceptance may be disheartening. In addition, the Electronic Resources & Libraries call for proposals was issued on August 18, 2008.

6. Plans for Second Call
The second call will be critical, so we welcome any input from the board on program themes or recruitment ideas. Historically, more proposals have been received from the second call, so we continue to hope for good pool of proposals. We expect to issue the second call around September 22, with a closing date of October 31. Allowing a few weeks to review proposals and contact speakers [where] we would like to make adjustments to their proposals, we plan to have the program slated for board approval by the end of November.

7. Conference Schedule
We are not suggesting any major changes in the schedule from the 2008 conference.

We are currently holding a no-conflict time for Society for Scholarly Publishing discussion groups. Jill Emery will be working with SSP in the fall to plan these sessions.

We recommend staying with the non-repeating format for programs. The conference evaluation responses were fairly even distributed over the three responses with 34.7% favor no-repeat, 37% neutral or uncertain, and 28.3% wanting to return to repeating format. Comments on this topic ranged from strong support of no-repeat to strong desire to have repeating sessions. Some comments suggested repeating popular sessions only. The most common reason in the comments for wanting repeating sessions was being unable to attend all sessions of interest. Because there are typically 5-6 sessions in each slot, it is unlikely that people would be able to attend all programs of interest, even if they did repeat. By not repeating sessions we can offer more total programs, and therefore hopefully meet more people’s interests. Furthermore, the non-repeat format allows us more flexibility in the schedule for no-conflict times for special programs or to add hot-topic sessions closer to the conference date and to allow the program to start a little later in the day. If the board supports the non-repeat format, PPC will pay more attention to distributing programs on similar themes, such as electronic resource management, across different time slots.

We have also included proposed times for a brainstorming session as well as time for attendees to meet the NASIG Board members. As these events are sponsored and organized by the board, we will adjust however is needed.

8. Vision Speakers and Preconference
The committee is currently discussing vision speaker and preconference ideas.

Publications and Public Relations
Glen Wiley, Chair
September 2008

Narrative of Activities Since the Annual Report

Continuing Activities

Kathryn Johns-Masten, our committee’s co-chair, makes ongoing changes to the Speakers and Consultants Directory when requested by NASIG members. Last year, our committee reworked the submission form, changed the order and naming of the profile fields, resolved some inconsistencies, removed old members’ entries, and resolved problems with the user input/update form. I am planning on having the committee send out more general requests for participants throughout the year such as announcement in the “What’s New” section of the NASIG website.

As part of our charge to proactively encourage publication of serials-related literature, we solicit for current topics and knowledge authors for new NASIGuides. We have a posted list of potential topics on the web page, but are also willing to consider suggestions for appropriate new topics. Our committee is currently brainstorming for new topics and willing be
discussing possibilities. We still have several NASIGGuides pending. Individual committee members are assigned to track and follow up on the progress of these guides. The potential guides are on MARC fields for serials, serials and institutional repositories, FRBR implications for serials, claiming for serials, and electronic resources workflow.

Since the duties of the NASIG Publicist have now been shifted to our committee, one of our new committee members, Marilyn Carney, has accepted that role for a year. As Rick Anderson said, “She has a PR background and should do an excellent job.” Marilyn Carney, Kathryn Johns-Masten, and I are currently working on a revamp of the Publicist’s Manual, which is now two years old and includes quite a bit of information. For example, NASIG’s recent switch of Internet service provider from Bee.net to ArcStone is not currently reflected in this manual. We hope to have an updated copy of the Publicist’s Manual to our board liaison by October.

Last year, we wrote a publicity message for a preconference on “Emerging Trends, 2.0 and Libraries” to be sent out to various listservs. This is our first example of being asked to write publicity messages. Our committee is currently trying to think of ways in which we may be more active in the future. In order to meet NASIG’s obligation to provide content to the UKSG’s Serials E-news, our committee is asking authors of NASIGGuides and of particularly good articles in the NASIG Newsletter to grant permission for them to be published by UKSG as well. This is an ongoing effort.

Completed Activities

The appointment of Marilyn Carney as NASIG Publicist, above.

I have set up Joseph Thomas, a PPR committee member, with working with the editors of ALCTS and the NASIG Newsletters. Joseph will try to get more NASIG content/announcements into the ALCTS Newsletter Online. It could be a regular feature in the News "From the Profession" section or perhaps one of the articles from our "Other Serials News". We may send information to ALCTS on upcoming conferences and events (such as workshops and classes), as well as opportunities such as scholarships or awards. The ALCTS editor can list the events in their calendar and also run a news item about workshops. The editor would also be happy to run a report on the NASIG conference, including reports on sessions that took place during the conference, if someone from NASIG is interested in writing a report. She can also announce new publications produced by NASIG (print as well as virtual), or guidelines or policies that will be helpful to ALCTS members. Lastly, the editor is also open to suggestions.

Also, I arranged for Nancy Olsen, a PPR committee member, to be working with Jill Emery of NASIG and Bill Cohen with Haworth/Taylor & Francis Group about NASIG taking on editorial responsibility for Serials Librarian. Nancy has been in journals publishing for more than 20 years and has recently joined SAGE from Wiley-Blackwell, where she oversaw their Life Sciences journals group. She works with many editors on many journals and was happy to help guide this project. However, I am unaware of any progress with these talks.

Proceedings
Buddy Pennington and Allyson Zellner, Co-Editors
September 3, 2008

Activities

- Currently, we are collecting the rest of the 2008 conference papers. Virginia has been indispensable in a few cases. We are planning on uploading the draft papers into Google Docs for initial edits in preparation for sending the papers to Taylor & Francis by December 1. Taylor & Francis has a much shorter production cycle than the one we had with Haworth. We will review proofs in early February with a planned publication date in April or May. This will ensure that copies of the Proceedings are available at next year’s conference.
For the 2008 conference, CPC continued its use of a cassette recorder to record the vision sessions for the reporters. For the 2009 conference, we have asked CPC to include a line for a digital audio recorder in its 2009 budget request.

We had a complication due to the fact that the presenters for one strategy session signed and returned NIH copyright cover forms instead of the NASIG forms. The board accepted them for the 2008 Proceedings but asked that we revise the NASIG copyright form to include an exception in cases where an author’s institution or place of employment requires retention of copyright.

The 2007 conference Proceedings were published by Taylor & Francis as volume 54, no. 1-4 of The Serials Librarian in late May. PDFs were collected and added to the new NASIG website by the Electronic Communications Committee in early August. They are available at:


We have confirmed with Taylor & Francis the following complimentary copies list for the conference proceedings:
- Presenters and recorders get 3 copies
- Editors get 3 copies
- NASIG board members get 1 copy
- NASIG archivist gets 1 copy
- NASIG Program Planning Committee members get 1 copy

Related to the above item, we submitted to Katy Ginanni, ASTF chair, that we would like to see the new administrative support person, if hired, help the committee in producing the complimentary copies list for Taylor & Francis as this task primarily involves collecting names and addresses.

Other Serials & E-Resources News

Mississippi State University Hosts NASIG-Sponsored Symposium on E-Resources and Libraries
Reported by B. Jean Sibley

For an eighth year, Mississippi State University (MSU) Libraries hosted an e-resource symposium for information professionals working in libraries across the Southeast. Co-sponsored by NASIG, MSU Libraries, EBSCO Information Services, and Serials Solutions, this year’s symposium was held at Mitchell Memorial Library on August 8, 2008. Titled “Play Your Cards Right!” this symposium provided the approximately one hundred attendees with valuable insights and knowledge that will enable them to overcome the many challenges related to the role and management of e-resources in libraries.

The symposium featured four presentations given by leading innovators in the field of e-resources and libraries. Keynote speaker Jane Burke, vice president and general manager of Serials Solutions, got the symposium off to a lively and thought-provoking start with her presentation “The OPAC is Dead: Managing the Virtual Library.” Burke addressed trends in both the access and management of library resources in an environment where library collections are increasingly digital. She stirred up some controversial issues, such as doing away with serials check-in and bibliographic instruction. “They don’t work,” emphasized Burke, because they are based on a print model.

The symposium’s second speaker was Dan Tonkery, vice president of Business Development, EBSCO Information Services. In his presentation, “Publishers, Agents, Users and Libraries: Coming of Age in the E-World,” Tonkery draws on over forty years of experience to expound on the major battle publishers are facing to remain in business. Tonkery stressed that the overall success of e-content is driving changes in the economic models as more information is becoming openly accessible online. Libraries also are finding pressure to change workflows and staffing to support this new medium. Tonkery
presented the attendees with the latest thinking on these issues.

The symposium’s third presentation, titled “Evolving Serials Workflows: Knowing When to Hold ‘em, When to Fold ‘em,” was presented by Maria Collins, associate head of Acquisitions at North Carolina State University Libraries. Collins discussed four phases of effective workflow management: planning, efficient strategies, staffing and resources, and ERM/communications tools. Collins shared with the attendees concepts, websites and applications currently being used for workflow management to illuminate the possibilities for librarians to create their own e-resource tools to meet their specific workflow needs.

The symposium’s final presentation was given by Emily Alford, reference and technology librarian at Michigan State University Libraries. In her dynamic presentation, titled “Promoting and Marketing E-Resources,” Alford focused on strategies that academic libraries can use to promote and market their e-resources. Alford showed how we can educate our users about changes, updates, and information about library e-resources. These included some freely available ways to promote resources out on the web, as well as creative ideas, handouts, and materials to help us reach our users.

Based on the enthusiastic evaluations submitted by attendees, this year’s symposium can be declared a success. While Burke’s presentation inspired the attendees to contemplate the larger issues associated with the move from print to digital, the presentations of Tonkery, Collins, and Alford all brought to light specific tools, trends, and strategies that promise to shape the future of e-resources. Article-length write-ups of each of these presentations are to be published in an upcoming issue of *The Serials Librarian*. At present, the symposium speakers’ PowerPoint slides and podcasts are accessible at [http://library.msstate.edu/eresource/schedule.asp](http://library.msstate.edu/eresource/schedule.asp).

**Citations: Required Reading by NASIG Members**

Kurt Blythe, Columns Editor

[Note: Please report citations for publications by the membership—to include scholarship, reviews, criticism, essays, and any other published works which would benefit the membership to read. You may submit citations on behalf of yourself or other members to Kurt Blythe at kcblythe@email.unc.edu. Contributions on behalf of fellow members will be cleared with the author(s) before they are printed. Include contact information with submissions.]

Welcome to the third installment of the *Newsletter*’s ongoing column of member-related scholarship. At twelve plus two entries, this quarter’s suggested reading list is our longest to date. As always, member names are set in bold type. And, please, keep in mind that any formatting mistakes are entirely attributable to your humble editor; I’m actually the last guy in the world that should be editing a column consisting of citations. Nevertheless, allow me to present:


**Garner, June, Karen Davidson, and Virginia Williams.** "Identifying Serials Trends through..."
Title Changes
Kurt Blythe, Columns Editor

[Note: Please report promotions, awards, new degrees, new positions, and other significant professional milestones. You may submit items about yourself or other members to Kurt Blythe at kcblythe@email.unc.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.]

With only two title changes (and one make-up change from long ago) this was a quiet quarter for members moving inter- or intra-institutionally, but that makes it no less important for the membership to be aware that:

Your humble columns editor, Kurt Blythe, has been appending the title of head, Serials Cataloging & Binding to his ongoing title of serials access librarian since June of this year. With the retirement of serials superstar, Frieda Rosenberg, and coinciding with an organizational shift that repositioned the Serials Cataloging (& Binding) Section from a no-longer-extant Catalog Department to a newly-formed E-Resources & Serials Management Department, I was bumped up the ladder. I may be reached at:

Kurt Blythe
Serials Access Librarian
Head, Serials Cataloging & Binding.
E-Resources & Serials Management, Serials Cataloging Section
CB#3914, Davis Library
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC 27514-8890

Phone: (919) 962-2050
E-mail: kcblythe@email.unc.edu

Eleanor Cook, former president of NASIG (2002/2003), has moved to East Carolina University to become assistant director for Collections & Technical Services, effective August 2008. Previously she served for 18
years as serials coordinator at Appalachian State University, with a recent, brief stint there as intellectual property & copyright librarian. Eleanor is excited about the new job, where she will get a chance to help shape new initiatives in many technical service realms. Cook may be reached at:

**Eleanor I. Cook**  
Assistant Director for Collections & Technical Services  
Academic Library Services, Joyner Library  
East Carolina University  
East Fifth Street  
Greenville, NC 27858  
Phone: (252) 328-2598  
E-mail: cooke@ecu.edu

And **Steve Oberg** has recently accepted an offer to move into a different group within Abbott Laboratories' library. Oberg says of his elevation from information scientist to senior information scientist, "Basically my responsibility will be to lead enterprise search and taxonomy efforts within the business worldwide." He adds, "I have always felt it was a huge plus that the library group in my large, global company has been given the responsibility for search and taxonomy. That means that just about everywhere there is a search box on a page within our intranet or on external Internet sites that is set up and maintained by the library. This will probably be the most ‘un-library-like’ job I have ever held. But I am ready for a new job and a new direction. I will still be working within the library but the scope of the job is much broader than that. One of the new things I'll be doing is a lot of client development and managing client relationships, as well as relationships with a new set of vendors. There is much more to it and frankly I don't understand it all just yet. My official start date will be September 29 but I am already easing into the role and out of my existing one."

Oberg can be found at:

**Steve J. Oberg**  
Senior Information Scientist  
Abbott Laboratories  
Dept. 043T, Bldg AP6B-1  
Abbott Park, IL 60064-6107  
Phone: (847) 937-0727  
Fax: (847) 937-6282  
E-mail: steve@obergs.net

As always, “Title Changes” congratulates the membership on their title changes, and wishes them all the best going forward.

---

**Calendar**  
Lillian DeBlois, Calendar Editor

[Please submit announcements for upcoming meetings, conferences, workshops and other events of interest to your NASIG colleagues to Lillian DeBlois, lillian.deblois@gmail.com.]

**December 5, 2008**  
**ACRL/NY Annual Symposium**  
“The 21st Century Librarian: Targeting the Trends”  
Baruch College  
New York, NY  
http://acrlnysym2008.wordpress.com/

**January 22, 2009**  
**NASIG - Executive Board Meeting**  
Denver, Colorado

---

**January 23-28, 2009**  
**American Library Association**  
Midwinter Meeting  
Denver, CO  
http://www.ala.org/ala/conferencesevents/upcoming/midwinter/home.cfm

**February 9-12, 2009**  
**Electronic Resources & Libraries**  
Los Angeles, CA  
March 20, 2009
NASIG UnConference
Manhattan, KS
http://nasignunconference2009.wetpaint.com/

March 27, 2009
North Carolina Serials Conference
“Are You Ready? New Opportunities in Challenging Times”
Chapel Hill, NC
http://www.nccuslis.org/conted/conted.php

March 30-April 1, 2009
United Kingdom Serials Group
Annual Conference and Exhibition
http://uksg.org/event/conference09

April 2-3, 2009
Association for Library Collections & Technical Service
“Basic Collection Development and Management”
Buffalo, NY
http://www.al.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/confevents/upcoming/workshop/index.cfm

April 6-May 1, 2009
Association for Library Collections & Technical Services
Web Course
“Electronic Resources & Acquisitions”
http://www.al.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/confevents/upcoming/webcourse/foelectronic.cfm

April 8, 2009
National Information Standards Organization
NISO Webinar
“KBART and the OpenURL”
http://www.niso.org/workrooms/kbart

April 13-May 8, 2009
Association for Library Collections & Technical Services
Web Course
“Fundamentals of Acquisitions”
http://www.al.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/confevents/upcoming/webcourse/foacquisitions.cfm

May 4-29, 2009
Association for Library Collections & Technical Services
Web Course
“Collection Development & Management”
http://www.al.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/confevents/upcoming/webcourse/focollection.cfm

May 6, 2009
National Information Standards Organization
NISO/COUNTER Webinar
“COUNTER: A How-to Guide”

May 13, 2009
National Information Standards Organization
NISO/COUNTER Webinar
“Usage Issues”
http://www.niso.org/news/events/2009/usage09

May 13-14, 2009
Association for Library Collections & Technical Services
“Metadata and Digital Library Development”
Harrisonburg, VA
http://www.al.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/confevents/upcoming/workshop/meta_digital.cfm

May 15-20, 2009
Medical Library Association (MLA)
Annual Conference
“Infusions”
Honolulu, HI
http://www.mlanet.org/am/

May 27-29, 2009
Society for Scholarly Publishing
31st Annual Meeting
Baltimore, MD
https://www.sspnet.org/Events/spage.aspx
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  University of Buffalo
- PDF Production Editor: Angela Dresselhaus
  Indiana University
- Board Liaison: Char Simser
  Kansas State University

In 2008, the Newsletter is published in March, June, September, and December. Submission deadlines (February 1, May 1, August 15, and November 15) are approximately 4 weeks prior to the publication date. The submission deadline for the next issue is:

February 1, 2009

Send submissions and editorial comments to:

Kathryn Wesley
Clemson University Libraries
Box 343001
Clemson, SC 29634-3001
Phone: (864) 656-5171
Fax: (864) 656-3025
Email: kwesley@clemson.edu

Send all items for “Title Changes” and “Citations” to:

Kurt Blythe
Email: kcblythe@email.unc.edu

Send all items for the Calendar to:

Lillian DeBlois
Email: lillian_deblois@gmail.com

Send inquiries concerning the NASIG organization, membership, and change of address information to:

Joyce Tenney
University of Maryland, Baltimore County Library
1000 Hilltop Cir.
Baltimore, MD 21250
Phone: (410) 455-3594
Fax: (410) 455-1078
Email: tenney@umbc.edu

NASIG address:

NASIG, Inc.
PMB 305
1902 Ridge Rd.
West Seneca, NY (USA) 30033-5305
URL: http://www.nasig.org