

United States Congress for hearing the voices of service members and in turn acting to meet their needs; and, that the American Library Association urges the United States Congress and the Department of Defense to continue to support military libraries by upgrading military library services through automation and increased funding, so that the quality of life, and readiness of airmen, seamen, marines and soldiers are fulfilled."

Resolution Commending the Library of Congress for its Support for the 1998 ALA Annual Conference in Washington, D.C., CD# 20.8, which read: "That the American Library Association expresses its gratitude to Librarian of Congress James Billington and to all the Library of Congress staff for extraordinary support and cooperation in planning for and during the 1998 ALA Annual Conference in Washington, D.C.; and, that the American Library Association commends the Library of Congress for its generosity and hospitality, for the quality and variety of the opportunities it made available to Annual Conference attendees, for the inclusive nature of the Library's bicentennial plans, and for the outstanding service the Library provides to Congress, to libraries, and to the nation."

Councilor Robert Franklin and seconder moved and by **CONSENT**, Council voted to support the LC Bicentennial Coin Bill.

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION, CD#27.1, EXHIBIT 26. Councilor Jenifer Abramson, chair, moved and by **CONSENT**, Council adopted the following two recommendations:

To discontinue the Independence Librarians Exchange Round Table (ILERT) in order to allow the round table to proceed with its plans to reorganize as a section of the Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies (ASCLA).

To discontinue the Special Conference Program Committee.

Councilor Abramson then moved to adopt or file the Internal Review Policy at the 1998 Annual Conference.

Councilor Pamela Sieving and seconder moved to strike Section 3 of the review questions of the Internal Review Policy.

Council then

VOTED, To appeal the decision of the chair to allow the above motion.

Council then

VOTED, To strike the words "or file" from the original motion, which read: to adopt or file the Internal Review Policy at the 1998 Annual Conference.

Councilor Erlene Bishop Killeen and seconder moved and Council

VOTED, To extend Council III through the end of this item only.

After an in depth discussion, Council

VOTED, To defeat the motion to adopt the Internal Review Policy at the 1998 Annual Conference.

INFORMATION ITEMS. The following items were distributed for information only: ALA Membership Committee Report, **CD#38.1, Exhibit 21**; ALA Division Reports, CD#35-35.11, **Exhibit 29**: American Association of School Librarians (AASL), CD#35.1; Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), CD#35.2; Association of Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS), CD#35.3; Association for Library Service to Children (ALSC), CD#35.4; American Library Trustee Association (ALTA), CD#35.5; Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies (ASCLA), CD#35.6; Library Administration and Management Association (LAMA), CD#35.7; Library and Information Technology Association (LITA), CD#35.8; Public Library Association (PLA); CD#35.9; Reference and user Services Division (RUSA), CD#35.10; Young Adult Library Services Association (YALSA), 35.11; ALA Committee—1998-99, CD#32 and Council Committees, CD#32.1, **Exhibit 30**; ALA Publishing Committee Report, CD#14.1, **Exhibit 31**; Continuous Learning: A Report to the ALA Executive Board, CD#57, **Exhibit 32**; ALA Public Awareness Committee, CD#58, **Exhibit 33**; Relationship with the Executive Director, CD#59, **Exhibit 34**; ALA Outsourcing Task Force, CD#60-60.3, **Exhibit 35**; Arthur Curley Award Announcement, CD#61, **Exhibit 36**; Spectrum Initiative, CD#23, **Exhibit 37**.

ADJOURNMENT. Prior to adjournment, outgoing President Barbara J. Ford presented incoming President Ann K. Symons with an engraved gavel to symbolize the passing of the office.

Council III was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

ALA Internal Review Policy

Policy: Each body within ALA shall conduct its own internal review at least every six years. The internal review provides a mechanism for ALA bodies to examine their charges and reflect on their current activities. This review may be conducted separately or may be carried out in conjunction with other internal reviews. The principal body shall establish procedures for, and carry out, periodical reviews of sub-bodies. The review shall be submitted to the ALA Committee on Organization, which may request further information. COO has the authority to monitor compliance with this policy. The Committee on Organization will alert ALA bodies that they must send copies of their completed internal reviews to COO in order to keep the Council apprised of their organizational structures. If COO has any concerns about the internal review as submitted, the Committee will meet with representatives of the body to discuss the review before any action is taken.

Background: The internal review provides a method for ALA bodies to examine their charges, reflect on their current activities and evaluate their position in ALA, their duplication of efforts within other ALA bodies and their own cooperation with other bodies, their own continuation or discontinuation.

In this policy the terms "body" and "bodies" are used to refer to units and committees, which are within the official scope of the Committee on Organization. "Sub-bodies" refers to groups that exist within these parent bodies, and may include committees, subcommittees, task forces, sections, councils, discussion groups, interest groups, and the like. Sub-bodies are not reviewed by COO but by the parent body.

Implementation Process: All bodies covered by the policy shall submit a review to COO within three years of the date of adoption of this policy. Subsequent reviews shall date from the time of submission of the first review.

Review Questions: The review shall follow these lines of inquiry:

1. Review the complete charge of the body; does it reflect current activity?
2. Summarize concisely the ways in which the body meets the current goals of ALA, as stated in the ALA Policy Manual, Section 1.3.

Review Questions (continued):

3. Is there overlap in scope or purpose between the body (including any sub-bodies) and other bodies (divisions, committees, divisional committees, round tables)? If so:
 - Describe the extent and nature of the overlap and the rationale for maintaining it.
 - Does the body under review maintain ongoing communication with the other body or bodies in question?
 - Is this overlap productive in the view of all the bodies in question?
 - What are the fiscal implications of the overlap (conference programs, use of meeting rooms, publications, ALA staff support, etc.)?
 - Are there ways to reduce any duplication of effort? Consider: joint or merged committees, shared programs, shared staff, combined publications, elimination of some or all bodies or sub-bodies)?
4. If this is a permanently established body, might it be effective as an ad hoc or limited term body directed toward a specifically defined outcome?
5. If you do not feel this body is effective or serving a useful purpose, would you recommend changes in its structure, or discontinuance?
6. Please identify any issues which come to your group that do not seem to fall within your charge.

revised 6/27/98

Annual
98

the Senate early in the month. We are hoping during the week of July 6th. This represents years of negotiations and planning on behalf of many parties.

I simply draw that to your attention because if and when this legislation is introduced, there may need to be a call for action among membership and you may need to be informed about this. It is a very important piece of legislation that will affect the way we libraries are able to disseminate publicly funded government information.

And one last reminder, the flyer that you have seen, ubiquitously distributed throughout the conference is this flyer calling action on three very very important pieces of legislation, some of which we already discussed. Protecting the e-rate and universal service for libraries and schools, protecting fair use, and also asking Congress to respect local decision-making in regards to Internet use.

There is a lot of information here that you can use in contacting your legislator, and we urge you to do that. I would like to know if there are additional questions.

>> WILLIAM ROBERTS: ALA Councilor. I realize you didn't ask for formal action. But it would be a big help not only talking to me and my Congressmen, but as an expression of the ALA official body, if we actually passed a motion at this time saying that we would like the LC bicentennial coin Bill. I just think that would add that much more power to it. And Congress does listen to what bodies like us say.

So I will move at this time that we pass a motion -- I don't want to do a lot of writing, but I'd like to just say pass a motion that we favor the LC bicentennial coin Bill.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Second? Okay.

>> Consent.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Any objections? It's passed.

>> WILLIAM ROBERTS: Thank you. I collect coins.

>> PAT WAND: Are there other questions about the final report from the committee on legislation?

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Thank you very much, Pat.

(Applause.)

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: I now direct your attention to Council Document 27.1, the report of the Committee on Organization. And call on Jenifer Abramson, chair of the committee, to present the report.

>> JENIFER ABRAMSON: We have a limited number of items of business for counsel's attention. I'll take them in order. The first item, regarding ILRT discontinuance and resorption. Representatives of both ILERT and ASCLA met with COO here at annual to provide us background on the three year planning process. As a result of a request by both bodies, COO recommends that Council discontinue ILERT in order to allow the round table to produce with the plans to reorganization agriculture a section of ASCLA.

COO commends both bodies on their careful planning to accomplish this merger.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Any discussion?

>> Consent.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Any objection?

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Next item.

>> JENIFER ABRAMSON: Second item. Discontinuance of the special conference program committee. The ALA Executive Board asked COO to consider discontinuing the special conference program committee. This committee has been inactive for at least three years. It would seem that the relatively new conference committee has assumed some of the duties formerly assigned to the special program committee. As a result, COO recommends that Council discontinue the special conference program committee.

>> Consent.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Any objection? Okay.

Council III
Wed, July 1,
1998

Next item.

>> JENIFER ABRAMSON: Moving right along. The ALA internal review policy revised draft, attachment A, and the definitions of ALA units. Council members saw the revised draft of the internal review policy through the Council list. However, I think a bit of background on the policy might be helpful to those relatively new to Council and perhaps to others.

Council first charged COO to draft an sunset review policy for ALA units in 1994 in Miami. This came from the recommendation of the original self-study committee.

In each of the four intervening years COO worked and reworked this policy. Its name was changed from sunset to internal review, to better reflect the full cycle of structural possibilities of ALA, sunrise, sunset and in between.

We hope this is the final version, the committee tried to articulate its role of that of, noses in, hands off. My thanks to RUSA representatives for this apt phrase.

While Council delegated to COO the authority to review ALA's structural well-being, COO does not expect to second guess ALA bodies on their internal organizational decisions. For example, note the final sentence of the policy. This was added to emphasize that COO would not recommend any action concerning an ALA unit without first meeting with representatives of that body to gather more information.

COO received many useful comments, which we have incorporated into the revised draft policy. I have used underlining and marginal sidebars to highlight the slight changes that COO made to the policy here at annual.

I speak for each of the current members of COO when I say that it is time for Council to tea side whether it wants an internal -- decide whether it wants an internal review policy.

I believe this policy has been vetted within an inch of its life. To accept and file this policy does not bind Council to any action on it. The policy would be available for reference at a future time should Council revisit the issue or wish to do so.

Therefore, the Council -- the Committee on Organization recommends that Council adopt or file the attached internal review policy at annual 1998.

>> As RUSA Councilor I want to give credit where it's do. It's from fill lip power, from the University of Michigan and somebody I admire.

A motion to amend at this time, is it appropriate?

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Yes.

>> By direction of the board of directors of RUSA I move to strike section 3 of the review questions of Council Document 27.1, attachment A. And I have a seconder. I would like to speak to that.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Okay. The motion is to strike section 3 under the review questions. Microphone 8. Speak to the motion -- to the motion to amend.

>> Last year the past president of RUSA and I attended a COO meeting to discuss our concern about an earlier draft of this policy. We were assured our concerns westbound considered as COO completed the work on this policy, and we were assured that divisional activities -- sorry. -- were not threatened by it.

However, our concern remains as most of the language is quite similar to that earlier draft, at least for this section. We believe that this is a burdensome and unproductive set of questions for a type of activity division. By definition, in article 6 of the ALA bylaw, type 6 activity divisions overlap with type of library divisions. As they carry out programmatic activities concerning functions which "apply to all types of libraries."

Every reading of drafts of this section by our board has elicited the same reaction. The assumption is that overlap is bad and represents an expense to be identified and rooted out. That is not our opinion. We

believe examination of all sides of an issue is productive, and want to support as many options for active participation in the association as possible, rather than reducing them. We can bring professional to issues as well as sexuality and ethnicity. We believe spending the time of our members on a hunt for fiscal details which pertain not only to our activities and programs, but also those of all other subbodies within the association is a poor use -- sorry. -- use of our resources and expertise. Thank you.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: 4.

>> SARAH PRITCHARD: Councilor-at-Large. I speak vigorously against this amendment, which I believe eliminates the guts of this policy. I speak as the person who was the chair of COO when we first wrote the policy and when we first discussed with the OSS C their intent which was passed as by Council. And I speak as the chair of the structure revision task force, which was charged with looking at the issue of overlap. I draw your attention to the third bullet under this section in question. Actually, encourages consideration of, if a -- in a positive way that there might be productive overlap. There is nothing in this suggestion -- in this section that suggests that overlap is automatically bad and must be stricken from the bodies.

What we very much want to do in this section is remind you, and it's to look at it. Frequently, with the number of committees and subcommittees that we have, units are not even aware of the overlap that may exist.

Units are not aware of the fiscal implications in, for example, extra numbers of meeting rooms or unused letters or printing costs. These questions are not prescriptive in any way, they are meant to raise the issues. And if everybody in the affected units said this is a wonderful, productive, encouraging of diversity overlap, fine. But we must have a way of periodically making people look at it. It has been a continuing concern of many people in this association.

>> MARY JANE ANDERSON: Councilor-at-Large. My concern is that we have a policy we are being asked to approve which is the first paragraph. We then have a background, which to me is history. Then we have an implementation process that do me does not relate to the policy.

The policy appears to say, and I agree with it, that every division unit, body, whatever, has to do this review. And I support that.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: The debate is on the amendment amendment.

>> But if we are amounting that that is not part of the policy -- I think we are out of order. I think we need to talk about what the motion says. Because I think the motion says the original motion said to approve the policy. It did not say to approve the background and an implementation process. Correct? So amending the motion doesn't make sense to me.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Microphone 4.

>> Could we have an answer -- sorry. Clarification on that? Are you moving only the first paragraph?

>> JENIFER ABRAMSON: We understand that only the policy is what would be written into ALA policy. Everything after policy beginning with background would not appear under policy, but I refer to the chair of policy monitoring.

>> DONALD SAGER: If that is a correct interpretation, I suggest that we deal with whether we agree with the policy or not, if we might, and then we talk about the implementation. Because I'm totally opposed to the way of implementation. But I'd like to be able to deal with it in a reasonable way.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Discussion is on the amendment. Could I call on the chair of the policy monitoring committee at microphone 2.

>> DONALD SAGER: The statement is correct that what we would do is incorporate into the ALA policies the statement, not the questions.

>> MICHAEL GOLRICK: Connecticut chapter Councilor. I believe if what

Mary Jane is saying is correct, then the motion to amend is out of order. Because what we should be considering is just the policy. And I would ask the chair to rule on that first.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Amendment has higher precedence and we will let this stand.

>> DONALD SAGER:

>> I don't understand the answer you just gave.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: It's not out of order.

>> With all due respect, may I appear to the house the decision of the chair?

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: You have that right, yes.

The decision of the chair has been appealed. The reasons -- microphone 10. Let's see if you can help us.

>> Perhaps, to clarify, is the document being moved or is the policy statement being moved?

>> JENIFER ABRAMSON: The policy statement is being moved by COO.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Thank you.

>> My understanding was that Council directed COO to only bring policy, and that is what COO is doing in the first paragraph.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Yes. The decision -- the discussion is now on the appeal of the ruling of the chair. Would the members state the grounds for his appeal? Microphone 6.

>> MICHAEL GOLRICK: Connecticut Chapter Councilor. It is simply that I believe, and I know that -- I believe that there are a number of my fellow Councilors who agree with my reading of both the rules and the original motion and what we are discussing, that you have made an inadvertent error in deciding that the amendment is appropriate. We believe that if the policy is what we should be discussing, that the amendment goes into the implementation issues and it's not part of policy and not part of our purview in discussing policy.

>> PETER GRAHAM: Councilor-at-Large. I just want very briefly to comment that appealing the decision of the chair is a reasonable practice. It reflects that the chair made a ruling, which I support, and it reflects the use of a legitimate tool to question that. I don't know how to tell you to vote on this. I just want to let you know it's an -- it is unusual for us. But it should be more usual. It could help to move thing along.

>> I'd like to ask for a point of clarification. There are several policy statements in the handbook, which at the end every them have a parenthetical note that reads "see the current reference file for related documents."

If the policy were accepted, the single paragraph that seems to be under discussion, would the supplemental material, including the Second, be included in the current reference file?

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Yes. It would be. . How do I make a.

>> How do I make a motion to get that out of the current reference file, which is really my intent, apparently.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: The discussion is on the appeal of the ruling of the chair right now. . Point of order.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: A point of order is not in order at this time.

The motion is on the policy part of this. I rule that the rest could be detached. People are now appealing that ruling.

>> No.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: No? Microphone 6.

>> MICHAEL GOLRICK: Connecticut Chapter Councilor. If that is what you intended to rule, that is not what many of us understood you to rule. If that is indeed what you truly say, and that we should be discussing only the policy part, then my contention is that the amendment suggested by the RUSA board of directors, which should get discussed, but is out of order at this point and we should be talking only about the policy. And what I understood

4 of 11

18

you to say was no, we should talk about the amendment now.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: That is correct. We need to talk about the amendment now.

>> MICHAEL GOLRICK: Then am I correct in believing, having appealed your decision, that now the body gets to vote as to whether they believe that the amendment is in order at this time?

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Yes. That is correct.

And I'm -- we will vote as soon as those who want to speak have had a chance to speak.

Are you speaking on the appeal?

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Okay. Microphone 9.

>> No.

>> BERNIE MARGOLIS: Councilor-at-Large. I rise to support the chair in her action. I think it's impossible to read the policy and not look at the implementation process suggested. When the words in the implementation process say "all bodies covered by the policy shall" a word like "shall" suggests that we cannot consider the policy suggested without the implementation. And I think that your ruling making appropriate the discussion of the amendment is in order.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Microphone 10.

>> As a favor for our recorder, please state your name. She is having a terrible time and we are get giving her names instead of listening to the discussion. I think theal peel that Michael has out is in order. I don't think we should be considering amendment. What should be in the motion is just the policy statement, and as a member LAMA COO committee, do I not feel bound to the questions here, because it says we shall follow these lines of inquiry. That means it's suggested. These are the ways -- things you are supposed to be thinking about, but I know that my division has autonomy to complete my review. And so I think the motion, the amendment motion, should be eliminated, because it's not in line. Thank you.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Okay. Microphone -- I want to clarify what the motion is. And the motion is that Council adopt or file the attached internal review policy.

Microphone 4.

>> JANET HILL:

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Discussion is on the appeal.

>> JANET HILL: The discussion is on the appeal. But now I'd like you to clarify what you just said. I'm sorry to be so confused. So when you say -- when you have -- say that we are to include consideration of all of -- could you repeat that? Okay. I'll start over again.

When I originally asked for clarification of what had been moved, I was told that what had been moved was the first paragraph. If what was moved is the first paragraph, then there is no text to strike. Therefore, I spoke in favor of the appeal.

(Applause.)

>> Point of order. We are out of order. We either need to decide to adjourn or to extend. I move that we adjourn.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Is there a second to the motion to adjourn?

>> Second.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Is there discussion?

>> Consent.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: All those in favor of adjournment, please rise. (Standing.)

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Okay. Be seated. Those opposed to adjournment, please rise.

(Standing.)

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: The motion is defeated.

>> I move that we extend by 15 minutes, and only include action items on our agenda.

5 of 11

19

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Okay. All those in favor of extension by 15 minutes, please rise.

(Standing.)

Those opposed?

(Standing.).

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: The motion passes. We will return to our discussion.

The discussion is on the appeal. And the person or committee chair has said that the recommendation was that Council adopt or file the attached internal review policy at 1999. It was not on the first paragraph.

>> ROBERT FRANKLIN: Councilor-at-Large. I support the chair's ruling, and I think if I -- I could help just by making one comment if you all would take that paragraph that is called "background" and simply move it to the -- entire end of the thing, then perhaps we could see more clearly that we are talking about the entire document, other than background, which let's just say got inadvertently placed in second place and should have been in whatever, tenth. Let's pretend like background is at the end and now we have an entire document being discussed at once and therefore there is an amendment that was on the floor, and the chair ruled that that amendment was perfectly okay. And I think that's just -- let's look at it that way and move ahead with supporting the chair's ruling on a vote that hopefully will happen very soon.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Is there anyone else who wishes to speak on the appeal?

>> FRANCIS BUCKLEY, JR: Member-at-Large. I had a question about the motion, which I thought I should wait to ask later, but now I need clarification for the purposes of this vote.

When we are asked to adopt or file, what does that encompass? I know what adopt is, and I know what file is, but how does this broadly cover this whole document?

>> JENIFER ABRAMSON: COO's intention was to have Council decide does it want an internal review policy, if so, whatever tweaking needed to be done, do it. If Council wanted to accept it and file the report for reference at a future time, which is allowable by Sturgis, we simply want Council to act. We worked on this four full years.

>>.

>> FRANCIS BUCKLEY, JR: You are asking that we do one or the other, not pass this motion as you introduced it.

>> Point of order.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: She has said appear don't the file -- adopt the file, not separate.

>> MICHAEL GOLRICK: Connecticut Chapter Councilor. With all due respect to Mr. Buckley, the superintendent of documents.

>> I believe the discussion should know can you say on whether we are going to uphold your decision to allow amendment or not. And I call that we vote, because I think a number of folks are very puzzled about this.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Okay. We have a motion to close debate.

>> Second.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: On the appeal. Is there a second? . Second.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: All those in favor of closing debate on the appeal, please rise.

(Standing.).

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Those opposed, please rise.

(Standing.).

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: The motion passes.

Okay. Now, we are voting on -- hearing no further discussion, the chair will put the question to a vote. Those in favor of sustaining the chair, please rise.

(Standing.).

6 of 11

20

>> Could you clarify what it is -- I'm still confused what we are doing at this point.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Microphone 8.

>> PAMELA SIEVING: I'm puzzled now as to what the effect of the vote that we are about to take now is. Sorry.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: The decision of the chair was to allow the amendment. So, if you vote yes, you're supporting the decision to allow the amendment. If you vote no, you're saying don't --

>> PAMELA SIEVING: Thank you.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: All those in favor of the decision of the chair, please rise.

(Standing.).

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Be seated. All those opposed, please rise.

(Standing.).

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Motion fails. The chair has been overruled --

(Laughter.)

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Okay. Let's see. Now, we are back to the motion. The motion with no amendment to adopt.

>> JENIFER ABRAMSON: COO is not taking a stance on this.

>> MICHAEL GOLRICK: Connecticut Chapter Councilor. I know that you don't take that last action personally.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: No, I don't.

>> MICHAEL GOLRICK: I ask that you rule that the motion is out of order, because as Mr. Buckley begin to suggest to us is not -- we have to decide to do something. The motion should be to either adopt or to file. And I would move to amend the COO motion that Council adopt the internal review policy.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Is there a second?

>> Second.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Is there discussion? Microphone 10.

>> KATHLEEN BALCOM: Director at large and member of COO. I would like to point out that I would support the motion to adopt. I'd like to point out to Councilors the question that RUSA had about review question 3, regardless of what COO would surmise out of the issue of overlap, the recommendation from COO would come to Council and Council would decide if that overlap was a good thing or a bad thing. And you would decide it on behalf of the members at large, rather than for COO or for a division.

This is the heart of why this policy was requested is the essence of question 3, the overlap issue.

And I think we have a long way to work in Council to decide ourselves whether some types of overlap are good or some types are bad. And those questions would indeed come to you with recommendations from COO and certainly from any body in our organization who had concerns, they would bring those through their representatives to you as well.

So you'd hear a good debate.

>> MARY JANE ANDERSON: Councilor-at-Large. I want to support adopting the policy as well. But I want to be very clear that in supporting it for myself, I am not supporting the specific implementation process that has been brought to us. Some of us may like it. Some of us may not. However, there are a lot of divisions that have very sophisticated review policies. And I think what we have heard during the -- some Councilors heard during the course of the week is serious concern that in addition to their policy -- what they are already doing, they will be asked to do much more.

So, I would like it to be very clear that COO has heard that we are not supporting the process, and that they have -- and that it would be inadvisable to go and put it into the manual at this point. Thank you.

>> BERNIE MARGOLIS: Councilor-at-Large. I rise to speak in opposition to the internal review policy. We heard for several days now about the great difficulty of moving things through our organization. And I want to suggest that this kind of self appraisal, if done at the schedule of every

Page 11

six years, will bog down COO as well as all of these bodies and subsubbodies, units and exit tease of the association, they will be involved in this self appraisal foreverment an the prosecretary of getting the kind of work expedited that we have been deliberating on will be made that much more difficult and cumbersome.

It seems that sort of an irony that you brought to us the dissolution of a round table and the dissolution of a committee, which we quickly acted upon. It seems like the process that we have in place is working very well, when there are parts of our organization that are no longer appropriate to our purpose, they get dissolved and disbanded.

And I'm not sure that a review every six years is going to in any way expedite or improve that process.

I suggest that we not adopt this. I rather that we file it. Thank you.

>> JUDITH ADAMS: I want to expression appreciation to you for disseminating this document prior to the conference, so that our divisions and other units could see it and discuss it before this meeting. However, I do have to tell you that the LAMA board, the LAMA organization, does not wish to support the policy. The reason for that is that we feel that the rigor, the existing rigor of agreement with divisions and other bodies, with policies already in existence, with existing reporting requirements and with unit review procedures do obviate the need for an over all ALA review policy.

Some of the unit review procedures, which I'm referring to, and documents which must be already prepared, our strategic plans, budget projections every three years and a new strategic and financial plan that all divisions have been asked to do, we feel that there is no need for an ALA internal review policy.

>> SHEILA INTNER: Councilor-at-Large and about to be president of ALCTS.

I recall one of the reasons why our division did not witch to support previous iterations of this. And I think that my personal objections as a Councilor-at-Large are with the before any action is taken. We do do internal reviewss and could file those every six years. I don't think we have to do more reviews. But I recent the thing that COO could take action unilaterally. I don't care if they talk to us. I speak against this adoption.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Remember the debate is on the amendment, which is to strike or file.

Microphone 10. I think we need to.

>>.

>> I think we need to --

>> No. It's to adopt.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Okay. He wants to to adopt, but we have to strike or file from her motion.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Microphone.

>> EColleen: I move to extend through the end of this item only.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Second?

>> Second.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Okay. All those in favor of extending, please rise.

(Standing.)

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Be seated. Those opposed, please rise.

(Standing.) okay. We will extend to the end of this item.

>> Now can I address the issue?

>> I left Council four years ago when this was referred to COO. At that time it was a financial time and space issue for our conferences. In the four years that I've not been on Council, I have continued to go to meetings, and see empty rooms that were planned for meetings that no one is using, which is costing us money. From listening to the division Councilors, I'm convinced that this cannot be passed. I'm very sorry to

8 of 11

22

hear that, that -- I think the at large constituency that I represent would like us to save money on room space and program times that aren't being used or that are the continuation of committees that say no report. Don't turn in reports, that that needs to be checked out.

I'm on, as I said before, the LAMA COO committee, we will be doing that this next year, with LAMA. So they will get a review, whether the board -- supports this or not.

But, Jennifer's committee worked on this for four years. We need to make the decision and decide. Thank you.

>> TAMARA J. MILLER: We believe in sunsetting and review. We have a rigorous sunset policy. All of our program bodies in LITA are sunsetted every three years. The difficulty that we have with this policy is that if in fact the heart of the matter is overlap and program space, an internal review policy is probably not the best way to deal with it. We would be pleased to see an internal review policy that allowed COO to review all of the internal reviews done within the division, but not in the burdensome and overly prescriptive we believe manner, given in the implementation information in this policy report.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Microphone 2.

>> I believe I was first.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Sorry. I got out of order.

>> MARK ROSENSZWEIG: ALA Councilor-at-Large and action Council member of SRRT. I want to speak on behalf of the action Council that discussed this several times in the past. We are opposed to this kind of proposal of COO, while we appreciate all the work that went into it, it was work in good faith and hard work undoubtedly, we reject the idea of this kind of an internal review process on this schedule. We do our own internal reviews. We make every effort to make sure that we are in compliance with the kinds of considerations that are outlined here. We do not accept the authority of COO to delegate to itself the right to pass judgment on round tables and other such bodies.

So I'm in agreement with the speakers from LAMA and from ALCTS, SRRT also rejects the adoption of this internal review policy.

>> LINDA MIELKE: Councilor-at-Large. I'm the immediate past president of the PLA, and I presided over a major reorganization of the PLA. And on balance, listening to the discussion, I'm in favor of the review questions.

Think they are probably a good idea. Those of us who look at ourselves all the time want to do better. And I heard different arguments. But it took courage on the part of the board of directors of the Public Library Association to do this major review. I think it's a good idea and I think we ought to pass this.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Microphone 6.

>> I speak in opposition to this item. Sorry.

>> S. MICHAEL MALINCONICO: Councilor-at-Large. I speak in opposition to this policy. With all due respect to COO and the hard work that it did and its intentions, I don't think it's -- I don't think this activity is necessary. If anything, it's unnecessary central medaling, and I think we can trust the divisions and round tables to act responsibly on behalf of the association. I therefore suggest that we file this proposal and not act on it.

>> WILLIAM ROBERTS: Council member. I think we have made up our minds, and I call for the question.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Okay. Is there a second to closing debate?

>> Second.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: All those in favor of closing debate, please rise.

(Standing.).

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Be seated. All those opposed, please rise.

(Standing.).

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: The motion passes.
Now let me try to be clear what the vote is on. The vote is on the amendment, which is to delete the words "or file" from the motion. So that the motion reads: "Council adopt the attached internal -- ad -- Council adopt the attached internal review policy in 1998. Those in favor of the amendment, please rise.
(Standing.).
>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Now people are clear with their voting, right?
>> No.
>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: I'm not sure people are.
The motion is on the amendment, which would delete the words "or file", meaning that the motion would then read "Council adopt the attached internal review policy."
All those in favor of the amendment --
>> WILLIAM ROBERTS: A point of order, what we have seen on the screen is that Council adopts this policy. So that is why a lot of us are standing up to vote that we are now adopting the policy.
>> No.
>> WILLIAM ROBERTS: That has been on the screen for the last 15 minutes.
>> It was my understanding that we drop that "or file" by consent.
>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Okay. There were objections to that.
>> Point of order. Just for clarification, if we vote yes on this, which now says to adopt it, we will then vote again on whether we wish to adopt it?
>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Right.
>> Trying to clarify now, before we had a tense that had an or in it and we didn't know what "or" was. Now we vote on this. And then we will vote again.
>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Yes right.
>> We are trying to get a motion on the floor on which we can really vote on.
>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Okay. So all those in favor of the amendment, which is to delete the words "or file" please stand.
(Standing.).
>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Okay. Please be seated. All those opposed, please rise.
(Standing.).
>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Okay. The amendment passes.
Now we need to vote on the motion, which is "Council adopt the -- unless there is discussion -- "Council adopt attached internal review policy."
All those in favor of the motion, please rise.
(Standing.).
>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Be seated. All those opposed to the motion, please rise.
(Standing.).
I think we need to count. Could the tellers come forward, please? All those in favor of the motion, please rise.
(Standing.).
>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Be seated. All those opposed to the motion, please rise.
(Standing.).
>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Okay. The vote was 55 in favor, and 65 against.
So the motion fails.
(Applause.)
Now, before we adjourn, we have some announcements to make. I'd like to call on the secretary of Council, William Gordon, for announcements. Bill?
>> EXEC. DIR. WILLIAM GORDON: All I want to do is to announce Council attendance. It will take me one second to step over to my folder.
>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: You could all pass your signed voting records to

the aisles for the tellers to collect.

>> EXEC. DIR. WILLIAM GORDON: Council attendance, 24,798. Last year, it was 23,352.

The way those numbers are divided, regular made, 11,799. Exhibit only passes, 4,107. Other and in that category are exhibitors, guests, and press, and staff, and that total is 8,892, for once again the grand total 24,798.

(Applause.)

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: That is wonderful.

>> EXEC. DIR. WILLIAM GORDON: Registration revenue through Monday, subject to adjustments, refunds, so forth, 1,537,510 dollars.

>> PRES. BARBARA FORD: Before we adjourn, it is traditional for the outgoing president to present the incoming president with an engraved Gavel at this time to symbolize the passing of the office to the new president. Ann, please accept this gavel with our best wishes.

>> PRES.-ELECT ANN SYMONS: Thank you. I'll stand on your box.

(Applause.)

Thank you. I now declare this 1998 annual conference session of the ALA Council adjourned.

(End of session.)

12:30 p.m.)

11 of 11

25