



# NASIG

# NEWSLETTER

Vol. 19, no. 4

eISSN 1542-3417

December 2004

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRESIDENTS CORNER	1
EXECUTIVE BOARD MINUTES	3
TREASURER'S REPORT	14
20 <sup>TH</sup> ANNUAL CONFERENCE (2005)	
CPC UPDATE	14
PPC UPDATE	15
19 <sup>TH</sup> ANNUAL CONFERENCE (2004)	
EVALUATION SUMMARY	16
ELECTION 2005	19
AWARDS 2005	19
PROFILES	
DOUG KIKER: NEW MEMBER	19
BYLAWS COMMITTEE	21
ERRATA	22
OTHER NASIG NEWS	
HISTORY TASK FORCE	22
PARITY IN DUES	22
OTHER SERIALS NEWS	
CHARLESTON CONFERENCE REPORT	24
PROFESSIONAL LIAISONS UPDATE	25
TITLE CHANGES	28
CALENDAR	30

## PRESIDENT'S CORNER

Steve Savage, NASIG President

NASIG has been very busy since my first article in the September issue of the *Newsletter*! Some of the most exciting—and satisfying—news is that the Milwaukee conference received the third highest overall rating among our 19 conferences to date.\* Clearly, the new hotel scenario and revitalized programming worked quite well. I'm sure the members of the 2004 Conference Planning and Program Planning Committees are very gratified to know that the conference attendees appreciated all of their hard work. Our thanks go to these committees and to the Evaluation and Assessment Committee for compiling the conference evaluation report.

In September, Carol MacAdam resigned from her position on the Executive Board due to increased responsibilities in her job. As the first step in appointing someone to fill the eight months remaining in Carol's term, the Board developed a list of qualities which we believe the *ideal* Board member would possess. We then discussed factors specific to the vacancy at hand. Next, we discussed a long list of potential appointees and ended up with a prioritized list of four names. Very fortunately for us all, our first choice enthusiastically accepted the appointment. (Thank you, Beverley Geer, and welcome back to the Board!)

The list of qualities describing the ideal Board member is a small but significant addition to our resources. While compiling the list, we realized that not only would it be helpful to us in the immediate appointment task, but it could also be useful in several ways for our nominations and elections process. The final version, along with additions specific to each Board office, will be made available to members on NASIGWeb and to the

---

\* The 1991 conference in Trinity is still the highest rated conference, with our very first conference in 1986, at Bryn Mawr, coming in second.



Nominations & Elections Committee. Hopefully this description will help members who are considering running for election to make more informed decisions and will help N&E in its process of paring down its lists of nominees to the final ballot of candidates. It may also help all of us when casting our votes.

The Board had a good meeting in October, as the long minutes later in this issue demonstrate. We've made a change in the style of the minutes. To help more members be better informed about the Board's work and decisions, we've added more description and background than the more streamlined "decision minutes" approach used in past years.

In addition to the work on finding a replacement for Carol, the major tasks of the meeting were:

- ensuring all relevant processes have been adequately adjusted as necessary due to next year's conference being much earlier than usual (May 19-22, 2005)
- reviewing progress by the numerous task forces and committees
- assisting the Anniversary Task Force and Conference Planning Committees with determining plans for the 20th anniversary celebration during the Minneapolis conference
- assisting the 2005 conference's Program Planning and Conference Planning Committees with their developing plans
- approving the 2005 conference budget and conference registration fees
- approving the general operating budget for 2005
- defining several key facets of the financial plan that will be created soon.

The meeting took place in the beautiful Hilton Minneapolis & Towers where the upcoming conference will take place. The Program Planning Committee is putting together an exciting set of offerings that will rival the extremely well-received program of the Milwaukee conference. Meanwhile, the Conference Planning Committee is preparing wonderful venues in the Hilton, and in the Marquette Hotel-Windows on Minnesota on Friday evening for our 20th birthday bash. Dine-arounds during the free evening were extremely popular in Milwaukee, so CPC is planning a similar evening for Saturday. Many excellent restaurants (at what I think are amazingly affordable prices) are available within just a few blocks of the hotel. In addition, there are many unique areas of interest in Minneapolis, including, of course, the Mall of America. Please see CPC's update article in this issue and go to these urls for more pictures and information:

Conference website:

<http://www.nasig.org/conference/2005.htm>

Hilton Minneapolis website:

<http://www.hilton.com/en/hi/hotels/index.jhtml?ctyho>  
cn=MSPMHHH

(be sure to see its online photo gallery)

Marquette Hotel-Windows on Minnesota

<http://www.marquettehotel.com>

Laying the groundwork for a financial plan was one of the most important accomplishments of the Board meeting. As part of this process, we made a tough decision that has been overdue for several years: we must raise the membership dues. This has been discussed frequently during recent months, including in the brainstorming session before this summer's conference, the Town Hall meeting during it, and in my article in the September *Newsletter* issue. It also has been discussed at nearly every Board meeting for at least the last four years.

During the October Board meeting and subsequent discussions, we made decisions for several components within this larger issue of dues:

- we cannot delay taking action any longer
- dues should be the cornerstone element around which our upcoming financial plan should be created, rather than merely one small component of it
- as our only stable, recurring source of income, it is absolutely imperative that our annual dues provide enough income to at least cover our annual expenses
- our current decisions must not only repair our current problem, but must also provide for *future* needs so we do not find ourselves in the same situation a few years from now
- the basic outline of the new dues structure should be the following (please see the separate article about dues for more details and background):
  - annual membership dues should be raised to \$75 USD
  - annual dues for students should be raised to \$25 USD
  - a new membership category with annual dues of \$25 USD should be created for retirees
  - annual dues for members outside North America should be raised to \$75 USD.

The driving factor for raising dues is the disparity between our expenses and our income. For this calendar year, our allocated budget is \$81,150 USD, but our income is \$43,000 USD. For 2005, our allocated budget is \$87,255 USD, and our anticipated income is \$43,500 USD. As everyone knows—except, apparently, many politicians—the only solutions for this are increasing income or decreasing expenses, or both.

Early this year, the Board began taking steps to contain NASIG's expenses. For example, we had negotiated with the conference hotel for reduced guest room rates and free meeting rooms during the October Board meeting. The hotel also picked up the expense for one of our two lunches, which was no small amount given that there were 15 of us. The Board also began imposing spending limits on itself for meals during its meetings. During the recent budget allocation process, we reviewed each committee's request for next year line by line. After comparing the requests with the expenses from 2003, expenses to date for 2004, and anticipated tasks during 2005, we reduced several committees' amounts. We also laid the groundwork for reductions in future expenses by taking greater advantage of technology for things such as membership renewals, the *Membership Directory*, voting, etc. Any further reductions from this point would seriously impair or eliminate current functions or cancel enhancements and new projects already underway.

Obviously, we cannot reduce expenses by nearly half without losing a huge portion of what NASIG has come to be for all of us and our professions. The only alternative is to increase income. The financial plan to be created this year will include a fundraising component, and we are also beginning to look at other income sources such as continuing education events and investments. Each of these three methods, though, would take several years—at least!—to produce enough new income to close the *present* gap between our income and expenses. And just as we expect serials to continue into the future accompanied by inflation and expansion via new versions and technology, we know that NASIG must also deal with inflation and the need to grow through addition of new and expanded services, resources, and procedures. So closing our present budgetary gap simply won't be enough.

Our primary source of income is something over which we do have immediate control, and if we are committed to keeping NASIG strong, it can be increased relatively quickly. This source of income is membership dues, and it does offer the only attainable possibility for making our

recurring, stable income match our recurring expenses soon.

I used to see the total of our assets in the Treasurer's reports in the *Newsletter* and think that NASIG was in fine financial condition. This was before I began attending Board meetings and learning how an organization's budget needs to be managed. I'd not realized, in particular, *how much* we are gambling on the unreliable, inconsistent income from conference surpluses.

The key to financial health is stability and predictability of income and expenses, not luck. We've been extremely lucky, so far, that our conferences have not been affected by a major health concern (such as SARS), suspension of airline service over a wide area (as happened on Sept. 11 and 12, 2001), a major natural or manmade disaster at a conference site, or any other unforeseen crisis.

Essentially, what all this boils down to is that NASIG needs an insurance plan for its continued health and success. The financial plan which the Board will be creating soon will provide this insurance—but it cannot be successful unless we resolve the most serious problem in our finances. This problem is the gap between our income and our expenses, and there is only one way to fix it without causing serious harm to the organization: we simply must raise membership dues so the income they provide will cover our general operating budget.

This action will be the foundation for future stability. Growth during the coming years can then be realized by continuing to work to contain expenses while instituting a fundraising program, updating and expanding our investments, and developing new income sources. So when you receive the annual ballot in a few months, please do vote "yes!" on the proposals to raise the membership dues. NASIG's stability and future depend on it.

## EXECUTIVE BOARD MINUTES

Elizabeth Parang, NASIG Secretary

Attending:

Officers:

Steve Savage, President

Anne McKee, Past President

Mary Page, Vice President/President-Elect

Denise Novak, Treasurer

Elizabeth Parang, Secretary

Members-at-Large:

Jill Emery

Judy Luther (left Monday at 11:00)

Kevin Randall

Stephanie Schmitt

Joyce Tenney

Ex-officio member:

Charlene Simser, *NASIG Newsletter* Editor-in-Chief

Guests:

Linda Hulbert and Sue Zuriff, Co-Chairs, 2005 Conference Planning Committee

Marilyn Geller and Emily McElroy, Co-Chairs, 2005 Program Planning Committee

### 1.0 Welcome (Savage)

Savage called the meeting to order at 8:17 a.m., welcomed Board members, and reviewed the rules of procedure. Board liaisons to committees will not repeat information included in written committee reports, only present additional information or lead discussion of points raised by committees. Novak volunteered to be the timekeeper for the meeting.

### 2.0 Role of Board & Requirements of Board Members (Savage)

Savage presented a draft statement of *Requirements for NASIG Board Members* that emphasizes this is a working Board—not just a group of decision makers. Board members refined the draft, agreeing that ideally, Board members would possess many of these qualities, and collectively, the Board as a whole should possess most, if not all, of the qualities. Board members suggested several changes, including that the document should be retitled *Guidelines for Board Members* because this is an idealized description and not requirements for candidacy or election. The Board also agreed that the final statement should be published in the March *Newsletter*, forwarded to the Nominations & Elections Committee to use as suggested guidelines in its work, highlighted in a President's column, and that a reminder about these guidelines should be sent out via NASIG-L at the time of elections and noted at the bottom of the ballot.

**ACTION:** Parang [later changed to Geer] will provide final wordsmithing for the *Guidelines*.

**DATE:** By Nov. 15.

### 3.0 Secretary's report (Parang)

#### 3.1 Board actions since Board meeting June 16, 2004:

7/21/04: Schmitt moved (Tenney seconded) that the Board approve and support the recommendation of the PPC to add both the poster sessions and the focused vendor demo to the conference schedule as regular, recurring items. The motion passed unanimously.

7/30/04: Savage approved the Nominations & Elections Committee's suggestion to move the deadline on nominations from the usual Oct. 15 to Sept. 15 due to next year's conference being a month earlier than usual

(the Bylaws stipulate that the annual election must occur at least 60 days prior to the conference).

8/2/04: Savage approved two suggestions from the Database & Directory Committee:

- 1) To move the deadline for membership renewal to Nov. 26, which is considerably earlier than usual, in order to ensure only eligible members may vote in the election.
- 2) To print and mail the membership renewal form only once this year, as a measure to save money and work, with these accompanying changes:
  - a) Include emphasized statements that this would be the only printed mailing, and that the deadline for renewals would be earlier than usual.
  - b) D&D would send multiple reminders to NASIG-L, stressing the earlier deadline, the single mailing of forms, and the availability of a printable form on NASIGWeb. Reminder will emphasize need to be a member to get rate at conference; make sure this is on next year's renewal form.

**ACTION:** Ask D&D to add to its notes the thorough revision of the renewal form to be done before next year's renewal season: The revised form should emphasize the Jan. 31 deadline for receiving the conference member registration rate (a person must be indicated as an active member in the membership database by Jan. 31 to receive the lower rate for that year's conference—consequently, the Treasurer must receive the completed renewal form and payment at least 2 weeks prior to that date.)

**DATE:** Immediately after Board meeting.

8/4/04: Tenney moved (Emery seconded) that we approve the revised Compensation & Reimbursement Policy prepared by Novak and Savage. The motion passed unanimously.

#### 3.2 Action items from June meeting

The Board reviewed Action items in-process or postponed. The following changes were made:

The Action item stating that PPC and the Board would create more specific AV guidelines was replaced with:

**ACTION:** Page will work with PPC to create more specific guides for AV use and run draft by Board.

**DATE:** By 11/15/04.

Novak will get information on Web conferencing from NetSpoke, the company we use for conference calls. The Board discussed other possibilities, including mini bulletin boards.

**ACTION:** Page and Luther will investigate options.

**DATE:** By Jan. 2005 Board meeting.

### 3.3 Board Items Status List

Board members were reminded to look at this list periodically and notify Parang or Savage of items that need to be changed or added.

### 3.4 Rename *Executive Board Working Calendar*

**ACTION:** Randall will ask ECC to change the name to *NASIG Working Calendar* to more accurately reflect its nature and usage.

**DATE:** ASAP

### 4.0 Treasurer's Report (Novak)

4.1 Report from the Treasurer indicated she had not yet received any Canadian or European renewals. We are unsure if delivery of the forms or completed renewals have been delayed by the U.S. mail. As of Friday, Oct. 15, 2004, 580 members, or about half the membership, had renewed.

### 4.2 2004 Budget and expenditures to date

Novak reported that NASIG had a total equity of \$211,033.05 and liabilities of \$0.00 as of October 9, 2004. The balance sheet shows a slight increase from last year because of surplus from the conference. Investment account has been up and down. The cost of the conference logo came out of the conference budget instead of conference planning. D&D used Gerald Printing, which submitted the lowest bid; committees should notify the President when printing bids are needed.

### 4.3 2004 Conference Budget:

The 2004 Conference posted an income of \$219,618.98 and expenditures of \$152,044.40, leaving a balance of \$67,574.58. Novak noted that going online only for brochures and registration saved significantly (\$3,000 on brochures alone). There was no charge for the meeting rooms, unlike at college campuses; money was also saved on the food expense, and the special event cost was less. The CPC was very careful about expenditures. Preconferences made money, while tours and souvenirs lost money.

### 4.4 2005 Proposed Budget:

The Board spent considerable time on Sunday and again on Monday discussing the proposed budget. Each committee's 2005 allocation request was discussed. In a few cases, adjustments were made after reviewing actual expenses during 2003 and tasks planned for 2005. As usual, all task force expenses will be included in the administration budget.

Possible new awards to celebrate NASIG's twentieth anniversary had been suggested by A&R. (See section 7.3.2 for more about these awards.) Lengthy discussion followed about the proposed new awards, the desire to increase the number of conference student grants, the state of 2004 expenditures, and the budget approved for 2005.

The Board also approved the proposed paraprofessional award, with minor changes. It was decided, however, that the 2005 budget does not contain adequate funding for adding this new award. Consequently, the decision was made to postpone this award until 2006 with the hope that additional money will be available for it to begin then as an annual award.

McKee moved (Tenney seconded) that awards for 2005 will include four Student Conference Grant Awards, one Mexican Student Conference Grant Award, one Fritz Schwartz Scholarship and Conference Grant Award, one Citation Award (a new award), and one Marcia Tuttle award, provided a suitable proposal is found (as usual). The motion passed unanimously.

The resulting budget for 2005 was approved. See the 2005 budget later in this *Newsletter* issue.

### 4.5 Receipts for membership

The statement, "Your cancelled check serves as your receipt," on the bottom of the membership renewal form will no longer be valid once the Check21 changes within the banking industry are in place. The proposed online renewal system must include some kind of printable receipt (see section 9.1.3).

### 5.0 Conference Planning Committee (Hulbert, Zuriff, Savage)

#### 5.1 Draft of copyright release for artwork

The conference logo was presented, admired, and adopted.

#### 5.2 Schedule, events, venues

The committee proposed having a more relaxed in-hotel event for opening night and having the key event the next night (Friday). A possible setting would be "Windows on Minnesota," where a meal would have a cost comparable to the museum event in Milwaukee. This would be one of the primary anniversary events. Other possible locations and food options were discussed; the decision about this event is CPC's to make, with consultation of the Board liaison and Treasurer concerning costs.

The committee investigated locations for late night socials. Although a parlor suite could be made available, the cost was prohibitive (\$800 room rental per night, plus bartender fees.). The hotel has an attractive open-area bar and lobby with plenty of seating, including areas which would accommodate card players, lively discussions, etc., very well.

**ACTION:** Page and Zuriff will contact advocates of the late night socials to request their assistance in planning late night socials using the hotel bar/lobby area.

**DATE:** When appropriate, shortly before the conference.

St. Thomas Law School Library has offered space for pre-conferences; it is located 2-3 blocks from the conference hotel.

Hulbert has received many boxes of souvenirs from past conferences that are not specific to those conferences. Every year people buy fewer souvenirs, especially t-shirts. Because this is an anniversary year, the Board members urged CPC to offer a t-shirt anyway. McKee moved (Novak seconded) selling t-shirts and one souvenir costing under \$1 in addition to the remaining generic souvenirs. The motion passed unanimously.

Web development is proceeding. The Board urged CPC to post the price per room, \$109 per night, immediately. Conference information sent to NASIG-L should also be added to the website for non-members interested in the conference. A suggestion was made to use the free search engine offered by Google to non-profit organizations as a "search our site" mechanism on the website.

**ACTION:** Randall will get input from the ECC concerning this suggestion.

**DATE:** By Dec. 1, for possible implementation by the Jan. 2005 Board meeting.

### 5.3 Conference budget

The proposed conference budget is essentially the same as that for the Milwaukee conference, with the usual increase for inflation. Jumbo postcards will be used this year for the announcements that registration is open, in order to avoid the numerous delivery problems encountered last year. These were caused by the mail-to and return addresses being too close to each other for reliable reading by U.S. Postal Service equipment.

AV costs were budgeted the same as last year, when \$15,411 was spent. Internet access in the meeting rooms is costly (\$500 per room per day), and the Program Planning Committee will promote screen shots over live access (as was the case for the Milwaukee conference). Booths/boards/stands for poster sessions are part of the

AV cost; in Milwaukee the cost was \$80 per board per day. PPC and CPC are investigating less expensive options for Minneapolis.

Novak moved (Emery seconded) that registration bags with the 20th anniversary logos be provided.

CPC had been asked if a reduced registration rate would be available to multiple registrants from the same institution. There is no reduced rate for this purpose because NASIG does not have organizational memberships.

As usual, the budget will contain a built-in contingency of 10% of the pre-contingency bottom line total figure. Novak noted that the conference is fully insured as part of the Finance Committee budget. The setting of the conference registration rate was deferred until after our Treasurer negotiates the hotel's prices for food on Monday.

## 6.0 Program Planning (Geller, McElroy, Page)

### 6.1 Draft schedule

The "Quick & Dirty" evaluation summary indicated that attendees were confused about the difference between strategy and tactics sessions. Restructuring these programs would affect the *Proceedings* and the reimbursement policy as well as, of course, future conference programming. Randall suggested the length of the presentation could determine the name, a distinction used by many vendors' user group meetings. PPC will consider this idea for next year.

**ACTION:** PPC will continue the discussion on program design and naming conventions, and make recommendations as needed.

**DATE:** In time for the call for 2006 conference program proposals.

User group meetings during lunch will work if separate rooms are available and lunches can be taken to them. CPC confirmed this will be possible. Geller noted that Networking Nodes have evolved over time. They were originally informal discussions and brainstorming among participants; many attendees now expect presentations. Schmitt suggested using discussion boards ahead of the conference to initiate a Networking Node and change expectations. Lunch connections were proposed as a networking opportunity but didn't work out as conceptualized and will not be offered this year.

The proposed schedule essentially follows last year's model. Several adjustments were made, however, based on feedback from last year's evaluations. The vision

sessions will be shortened this year to one hour, and the vendor demo expanded to two hours. Other minor changes will make better use of time.

The proposed meeting for ECC training, including Web liaisons, may require computer and AV equipment beyond the hotel's resources. If so, it may need to be held outside the hotel (such as at St. Thomas University).

**ACTION:** Randall, Schmitt, ECC co-chairs and PPC members will discuss time and equipment requirements for Web liaison training. PPC will add it to the schedule and discuss possible facilities with CPC.

**DATE:** Before the final program is established.

## 6.2 Draft program

The new Web form for submitting program proposals worked well and greatly simplified the reviewing process. A second call has just been issued that targets specific topics not yet submitted.

**ACTION:** The Secretary will continue to be responsible for the notification letters sent to submitters of program proposals not incorporated in the program. PPC will provide the contact information for these to the Secretary.

**DATE:** When the program is finalized.

The program is coming together nicely and will be finalized by November 15th. The Anniversary Task Force will create the third vision session on Sunday morning. Following longstanding NASIG policy, proposals for presentations that have previously been given elsewhere will not be considered.

Proposals have been received from non-NASIG members. More cataloging programs might be solicited, because cataloging rated highly among desired topics, as were e-journals and print acquisitions.

Last year's conference in Milwaukee was the third highest rated of all NASIG conferences; the highest rated was Trinity in 1991 and the second was Bryn Mawr in 1986. To promote this year's conference, we will send targeted announcements to specific lists and audiences, as well as to midwestern state library associations. NASIG will have a table with membership brochures and information about our conference at the ACRL conference the month before ours.

By policy, NASIG does not pay honoraria to NASIG members. The opening night speaker and some vision speakers are typically not members, however, and often have set speaking fees. To simplify their work, CPC's conference budget (which includes reimbursements for

PPC's speakers) should include a budget line for speakers' honoraria.

Page moved (Emery seconded) allocating \$500 to CPC to recruit a local speaker. The motion passed unanimously.

Luther moved (Novak seconded) allocating \$3000 to PPC for honoraria. Following further discussion, a friendly amendment was made to raise the amount to \$5000. Luther accepted the friendly amendment, and the motion passed unanimously.

## 7.0 Committee Reports

### 7.1 Site Selection (Luther, Page, Tenney)

7.1.1 Denver presented a strong bid for the 2006 conference and has good hotel choices. Luther, Page, Tenney, and Savage made a site visit that was largely financed by the competing hotels and the Convention and Visitors Bureau. The hotels have been very responsive in answering subsequent questions and are aggressively competing for our business. Emery moved (McKee seconded) to accept Denver as the site for the 2006 conference; the motion passed unanimously.

**ACTION:** Tenney will continue negotiations with competing hotels to get the best possible deal for NASIG, with the goal of having a fully executed contract in place by December 31, 2004.

Page and Luther are investigating a number of sites for 2007, including New Orleans, Washington, D.C., Calgary, Montreal, Toronto, other sites in Canada, and elsewhere. Page and Tenney attended an "affordable meetings" conference in Washington, D.C. where they made several good contacts and gathered valuable information, including numerous cost-saving measures. Several cities and individual hotels represented at this meeting have already contacted us expressing interest in hosting our conference in the near future.

### 7.2 Archivist (Parang)

7.2.1 Our deposit account with the University of Illinois will pay for adding new materials to the archives and for photocopying and mailing by archives staff for any official NASIG business. McKee noted that anyone could access the archives, not just NASIG members.

**ACTION:** Parang will double-check with Seymour-Green as to whether confidential material is included in the archives; we believe anything identified as confidential by NASIG can be accessed only with written permission from the Board or NASIG's archivist.

**DATE:** ASAP

### 7.3 Awards & Recognition (McKee)

The Committee has been updating the library school contact spreadsheet; the publicist has agreed to send out NASIG award announcements to these schools utilizing the list. A permanent change in procedures will be CPC making hotel arrangements for award winners to ensure all gratis hotel rooms are being utilized to reduce NASIG expenses. The committee's recommendation to increase pocket money for the grantees/awardees (from \$50 to \$75) was accepted by the Board and included in the proposed 2005 budget.

Emery moved (Tenney seconded) that the Board accept the A&R Committee's proposal to reduce the committee from 16 to 12 members beginning with the 2005/2006 year. This committee size would be able to absorb the work for the proposed new awards smoothly. The motion passed unanimously.

#### 7.3.1 Mexican Student Grant

Procedures for this award will be the same as in past years. However, if procedural problems of previous years, which resulted in unnecessarily exorbitant expenses, are not resolved this year, the award may be eliminated after the Minneapolis conference.

#### 7.3.2 Special awards for 20th anniversary

Savage had requested the committee consider creation of two new awards for the 20th anniversary conference: one would be an award for a long-term serialist and the other would be for a paraprofessional. The committee's co-chairs wrote and submitted descriptions and application forms for both suggested awards. Depending on final decisions to be made on Monday about the general operating budget, the Board endorsed both awards with a few minor modifications.

#### 7.3.3 Conference Student Grants

The desire to increase the number of Conference Student Grants to pre-2002 levels was discussed. As with the proposed new awards, this decision was deferred until after the final decisions about the general operating budget for 2005 to be made on Monday.

### 7.4 Bylaws (Tenney)

There were no items to discuss at this time.

### 7.5 Continuing Education (Luther)

Luther noted that CEC's budget has decreased yearly for the past several years. In 2000 it was \$19,000; this year it

as \$7,200. She has spoken with the committee about generating money with programs; a task force could investigate this possibility. The Board should ask the committee to produce a five-year plan to become self-supporting and to create a new group to create original programming.

**ACTION:** Savage will set up a special task force to create two new continuing education programs that will also be revenue generating; this task force will report to the CEC co-chairs.

**DATE:** By Dec. 1.

#### 7.5.1 2005 list of events and budget

Money given to outside groups needs to be for a specific serials topic and NASIG must be publicly acknowledged as sponsors or co-sponsors. We will stop providing funds to other organizations for receptions during their meetings or simply to co-sponsor meetings.

#### 7.5.2 Online continuing education

The committee has a task force to look at electronic/online continuing education scenarios; these tools tend to be expensive.

The meeting adjourned for the day at 4:45 p.m. and resumed the next morning, Monday, Oct. 18, 2004, at 8:15 a.m.

### 8.0 New Board member to replace Carol MacAdam

The Board used the previous day's discussions about *Guidelines for Board Members* (see 2.0) as the basis for this discussion. It was also agreed that given the short amount of time left for this vacant position (approximately 7 months), a person who has previously served on the Board or who knows NASIG inside and out was needed. A lengthy list of names was considered and narrowed down to four. Each Board member then anonymously ranked the four. Parang collected the rankings and compiled the results, using a weighing method to assess each candidate's total of 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th place rankings.

**ACTION:** Savage will offer the appointment to the person with the highest ranking, and if necessary work through the list in order by rank until (hopefully) the appointment is accepted.

**DATE:** ASAP

[Note: The appointment was offered to the Board's first choice, Beverley Geer, a few days after the meeting. She accepted the offer and began serving immediately.]



## 9.0 Committee Reports, continued

### 9.1 Database & *Directory* (Emery)

#### 9.1.1 Database conversion:

The committee is working with the Online Registration Team (ORT; see section 10.3 below) to convert the membership database from the current MSAccess platform to an .asp pages compatible platform. This is necessary for enhancements to the online registration system that ORT will create in the next few months. (This may also support additional functions such as online voting.) An access issue exists due to a firewall. Testing will begin soon. The database will become Web accessible and would allow information for non-renewed members to be retained (currently, these records must be purged annually).

#### 9.1.2 Continue print *Directory*?

The print *Directory* is a large expense (approx. \$6,000 per year). The Board discussed whether the need for the print version outweighs the cost of printing and mailing, and the huge workload it imposes on the committee, particularly in light of the searchability of the online version and the easily printed PDF version which is also available on NASIGWeb. The committee will maintain the *Directory* online but will most likely shift to distributed maintenance.

The Board discussed an approach that would encourage members to decrease reliance on the printed *Directory* in favor of the online version, without forcing anyone to do so. The Board decided to reverse the current approach in favor of a one-year trial of a new approach. Instead of assuming each member prefers a printed copy unless specified otherwise on the renewal form, the assumption will be each member is comfortable with the online version unless specified otherwise on the form. The option related to the *Directory* on the renewal form will be revised accordingly. Consequently, next year's renewal forms, combined with usage statistics for the online version, will provide hard data about preferences of the membership as a whole. This information then will be weighed against the production costs and staff time needed to produce the printed *Directory* before making a final decision about continuing or discontinuing it. [Note: During 13 of the 15 months between July 2003 and Sept. 2004 (two month's data within this time frame are missing), the online *Directory* was accessed 20,048 times!]

**ACTION:** Change the question related to the *Directory* in the NASIGWeb renewal form (currently printable only)

to "Check here if you want to receive a printed copy of the *Membership Directory*."

**DATE:** By Jan. 2005.

**ACTION:** Discontinue sending printed copies of the *Directory* to new members.

**DATE:** Beginning Nov. 1.

#### 9.1.3. Online membership/renewal

Online new membership and membership renewal functions would eliminate \$772 in postage each year, additional costs for printing of forms, costs for stationery, a huge amount of work each year for the Treasurer and D&D, provide convenience for members, allow automatic receipts in place of the disappearing cancelled check option (see 4.5), and tie in well with enhancements to the online conference registration system. Implementation of online renewal should not delay work on the ORT project enhancing the online conference registration system (see section 10.3). Implementing online registration is built into the ORT's \$3,500 budget (included in the administration portion of the proposed 2005 budget) and will move forward.

#### 9.1.3 D&D proposal re: separate membership committee

McKee noted that the Public Relations and Outreach Task Force had investigated this proposal last year and stressed the need for a public relations committee. Emery noted that member services are also needed. Luther stated NASIG needs an initiative to connect with the vendor community and invite them back. The Board was uncertain of D&D's intention with their recommendation, however. ECC may eventually take on maintenance of the database of members as it moves online. In that case, the Board will need to revisit D&D's charge to see if there remains a need for this committee.

### 9.2 Electronic Communications (Randall)

Board members expressed appreciation for the committee but indicated that training and work needs to be more distributed within it. There is a lack of experienced people volunteering for this committee, and perhaps certain functions need outside support. In particular, each co-chair provides a huge amount of the committee's hands-on work, which must make it very difficult to function as a co-chair as well. Can the roles of production worker and co-chair somehow be split to ease the burden on the co-chairs and distribute the committee's work more evenly?

**ACTION:** Randall to ask the ECC co-chairs to consider possible ways to a) distribute the tasks of list managing and website maintenance among the committee members, b) provide or arrange for training to support these

changes, c) develop their co-chairing functions further, and d) identify how such changes would affect the committee's overall functioning and future.

**DATE:** Report to Board by May 2005 Board meeting.

### 9.3 Evaluation and Assessment (Schmitt)

Schmitt noted that a large amount of time is needed to process evaluations. The task force for online evaluations should be picked soon; the current software is getting outdated.

The 2004 conference evaluation report indicated that complaints were largely the same as always, with food being high on the list. There were fewer complaints about accommodations, however. The conference had 603 attendees, and 271 evaluation forms were submitted. PPC suggests streamlining the form when it moves online. The task force to be created for investigating online survey software will be charged to begin its work by reconsidering what is needed from the conference evaluations.

### 9.4 Newsletter (Simser)

Simser reported that Web usage data provided by bee.net indicated that hits on the main index page doubled after the username/password requirement was dropped. At the conference, she informally gathered comments concerning the online *Newsletter* from conference attendees.

Simser asked the Board for clarification on content for the conference photos website. Earlier this year, the Board recommended including photos with people rather than only scenery. She also noted that she'd had some difficulty with submission of digital photos; many did not transmit well.

**ACTION:** Randall to ask ECC to review the site and provide guidelines concerning content to the website manager.

**DATE:** ASAP

Simser noted that Savage's request for CEC to routinely route information for the NASIG Calendar has not yet been realized.

**ACTION:** CEC must funnel information to the *Newsletter* for the Calendar.

**DATE:** Beginning immediately and ongoing.

#### 9.4.1 Relationship between *Newsletter* and archives:

Simser reminded the Board that while the *Newsletter* itself is archived as an official publication of NASIG, its

content is not systematically used as the official record of reports for archival purposes. This is in keeping with the 2001 report on electronic archiving at:

<http://www.nasig.org/committees/archivist/elecsecs.htm>

She noted that in discussions with Seymour-Green (NASIG archivist), Parang, and Tenney, some gaps in archiving the history of the organization may exist and that no clear archiving guidelines are documented.

**ACTION:** Those involved will continue their discussion online.

**DATE:** For the Jan. 2005 Board meeting.

### 9.5 Nominations and Elections (McKee)

The committee received 77 names for consideration. The committee completed its Strategic Plan review. As a new task the committee could take on to support implementation of the Strategic Plan, the committee suggested a change to the instructions concerning candidates' position statements. This would add the words, "especially those outlined in the 2003 Strategic Plan," so that the instructions would read:

**POSITION STATEMENT:** *(This should reflect your view of the major issues relevant to NASIG, especially those outlined in the 2003 Strategic Plan, and your commitment, interest, and anticipated contributions to NASIG. Please limit to 200 words.)*

The Board accepted the committee's recommendation and thanked the committee for being the first committee to review its charge in light of the new strategic plan.

#### 9.5.1 Reference calls

The Board and the committee are considering codifying and regularizing N&E's reference-calling procedure; the committee has used such calls some years and not used them during other years. A shift from quantitative to qualitative information is needed. Nominees would be told reference calls would be made to individuals who had been in charge of NASIG groups the candidate had worked with in the past, such as chairs of committees, Board liaisons for committees, Board officers (for nominees who have previously been Board members), etc. The committee will decide at which stage in their process they will make reference calls. The same number of calls will be made for each person still being considered at that time. The same questions will be used for each person in a specific position's pool of nominees.

The committee is very determined that the new petition process will be implemented this year, for the first time, without a major "hiccup." All petition candidates are

required to submit the same type of position statement as slated candidates. The Board agreed that each petition candidate will be indicated as such on the ballot. The petition process could result in a lengthy ballot, increasing printing and postage costs.

#### 9.6 Proceedings (Randall)

As always, the committee's biggest problem is getting papers from the presenters. After discussion of several options and alternatives, McKee moved (Page seconded) that if the speaker(s) do not submit a paper within 30 days after the conference OR agree before the conference for their presentation to be tape recorded, NASIG will not reimburse them for expenses. The motion passed unanimously.

In answer to the editors' question of whether papers should be due at the time of the conference, consensus was that this was not practical, but that all papers should be due at the same time: 30 days after the conference.

#### 9.7 Professional Liaisons (Schmitt)

One purpose of our professional liaisons is to gather information that Simser may use for the *Newsletter* calendar and columns. Schmitt did not find documentation for liaisons' reporting, so she created a form and provided deadlines. She also found volunteers to fill several vacant professional liaison positions and found several others to replace people who have been professional liaisons for years but done little in those roles.

##### 9.7.1 ALCTS/NASIG Synergies

Discussion was tabled due to the meeting's time constraints.

##### 9.7.2 SSP Matchmaker Proposal

SSP has invited NASIG to participate in a program connecting small publishers with librarians. NASIG's Strategic Support Task Force will begin a project soon to investigate possibilities of expanding our mentoring program. This SSP proposal may fit well with it; NASIG and SSP would be pooling resources. The liaison asked if the Board would allow SSP to make an announcement in the *Newsletter*.

**ACTION:** Schmitt will contact October Ivins of SSP and indicate we need to await the report of the Strategic Support Task Force.

**DATE:** ASAP

#### 9.8 Publications (Emery)

Emery reported the committee has been revitalized.

##### 9.8.1 Charge/purpose of committee

The co-chairs feel they have a nebulous charge. The committee is working on the page, "Information for Authors." The committee wants harmonization of all publications, especially in terms of their metadata. They suggest creating a publications group to handle all publications: *Newsletter*, *Proceedings*, *Handouts*, and *NASIGuides*.

**ACTION:** Ask the committee to rewrite its charge and bring it back to the Board; it should emphasize that its focus is not on writing (authorship) by committee members.

**DATE:** By the Jan. 2005 Board meeting.

##### 9.8.2 *NASIGuides*

The committee is excited about the *NASIGuides*. The ISSN Guide will be posted soon; it has been sent to Regina Reynolds for her comments. Two more *NASIGuides* are in process.

##### 9.8.2.1 Request for subjects/topics for more guides

**ACTION:** Board send feedback about possible topics to Emery.

**DATE:** By Nov. 15; Emery will remind the Board.

##### 9.8.2.2 Marketing plan

The committee is adamant about not charging for Guides; they want the Guides to be open to all not just NASIG members. The committee feels there is no need to market extensively; they will send notices to the publicist as the Guides are made available.

Charging for online publications would provide "webvenue." Emery read the statement against charging prepared by the committee. The Board indicated branding should appear on every page. Copyright should remain with the author, with NASIG having non-exclusive rights to distribute. In marketing the Guides, NASIG should get credit for its effort.

#### 9.9 Publicist (McKee)

McKee reminded the Board to inform all committees that NASIG does not courier membership brochures; two weeks advance notice is required.

## 10.0 Task Forces, etc., Reports

### 10.1 Anniversary Task Force (McKee)

The Board accepted nearly all of the suggestions for celebratory activities the task force proposed in its report. Parang reported that the archivist has t-shirts from previous conferences; Board members suggested the archivist should get professional photos taken of the t-shirts for the physical archives and the online conference photo archives. Then the t-shirts could be used for an exhibit at the 2005 conference and then possibly for a quilt. The task force will work with CPC on the Friday birthday celebration.

**ACTION:** Request archivist have photos taken of conference t-shirts.

**DATE:** Before 2005 Conference.

**ACTION:** Savage will forward to CPC the task force's plans for celebratory activities for the two groups to coordinate efforts.

**DATE:** By Nov. 1.

### 10.2 History Task Force (Tenney)

The task force would like to ask via NASIG-L for volunteers to be interviewed. The Board agreed but cautioned the task force to remind people to respond to the task force and not to NASIG-L.

### 10.3 Online Registration Team (Novak, Schmitt)

This team's charge overlaps with that of D&D. Schmitt reported that the member vs. nonmember conference fee is locked into a person's status in the member database. In implementing online registration it will be necessary to strengthen the communication flow between Treasurer and registrar. One problem to be addressed is how to look up people in the member database; an accurate and consistent way to identify each person is needed. In the future, the system could use the membership number that now only appears on the membership renewal form.

The written report presented several options for online conference registration. Option one is more restrictive. If people don't match the member list, they will have to contact membership in order to register for the conference at the member rate. The task force anticipates meeting the deadline date. Training at the conference allows communication to take place between the new and old committee members and allows transfer of the laptop. An Internet connection in the registration area of the hotel would cost \$500 a day, but in a hotel room it is only \$10 a day; therefore, the connection will be in the CPC room.

### 10.4 Strategic Support Task Force (Savage)

This task force has been slow getting started but has several projects assigned.

### 10.5 Translators Resource Team (Schmitt, Savage)

Savage reported that the team is completely set up and has been given their first project: translating the Strategic Plan into both French and English.

### 10.6 Online Survey and Evaluation Task Force (Savage)

This task force has not yet been appointed.

## 11.0 NEW BUSINESS

### 11.1 Conference registration fee

Following negotiations with the hotel, the maximum cost for food was set at \$98,000 for hotel meals (which do not include the Friday evening anniversary event). Adjusting CPC's proposed conference budget for this amount, reducing the AV cost to last year's actual costs, adding in \$5,500 in honoraria for speakers, and adding a 10% (\$19,000) contingency fee, resulted in the projected budget for the 2005 Conference being \$208,500, about 10% more than last year. The Board anticipates 550 registrants. The Board decided that tiered pricing would be used for all future conferences. Tiered pricing includes higher rates for nonmembers than members, and daily rates high enough that it would be more expensive to register for two full days at the daily rate than for the full conference at a member rate.

Novak moved (Tenney seconded) setting the registration rate for NASIG members at \$375, charging nonmembers \$475 (\$25 higher than last year), and keeping day rates the same as last year. The motion passed unanimously. It will be noted to NASIG members that the member rate for the conference did NOT increase.

**ACTION:** CPC, the publicist, and the President will all publicize the January 31 deadline for new memberships and membership renewal in order to qualify for the member conference rate.

(Note: A person's current membership must be recorded in the *Membership Directory* by Jan. 31 to receive the member conference rate. In order for this to be possible, the Treasurer must receive the person's form and payment at least 2 weeks prior to Jan. 31. This factor will be included in all publicity.)

Rather than have NASIG organized tours that tend to lose money, the CPC will set up a threaded discussion

focusing on commercial tours and will have links from the conference site to such tours.

## 11.2 Financial Plan

Savage distributed copies of the President's Corner column on Financial Planning. Savage, Schmitt, and Emery will draft a financial plan.

Discussion revealed that NASIG needs a financial plan for the following reasons:

- Current budget allocation process includes no guidance for committee chairs for how to determine their budget requests or for Board members on how to make budget decisions.
- Need long-term projections for income and expenses.
- Need to track trends in spending and income.
- Need recommendation of how to improve budget allocation process.
- Need ideas for new sources of stable revenue.

Novak recommends putting \$35,000 of the 2004 conference profit into the Schwab savings account. Savage stressed NASIG should use one-time money for one-time expenses, not for recurring, basic expenses. Membership dues should support NASIG's general, annual, recurring operating expenses; fundraising could support publications, grants and awards, continuing education, etc. Board members discussed whether conference attendees' registration fees should subsidize other activities throughout the year.

NASIG should consider having a paid staff or using an association management service. However, a task force should examine this issue: What are the options, create a list of tasks that need to be handled, costs, issues with becoming an employer, service issues with association management services, etc.

Most conferences have made money. Pittsburgh lost over \$5,000. The Board needs to aim for a better perception among the members of the real financial situation of the organization. One way to do this would be to include the CPC budget in the *Newsletter*.

### 11.2.1 Relationship between fundraising, membership dues

A financial plan should include a combination of raising membership dues and a fundraising plan to endow functions the members are interested in supporting, i.e., student grants. The financial plan needs to be geared towards the longer term. Goals of the financial plan would be stability and the ability to undertake new initiatives, such as online surveys, online voting, and online evaluations. Fundraising could be a significant component

of a financial plan, but clear goals should be set. Any dues increase needs to be in line with other financial issues and should coordinate with other major issues of a plan. Dues should be raised to cover the operating budget.

McKee moved (Emery seconded) that the Board initiate the process of raising the membership dues to \$75, with the vote to be included with the 2005/2006 Board election. The motion passed with 7 yeas, 1 nay and 1 member absent during the vote.

Page moved (McKee seconded) that the Board also initiate the process of raising student membership dues to \$25 and creating a retiree rate of \$25. The motion passed with 8 yeas and 1 member absent during the vote.

The Board will use NASIG-L, the *Newsletter*, and the President's column to publicize the need for a dues increase and include a rationale with the ballot.

**ACTION:** Page will write a draft text for each of these two ballot measures for Board review before sending the final version to the Bylaws Committee.

**DATE:** By Nov. 1.

### 11.2.2 Fundraising

#### 11.2.2.1 Continue drawings?

The Board agreed to hold another fundraising drawing at the 2005 conference. This drawing will be for a free conference registration at the 2006 or 2007 conference and a year's free membership. The Board is continuing this fundraiser because the initial one in 2004 was enthusiastically received by the conference attendees and raised \$1,425! Approximately \$1,100 remained after deducting the drawing winner's free 2005 conference registration and membership dues; this money will be used to fund an additional 2005 Conference Student Grant.

**ACTION:** McKee volunteered to run the drawing

**DATE:** At the 2005 conference

**ACTION:** Savage will ask the CPC to check with the Minneapolis Convention and Visitors' Bureau to ensure we comply with all relevant Minnesota regulations.

**DATE:** Before the conference

#### 11.2.2.2 Add donation line to membership and renewal forms

There was not enough time to make this change to the renewal form before this year's earlier renewal cycle began. Additionally, because this raises many financial and legal issues which are new to NASIG, this decision

has been postponed so it can be made within the scope of the fundraising portion of the upcoming financial plan.

11.2.2.3 Other fundraising methods

This has also been postponed until creation of the financial plan.

**ACTION:** Denise will email Martha Burke about how much time would be needed to create a t-shirt quilt.

The Board agreed the following agenda items would be handled via the Board list:

- 11.6 NASIG/Mexico issues
- 11.7 UKSG *E-Serials Newsletter*
- 11.8 Committee report templates

There being no further business, Savage adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

## TREASURER'S REPORT

Denise Novak, NASIG Treasurer

NASIG currently has \$211,033.05 in assets. This includes \$155,715.55 in bank balances and \$55,317.50 in the investment account.

<b>Balance Sheet</b>	
(Includes unrealized gains)	
As of 8/1/04	
ASSETS	Balance
Cash and Bank Accounts	
Charles Schwab-Cash	31,560.50
CHECKING-264	73,006.94
SAVINGS-267	82,708.61
TOTAL Cash and Bank Accounts	187,276.05
Investments	
Charles Schwab	23,757.00
TOTAL Investments	23,757.00
<b>TOTAL ASSETS</b>	<b>211,033.05</b>
LIABILITIES & EQUITY	
Liabilities	0.00
Equity	211,033.05
<b>TOTAL LIABILITIES &amp; EQUITY</b>	<b>211,033.05</b>

NASIG has expended \$48,287.68 on operating expenses for the year to date. This includes all committee activity, such as the *Membership Directory*, Awards and Recognition Committee, and Continuing Education Committee expenses.

### NASIG Budget Expenditures

1/1/04 Through 11/1/04

Admin-Board Expenses	-13,358.25
Awards & Recognition	-9,855.61
Archives	-1,502.45
By-Laws	-983.13
Continuing Education	-5,590.99
Conference Planning	-31.95
Site Selection 2006	-480.11
Electronic Communications	-5,905.74
Evaluation	-271.13
Finance	-3,537.76
Nominations & Elections	-984.71
Database & <i>Directory Proceedings</i>	-6,597.12
Publicist	-74.68
	-114.05
<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>	<b>-48,287.68</b>

NASIG is, for the most part, financially stable. As I stated in 2003, NASIG needs to keep an operating reserve in case of an emergency. The organization has counted on annual conference surpluses and payment from Haworth Press for the annual *Proceedings* to meet its operating expenses. Membership dues account for only 30% of the income needed to meet NASIG's financial obligations.

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

### CPC UPDATE

#### NEWS ABOUT 2005 ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE IN MINNEAPOLIS

Linda Hulbert and Sue Zuriff, CPC Co-Chairs

NASIG'S 2005 conference, our 20th, will be held in Minneapolis, Minnesota, from May 19-22, 2005, at the downtown Hilton hotel. It's in the heart of Minneapolis, with a rich choice of restaurants and entertainment

nearby. A nearby highlight is Orchestra Hall and the beautiful Peavey Plaza, a popular spot for downtown workers to gather over the lunch hour.

Our preconferences will be held at the University of St. Thomas Law School, just three blocks from the Hilton.

Light rail from downtown to both the airport and the Mall of America will be operational by the time the meeting starts, making transportation to and from the airport convenient and inexpensive.



The Conference Planning Committee has been busy! We've just finished selecting a spiffy logo for a special conference. Its dancing figures in red and black capture the festive spirit of "roaring into our 20s." Take a look at

it at: <http://www.nasig.org/conference/2005.htm>. We will be busy adding other information to the site during the next few months.

We have lined up a terrific conference opening speaker: Larry Millett, a noted local journalist, historian, and fiction writer. His most well-known work is the book, "Lost Twin Cities," which details all the beautiful architecture torn down over the years. He has also written a series of books featuring the adventures of Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson in nineteenth-century Minnesota. He should be a very interesting speaker!

Our big bash will be a Friday evening anniversary celebration at Windows on Minnesota. It's at the top of the IDS Tower, the tallest building in Minneapolis, offering spectacular views on all sides. There will be dinner and a giant celebratory cake, along with music and NASIG-related entertainment from the NASIG Anniversary Task Force. It will be a memorable evening!

We're still in the preliminary stages of planning independent evening activities. We'll do another "dine-around" since that was so popular in Milwaukee. The Minnesota Twins stadium is near downtown Minneapolis, and there are also many shows in restored old theaters along Hennepin Avenue, very near our conference hotel. There will be many choices.

We are looking forward to introducing NASIG members to the Twin Cities area. Minneapolis has 5 of Minnesota's 10,000 lakes within its borders and is really beautiful in the springtime. There will be more details in the next *Newsletter*.

### PPC UPDATE

Marilyn Geller and Emily McElroy, PPC Co-Chairs

The NASIG 2005 Program Planning Committee has spent the autumn months reviewing proposals and scouting out topics and speakers that just have to be included in our anniversary conference. As we write this, the committee has the very difficult job of making final decisions about which proposals to accept.

This year, we received 40-50 proposals in the first call that closed in early October. Committee members quickly reviewed these proposals in order to identify what was missing from a perfect conference schedule. The result was a targeted second call for proposals, which will allow us to present a comprehensive buffet of choices for conference attendees.

This year, we also used a new Web form for proposal submissions. The completed form is sent to the "prog-

plan" mailbox and delivers proposals in a standard format that drops into a spreadsheet. We have found that this process has created less confusion and has made it easier to deliver complete program information to committee members. Currently, the insertion of proposals into the spreadsheet is manual, but we will continue to work on the behind-the-scenes programming to make this a more automated process.

We are continuing to evaluate special program events, including the Poster Sessions, Focused Vendor Demo Session, Networking Nodes, and User Groups, among others. As always, we welcome your comments and ideas.

Special thanks to the members of our committee and our Board liaison, Mary Page.

# NASIG 19TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE (2004)

## CONFERENCE EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT

Mary Greci

NASIG's 19th Annual Conference was held almost completely within the Milwaukee Hilton and Conference Center, marking a departure from NASIG's traditional campus venue and last year's hotel/campus hybrid approach. The program format was also quite different from past conferences. Although reaction to these changes was mixed, the conference was still a marked success, and many attendees said the sessions were some of the best in recent years.

Two hundred and seventy-one conference attendees completed and turned in evaluation forms for this conference. University libraries, unsurprisingly, again provided the largest number of respondents, up one percentage point from last year to 59%. College libraries were once again the second most represented group, providing 12.5% of the completed surveys. Community college libraries were represented by less than 1% of the respondents, bringing the total percentage for academic libraries to approximately 72%. This representation is typical of previous NASIG conferences.

Medical libraries continued to rank third in attendance, accounting for 5.5% of respondents. This number is typical of years prior to last year's conference in Portland, when medical library respondents provided 8.8% of the completed surveys. Subscription vendor and government, national, or state library representation both increased to 4.1% (up from 3.4% and 2.9% last year). Special and corporate libraries were next, accounting for 3.3% of returned surveys (up from 2.9% last year). Law library responses again increased, representing 2.9% of the surveys (up from 2.5% last year). Public library responses remained fairly steady at 2.2% (compared to 2.1% last year). Publishers provided 1.8% of responses, and library networks, consortiums, or utilities increased slightly to 1.5% (up from 1.3% last year). Automated systems vendors were represented by less than 1% of respondents, and 1.5% chose the category "Other."

The number of survey respondents with over 10 years of serials-related experience dropped to 54.6% (down from 56.4% last year). As with last year's survey, approximately 15% of the responses were provided by attendees with 1-3 years of experience. Those with 4-6 and 7-10 years of experience each accounted for 13.3% of respondents (as compared to 15.8% and 9.4% last year). Attendees with less than one year experience provided 3.3% of the completed surveys (up from 2.6% last year). 41.3% of respondents had attended 1-5 previous NASIG conferences, and 22.51% were first-timers.

Representation in the other categories dropped as the number of conferences attended rose, with 19.9% having attended 6-10 conferences, 11.1% having attended 11-15 conferences, and 5.2% having attended 16-18 conferences.

58.9% of survey respondents identified themselves as serials librarians (up from 54.3% last year). Electronic resources librarians provided 40.3% of this year's completed surveys (up from 36.3%), and for the second year in a row, this was the most frequently chosen category after that of serials librarian. Acquisitions librarians submitted 32.8% of the responses (up from 29.9% last year). Catalog librarian representation rose to 31.7% (up from 29.1% last year), but this number is still substantially lower than the 37.1% representation at the 17th conference. Collection development librarian representation increased to 26.1% (compared to 23.5% last year), and reference librarian representation increased to 19.4% (up from 18.8%). Processing and binding unit staff attendance rose again, to 14.2% (up from 13.2% last year). Each of the rest of the categories applied to less than 10% of respondents. This includes training and development staff representation, which showed a marked decrease to 7.1%, exactly half of what it was last year. Presidents, CEOs, and vice presidents submitted the fewest responses, making up 0.75% of respondents. As usual, many respondents identified themselves with multiple categories, showing once again the variety of discrete roles filled by those working with serials.

On a scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the highest), survey respondents gave the 2004 conference a mean rating of 4.42. This was the first time NASIG used a conference hotel for both housing and nearly all conference events, and survey respondents rated the overall experience with this new setup at 4.44. Some attendees said they missed the campus atmosphere; however, the majority found hotel rooms to be an improvement over past dorm experiences. Several mentioned a preference for the hybrid approach used in Portland last year, when attendees stayed in area hotels but the meetings were held on campus. Others, however, mentioned a preference for this year's hotel/conference center approach.

The conference's geographic location rated 4.43, with most respondents thinking Milwaukee was a great place to meet. The hotel rooms rated 4.3, down slightly from last year. Cleanliness, air conditioning, plenty of towels, and friendly hotel staff generated the most positive comments, while negative comments generally focused



on problems with individual rooms. Meeting rooms received a rating of 4.19, with the meetings in the ballroom receiving the most negative comments. Once again, most people felt the rooms were too small to accommodate the number of attendees. Even so, meeting rooms rated higher than in recent years. Meals and breaks got ratings of 3.77 and 3.75 respectively, with food in general receiving the most negative comments. Social events received a high rating of 4.42, compared to last year's 3.92. When told of the conference registration savings, the majority of respondents said they preferred one organized social event as opposed to two per conference.

The conference opening session was highly rated at 4.5. Most respondents enjoyed the presentation on the history of Milwaukee, although some thought it was too long. There was praise for the excellent food, with several people noting that more explanation was needed regarding the location of food stations and tables. Some respondents suggested that a brief explanation of each award would have been helpful.

This year's business meeting, conducted in a town hall format, was well received, and many respondents commented on the great discussion. Attendees liked the combination of learning about the internal workings of NASIG while at the same time participating in the decision-making process. There were many requests for this type of meeting to be included in future conferences, although some questioned whether the Sunday slot was the best time for it. Overall, respondents gave the business meeting/town hall a rating of 4.23.

Conference sessions were organized differently this year, with vision, strategy, and tactics sessions taking the place of the traditional plenary and concurrent sessions. Vision Session 1, which experimented with an interview format, generated mixed reactions and a rating of 3.41. Comments on the effectiveness of the format were split, and some respondents felt a session of this type would have been more appropriate later in the conference schedule. Vision Session 2, "What's the Big Deal," generated a rating of 4.09, and Vision Session 3, "Alternative Scholarly Publishing," was also well received with a rating of 3.98. A recurring comment concerning the vision sessions as a whole was that it was difficult to hear the speakers. Respondents felt the ballroom setting and acoustics did not work well, and some mentioned a preference for having these large meetings in an auditorium.

Strategy sessions generated ratings from 3.85 to 4.76, with 6 of the 8 sessions rating over 4.00. The highest session rating for the conference as a whole went to the strategy session "Economics of Society Publishing," with Bill Kasdorf, Keith Seitter, and October Ivins. The

strategy session with the second highest rating was Mark Leggott's session, "Open is as Open Does," which generated a rating of 4.55. "Hidden Costs of E-Journals," presented by Rollo Turner, followed with a rating of 4.28.

There were 19 tactics sessions offered this year. Ratings ranged from 3.40 to 4.57, with 10 sessions rated at 4.00 or higher. The most popular tactics session was "How To Be a Good Customer," presented by Rick Anderson and Jane White. "Serials Standards: Envisioning a Solution to the Online Serials Management Mess," presented by Theodore Fons and Regina Reynolds, received a rating of 4.55. Kristin Antelman's session, "Implementing a Serial Work in an Electronic Resources Management System," came next with a rating of 4.34.

The overall rating for this year's poster sessions was 4.12, down slightly from last year's rating of 4.26. Ratings of individual posters ranged from 3.69 to 4.44, with the highest rating going to Anna Hood's poster, "Bringing Open-Access Journals Into the Catalog." Respondents were pleased with the size of the room set aside for the session. Most felt that the scheduling was good; however, the overlap with the focused vendor demos made some feel the session should have been longer to accommodate those wanting to attend both. General comments regarding this part of the conference were positive, with many respondents mentioning improvements over past poster sessions.

Networking nodes generated a lot of interest this year, with many attendees feeling the setup was less than ideal. Survey respondents wanted to continue networking nodes but felt the sessions needed more structure and more specific topics. Some suggested having attendees sign up for particular nodes as an aid to determining room size. Specific topics requested for future networking nodes include electronic resource management, cataloging, public libraries, special libraries, and a node for new serialists.

This was the first year that user groups met during the conference rather than after the last conference session and the first time lunch connections on particular topics were offered. The change to the user groups meeting time was made in response to requests from previous surveys, and several people mentioned they preferred this year's time slot. The venue for both lunch meetings, however, was not well received and prompted numerous complaints. Most notable were comments about the noise and distraction of having all groups meet in one large room, the lack of space at tables, a desire for separate meeting rooms, and a general dislike of having a meeting during a meal. Some respondents also mentioned the loss of lunch as an informal networking time. Still, attendees

liked the idea of user groups and informal topical meetings in a style similar to the lunch connections.

This was also the first NASIG conference that included focused vendor demos. While this session received mixed reviews, it rated well at 4.06. Many respondents liked the idea of focused vendor demos and thought this was an excellent session. Others felt vendor demonstrations were out of place at NASIG, and some were unsure whether the session belonged or not. Specific negative comments centered on the less than ideal room setup and the scheduling conflict between the demos and poster sessions. Many attendees suggested changes, the most prevalent being to have the demos session in a larger room with more screens available for better viewing. Advance notification of the purpose of the session and the topic was also frequently suggested. Some felt that information on the format of the session would be useful when deciding which sessions to attend.

There were three preconferences offered this year and all were well received. Steve Miller's "Integrating Resources Cataloging Workshop" received a rating of 4.58. "Budgeting Lessons and Stories," presented by Nancy Slight-Gibney, Virginia Taffurelli, and Mary Iber, rated 4.33. "Serialist Boot Camp," presented by Beverly Geer and Susan Davis, showed a rating of 4.14. Although 25% of respondents said they would have preferred that the preconferences be located in the conference hotel, close to 93% said they enjoyed the campus location.

This year's survey included specific questions about conference programming, which were also answered using the scale of 1 to 5. When asked if there was a balance in the types of programs offered, attendees responded positively with a mean rating of 4.08. Respondents were less enthusiastic about the layout and explanation of program choices, rating these as 3.38. Interest was shown in future programs in all areas related to serials, but technology and issues related to electronic serials generated the highest scores. The surveys generated a long list of potential topics as well as a longer than usual list of suggested speakers that should prove useful when planning future conferences.

The new program format, with vision, strategy, and tactics sessions, was generally well received, although some people said the terminology was confusing. Overlapping sessions, breakfast meetings, and working lunches generated the most negative feedback. The packed schedule, excellent session choices, and mix of theory vs. practice were the things most often praised by respondents. Overall, respondents seemed generally pleased with the format and content of the sessions.

This conference was the first one to include a conference discount from an airline. Those who used Midwest Airlines were generally pleased with the service. Many did not use the airline, however, because of institutional restrictions, pricing, flight schedules, and a limited service area. Some attendees had already booked their flights by the time the conference discount was announced and so could not take advantage of it.

When asked to rate the NASIG conference website, over 92% of survey respondents said that it was clear and well organized. Respondents appreciated the online registration form, finding it easier and quicker than registration by mail; however, several attendees felt that the online form and schedule information were confusing and less than complete. Over 97% of respondents found conference information provided in NASIG-L emails to be helpful. Many people asked that this information be added to the website as it becomes available, making it easier for both members and non-members to have access to all the information they need in one place. Almost 97% of respondents felt the hotel information provided on the website was clear and complete. Reaction to the postcard mailing was mixed, with many respondents saying they did not receive a postcard.

The evaluation survey is produced by members of the Evaluation and Assessment Committee, and we welcome suggestions and feedback regarding the survey form and the conference itself. Please address questions, comments, or suggestions to Wendy Baia, [wendy.baia@Colorado.edu](mailto:wendy.baia@Colorado.edu). All suggestions are forwarded to the appropriate Board and/or committee members.

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

2004 Evaluation and Assessment Committee:

- Wendy Baia (Chair)
- Joe Badics
- Ann Ercelawn
- Mary Greci
- Leanne Hillery
- Beth Holly
- Lanell Rabner
- Tina Shrader
- Veronica Walker
- Josephine Williamson
- Stephanie Schmitt (Board Liaison)

## 2005 ELECTION TO INCLUDE NOMINATIONS BY PETITION

Kathryn Wesley, Chair, Nominations & Elections Committee

Last spring, NASIG members approved a bylaws change to allow nominations for Executive Board positions through a petition process (see Article VII, section 1, of the NASIG Bylaws at <http://www.nasig.org/public/bylaws.html>). Prior to this bylaws change, candidates were placed on the ballot only by the Nominations & Elections Committee or as write-in candidates. The nomination-by-petition process will be instituted in the upcoming 2005 election.

In mid-December 2004, N&E will announce on NASIG-L the slate of candidates we have selected for the upcoming election. At the same time, the committee will issue a call

for nominations by petition. Interested parties will have about two weeks to respond.

Petitions must include endorsements by at least 10 active members and the written acceptance of the candidate. Petitions may be submitted by paper or email to the Nominations & Elections Committee. Candidates who are nominated through this process must also submit a position statement. The position statement should reflect the candidate's view of major issues relevant to NASIG and his or her commitment, interest, and potential contributions to the organization, preferably in no more than 200 words. Any active member who meets these requirements will be placed on the official ballot.

## NASIG AWARDS

Rachel Frick, Chair, Awards and Recognition Committee

NASIG is proud to announce the beginning of the application cycle for their 2005 grants, awards, and scholarships to be awarded at the 20th Annual Conference in Minneapolis, Minnesota. As part of the NASIG mission to promote communication and sharing of ideas among all members of the serials information chain, the organization has created a robust and active awards and recognition functionality to engage more participants in the serials conversation and recognize those who are actively contributing to the profession.

Every year, NASIG awards several student travel grants, awards for promising serialists, scholarships for library school students, and an international award to aid in serials research. Since 1988, NASIG has granted over 120 student grant awards—including 4 grants for Mexican students—5 Marcia Tuttle Awards for international serials research, 7 Fritz Swartz educational scholarships, and 21

Horizon awards to recognize up-and-coming members of the profession.

In recognition of NASIG's 20th anniversary, we have created a new award to acknowledge the contributions of a professional to the serials field. Years of service are not the primary focus, but rather the impact one has made on the profession. This could be exhibited in publications, presentations, innovative thinking, service, and personal excellence. The award provides the recipient with conference registration, three night's housing, and travel costs to NASIG's annual conference. In addition, the recipient will receive a year's free NASIG membership and a monetary award of \$500. For more information about these awards and the application process, please refer to the NASIG Awards website at <http://www.nasig.org/award/index.htm>.

## NASIG PROFILES DOUG KIKER, NEW MEMBER

Maggie Rioux

Ordinarily, the subjects of *NASIG Newsletter* profiles have been our "movers and shakers"—committee chairs, Executive Board members, and others well known to the NASIG community. This month, however, I decided to try something different. I decided to profile a future mover and shaker—a new NASIG member. And where does one find a new member? After all, committee chairs and Board members are kind of easy to locate compared to NASIG newbies. Actually, it wasn't too hard. I simply informed Douglas Kiker, my conference mentee last June,

that he would be the subject of a *Newsletter* profile in a few months and would be hearing from me later. Since he was in a relative daze in the midst of his first conference experience, he simply nodded. Luckily, he was still agreeable when he got home and came to his senses, and willingly provided me with information about himself and his serials adventures.

Doug tells me that he's a born-and-bred Florida cracker—one of those rare folks whose family has been in Florida

for about a hundred years. He did his undergraduate studies in political science at the University of Florida. While there, he worked as a student assistant in the library government documents department (where he's now the head of the serials acquisitions unit) and discovered it was a cool place. While staying on at UF as a library technical assistant after his B.A., he got a feel for how the library world is organized, where he wanted to fit into it, and how to get there (highly organized—the mark of a good serialist).

Having planned his life, Doug headed off to Florida State University's School of Information Studies. This actually was a very daring move: FSU and UF are major rivals in sports and everything else. He says it was a great school with great faculty, but he retained his Gator loyalties, albeit underground for a bit.

Next step: find a job. Doug's wife had an opportunity open up in Washington, D.C., so they headed north. D.C. is usually a good job market for newbie librarians, especially those with government document experience, and Doug did well in the four years they were there. He first worked for a private document delivery and information brokering company specializing in FDA information. He then did contract reference work for the National Library of Medicine, where he encountered serials in a big way. His newfound interest in serials, plus the experience he had gained, enabled him to snag a position back in Gainesville in 2001. After two years as coordinator of academic support services, he was appointed head of the serials acquisitions unit in July 2003 with the rank of assistant university librarian. Way to go, Doug!

On the advice of longtime NASIGers Michele Crump and Naomi Young, Doug promptly joined NASIG, and last June, he attended his first NASIG conference. He had a great time being among lots of serialists without having to search them out in a crowd of other folks. He also says he found NASIG “a nice blend of academics and company representatives that seemed to work well together.” We'll definitely see a lot of him at future conferences.

When I asked for his CV as a starting point for this profile, Doug told me that he thought it was kind of sparse since he's rather new in the field. However, I think he's making a great start. In only one year, he's already co-authored an article in *Library Resources & Technical Services* and been involved with two sessions at the Charleston Conference (“Beastly Breakfast” discussion leader in 2003 and “Lively Lunch” presenter in 2004). Having fallen in love with NASIG and feeling his “biological tenure clock ticking away,” he's working on a program proposal for NASIG 2005 and looking forward

to completing a volunteer form for possible committee appointment.



Doug also wanted me to let you know he has a lovely wife (Salina) and a really cute son (Xander) who's almost three. He made me promise to put their picture in the *Newsletter*, so here it is, Doug, as promised.



Also, here's a picture of Doug himself, supposedly hard at work. Now that you know what he looks like, remember

to say hi to him in Minneapolis next May when he attends his second NASIG conference.

Oh yeah—the Florida weather mess. Remember last August and September’s hurricane outbreak, when Florida seemed to be sitting there with a big “Kick me!” sign? Well, I asked him about it, and Doug says that Gainesville came through it okay: UF was closed a total of 3-4 days for all three hurricanes together. As of this writing, the excess water from all the rain is gradually drying up. Doug put it quite eloquently:

A Louisiana-style bayou was created in the wooded area behind my house, so it now feels like we live in Cajun country. It stinks like a swamp, too! Then there’s also the Old Testament-type plague of tiny frogs that resulted

from so much wet weather. They’ve invaded and taken control of our swimming pool. It’s just now turning clear and sky blue after a very green period. The water in the bayou appears to move by itself due to all the next generation tadpole/pollywogs swimming around in it. Interesting biological phenomena have been observed during this hurricane season. Fortunately, we didn’t have any real damage to home or work.

Cheer up, Doug! The frogs will eat the mosquitoes which should be hatching soon. And I bet you and your neighbors will start feeling a lot better when the pictures of northern blizzards start hitting the Weather Channel. And we’ll all look forward to seeing you in Minneapolis.

## BYLAWS COMMITTEE

The past year’s profiles—Continuing Education and Nominations & Elections—have covered a couple of committees whose activities we encounter frequently on NASIG-L, in the *Newsletter*, and at various conferences we attend. This month’s profile subject is normally a lot quieter (at least from the membership’s point of view), but certainly no less important than the others. The NASIG Bylaws Committee is the group which takes care of our infrastructure. It waits until needed to go into action, but when the time comes, its role is vital to our organization’s operations (hmm, sounds a little like Superman, doesn’t it?)

The Bylaws Committee was originally formed in 1988 to review the original two-page NASIG bylaws and make them more comprehensive. Tina Feick, Elaine Rast, Sylvia Martin, and Marty Gordon waded in and got it done. Since then, there have been a number of changes in response to the evolving needs of the organization, but the basic document still stands. The committee itself is specifically enjoined from proposing changes and must only react to proposals submitted to them by others. While all the proposed changes in committee memory have come from the Executive Board, there is nothing in the rules that says an individual member can’t propose a change. Once a bylaws change has been officially proposed, the committee has detailed guidelines for reviewing it, obtaining a rationale, notifying the membership, and conducting the voting. The guidelines, which are on NASIGWeb at <http://nasig.org/bylaws/guide.html>, make interesting reading. The voting procedures also cover the handling of any other membership-wide ballot (except the regular election), which the Board added to the Bylaws Committee’s charge a few years ago to take advantage of their expertise.

Once a year, the committee reviews the current bylaws, looking for inconsistencies, errors, conflicts between sections, etc; however, this is not the same as having committee members actually proposing substantive bylaws changes. The idea behind this prohibition is that the committee itself must remain neutral. As Alice Rhodes, last year’s Bylaws Chair, explained, “If I had had some pet projects or peeves, I could have proposed them and put them on a ballot with descriptive text designed to lead the membership to vote the way I wanted.”

If it seems to you that there have been a lot of bylaws changes in the past few years, you’re right. There were three changes last year and two the year before that. In the previous few years, however, there was no activity. Both Alice and Adolfo Tarango, the current chair, attribute the recent flurry to housecleaning that needed to be done as well as new directions and issues, especially related to NASIG’s new strategic plan.

As part of my research, I asked both Adolfo and Alice how they ended up on this particular committee. Alice said it was one of the committees she mentioned in her original NASIG volunteer form: She had similar experience from other committees. Adolfo hadn’t mentioned any particular committee of interest on his form, but was asked by Steve Savage if he would take Bylaws. He accepted since, once suggested, it seemed to him to be in line with his background and interests. Konstantin Gurevich, a new committee member this year, said Bylaws was his first choice: He thought it a good spot to learn more about NASIG as well as being a place where even a new member could make a worthwhile contribution. His interest was also piqued by the lively discussion of last year’s bylaws changes.

I also asked these folks if they felt overlooked since Bylaws isn't one of the more glamorous or visible of NASIG's committees. To their credit, both Alice and Adolfo said absolutely not. While it isn't glamorous, they both feel that the membership understands the

committee's importance and respects its work. This is, after all, the committee which protects the foundation upon which all the rest of NASIG rests. What could be more important than that?

## ERRATA

The March 2004 Treasurer's Report (PDF version) contains a typographical error. On the balance sheet, the date of the report, "as of 10/11/03," should read, "as of

12/31/03." The HTML version of the *Newsletter* has the correct date. The Editorial Board regrets this oversight.

## OTHER NASIG NEWS

### NASIG 20TH ANNIVERSARY HISTORY TASK FORCE

Sheryl Williams, Chair

The History Task Force is deep into capturing the history of the first twenty years of NASIG. It's been fascinating to watch the organization change and grow since the mid-80s as we have pored over the *Newsletters* and *Proceedings* and conducted interviews. The document is developing nicely; there will be names you haven't thought about in years. There will be reports of the conferences you attended, along with those you regrettably missed. You'll marvel at the farsightedness of planning from our first decade. It may be called a history of NASIG, but it's also a celebration of its members.

The history will be ready in time for our anniversary celebration next spring. The committee members hard at work on this document are:

Elizabeth Lowe  
Catalog Librarian  
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville  
Edwardsville, Illinois

Peter Picerno  
Collection Services Librarian  
St. Edwards University  
Austin, Texas

Sara Ranger  
Information Services Librarian  
University of Houston  
Houston, Texas

Rocki Strader  
Electronic Resources Manager  
Ohio State University Libraries  
Columbus, Ohio

Sheryl Williams, Chair  
Head, Serials Department  
University of Nebraska Medical Center  
Omaha, Nebraska

Joyce Tenney, Board Liaison  
Serials Librarian  
University of Maryland, Baltimore County Library  
Baltimore, Maryland

### PARITY IN DUES: PROPOSAL FOR A CHANGE OF APPROACH

Steve Savage, NASIG President

During its October meeting, the Executive Board decided that NASIG simply must raise its basic membership dues in order to close the widening gap between our income and our expenses. (Please see the President's Corner article in this issue for more about these issues.) To accomplish this, the basic outline of the proposed new dues structure includes:

- annual membership dues of \$75 USD
- annual dues for students of \$25 USD
- a new membership category for retirees with annual dues of \$25 USD
- annual dues for members outside North America of \$75 USD.

NASIG has always used the flat-rate approach to membership dues: all North American members within the established categories (students and “everyone else”) paid the same amount in U.S. dollars. The Board believes that a major reason why NASIG has made so little success with membership development among Canadian and Mexican serialists has to do with our longstanding flat-rate policy for dues. Consequently, we are proposing that NASIG’s approach to dues be changed from the flat-rate structure to a parity approach. Here is why:

The philosophy of dues rates for members comes down to two approaches:

- 1) Do we base the rate solely on the organization’s financial concerns (expenses per member)?
- Or:
- 2) Do we base the rate on the organization’s broader concerns (membership development, developing a greater global presence and role, etc.)?

Essentially, the differences in these questions come down to: Do financial considerations trump strategic plan goals, or vice versa?

If we consider dues only from the financial standpoint (#1 above), we do what we’ve always done: set the same rate for all members. Except that we haven’t actually done that. We raised the rate (essentially, added a penalty) for Canadian members so they pay currency conversion costs rather than NASIG. But yet, we didn’t do this for Mexican members. And at the same time, we lowered the rate for students, and we hope to do the same for retirees.

If we consider dues from the broader perspective (#2), using dues as a tool toward other goals in addition to financial ones, we need to view them from the perspective of individual members. Meaning, when a person is deciding whether to join NASIG or renew membership, they balance what they expect to get from the organization with the question, “Can I afford what it will cost me?”

The Board decided that it is in NASIG’s best interests to not base our approach to dues solely on the financial perspective, for four reasons:

- 1) Our current policy seems to me to be a mixed up, inconsistent, and unfair set of factors, as described above.
- 2) If we want more members from Canada and Mexico, we have to become realistic about the “Can I afford it” aspect of their decision-making process.
- 3) We have always made our dues-related decisions solely from the U.S. perspective, with truly no

realistic understanding of the situations or perspectives of Canadian and Mexican serialists.

- 4) All of these factors have produced a membership dues structure that actively works against progress toward the issues of membership in Canada and Mexico that we have been struggling with—and making almost no progress—since NASIG’s very first year.

After consulting with an economics professor and a business and economics librarian about how to accomplish this change of philosophy about dues, we learned that we should use a parity approach rather than a flat rate method. In the parity approach, the same portion, or percentage, is applied against the average salaries for each country in question. Consequently, we used average salaries taken from the 2003 gross domestic products (which is what the economist recommended). This allows for variances of salaries between librarians, paraprofessionals, vendors, publishers, etc.

These are the average incomes for 2003:

U.S.	\$37,800 USD
Canada	\$29,500 USD
Mexico	\$ 9,000 USD

So if we were to raise dues for all of our North American members to \$75 USD (the flat-rate approach), we would be asking U.S. members to pay .2% of the average U.S. salary, and asking Canadian members to pay .25% of the average Canadian salary, and Mexican members to pay .83% of the average Mexican salary. That’s obviously not fair. Yet this is the approach built into our current dues policy (just using \$25 USD instead of \$75). It’s no wonder we have few Canadian members and far fewer Mexican members!

Another way of looking at this: if NASIG were based in Mexico and had set dues for Mexican members at an amount equal to .83% of the average Mexican salary, and then used that percentage to determine U.S. and Canadian dues, we’d be asking U.S. members to pay \$314 USD, and Canadian members to pay \$245 USD (\$292 CAD). *There is no way we would even consider asking all of our members to pay that high of a percentage, so why have we been asking members in one of our constituent countries to do so?*

If we are to base our dues policy on parity instead, meaning each member would pay the same *portion* of their income, we could do it on the honor system. That would mean asking each person to calculate .2% of their salary and pay that amount. This would obviously create chaos. Or we could take a more structured, data-driven approach instead and set dues at the same percentage for each constituent country’s average salary. This is the

method that both the economist and the business librarian recommended. The result would be:

U.S.	\$75 USD
Canada	\$60 USD
Mexico	\$18 USD

Getting back to the perspective of “will what I get from NASIG be worth the cost to me?”, this parity-based structure would mean that we think U.S., Canadian, and Mexican members would all place the *same value* on NASIG. Our existing approach to dues has always implied members outside the U.S. find *more* value in NASIG than those in the U.S.

We currently have so few members in Canada and Mexico that the lower rates for serialists in those countries would not create a noticeable, negative effect on NASIG’s income at present. Maybe if we set dues for

Canadian and Mexican serialists that are more realistic to their own situations, we would eventually have more members from these countries. In addition to finally making progress with a longstanding shortcoming, this would *increase* our income.

We’ve talked a lot during the last year about the fact that NASIG is at the end of its adolescent phase and needs to jump the hurdle into a more mature organizational character. Developing this more sophisticated and realistic approach to our dues is one more major step toward this growth that we can accomplish now. Consequently, this parity approach is built into the proposed changes for dues that the Board will place on the ballot in a few months. Please vote to adopt this change so we can finally set the stage for significant progress on both our financial and membership goals.

## OTHER SERIALS NEWS

### THE JOURNALS REVOLUTION: A PRIMER PRECONFERENCE AT THE CHARLESTON CONFERENCE 2004

Presented by:

Carol Tenopir, University of Tennessee; Michael Mabe, Elsevier; Carol Hansen Montgomery, Drexel University

Reported by: Cris Ferguson, Furman University

This preconference program featured three speakers and was divided into four parts, each addressing a different aspect of the nature of journals and serials materials. Carol Tenopir of the University of Tennessee opened the session with a discussion of the characteristics of journals. Michael Mabe followed, highlighting the history of journals, the development of new journals, and the basic practices of journal publishers. Carol Montgomery spoke about the migration of print subscriptions to online at Drexel University. Tenopir then spoke again, concluding the session with a discussion of results of recent user behavior studies.

Carol Tenopir’s discussion of journal characteristics centered on the growth of full-text sources and highlighted a few alternatives to traditional journal publishing. According to the July 2004 edition of *Fulltext Sources Online*, the total number of active periodicals has risen from approximately 4000 titles in 1993 to over 22,000 in 2004. Tenopir breaks these full-text resources down into two major models: the journal model, where journals are made available individually or in a package, and the article model, where journal articles are aggregated together in full-text databases. Tenopir went on to define three of the primary economic models for access to electronic journals: traditional subscriptions, open-access publishing (authors and/or their institutions

pay to publish), and publishing subsidized by institutions or individuals. Examples of this last model include institutional repositories, self-archiving, and e-print services like arXiv.org.

Michael Mabe, the Director of Academic Relations for Elsevier, began his presentation with a history of the development of journals. Robert Hooke first proposed the idea of a weekly printed publication in 1663, and the first issue of *Le Journal des Scavans*, the first journal, was published January 5, 1665. Since that first peer-reviewed journal in 1665, the number of peer-reviewed journals has increased to 17,700 in 2004. Mabe went on to describe three different ways that journals grow: organically, where existing titles get fatter; by fission, where existing titles split into parts; and by new creation, where a new journal starts up due to demand in the scientific community. Mabe finished up his presentation with some discussion of the publishing cycle and the role of the publisher in the process.

Carol Hansen, Dean of Libraries at Drexel University, highlighted some of the consequences, both positive and negative, of Drexel’s migration from print to online. Developing and managing the electronic journal collections has proved more complex than a more traditional print journal collection. Montgomery pointed



out that there are many more variables when selecting electronic resources, such as the quality of the visuals and the items included in the electronic version. Negotiating licenses and prices also complicates the issue. Managing the electronic collection has proved equally complicated. The increased electronic subscriptions have had an impact on staff and administrative costs. At the same time, there have been some cost savings through decreased check-in, binding, and shelving. Through her cost analysis, Montgomery determined that the operational cost per use of print journals was actually higher than cost per use of electronic journals, and full-text databases turn out to be quite cost effective at a rate of approximately \$1/use.

Carol Tenopir wrapped up the session with a talk on user behavior patterns. The presentation was based upon a recent study she completed for the Council on Library and Information Services. Through her examination of various user behavior studies, Tenopir has determined that reading varies by subject discipline and workplace. For example, practicing pediatricians read more articles per year than do university scientists or engineers. In addition, the percentage of articles read in print and electronic formats varies from discipline to discipline. Tenopir concluded her presentation with some comments and observations on student behaviors.

## PROFESSIONAL LIAISON UPDATES

*[Ed. note: Derived from reports submitted during the fall by NASIG's Professional Liaisons group.]*

### **Connie Foster**

**Liaison to: American Library Association, ALCTS, Serials Section**

For ALA Midwinter and Annual I have reported on NASIG conference and program plans and other initiatives, usually at the Sunday morning Executive Committee meeting. Interest remains strong in collaborative efforts between the two groups. One particular task force still needs to be formalized, and that is the one to explore synergies between NASIG and ALA/ALCTS/Serials Section. The purpose of this task force will be to focus on serial publications of mutual interest and ways to share resources and sponsor programs. As volunteers, it is often difficult to maintain threads of sanity in our various efforts, but both groups share common goals, members, and interests, so we should be able to move forward with more concrete activities soon.

### **Stephen Headley**

**Liaison to: Public Library Association (PLA)**

The PLA 2005 Spring Symposium is March 7-9, 2005, in Chicago at the Palmer House Hilton Hotel. The spring symposiums are offered every other year in the years in which there is no national conference. The next PLA National Conference will be in Boston in 2006 from March 20-25.

Program proposals for the NASIG 2005 Conference have been discussed with other public librarians and it is true that little attention has been paid to serials at PLA conference. Together with other public librarians in NASIG, we hope to make serials issues more visible in future PLA events and hopefully promote NASIG at the same time.

### **Trina Grover**

**Liaison to: Canadian Library Association (CLA)**

The bulk of the information about past activities of TSIG and SIG can be found on the website at <http://www.fis.utoronto.ca/people/affiliated/tsig/index.html>. However, that site is moving to <http://library.queensu.ca/cts/tsig/tsig.htm>. You will find full and up-to-date contact information at <http://library.queensu.ca/cts/tsig/tsig-contact.htm>.

The SIG in partnership with the Technical Services Interest Group (TSIG) are coordinating a 2-day SCCTP Basic Serials Workshop in Toronto, Nov. 4-5. Many thanks to Nathan Rupp and the Continuing Education Committee for their generous offer to sponsor this event. Details can be found at [http://www.cla.ca/conference/sig\\_tsig\\_workshop.htm](http://www.cla.ca/conference/sig_tsig_workshop.htm). We have proposed a number of programs for the CLA annual conference next year in Calgary, which include:

1. Reorganizing Technical Services in Your Library
2. E-Resource Management: Acquisitions and Access
3. AACR3 Update: The New Rules

### **Regina Reynolds**

**Liaison to: Library of Congress – NSDP**

The ISSN standard (ISO 3297) is under revision to better accommodate needs in the digital environment. The effort began in fall 2003 and is expected to last until 2006. Major issues are the scope of ISSN coverage and at what level to assign ISSNs (work, title, manifestation, product). Solutions to the “multiple ISSN” problem are being considered, particularly the use of ISSNs as part of a larger, title-level identifier.

**Heidi Arnold****Liaison to: American Theological Library Association**

*Membership:* Over 60 of ATLA's 561 individual and student members, or more than 11 percent, are actively involved in the Technical Services Interest Group at ATLA. This liaison plans to contact these individuals, and for those who are not members of NASIG, see if they would like to become NASIG members.

*Open URL Projected Development in the Index Department at ATLA Headquarters:* As the creators of the ATLA Religion Database, the index department projects that an open URL enhancement will benefit users. In the words of Cameron Campbell, "With the implementation of open URL, the ATLA Religion Database becomes more than a signpost, it becomes a gateway." The enhancements to the production process for the ATLA Religion Database are in the planning phases at this time. The ATLA Religion Database indexes over 600 serials in theology and religion.

*ATLA to offer professional development course in Theological Librarianship:* ATLA Executive Director Dennis Norlin and John M. Unsworth, Dean of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Graduate School of Library and Information Science, have signed an agreement that will insure that the university will offer a full-semester course in theological librarianship beginning with the fall semester 2005. The course will be offered through the university's renowned LEEP online program and will be available both as a full-credit course and also as an enrichment course for students not enrolled in a degree program.

*Cooperative Digital Resources Initiative (CDRI):* CDRI provides a freely available, Web searchable, central repository of digital resources contributed by participating libraries. CDRI enables ATLA member libraries both to create digital resources and to benefit from the digital projects of other libraries.

*ATLA Selected Religion Websites (ATSRW):* The ATLA Selected Religion Websites project is a collaborative endeavor to make selected websites in theology and religion accessible through local OPACs. All ATLA members are invited to participate in the project by submitting websites for consideration; a submission form is located on the project description page, <http://www.atla.com/tsig/atrw/sitestoconsider.html>.

*ATLA Annual Conference Schedule:* Austin, Texas, June 15-18, 2005

**Veronica Walker****Liaison to: Special Libraries Association (SLA)**

SLA has created a new Competitive Intelligence Division to attract CI professionals, making it the 24th professional interest network within its membership. SLA has launched a \$1 million fundraising initiative to support the transformation of its Professional Development Center by 2007. The annual campaign for professional development will provide funding for capital projects and meet continuing education needs without raising dues or making the cost of these continuing education programs beyond the reach of most participants.

*Conferences*

Leadership Summit: January 26-29, 2005, Tampa, Florida  
Annual Conference: June 5-8, 2005, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

For more information see <http://www.sla.org/content/learn/index.cfm>

**Judy Wilkerson****Liaison to: Medical Library Association (MLA)**

The current officers of the MLA Technical Services Section are listed on the following Web page: [http://library.umsmc.edu/tss/officers\\_current.html](http://library.umsmc.edu/tss/officers_current.html). The Collection Development section officers are available at: [http://colldev.mlanet.org/Coldev\\_roster04-05.html](http://colldev.mlanet.org/Coldev_roster04-05.html).

*Organizational News:* Within the Technical Services section there are two new task forces. One will look at suggested changes needed for administrative metadata that would help librarians manage records for maximum usefulness in serving patrons and provide current information in spite of the volatile trends in the serials industry. The second task force is charged with responding to the disbanding of HSOCLCUG (Health Sciences OCLC Users Group) by possibly absorbing some of its functions.

*Conferences:* MLA held its annual meeting in May 2004 in Washington, D.C. The high points for serials professionals was the discussion of three topics: 1) Open access initiatives for scholarly publishing, 2) Institutional digital archives, and 3) Archiving of electronic journals.

*For MLA 2005 San Antonio go to:*  
<http://www.mlanet.org/>.

*Regional meetings for Chapters:* A list of the chapters and their fall meetings is available at: <http://www.mlanet.org/chapters/chapters.html>

*Other:* The legislative task force has been busy monitoring funding for the National Library of Medicine

and the National Institutes of Health. The appropriations bill for NIH has not passed. Medical libraries are dependent on NLM for document delivery systems, journals management, database access, and the provision of links, so the funding of these functions becomes central to our mission. Other issues on the radar are the proposed changes in intellectual property issues with ENDUCE, the WIPO initiatives, and taxpayer access policy for NIH research.

**Frank Richardson**

**Liaison to: American Association of Law Libraries (AALL)**

2005 Annual Meeting, to be held in San Antonio, Texas, on July 16-21, 2005

Please see latest issue of *Technical Services Law Librarian*, Vol. 30:1, and September 2004

HTML (in process):

<http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/tsll/tsll.htm>

PDF [1.7 MB]:

<http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/tsll/30-01/30-01.pdf>

**Hien Nguyen**

**Liaison to: Library of Congress – CONSER**

*Organizational News:* Les Hawkins was named CONSER Coordinator after the retirement of Jean Hirons, and Hien Nguyen was appointed CONSER Specialist after acting in that capacity for most of the fiscal year. Jean Hirons continued serving CONSER as a consultant for part of the fiscal year by completing a report on expanding the SCCTP program to include distance learning and coordinating the CONSER Summit on Serials in the Digital Environment. In early 2004, CONSER implemented changes to its membership structure, moving Enhance level members to the Associate level, and changing record contribution requirements.

The Serials Cataloging Cooperative Training Program (SCCTP) conducted 74 workshops in 2004. Three Serial Holdings Workshops and Two Advanced Serials Cataloging Workshops held in April and September were sponsored by NASIG. Grants from the NASIG Continuing Education Committee enabled these workshops to reach trainees in diverse locations, including Hawaii and Montreal, Quebec (THANK YOU!) Future plans for the program include updating the

workshop manuals to be in compliance with the AACR2 2004 rules revision and providing supplementary material on the Web to accompany existing SCCTP workshops.

The CONSER Summit was held in March 2004 and resulted in recommendations that have become the focus of CONSER discussion and activity throughout the year. The summit was a meeting of 70 people representing all library service areas, the serials industry, and standards communities. The purpose of the summit was to gain an understanding of electronic resource growth and usage and to help CONSER shape strategies for the future. Panel discussions focused on publishing, users, and standards. A poster session on the summit was presented by Hien Nguyen at the 2004 NASIG Conference (A HUGE SUCCESS! CONGRATULATIONS!) in Milwaukee. Some of the recurring themes of the summit were that libraries should focus on making sure our systems are interoperable, we should try to share data more efficiently, and provide better coverage of e-serial packages within the CONSER database. The summit recommendations for CONSER and the PCC and a summary of the proceedings are available at <http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/summit.html>. The PCC Policy Committee will be looking at other recommendations from the summit this fall at its annual meeting in November.

The CONSER Operations Meeting was held May 6-7, 2004, with 40 CONSER operations representatives in attendance. The representatives discussed specific cataloging problems and recommendations from the CONSER Summit on Serials in the Digital Environment (meeting summary available from <http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/conop2004.html>). Three new task groups were formed to pursue summit recommendations.

*CONSER Documentation:* In December of 2003, Module 31 of the CONSER Cataloging Manual (CCM) was updated to reflect changes resulting from implementation of the aggregator-neutral record and to remove older material. An update to the CONSER Editing Guide (CEG) was issued in spring 2004. Extensive updates to several modules of the CCM are being revised to be in compliance with the AACR2 2004 rules revision and will be released in fall 2004.

## TITLE CHANGES

[Note: Please report promotions, awards, new degrees, new positions, and other significant professional milestones. You may submit items about yourself or other members to Susan Andrews (Susan\_Andrews@tamu-commerce.edu). 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.]

**CAROL ABATELLI**, who was hired as Head of Public Services, Eastern Connecticut State University, in 2001, became Head of Collections and Electronic Resources Management on October 1, 2004. The job change is part of ECSU Smith Library's increased focus on collection management, particularly with respect to e-journals and other e-resources. Carol will serve as collection development officer and also as the manager of the serials department, a job she took over last year following the resignation of the Head of Technical Services. Her new address is:

Eastern Connecticut State University  
J. Eugene Smith Library  
83 Windham Street  
Willimantic, Connecticut 06226  
Phone: (860) 465-5562  
Fax: (800) 465-5517  
E-mail: abatellic@easternct.edu

**KAREN ANSPACH**, formerly Library Automation Specialist at Mandarin Library Automation, Inc., e-mailed, "I started my own consulting company over a year ago. My company's focus is on providing hands-on service to small and special libraries in need of expert assistance with automation projects. These may be libraries requiring help in developing an RFP and selecting a new or updated ILS system or assistance with other automation or data issues they may have. My knowledge of library automation, data management, and standards such as the MARC holdings format is very valuable to those libraries wishing to maintain the best possible system and having personal support from their consultant." Karen's consulting firm is Karen Anspach Consulting, and her contact information is:

Karen Anspach Consulting  
7185 Lorenzo Lane  
Delray Beach, Florida 33446  
Phone: (561) 499-4271  
Phone (cell): (561) 302-9707  
E-mail: karen@anspachconsulting.com

Former Cataloging Consultant **THOMAS E. CHAMPAGNE** is now Catalog Librarian at the Thomas Jefferson School of Law. His new contact information is:

Thomas Jefferson School of Law  
2121 San Diego Avenue

San Diego, California 92110  
Phone: (619) 297-9700 ext 1109  
Fax: (619) 374-6394  
E-mail: tchampagne@tjssl.edu

**PAM CIPKOWSKI** decided to abandon her grueling commute to her job as Cataloging/Indexing Librarian at Northwestern University's Transportation Library to become an Audiovisual Cataloger at Follett Library Resources in McHenry, Illinois. In making the jump from the library side to the vendor side, Pam's new job gives her the opportunity to do more cataloging than in her previous job; plus, her commute to her new home in Illinois is now much shorter and more pleasant! Her new contact information is:

Follett Library Resources  
1340 Ridgeview Dr.  
McHenry, Illinois 60050  
Phone: (815) 759-1700  
E-mail: pammychip@comcast.net

**STEPHEN D. CORRSIN**, Associate Chief, Acquisitions, at the New York Public Library, The Research Libraries, wrote, "I started on Sept. 13, 2004. With the early retirement of the longtime Chief of Acquisitions, I find myself as Acting as well as Associate Chief. It keeps me busy." Steve was previously the Technical Services and Systems Librarian at Wayne State University. He can now be reached at:

The New York Public Library, The Research Libraries  
5th Ave & 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10018-2788  
Phone: (212) 930-0839  
Fax: (212) 930-9258  
E-mail: scorrsin@nypl.org

Ex-Serials & Electronic Resources Librarian at Eastern Kentucky University, **ANNA CREECH** started her new job as Serials & Electronic Resources Librarian at Central Washington University Library on Sept. 7, 2004. About this job change she commented, "A combination of factors lead me to decide that it was time to move on from the comfortable place I had created for myself in Kentucky and to take on new challenges. A hobby wasn't enough, so I packed up my worldly possessions and moved across the country to take on the responsibility of heading the serials department here at Central Washington University. I've learned that a bigger office

results in more work to fill it with stacks of papers and folders, not to mention book trucks of stuff that no one has wanted to tackle for years.” Anna’s new addresses are:

Central Washington University Library  
400 E. University Way  
Ellensburg, Washington 98926  
Phone: (509) 963-1718  
E-mail: creecha@cwu.edu

In May 2004, **MICHAEL A. EDWARDS** became the Technical Services Librarian at the Pentagon Library. He was Serials Specialist at the Library of Congress. Michael can currently be contacted at:

Pentagon Library  
6605 Army Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20310-6605  
Phone: (703) 695-3146  
Fax: (703) 695-4009  
E-mail: michael.edwards@hqda.army.mil

**SANDY GURSHMAN**, formerly Sales Director at Marcel Dekker, wanted to let us know that, “I’m back in the subscription agency arena as Director of Publisher Relations for Wolper Subscription Services, based in Easton, Pennsylvania. After two years at Marcel Dekker learning about publishing from the inside, I’m excited to be contributing to the growth of this nimble, service-oriented subscription agency and looking forward to working again with publisher colleagues and other partners in the information-provider community.” She can be reached at:

Wolper Subscription Services  
6 Centre Square, Suite 202  
Easton, Pennsylvania 18042  
Phone: (610) 559-9550  
Fax: (610) 559-9898  
E-mail: sgurshman@wolper.com

The new Acquisitions Librarian at the Arizona State University-West’s Fletcher Library, **SMITA JOSHIPURA**, said, “I would like to let you know that I migrated from India in the last five years and had an MLS from India, with more than twelve years of professional experience in a research library. Since my degree from India was not ALA-accredited, I was hired at ASU West as a bibliographic services specialist in 2000. During this period I realized how important it is to acquire an ALA-accredited degree. With tremendous support and encouragement from my dean, I decided to join school once again! I started my MLS at the University of Arizona as a distance education student in 2002 and

completed my degree in spring 2004. Since I now hold an ALA-accredited degree, I was offered a position as an academic professional at the same place in July 2004. My responsibilities remain the same. Though I was equally respected with other librarians, I am glad that now my status has been changed to academic professional. It is very important in an academic set-up and it means a lot to me. I am glad that I could accomplish my goal to work as a professional librarian in the U.S.” Smita’s addresses are:

Arizona State University-West  
P.O. Box 37100  
Phoenix, Arizona 85069-7100  
Phone: (602) 543-8504  
Fax: (602) 543-6500  
E-mail: SJOSHIP@asu.edu

**REBECCA MARTINEZ**, former Accounts Manager at Swets Blackwell, Inc., had this to say about her new job: “In July I made the leap from vendor to academic library, and I’m pleased to say that the move has been a very positive one. During my six years at Blackwell’s, Swets Blackwell, and eventually Swets Information Services, I discovered a career path that I would never have imagined for myself. I am fully utilizing every bit of experience I had working with serials for my new position as New Brunswick Libraries’ Collection Services Coordinator and Serials Acquisitions Team Leader (a mouthful to say the least!) I have been managing and analyzing every aspect of serials ordering, including evaluating how our vendors can help us to better manage our many subscriptions—obviously, my time at Swets has proven to have been a very good foundation! I love my new position at Rutgers and have had the fortune of working with inspiring people and am being challenged in new ways every day. I’m looking forward to my future time here at Rutgers and am hoping to begin an MLS degree within the next year or so. I hope to see you all at a NASIG conference soon!” Contact Rebecca at:

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey  
Library of Science and Medicine  
165 Bevier Road - 3rd Floor  
Piscataway, New Jersey 08854-8009  
Phone: (732) 445-3856 ext. 312  
Fax: (732) 445-3208  
E-mail: rannmart@rci.rutgers.edu

**NICOLE MICHAUD-OYSTRYK** of the University of Manitoba’s Elizabeth Dafoe Library has changed titles from Acting Associate Director, Collections, to Head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library. Nicole’s addresses are now:

University of Manitoba  
Elizabeth Dafoe Library

Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2N2  
CANADA  
Phone: (204) 474-921  
Fax: (204) 474-7577  
E-mail:  
NICOLE\_MICHAUD-OYSTRYK@umanitoba.ca

Previously Serials Cataloger at the Library of Congress, **HIEN NGUYEN** is now CONSER Specialist at that library. Her contact information remains the same.

**SUE WILLIAMS** is now the University of Colorado at Boulder's Faculty Director of Gifts. She was that university's Collection Development Librarian.

The former Senior Bibliographic Assistant at Binghamton University Libraries, **JILL D. YAPLES** said of her title change, "Even though it is a change in title, it's not a new job. My new title is more descriptive of what I do. I catalog electronic resources in all formats: floppy disks, CD-ROMs, Web resources, etc." Jill's new title is Electronic Resource Cataloger at the same institution. Her contact information is:

Binghamton University Libraries  
Cataloging Services  
PO Box 6012  
Binghamton, New York 13902  
Phone: (607) 777-2862  
Fax: (607) 777-4848  
E-mail: jyaples@binghamton.edu

## CALENDAR

Kathy Kobyljanec

[Please submit announcements for upcoming meetings, conferences, workshops, and other events of interest to your NASIG colleagues to Kathy Kobyljanec at [kkobyljanec@mirapoint.jcu.edu](mailto:kkobyljanec@mirapoint.jcu.edu).]

January 13, 2005  
*NASIG*  
Executive Board meeting  
Boston, Massachusetts

January 14, 2005  
*American Library Association*  
Midwinter Institute  
"Codified Innovations: Data Standards and Their Useful Applications"  
Sponsored by Association for Library Collections & Technical Services (ALCTS)  
Boston, Massachusetts  
<http://www.law.yale.edu/library/techserv/alcts/>

January 14-19, 2005  
*American Library Association*  
Midwinter Meeting  
Boston, Massachusetts  
<http://www.ala.org/ala/eventsandconferences/midwinter/2005/home.htm>

March 7-9, 2005  
*Public Library Association (PLA)*  
PLA 2005 Spring Symposium  
Chicago, Illinois  
<http://www.ala.org/ala/pla/plaevents/plaspringsymp/PLASpringSymposium.htm>

May 18, 2005  
*NASIG*  
Executive Board meeting  
Minneapolis, Minnesota

May 19-22, 2005  
*NASIG*  
20th Annual Conference  
Minneapolis, Minnesota  
<http://www.nasig.org/conference/2005.htm>

June 15-18, 2005  
*American Theological Library Association (ATLA)*  
ATLA Annual Conference  
Austin, Texas  
<http://www.atla.com/member/conference/confhome.html>

See also the *American Libraries* "Datebook."

## ***NASIG NEWSLETTER***

The *NASIG Newsletter* (ISSN: 1542-3417) is published 4 times per year for the members of the North American Serials Interest Group, Inc. Members of the Editorial Board of the *Newsletter* are:

Members of the *Newsletter* Editorial Board are:

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

Send all submissions/editorial comments to:

Charlene Simser  
Kansas State University  
137 Hale Library  
Manhattan, KS 66506-1200  
Phone: (785) 532-7444  
Fax: (785) 532-7644  
E-mail: csimser@lib.ksu.edu

Send all items for "Title Changes" to:

Susan Andrews  
Texas A&M University—Commerce  
Library  
P.O. Box 3011  
Commerce, TX 75429-3011  
Phone: (903) 886-5733  
Fax: (903) 886-5723  
E-mail: Susan\_Andrews@tamu-commerce.edu

Send all items for the Calendar to:

Kathy Kobyljanec, [kkobyljanec@mirapoint.jcu.edu](mailto:kkobyljanec@mirapoint.jcu.edu)

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

Elizabeth Parang  
Pepperdine University  
Payson Library  
Malibu, CA 90263  
Phone: (310) 506-4046  
Fax: (310) 506-4117  
Email: [elizabeth.parang@pepperdine.edu](mailto:elizabeth.parang@pepperdine.edu)

NASIG address:

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

### *NASIG NEWSLETTER COPYRIGHT STATEMENT*

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

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

**1 February 2005**

**NO LATE SUBMISSIONS WILL BE ACCEPTED**