

NASIG Fall Board Meeting
October 19, 2021
Baltimore Marriott Waterfront Hotel

Meeting room: James Room, 4th Floor

Executive Board:

Ted Westervelt, *President*

Dana Sinclair, *Vice President/President-Elect*

Betsy Appleton, *Past President*

Willa Tavernier, *Secretary*

Cris Ferguson, *Treasurer*

Shannon Keller, *Treasurer-in-Training*

Members at Large:

Keondra Bailey

Treasa Bane

Katy DiVittorio

Mary Ann Jones

Moon Kim

Courtney McAllister

Anu Moorthy, *Ex Officio (Social Media & Marketing Coordinator)*

Guests:

(PPC Co-Chair) Sarah Dennis, (PPC Co-Chair) Heidi Card, (Anna Creech (Conference Coordinator), (CPC Co-Chair) Jacqueline Brellenthin, (CPC Co-Chair) Maria Aghazarian, Steve Oberg (Morning session), *Ex Officio (Social Media & Marketing Coordinator-in-Training)*

Apologies

Angela Dresselhaus, *Ex Officio (Newsletter Editor)*

1.0 Welcome & Introductions: The meeting was called to order at 9:03 am by President Ted Westervelt, followed by introductions by each attendee. Ted advised the meeting that Newsletter Committee Chair Angela Dresselhaus is stepping back as Newsletter Editor, and Communications has been made aware. CPC and PPC should work with Communications in the interim for any material that needs to be made publicly available.

2.0 CPC report (Brellenthin, Aghazarian); PPC report (Card & Dennis)

- 2.1 Conference theme & logo: In response to the CPC query about a conference theme, Westervelt & Jones advised that the conference theme had been dispensed with as it was too limiting and often forced proposers to shoehorn their presentation to fit a particular theme.
- 2.2 Conference planning progress: Efforts are being made to keep the food budget as close to the minimum number of attendees as possible. CPC is still waiting for confirmation of vision speakers and is currently investigating vendor sponsorship e.g. for lunch and lanyards (lanyards are quite expensive). It is expected that most presenters will be in person and CPC will need volunteers from other committees to assist with the virtual conference element e.g. monitoring Discord for Q&A. The Posterboard vendor will deliver, set up, and breakdown the boards.
 - 2.2.1 A discussion followed regarding how to implement contact tracing at the in-person conference. The state of Maryland has a COVID App that we can leverage. In addition concerns were expressed about room limits, spacing seating, vaccination requirements, and requirements for masking over buffet line. There was general consensus that standard messaging is required as well as having volunteers in place to respectively remind persons of room limits, as well as signs on the doors that the session is at maximum capacity. This messaging will need to start early in the conference marketing process. While it would not be workable for PPC to have a program ready at registration so that persons can choose sessions at

registration, there can be messaging that this will be in place. Sched allows for limits to be placed on the number of attendees per session. We can also consider adding this to the Code of Conduct.

2.2.2 Concerns were raised about the conference experience if people were 'locked out' of sessions having met their maximum, however, the pre-recorded virtual sessions will be streamed at the same time as the in-person session so this will be an option for attendees to switch to.

2.2.3 With regard to the minimum requirements for in-person attendees/food, concerns were raised about whether institutions will provide funding for in-person conferences. There was a general feeling that most institutions have reinstated this. In addition, Ted Westervelt noted that the anticipated rollout of vaccines for younger children should mean a more stable situation by summer 2022. Anna Creech advised that even if that minimum is not met, we are too far along in the timeline to be able to cancel without penalty, and it would still be more cost-effective to have the in-person conference even if the minimum is not met because the cancellation fee is so prohibitive.

2.3 Program planning progress: Weekly meetings have been established with the Chair and the Board liaison. The Committee is currently working on editing the call for proposals and figuring out what the proposal deadline will be - possibly Dec 15, 2021 . They are also revising speaker resources and testing out Proposal Space. PPC has also established early communication with CPC. PPC sub-committees are currently setting up how work will be divided, blocking out the schedule, and preparing a draft with the rooms and occupancy, prioritizing larger rooms.

2.4 Vision speaker update: Amelia Gibson is unavailable but Sarah Lamdan has confirmed. A request was also sent to Sofia Leung. Moon noted that E&I has a panel every year and therefore we need to look at compensation as well as the issue of unpaid labor. Last year they received free registration and an honorarium, but it is more expensive to attend in person. The general consensus was that E&I panel speakers should be compensated the same as Vision speakers i.e. \$1000 for

the panel. Given that the compensation & reimbursement policy states that NASIG members are not compensated for speaking, there is an issue of whether as NASIG members the panelists would have already been at the conference. Conversely, NASIG has been trying to incentivize attendance by persons who normally would not attend, and for vision speakers, all expenses are covered although the honorarium is split. Anna noted that vision speakers use our free room i.e. 1 room for every 50 rooms booked.

Motion - Mary Ann Jones moved that for NASIG 2022 there be 2 vision sessions 1 individual session, and 1-panel session by E&I with 3 speakers and that NASIG covers the honorarium (which will be per session), travel, hotel, and meals for the speakers. Dana Sinclair seconded the motion.

Further discussion on the motion concerned when E&I will need to notify PPC of who the speakers will be, and Sarah indicated that this should be done by January.

Vote - There were 11 votes in favor, and none opposed. One member had to briefly step away from the meeting and was not present for the vote.

- 2.5 Registration fee for the virtual conference - PPC thinks it is important to offer a discount for the virtual conference. We agreed on registration rates but did not specifically include a virtual rate. In 2020 which was virtual the rate was \$40 for members and \$100 for non-members, and a group rate of \$350.00 which provided access for an unlimited number of persons. The Charleston Conference, by comparison, limits group registration to access for 5 persons. Now that we are in person it is not clear whether those numbers are still appropriate. The in-person registration rates are set out in the July minutes and are

Early Bird

Full Conference Registration – Members \$435

Full Conference Registration – Non-members \$550

Full Conference Registration – Support Staff \$150

Full Conference Registration – Students \$100

Late

Full Conference Registration – Members \$485

Full Conference Registration – Non-members \$600

Full Conference Registration – Support Staff \$250

Full Conference Registration – Students Now \$150

On-site

On-site Full Conference Registration – Members \$510

On-site Full Conference Registration – Non-members \$625

1-Day Registration

1-Day Conference Registration – Member & Non-member \$250

1-Day Conference Registration – Students & Support Staff \$150

Preconferences

1/2-Day – Member & Non-member \$100

1-Day – Member & Non-member \$200

2022 Registration Discounts

Vision Speakers receive free registration.

Program Speakers will receive a \$100 discount on the in-person conference rate of their choice

NASIG Conference Staff (CPC committee members and conference staff receive half-off the conference rate of their choice).

2022 NASIG Membership Rates

US Tier 1 Members (salary range up to \$50,000) - \$75 USD

US Tier 2 Members (salary range \$50,000 or above) - \$100 USD

Mexico Members - \$18 USD

Canada Members - \$60 USD

Retired Members - \$50 USD

Student Members - Free

Lifetime Members - \$1000 USD (one time; Canadian and Mexican members should contact the NASIG Treasurer for the current exchange rate)

Organizational (Bulk Membership) Members - \$195

The organizational membership includes three individual memberships.

Action item - CPC/PPC should consider what rate should be charged for the virtual conference and send a proposal to the November board meeting.

The CPC and PPC Chairs were excused from the remainder of the meeting. Anna Creech, Conference Coordinator was excused, to rejoin the meeting for discussion of item 9 - Logistics of hybrid conference planning.

3.0 Strategic plan

3.1 Betsy Appleton reported that the Task Force had its first meeting the previous week and established a timeline for the next 8-10 months

3.1.1 November - make a list of strategic directions

3.1.2 December - Survey the membership about the list, specifically seeking suggestions for any areas that ought to be added

3.1.3 Jan/Feb - Work on survey results, prepare the initial draft of the strategic plan, and send it to NASIG Committees for feedback.

3.1.4 April - finalize the draft

3.1.5 May - webinar to publicize the draft

3.1.6 June - NASIG member vote at the membership meeting

Willa suggested that preserving and building on the NASIG sense of community should be included in the strategic directions. There were no questions.

4.0 [OIC Report on the future of NASIG Proceedings](#)

- 4.1 The biggest concern is how to recoup the \$15,000 earned annually from Taylor & Francis. The frontrunner for migrating the Proceedings to is Michigan Publishing which provides a similar level of editorial services to Taylor & Francis. Michigan's monograph publishing model means that there would be no dois for the individual presentations. Clemson can publish the proceedings as a journal but they are currently using BePress for this and there is some concern about what happens if they move away from BePress.
- 4.2 In discussion, Shannon noted that Michigan also has the option to publish as a journal. Issues raised included whether Michigan's doi issue is just that they do not have a contract with a doi vendor and whether that might be supported by another institution, or whether it is structural i.e. all chapters would be available at a single URL so that a doi cannot be specifically applied. Given that a) NASIG as a standard-setting organization that issues best practices for Electronic Resources Librarians and Scholarly Communication Librarians, b) the need to support the scholarly ecosystem, and c) the way that dois enable citation tracking and the scholarly semantic web, the doi issues is a redline. The Board discussed the Michigan journal option and the overall costs for PDF and XML.
- 4.3 With regard to Clemson, NASIG has a prior relationship with them and Clemson is likely to support the migration of content from BePress to any new platform they adopt. and Betsy noted that we need to sign a contract before January. The contract is negotiated by the President who can take it to the Board.

Action item - Ted will put OIC in communication with the Proceedings Editor, and PPC folks to ensure that they are on board with the transition.

Motion - Shannon Keller moved that NASIG proceed with the Michigan Publishing Journal platform contingent upon answering our final questions, for the 2021 Proceedings. Mary Ann Jones seconded.

Vote - There were 12 votes in favor, 0 abstentions, 0 opposed.

5.0 Treasurer's report

- 5.1 Cris Ferguson reported that
 - 5.1.1 Newly issued NASIG credit cards will be sent out as soon as they are received.
 - 5.1.2 NASIG financial documents are currently sitting in 4 GOBI boxes sent to Cris, and she is working on a retention strategy for digitization and disposal with a view to having this ready in time for handover to Shannon.
 - 5.1.3 There needs to be a separate Treasurer Gmail or other email account that can be directly accessed by the Treasurer and Treasurer in training.
 - 5.1.4 A FedEx account has been set up for direct billing to NASIG, and it is available for use by anyone needing to send conference material.
 - 5.1.5 The investment accounts have recovered the \$25,000 withdrawn in January to pay the cancellation fee for the 2021 conference.
 - 5.1.6 Plaques have been ordered from Brandon's.
 - 5.1.7 For each outgoing committee chair, donations to C4Disc have been made in their name.
 - 5.1.8 NISO renewal is coming up shortly. NISO provided a 50% discount on NASIG's membership fee last year, in return for naming NISO a conference sponsor. However, this was a 1 time deal during the pandemic.
- 5.2 Discussion on a solution for the Treasurer email account included GSuite for non-profits and Dropbox. Although the Proceedings Committee already has a dropbox account, there would be an issue of permissions/access to Board documents, but there are preservation and privacy concerns on the Google side, and we have to ensure that NASIG retention policies will also line up with whatever solution is chosen. Mary Ann Jones advised that Lisa Varicella has the last box from the 2019 conference.
- 5.3 The Board also discussed taxes, which are due to be filed by mid-November. There is currently no accounting software being used because the crosswalk between Quickbooks and Wild Apricot did not work. The raw data - account statements, etc. have been sent to the tax accountants who will indicate if they need additional documents.

Action item: Willa and Shannon should coordinate to determine how best to store and access NASIG records and email accounts.

6.0 Fiscal sustainability

6.1 Nicole Ameduri advised that we currently have 4 conference sponsors, 2 of whom have increased their sponsorship tiers - Bloomsbury to Tier 1 and Brill to Tier 2 - the other sponsors are AIG and Springer-Nature. We are ahead of where we were this time last year but it would be good to have NASIG masks and lanyards for promotional purposes during fundraising efforts.

Action item - Cris Ferguson to advise on who does NASIG swag like lanyards etc.

6.2 Ted noted that our fiscal priorities are to 1) break even for the conference, b) increase membership, c) increase sponsorship, and d) target growth for investment funds e.g. 10%. He then opened the floor for discussion of the pain points for fiscal sustainability. The discussion started with considering the \$15,000 that NASIG will lose in transitioning the Proceedings to Open Access, and whether growth in investment income will offset this. The original intention was to retain an amount equal to the expenses of 2 conferences in the investment account. It is not currently at that level but this can be one goal - each conference costs approximately \$200,000. With the intention to eventually switch to cycles of in-person and online, even a bad year may not be catastrophic - we can very conservatively make a modest profit e.g.5% in a virtual year to offset losses of an in-person conference year. The discussion also concerned getting a one-time consultant to give us strategic advice and setting up a Financial Sustainability task force to carry out what we need to do. We also need better marketing around the competencies that NASIG publishes.

6.3 Another item of discussion was how to increase conference attendance. While we don't have to become ACRL, in our best years we have had 500-700 attendees, but there is more competition as there is now the ER&L conference. Location is a key consideration and cheap but fun cities are our best bet while ensuring these cities are comfortable for potential attendees from marginalized groups. Content is

also key and we should aim for content that is useful for attendees' professional practice. For 2021 we dispensed with the pre-conferences which were specifically geared toward that.

- 6.4 Location also affects sponsorship, as learned from the planned Spokane conference when Spokane turned into a Covid hotspot. Moon noted that there are certain locations that the state of California will not provide sponsorship to attend conferences because of discriminatory laws. Ted cited North Carolina as an example of a city with a strong library tradition but problematic laws, and this is one prohibited location.
- 6.5 The discussion then turned to how to identify a good city that meets our requirements where we can have the conferences regularly, which should bring down costs if we re-use the same location, and is also easier on CPC. At present NASIG has more leeway since we are not working so many years in advance. Mary Ann noted that a previous board identified three locations - Wisconsin (which is now out), Pittsburgh, and Spokane, however some of the membership survey results indicated that one of the things people like, is the opportunity to travel to different cities. Additional suggestions included having a roster of cities but then a 'wild-card' year for a new city and choosing cities with LIS schools. Keondra noted that for Baltimore 2022 we should reach out to the UMD College Park library school. Another suggestion was a more robust LIS ambassador program, perhaps having students as the NASIG ambassadors, and building relationships with library school student organizations. There have been many calls for NASIG Ambassadors and Keondra advised that a couple of spots have been filled. This is something that Mentoring & Student Outreach as well as the Strategic Planning Task Force can consider.

Action item - Mary Ann will ask CPC to contact the UMD College Park library school with a view to encouraging student participation in NASIG 2022 in Baltimore.

Action item - Betsy will put Mentoring & Student outreach and the Strategic Planning Task Force in touch with each other on outreach to library school student organizations and developing student NASIG ambassadors.

7.0 **Sponsorship for free E&I webinars** (3 annually) - discussion on this item was tabled to be dealt with as part of the Secretary's report.

The morning Session ended at noon.

The afternoon session began at 1:15 pm

8.0 **Committee goals & updates**

8.1 The Communications Committee update was given by Treasa Bane

8.1.1 Using Figshare for the 2022 conference

8.1.1.1 By general consensus, the Board agreed that it would be fine to categorize conference dates on Figshare.

8.1.2 Simplelists:

Many individuals report not receiving emails from the list. The biggest problem is not having the right email address, especially with job changes, and people did not confirm their email for Simplelists. However, there was an issue with the SERIALST list and Simplelists not remembering that we had merged. Treasa's name is associated with our DNS records at hover.com but we need to talk about where things should be stored e.g. Treasa has personal notes about the DNS record process, but it would be useful to have a dedicated person on the Communications Committee, especially if we ever transition away from Simplelists.

Action item: Shannon & Willa to consider where to store DNS information in their planning for storage of NASIG documentation.

8.1.3 Should SERIALST also abide by NASIG's rule to not post jobs unless a salary is listed?

8.1.3.1 A salary listing is required by NASIG to post on the jobs blog, but SERIALST just accepts posts. Many are job ads and some don't

have a salary. To review and moderate posts and request a salary when missing will be more work for the list moderators, and we have to look at the return on investment as moderating may not be the best use of volunteer time. We should pilot and revisit at the conference. Anu noted that right now the moderators are checking each message. Further discussion considered whether to redirect all job postings to the NASIG jobs board or to use a moderation process but develop standard language to send out when job ads do not contain a salary. Mary Ann advised that there are many persons on SERIALST who are not NASIG members because SERIALST was not always managed by NASIG and reaches a much wider audience. Prohibiting job ads on SERIALST would mean depriving library hiring staff of that wider audience, at a time when libraries are already having difficulties finding candidates.

8.1.3.2 By general consensus, the Board agreed that SERIALST should abide by the NASIG rule not to post jobs unless a salary is listed, and the moderators should develop standard language to send to persons submitting job ads without a salary.

8.2 The Evaluation and Assessment Committee update was delivered by Treasa Bane

8.2.1 The committee completed the survey for OIC, and asked for the Board's feedback on resending the survey because of poor response numbers.

8.2.1.1 By general consensus, the Board agreed that it is not necessary to send this out again since OIC has submitted a recommendation which the Board has voted on.

8.2.2 The Committee requested a copy of the conference report, and asked whether this will be printed in the Newsletter.

- **Action item:** Willa should review previous agendas to find the conference report and identify the Board version and web version, and send this to the Communications Committee.

8.2.3 A self-evaluation survey for committees is mentioned in the E&A manual but it is not clear when it is required to be done.

8.2.3.1 Mary Ann Jones and Katy DiVittorio provided background on this survey. It was created by specific request of the NASIG Board and was intended for Committee members to give feedback to the Board.

8.2.3.2 Further discussion involved whether this could be helpful in a strategic planning year. However, given that committees are communicating with liaisons and already have much to do, by general consensus it was agreed that this self-evaluation survey should be shelved.

8.2.3.3 Another issue that was brought up in the course of the discussion was that many of the committee manuals are out of date or unwieldy. Working Calendars are also problematic. These manuals should be brought up to date before the end of the NASIG year, for handover to new Committee Chairs. There is also no central space for accessing committee manuals.

Action item: Liaisons to ask Committee chairs to update manuals before the end of the NASIG year.

Action item: Willa and Shannon to consider where to store committee manuals as part of establishing recommendations for storage of NASIG documentation.

Action item Willa to audit committee chairs requesting links to manuals.

8.3. The Proceedings Committee update was given by Dana Sinclair.

8.3.1 Editing is in process and on schedule. Dana is working on the final article which will be delivered by the deadline.

8.4 Nominations and Elections update was given by Katy DiVittorio.

8.4.1 The [call](#) for candidates went out 9/27/21 and will close 11/12/21. There are 3 open positions 2 of which are for members-at-large.

8.5 Digital Preservation Committee update was given by Katy DiVittorio.

8.5.1 A Model Preservation Policy for Digital Publishers & Preservers webinar took place 9/16/21.

8.5.2 A working group developed a [model digital preservation policy](#) which is now out for [community consultation](#). The deadline for responses is 30 November 2021. The Working Group will reconvene in December 2021 to produce a final document to launch at NASIG 2022.

8.6 The Awards & Recognition update was given by Moon Kim.

8.6.1 The Committee is updating the various application pages and will decide this month about the Mexican Student award and the Tuttle award. The Committee is using its Manual and Working Calendar.

8.7 The Mentoring and Student Outreach update was given by Betsy Appleton

8.7.1 There are still vacancies for LIS Ambassadors

8.7.1.1 This was discussed as part of Fiscal Sustainability and should be coordinated with the Strategic Planning Task Force.

8.7.2 NASIG is now live on Skilltype, a platform developed by Tony Zander. Betsy currently has access and is giving access to CEC chairs and NASIG Board members.

8.7.2.1 Courtney added that Skilltype is a platform for professional development and skill acquisition. NASIG is trialing the platform to host its content and to access professional development for its members.

8.8 Keondra Bailey (liaison to Bylaws Committee and Standards Committee) queried when budget requests and Fall reports are due. Willa advised that these are usually submitted for October 1 at the Fall Board meeting but she did not remind chairs and proposed in the Secretary's Report linked below that they should be submitted by November 1. By general consensus, the Board agreed that this would be too short notice and that liaisons should ask committees to submit these by November 15. Keondra also inquired where to send items that are usually sent to the Newsletter Committee since that

committee is on hiatus, and Ted Westervelt advised that anything for public dissemination should be sent to the Communications Committee.

Action item: Liaisons to ask committee chairs to submit budget requests and Fall reports by November 15.

9.0 Logistics of future hybrid conference planning.

Anna Creech rejoined the meeting for this discussion.

9.1 Anna advised that the 2023 conference is planned for Pittsburgh from May 21-25, 2023; and the 2024 conference is planned for Spokane, with dates to be determined.

9.2 The first issue discussed was whether all in-person conferences would have a hybrid element. Suggestions and observations included:

- LPC's virtual conferences have been afternoon only.
- We can consider reserving 2 morning sessions for in-person pre-conferences only, with hybrid concurrent sessions in the afternoon. The 4-hour pre-conferences have never made money. We pay the facilitators, or where they cannot accept compensation, pay for their airfare. The website currently states:

“**Pre-conference Speakers:** Half-day pre-conference speakers will receive \$500 to spend on travel and lodging, and speakers must divide this up amongst themselves. Half-day speakers will receive the discounted speaker registration rate for up to three speakers. Full-day pre-conference speakers will receive \$750 for one speaker and \$1,000 for two speakers to spend on travel and lodging, and speakers must divide this up amongst themselves. Full-day pre-conference speakers will receive the discounted speaker registration rate for up to three speakers.”

- For individuals not attending morning pre-conferences, mornings can be devoted to organizational activities such as interest group meetings, Poster sessions, and the Vendor Expo, time for networking and meetings, etc. The usual structure of the conference is 5 ½ days. If we remove 2 mornings to assign to in-person

workshops we need to schedule the remaining 3 1/2 days carefully. It is crucial to provide sufficient concurrent sessions for the in-person attendees, and if the final day is extended the discounted room rate will not apply. The cut-off date for changes to the room block is November 20, 2021. Any changes that we make must be sustainable for future boards.

- Less concurrent sessions can be offset by the morning workshops which will provide more practical learning opportunities. This can also translate into a cheaper cost for producing Proceedings as there will be fewer articles, unless we increase virtual-only sessions.
- While the final morning session has always seen low attendance, depending on the location this will vary e.g. Spokane because of flight times from the West Coast we may see more attendance here.
- Making the pre-conferences part of the conference, without additional registration costs or having to spend an additional hotel night would make them more accessible. However, we need to have sufficient sessions for attendees as these practical sessions work best with limited numbers (in the past these have been capped at 30). We can't risk attendees being unable to attend sessions because of capacity limitations especially if we will not have concurrent sessions running alongside these. In 2019 we had 30 concurrent sessions. Pre-conference sessions that have been popular in the past are a) MARC editing; b) Scholarly communication (we can have several sessions as a wide range of topics fall here); c) Licensing & negotiation; c) Inclusive hiring practices. We can ask facilitators what capacity is ideal for each workshop. If this format works we can look at increasing the registration fee by a modest amount of \$10/\$15 in the future to cover compensation to facilitators.
- The reduction in concurrent sessions will not be drastic as traditionally there has only been 1 block of concurrent sessions in the mornings.
- We also have to look at what capacity the venue has in determining the number of workshops. In Pittsburgh we have the ballroom and 5 smaller rooms; In Spokane, we have 8 rooms.

- We need to determine what the value proposition will be e.g. NASIG is the premier conference to attend for in-depth professional development, dedicated time for networking and interest groups, and making meaningful connections between vendors and attendees, with a full hybrid experience for afternoon concurrent sessions.
- It is important to have a cohesive hybrid experience. The virtual and in-person components should complement each other and not just duplicate content. CNI in December 2021 aims to do that. We will definitely need to revisit how we run the hybrid sessions post-Baltimore because of prohibitive A/V costs, however, it is hoped that the technology will catch up. In the future, we expect to alternate virtual and in-person conference years. We have had some success with virtual only in 2020 and 2021. However, we should re-assess this post-Baltimore and determine what type of conference the 2025 conference will be. This should also be considered by the Strategic Planning Task Force.
- We also need to consider where vision sessions will fit, and have all these changes documented for PPC and CPC.
- Finally, whatever we decide we will need to market these changes strategically, and heavily.

Action item - Shannon will map out a proposal incorporating the matters discussed comparing it to the 2019 conference.

10.0 **The [Secretary's Report](#)** was given by Willa Tavernier

10.1 Sufficient votes were received to approve the September [Minutes](#).

10.2 Reminders for budget requests and Mid-year reports did not go out. Liaisons should ask committee chairs to submit budget requests and Mid-year reports by November 15th, as the suggested deadline of November 1 is too close.

10.3 Action items update:

10.3.1 What will be the [Next steps on fundraising for E&I Committee complimentary webinars?](#)

10.3.1.1 In discussion, the Board members noted the need to ensure that this is not confused with sponsorship for the Conference. We

can look for specific sponsors among vendors who have a history or current focus on EDI, or who are currently promoting EDI collections. Libraries may also want to sponsor because many are having difficulty recruiting diverse candidates.

Action item: Ted will ask Nicole to find 3 sponsors who are investing in the E&I market and will cc Moon on correspondence.

- 10.3.2 Clean up of [Trello Board](#) and decision on whether we will use this for action items. The Board reviewed the [Trello Analysis](#) and selected items for retention, and advised that the method of tracking action items should be decided by the Secretary. Willa Tavernier advised that she would create a spreadsheet in Google drive for tracking action items since this is where most documentation is currently kept, and would shift the Trello items to a spreadsheet.

11.0 Parking lot issues & Any other Business

- 11.1 The A&R and LPC cross-pollinator idea refers to the arrangement where each organization provides free registration for a delegate from the organization to its annual conference. Currently, NASIG and UKSG do this by jointly sponsoring the Merriman award. This was easy to offer for our all virtual conferences but should be discussed further.
- 11.2 Mary Ann Jones has been following up with Joe Varicella on the final NASIG logo packages, and for his invoice, and she will reach out to him again.
- 11.3 Cris Ferguson reported that the Amazon Smile account has not earned much. Shannon offered to investigate how we can market this better. For our investment accounts, all our dividends are reinvested in the same accounts. However, funds are easily accessible on simple email instructions to the investment managers to transfer the funds to the NASIG checking account, and all procedures will be noted prior to handover to Shannon.

- 12.0 The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm.