

ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE LIBERAL STUDIES PROGRAMS

**Spring Board Meeting
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma**

March 24 and 25, 2006

Minutes

Meeting called to order by Donna Zapf, president, at 3:25 pm, March 24, 2006.

Present: Donna Zapf, president, Linda Paulson, vice-president, James Pappas, secretary/treasurer, David Gitomer, Melissa Hilbish, Kristine Rabberman, David Rankin, Mary Rockcastle, Jerry Jerman, R. Barry Levis.

- 1. Agenda was present and approved with amendments.**
- 2. Minutes from the fall 2005 board meeting were presented and approved.**
- 3. Minutes from the fall 2005 business meeting were presented and will be submitted to the full membership at the business meeting in October 2006.**
- 4. Awards**
 - a. The National Faculty Award criteria were reviewed. They will be sent out to the membership along with the call for nominations.
 - b. The Outstanding Contribution Award criteria needs to be formalized and documented.
 - c. The 2006 awards committee comprises Kris Rabberman, Sandra Lubarsky, and Michael Fellman.
- 5. Online Programs**
 - a. The board noted and discussed the increasing number of programs offering online options and implementing other media-enhanced pedagogy (e.g., email, Blackboard), and that it needs to be addressed at the 2006 conference.

Donna Zapf reconvened the meeting at 9 am, March 25, 2006.

- 6. President's Report**
 - a. Donna reported she had little new to report.
- 7. Budget**
 - a. 2005 Budget
Donna reported on the situation from the 2005 conference: a \$12,000 hotel rebate to compensate us for the problems with the banquet. She reported that we will cover our budgeted conference costs.
 - b. 2006 Budget
The board reviewed adjustments to the budget with the dues increase. Full and

Associate membership dues will be \$250. Mary Rockcastle moved to approve the budget and Kris Rabberman seconded that motion. It was agreed that Dick Wertime's move for an increase in full and associate membership fees was of great service to the organization. David Gitomer raised a concern to ensure that retirees would be able to receive the journal and still participate in the conferences if they wished stay involved. The potential fee of \$40 was considered but remained unresolved and will be an item for future discussion.

b. Journal

Jerry Jerman reported on the budget for the journal. There was considerable discussion about continuing to seek journal sponsorships from additional institutions. This will be a high priority activity for the new journal.

8. Membership Survey

- a. Melissa Hilbish indicated that she did not get many responses from the board to the draft survey. Board members suggested the survey should be shortened, there should be a clearer focus on what we are trying to achieve; a series of "little surveys" offered online to specific members may allow for easier gathering of data. At the same time, it was decided that we should always follow up with a paper survey.
- b. The group discussed the use of the survey: for "institutional alignment" and being an effective benchmark for dealing with central administration regarding salaries, resources, organization, etc. It was noted that the results could be sent out in a newsletter format in the spring and this would encourage people to return their surveys the following fall. The question was raised as to who would have access to this data and how would it be used.
- c. Jim suggested that if this is going to be an ongoing program we may want to consider some sort of institutional stipend for whoever collects the information and creates publications to organize and disseminate it.
- d. Melissa indicated that she and her committee would continue working on the survey and would send it to the board soon. Donna indicated that she would work with Melissa, Kris, and Cecilia to see if Ellen could be helpful in this activity.

9. Committees

- a. Donna indicated that she and Ellen will draft committee chair descriptions that will include responsibilities, procedures for working with the national office, and timelines for actions and deadlines. They will also be developing "best practices for the board" that would be useful for new board members as they looked at the calendar year, at awards, job descriptions, etc. She felt it was important to draft responsibility statements so that committee members knew what responsibilities they had to both the board and their committees.
- b. Linda and Donna discussed the **nominations committee** and reported that Donna, Jim, David G. and Mary would be going off the board. Linda and Melissa are on the nominations committee. Donna reported that it is typical that there be a solicitation for nominations for both Vice President/President-Elect and Secretary/Treasurer. The nominations committee will report back to the conference with a slate for new officers and board members.
- c. Kris agreed to chair the **awards committee** that will include Michael Feldman,

- Natalie Cole, and Sandra Lubarsky. There also was a discussion on the “Fellow” status versus the “Outstanding Award.” Previously, past presidents have become fellows and it has been a recognition of an outstanding contribution. There was some discussion as to what fellow meant and some concern about whether fellow is really a more general recognition or if it should be a specialized category. Several people indicated that Phyllis O’Callaghan should be the recipient for the Outstanding Professional Award and Kris will think about how to develop a “showcase” for the kind of work that she has done for the association. Kris will also be working on the criteria for the two awards to ensure they are differentiated.
- d. David Gitomer reported on the **membership** activities. He has transitioned many of his activities with the contacts, membership survey and solicitation for unpaid dues to Ellen who will be carrying on that activity as part of her staff duties. Collections seem to be going well. He suggested that the board should review the constitution and clarify the description and responsibilities of the various membership categories. There were several questions regarding Article IV on membership including the meaning of “good standing” and whether institutions should have the responsibility of attending meetings or having a representative present at the business meeting. It was felt that the board should particularly look at current practice and develop new language for the membership categories for the constitution. Donna asked David to develop a better document to review for the October meeting. It was felt this could be discussed via email.
- David G. raised a concern that many members leave the conference before the business meeting and that their attendance is important. Since many decisions are made by the membership as a whole, participating in the business meeting is critical.
 - There is concern about the constitution and the need for a number of changes. David, Jim and Donna will be work on it. It was noted that they could call on Phyllis O’Callaghan, and her association “memory,” to clarify the history if necessary.
- e. David Rankin indicated that there is some concern with the timing and guidelines for the **annual conference**. While he felt that we should not be too prescriptive, it is critical to have balanced budgets and a key way of doing things, e.g., how to approach hotel contracts. He noted that the session moderators need to do a better job in controlling the time. The group discussed the need to increase attendance by reaching out to member institutions and have them become more active in soliciting attendance. In response to the problem of limited funds, Jim suggested that the AGLSP may be able to assist programs, such as a letter from the AGLSP President to institutions’ presidents/deans/ chairs complimenting the institutional member for the good work that is being done in the field; or, complimenting him/her on a paper or presentation, etc. The intent would be for the association to make the unit visible to the campus university leader.

10. 2005 Conference

Mary Rockcastle reported that it took a great deal of work to finalize the financial settlement and that Connie Hessburg of University of MN did an excellent job. There was some concern that featured speaker Matthew Fox, even though popular with some people, was a

controversial figure and that his presentation was somewhat non-substantive. It was noted that we should be cautious with the fees paid to outside speakers in future conferences.

11. 2007 Conference

- a. Future conferences were discussed and the feeling was that perhaps Simon Fraser University would volunteer to hold the 2007 conference in Vancouver. Then perhaps David Arant could be contacted to see if Memphis would be a possibility. Ellen Levine will prepare a list of other 2007 conferences; New Orleans was thought to be a very good option. Jim indicated that because of a program they have in New Orleans, that if no institution were available, he might consider working with the board on that conference.
- b. The question of where to have the summer meetings came up. The feeling was that the summer meeting was very useful, though it clearly required some additional expense on the part of the organization. This is an issue to be discussed in the future.

12. Conference Workshop

- a. The conference workshop was discussed as a separate institute or a pre-conference. The workshop was thought to be something that was value-added for participants and, while we had many repeat attendees, it seemed to be useful for the group last year. David G. noted that the conference topic should be central and important to all programs but that we needed a new approach to the workshop so it would not be perceived as a repeat of the previous year. There was some discussion whether the beginning day -- which has in the past been called the pre-conference -- has enough substance to bring people in for the full day. Dave R. felt that people who were new to administering programs, who needed guidance or were even exploring establishing such programs could find the “nuts and bolts” helpful for them. One option is to ask questions in advance and then group people by their interests.
- b. There was considerable discussion as to the topics, formatting, setting and structure of the workshop.

13. The Journal of Graduate Liberal Studies

- a. Mary Rockcastle and Jerry Jerman reported that they were working on the infrastructure of the journal. The cost is anticipated to be between \$5,000-\$5,500 per issue. It was suggested that a greater quantity could be printed for a marginally lower cost allowing us to have a number of additional copies for use with our students.
- b. There was considerable discussion as to the design, layout, cover, inside formatting, etc., of the journal. Barry Levis, Jerry Jerman, David Gitomer, Mary Rockcastle and Melissa Hilbish make up the Publications Committee and were delegated to work on approving those aspects of the journal. The committee would see a cover design, sample pages, footnotes/endnotes layout of the pages, etc. Donna suggested that the editors and chair of the publication committee would make the final decision.
- c. Jerry proposed a number of ideas for promoting the journal and he will be working with OU’s marketing department to put together a promotion plan, identify new audiences, establish publicity, do website promotion and consider strategies for library promotion. The launch of the journal will be fall 2006 and presented at the conference. The group discussed the possible increase of sponsorships and it was felt that sponsorships could be as much as \$500 or maybe there could be additional secondary sponsorships of

\$100 from each of twenty institutions. It was also felt that a possible “kit” for faculty members on how to use the journal in classes would be helpful. While these are ambitious ideas for the journal, it was felt that these would develop in time.

- d. The sponsorship issue was raised again. It was suggested that a letter go to the full membership promoting sponsorships and a special note go to those who are already sponsors. It was felt that we needed to clarify what sponsorship meant, e.g., where the name appeared, how the name appeared, would sponsorship lead to participation on the editorial board, etc. Also, it was asked whether each institution providing a sponsorship would receive a certain number of issues. For example, it was felt that a \$500 sponsorship would get 20 complimentary subscriptions. There was some discussion as to the cost of a single issue and \$15 was suggested. It was felt that a \$25 subscription for institutions/libraries was reasonable. Additionally, students and alumni should have the opportunity to buy individual issues.
- e. Jerry described the ongoing work with the design and noted that the title *Confluence* was selected by the committee. This title could be used for the journal, the website, etc. It was felt that with the title *Confluence*, that “The Journal of Graduate Liberal Studies” should appear somewhere on the cover. Mary and Donna will develop an RFP for a new editor.
- f. Barry Levis indicated that we needed additional editorial reviewers. He needs at least seven to twelve reviewers in the areas of literature, psychology, media studies and history. It was decided that they need not be from member institutions but from among those active in liberal studies.

14. Summer Meeting

Donna suggested that the next summer meeting should focus on only one agenda item: the constitution. It was felt that this would occur after email committee activities after the board meeting. This is still to be decided.

15. Board Meeting

The next board meeting will be on Friday, October 13, 2006 at the Annual Conference.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectively submitted,

James P. Pappas

Secretary