

NASIG Board Meeting Minutes

September 13, 2022 | 1-2:30 pm

Meeting Link -

<https://iu.zoom.us/j/88156371343?pwd=RlRwQ3FXVXA5RlZBeHgyb1dGRkZqdz09>

Executive Board:

President: Dana Sinclair, 2022/23

Vice President/President-Elect: Courtney McAllister 2020/2022

Past President: Ted Westervelt, 2022

Treasurer: Shannon Keller, 2022/24

Members at Large:

Mary Ann Jones, 2020/23

Treasa Bane, 2021/24

Moon Kim, 2021/24

Sonali Sugrim, 2022/23

Ilda Cardenas, 2022/25

Xiaoyan Song, 2022/2025

Ex Officio

Steve Oberg, *Social Media & Marketing Coordinator*

(Post currently vacant) *(Newsletter Editor)*

Guests

Anna Creech

Sarah Dennis

Apologies

Willa Tavernier, Secretary

1. Welcome (*President Dana*)
2. Final Report - [Conference Evaluation Survey](#)

The Board noted that the conference evaluation reflects disappointment with the virtual piece. We need to decide whether we continue to do hybrid.

Discussion

Courtney pointed out that this may be a matter of disappointed expectations compared to a fully interactive experience like ER&L. Mary Ann pointed out that we set clear expectations early and make it clear that we cannot do a hybrid event and that we are not an ER&L or Charleston, and we should focus on putting out a final program earlier with confirmed vision speakers to drive attendance in person.

Anna suggested we rethink how we do the conference including how we handle the in person and virtual components, including different presentation styles across both. A recorded presentation is not the same as in person or giving a virtual presentation. We cannot replicate the elements of an in-person experience in the virtual space e.g. chatting while in line for food.

Shannon noted that because of financial commitments we need to boost in-person attendance in Pittsburgh.

The Board considered that diversity and inclusion matters, and we will exclude some persons if we do in person only. However, PPC needs to know now. Options are

- Onsite only
- Onsite with virtual component
- Hybrid

The Board also discussed having a virtual conference at a different time since we are not sure that hybrid will work for us this coming year. We can try to lower A/V costs.

- Not everyone needs to do a Powerpoint
- No mics in smaller rooms

Any secondary conference should be when PPC activity is at its lowest point. To do the 2022 conference presenters had a lot of work – recording before the conference, presenting at the conference, conference proceedings. We need to reduce the burden on presenters. Also, June/July acquisitions folks and collections managers have year-end priorities; so a virtual conference later in the year may attract more persons from acquisitions, and collection managers.

Questions arising from the discussion were:

- When do we hold the virtual?
- What form does the virtual take?
- How do we incentivize in person attendance at Pittsburgh?

Decision

The Board decided to hold another meeting before the October meeting specifically to decide on questions surrounding a virtual conference or virtual elements of the conference.

3. Pittsburgh conference

2023 Pittsburgh Conference Financial Planning

President Dana noted that we touched on this in the discussion above, but we do need feedback on the new conference program.

4. Feedback on new conference program

E&A (Tresa) – Tresa Bane provided feedback from E&A about the top ten workshops suggestions from the suggestion form. The first two MARC Edit and Serials Cataloging, along with the new RDA toolkit were suggested at least twice in the survey. So those are top priorities. Additional topics were streaming media, virtual space services, data, analytics, and DEI. There was only one specific speaker that was suggested or recommended. There was also suggestions of someone from PSI or the IP registry, and also someone seemed interested in someone from a consortium executive to discuss consortium priorities. In terms of rates of interest in session topics, number one being issues related to print serials, the second being vendor relations, the third preservation, the fourth cataloging and metadata, and the fifth institutional repositories.

PPC (Courtney & PPC Co-Chair, Sarah Dennis) - Courtney McAllister advised that PPC has been getting good feedback on the call for workshop suggestions um, and pursuing a couple of other opportunities that have been suggested by folks on the Board. So we're hoping to get some really good and enticing workshops they can use to draw people to the conference along with the vision speakers and help emphasize the value of onsite attendance. Having that clarification about how the in-person is happening with the virtual will give us direction that we need to make some other decisions in terms of the call.

Sarah echoed Courtney's information regarding the workshops and advised that PPC has also gotten good suggestions for vision speakers. She noted that PPC needs information on what payment and other benefits will be provided to workshop providers/speakers.

CEC (Courtney)

Courtney advised that she had not yet solicited feedback from CEC as she thinks it best for us to clarify the virtual component first, in particular whether the virtual component will go by way of the webinar stream. Once that is settled she will reach out to CEC for their input but she wanted to kind of know a little more clearly what could be expected of them before throwing it out there for consideration.

5. 2022 Presentations - Figshare (*Treasa*)

Treasa reported that the 2022 presentations were not uploaded to Figshare as we did not ask the presenters to do so, but focused on getting recordings for upload to YouTube. Communications would like direction on whether this should be done, not only for the 2022 presentations but as a general practice going forward.

Decision

The Board decided by consensus that presentations should be uploaded to Figshare each year unless and until a decision to change this practice is made.

6. Exit interviews - E&A (*Treasa*)

Treasa reported that E&A would be happy to put together a questionnaire but they don't think they are the right body to conduct the interviews. If this is during the time of the conference, or shortly after, they are really busy working with survey data for other things, so that might not work out very well for them. So the questions are when are these exit interviews and whether E&A is responsible for conducting the interviews.

Discussion

- E&A might not be the best body to do the survey especially with the post-conference responsibilities
- It may be possible to do the survey after the conference to find out if someone wants to talk about their experience or has feedback they want to offer. Then we could set aside some time during one of the board meetings in August for feedback about committee experience, and possibly have folks join us. In that case it would not be a specific committee's responsibility to interview people, but we could still get that feedback from people who want to share it, or if they see, you know, opportunities for improvement, or just had a really great experience, they want us to be aware of. So this would be an optional interactive component, maybe we could just handle that as people want to offer it.

Decision

E&A should add a question to the post-conference survey for committee members to indicate whether they would be interested in sharing feedback on their committee service with the Board.

7. Comments from OIC - see Secretary's Report 2022-23

Discussion

- There is currently no OIC chair
- The Committee was formed for a specific purpose and the people who

were drawn to that initiative came together for that specific purpose. There was real anxiety amongst the group about whether they had the expertise for to transition that focus to other open initiatives, and they didn't seem that comfortable with some of the stretch goals.

- It may be that OIC just needs to be disbanded
- We can reconstitute another committee if a specific initiative is needed
- E&I may be able to take on some work on other open initiatives that may intersect with equity and inclusion goals e.g. openness, transparency, accessibility, social justice
- If the members have other interests they can be integrated into other committees

Decision

OIC would be disbanded. VP Courtney will send them letters thanking them for their service and will co-ordinate with Moon Kim (OIC liaison) to integrate any interested members into other committees.

8. Members' Forum - Scheduled for Sept 23rd 12pm Eastern

There were no outstanding tasks or questions and the Board decided that a reminder should be sent.

9. Treasurer's report

- a. [September 13, 2022](#) Shannon Keller advised that-
- Courtney is set up with access to the financial accounts and can pay any outstanding items while Shannon proceeds on her maternity leave.
 - Credit card - The current offerings from Chase require that there is a personal guarantor of basics credit card is currently still. Beverly Geckle, who was treasurer four treasurers ago, and is gracious, and is an active member of Nasig is still super helpful. She signs things, and we need her to sign things, et cetera. The ideal situation is that basic would transition to a credit card that does not require a personal guarantor. And from the research that I have done, we basically have two options that do not require us also changing from Chase Bank as the financial institution that has our checkings, savings, and investments. Because I think doing all of that is probably too much in one go like that.
 - Other options are the US Bank Community card, and then any of the small business credit cards from Bank of America are also, you know, good options. For essentially what would be an organizational credit card that does not require a personal guarantor.

Discussion

The Board discussed the pros and cons of transitioning to another type of credit card such as losing points which are used for gift cards for members for various reasons, and weighed this against the fact that Chase requires a personal guarantee from a Board member

Motion

Shannon proposed a motion that NASIG switch credit cards from Chase credit card to a credit card that does not require a personal guarantor. Mary Ann Jones seconded the motion.

Further discussion

Mary Ann Jones suggested that Shannon look at the fees that are involved in each of the alternative options for credit cards and choose the one that has the least expensive fees.

Decision

The vote passed unanimously.

10. [Secretary's Report](#)

- a. Committee Chairs Orientation: this item was noted by the Board
- b. Member's Forum: this item was already dealt with at this meeting
- c. Defining a Strategic Affiliate Program: this item was tabled
- d. Chairs for OIC & E&I not yet identified: The Board previously decided to disband OIC and will continue to work on finding a chair for E&I.

11. Other business

Sonali Sugrim reported that the Nominations & Elections Committee have asked if NASIG has a Survey Monkey Account. Courtney advised that NASIG does and she would liaise with Sonali after the meeting about this.

President Dana ended the meeting at 2:33 pm