***Council Forum I – Essence Notes***

**Intellectual Freedom Committee – Discussion of 2 Resolutions**

(Martin Garner) These motions were referred to International Relations & Intellectual Freedom Committees, the committees have met jointly and have approved the motions. Because the committees will not meet again before the resolutions come before council, no edits can be made. Amendments may be made on the council floor.

**Resolution on U.S. Enterprises' Abridgement of Free Speech**

*Resolved, that the American Library Association (ALA), on behalf of its members:*

1. *reaffirms its commitment to free speech and free expression as previously stated in “The Universal Right to Free Expression: An Interpretation of the Library Bill of Rights”;*
2. *strongly urges U.S. enterprises that allow for social interaction and comments on online platforms to resist efforts from governments to suppress or restrict the “right to freedom of opinion and expression” as enshrined in Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;*
3. *urges those same U.S. enterprises to address disinformation, as well as targeted harassment or hate speech, in order to protect the honor, dignity, and humanity of users of their online platforms; and*
4. *recommends library workers and governing bodies share this resolution with library users and local media.*

**Discussion:**

(Garner) Intent of resolution is in support of people being able to speak up and not loose platform because they are speaking in defense of their beliefs, while also being aware that platforms can enforce codes of conduct and de-platform people when they break those codes.

(Gina Kromhout in chat) to add to Martin - this is to distinguish between speaking on a platform in support of democracy or a discussion on ieas and speaking hate speech

(Eileen Palmer in chat) Can you speak to why you chose the term US enterprises and what it is intended to include?

(Garner) Tried to find a term that addressed all entities included. Needed a broader term, ultimately went with enterprises because it appears to encapsulate all entities. Chose US because of the position on the First Amendment, so urge those companies to be cognizant of that.

(Kromhout in chat) we wanted to address all enterprises, but we needed to stick to US-centric things

(Palmer in chat) So this would also apply to libraries and could be used by them in their social media policy?

(Garner) Could be used by them and their social media policies. Nothing in the document that would be counter to that, but they are not the intended target.

(Kromhout) Not meant to target libraries, but it could. There shouldn’t be anything that would change the libraries social media policy, unless their governing body would try and force rules against; intended to be used as a tool to help educate library staff and public users on issues;

(Aaron Dobbs in chat) US enterprises could also be explained in a footnote? (so future readers can see the thinking)

(Lorelei Sterling in chat) does enterprises include non-profits or just for-profit entities?

(Kromhout in chat) it could be any body

(Garner) Not intended for non-profits, but could apply

(Kromhout) gave an example of how it might be applied

(Garner) Will update with footnote as suggested above

**Resolution in Support of Open Educational Resources**

*Resolved, that the American Library Association (ALA):*

1. *affirms that open educational resources can be as effective, authoritative, and of academically rigorous quality as traditionally published learning materials;*
2. *encourages library workers to support initiatives that promote the creation, discovery, and dissemination of open educational resources; and*
3. *encourages library workers to advocate for initiatives at all levels of government that support open educational resources.*

(Garner) This resolution came as a request from a councilor that ALA go on record affirming OER as in the resolved clauses (above)

(Jennifer Boettcher) Supports resolution but wonders about recognizing that creators of content and publishers have a right to profit

(Garner) Group didn’t take into context the ability to monetize content; the resolution doesn’t denigrate that ability; therefore, the omission of it in the resolution leaves that ability open for publishers and creators of content

(John DeSantis) Can we add an additional resolve clause that encourages libraries to establish or incorporate initiatives in their libraries for content creation within the library?

(Garner) Reminder that edits can’t be made before the resolution comes before council; however, amendments can be made. Believes this would fit within the spirit of the resolution

(Jim Neal in chat) Can we add something about preservation

(Garner) welcome to add it when it comes to the floor, because of the compressed meeting schedule, these have all been approved, so they can’t be changed. However, believes this would be supported on the floor

(Diane Chen in chat) AASL has a toolkit to help position school librarians in efforts to create and curate open educational resources (OER) that will extend their role as leaders within their schools. The OER Toolkit is freely available for download at [www.ala.org/aasl/toolkits](http://www.ala.org/aasl/toolkits)

(Garner) Can drop this into the footnote, as an example of what other divisions have done.

**Forward Together Working Group – Discussions of Resolutions 1-3**

(Jack Martin, Co-Chair) Resolutions are the best they could create within the timeframe, the working group is a group of council, and was voted on by council, these may not be changed at this time, but amendments can be added, after discussions with President Jefferson, these are the only resolutions on the agenda (?)

(Christina Rodriquez, Co-Chair) they did agree on the order that they should be presented, their may be more detail and/or analysis needed, if so, then the body needs to make that known

(Martin) this now belongs to council, and depending on what happens, these will go to a membership vote

(Karen Schneider) Concern about not bringing resolutions to council, lets let transparency in governance and process work

(Martin) this came from a discussion with Julius and Marsha, ideally would like to plow through the resolutions, but if others need to come to the agenda, it is up to Julius and Marsha to set agenda

(Marsha Burgess, Council Secretariat) Clarification: The Presiding Officer sets the agenda, not staff.

**Resolution on the ALA Core Values of Librarianship**

*Resolved, that the American Library Association (ALA), on behalf of its members:*

1. *Establishes a task force with a broad membership reflecting the diversity of the Association to review the ALA Core Values and make recommendations at Annual 2022 regarding any necessary revisions.*
2. *Imbues the task force with the following charges including, but not limited to:*
   * + - 1. *The establishment of a regular review process*
         2. *A plan to reduce the multiple locations where the ALA Core Values are listed to a single, easy-to-find location.*

(Rodriquez) this resolution recognize that there are many places where Core Values are represented on the website and in documents; there are inconsistencies, this resolution would create a Task Force to find where they are, clarify, and make consistent.

(Martin) Clarification, not core values of the association, but of the governance

(Martin Garnar in chat) No, it's referring to the Core Values of Librarianship as the title indicates.

(Eileen Palmer in chat) Can we go back to Martin's point please?

(Garner) They are talking about the Core Values of Librarianship, there is confusion, found here <https://www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/corevalues>

(Jennifer Boettcher) We can reprint the core values, can’t we? We don’t have to only refer

(Garner) Concern is that they are posted in several places and not all are the same, not going to restrict people, but need to have them in one place

(Gina Kromhout in chat) why can't it be in multiple locations?

(Melissa Cardenas-Dow in chat) wouldn't this mean we're seeking alignment and agreement and lessen self-contradiction?

(Kromhout in chat) ohhhh I see, that they're not exactly the same - yeah I get it

(Martin in chat) I think so Mellisa!

(Boettcher in chat) Yeap that is what I thought.

(Dorcas Hand in chat) I can see that it would be hard to keep all locations up to date in the face of ongoing updated versions, so linking to the original even if they are reposted elsewhere.

**Resolution on ALA Roundtables**

*Resolved, that the American Library Association (ALA), on behalf of its members:*

1. *affirms Round Tables are a vital part of the ALA structure.*
2. *requires Round Tables maintain a minimum of 150 members. A Round Table unable to meet the minimum membership within one year may become an Interest Group, join with another roundtable, or disband.*
3. *requires that all Round Tables adhere to a common template of core By-Laws while maintaining the flexibility of their own operating principles.*
4. *requires that all Round Tables align with nominal, annual membership dues to be recommended by the Round Table Coordinating Assembly.*

(Mario Gonzalez) Took a look at bylaws and came up with these resolutions due to the fact that RTs are a critical part of ALA and that they want to recognize that and create guidelines for them; no way suggesting that RTs be eliminated

(Schneider) from the Fiscal Working Group, having bylaws consistent is a good idea

(Boettcher) agree with indexing because if we get smaller who knows what will happen, re: no. 4 if the assemblies do not get passed, but this does, are we tying ourselves to the assembly model

(Rodriquez) Round Table Assembly already exists, so is not predicated on other assemblies

(Trish Hull in chat) FYI you probably already know the rt coordinating council had a bylaws group that has created a bylaws template

(Victor Baeza in chat) Keep in mind that the Round Table Coordinating Assembly has already created a recommended set of bylaws.

(Tara Brady) No 3 seemed unclear to folks outside of the working group, how do they do that if have to use core template? Would like clarification that the bylaws are not the be all end all and that there is room for RTs to retain their own individuality

(Rodriquez) Will consider that

(Susan Jennings) No 3 is in reference to structure not process, this will allow for a framework

(Mike Marlin in chat) maybe a different word than require? strongly advises?

(Brady in chat) Yes thank you Mike

(Baeza in chat) I think that the use of "core" means each round table can have others that don't conflict with the "core" ones.

(Schneider in chat) I like to say you don’t get your identity from your bylaws

(Jim Neal in chat) By laws template excellent

(Martin) A note that ALA is the only legal entity

(Ana Elisa de Campos Salles in chat) …I think Tara used a better word than operating principles when she was speaking: operating procedures.

(Amber Williams in chat) Mario- I’m sure you covered this at some time, so sorry for the repeat- why did the group settle on 150 instead of a percentage of membership? That would adjust to the ALA membership

(Gonzalez) 150 is .25 of 1%, did not want to peg membership to a fluctuating number and have to keep up with that because they thought it important to have a solid foundation of membership

(Schneider in chat) 100 members now

(Baeza in chat) Much better than a moving target on membership requirement

(Boettcher in chat) It's paying members, right?

(Jennings) Don’t they bylaws already have a number

(Gonzalez) yes, currently set at 100

(Schneider in chat ) It’s members, regardless of full paying, discount, etc

(Gonzalez in chat) It is ALL members

(Trish Hull) Part of RT Assembly, For the most part, fairly easy document for RTs to adhere

**Resolution Establishing Six Standing Committees under the ALA Board of Directors**

*Resolved, that the American Library Association (ALA), on behalf of its members:*

1. *Creates Six Standing Committees of the Board of Directors: Finance and Audit, Nominating, Leadership Development, Association Policy, Public Policy and Advocacy, and Professional Values.*

(Rodriquez) a number of resolutions under this, this is only the first on

(Martin) Subset of working group worked on and created these, important that in the whereas clause there is a place for others committees to be created as needed, would it be easier to pass the creation of these committees first, and then look at the dissolution of the others

(Marlin) heard confusion expressed about other committees and chairs, if their committee not mentioned what does that mean to their committee – will they be sunsetted, etc.? Would be helpful to have that spelled out

(Martin) from a bylaws and governance perspectives, it is better to have fewer committees specified in the bylaws because needs change, would it be better to have fewer committees, then others assessed and created, but not at a bylaws level

(Rodriquez) if we approve these committees, it doesn’t mean that the others will disappear, this group was only tasked with creating bylaws at the conceptual level, there will be another group responsible for implementation

(Marlin) when you introduce, then need to state what was stated above.

(Hand in chat) With the idea I have seen from (I think ) Martin about adding 2 more re Intellectual Freedom and another, and the request that any changes be accommodated in amendments rather than additional resolutions, how will/can that be managed in this context of a lead resolution and 6 more supporting it?

(Garner) Will be proposing amendment changing the number from 6 to 8, will add Social Justice Committee, Sustainability Committee, professional Values Committee, so it could change the amendment

(Boettcher in chat) These committees and their antecedents are current committees of Council, right?

(Dobbs in chat) Council and Association committees

(Baeza in chat) So if all the resolutions passed, Council and membership voting, when would be the earliest, or planned, date that they would take effect?

(Rodriques) March 2022 implementation, but fluid, anything approved will have to go to membership for a vote

(Dobbs in chat) the FT Financial Analysis Working Group quantified what could be quantified so far -- but the costs associated with the Assemblies have not been quantified (and could be significant)

(Schneider in chat) Correct, Aaron. That’s why it’s good to review the work of the Fiscal Analysis WG. Our report is based on significant amounts of data and other input from ALA staff and other sources. Months of work.

(Brenda Pruitt-Annisette in chat) What happened to Accreditation (COA)? What was the final decision?

(Martin) Chair of fiscal implications WG has been on the group, they haven’t been as concerned about fiscal implications because trying to create the best organization and then look at fiscal implications, concerns about accrediting credentials

(Rodriques) if you go through the other resolutions, it does indicate their would be a

(Stephanie Chase) really like for leadership to listen to the conversation around finances, while we might be focused on not looking at the finances, but it should be included, PLA took a poll and most people want to wait until we look more at the finances behind this before we start putting structure in place

(Jennings) it has been difficult to try and get a financial picture on items that have not ever existed before, the report based on what they were given, please read the report. In the implementation, is there going to be a financial piece going along with it

(Martin) We tend to talk about this without thinking about how we can be more nimble, does ALA have to pay for all of the things that we currently are, we have shown amazing stride in adapting to a virtual experience

(Schneider) as a board member, share fiduciary responsibility for entire association, alert to situations that can put us in dire straights, notice that the fiscal report stops short of recommendations, and only did what they needed to do, whenever you take things away, you also add staff costs, goes back to SCOE and the report about needing more engagement and opportunities to engage, Stephanies concerns are very real, resolutions here that ALA can’t afford, the conversation needs to happen in council meetings, will hear more this weekend

(Jessamyn West in chat) this accrediting credentials issue sounds kinda huge.

(Garnar in chat) Ultimately we are concerned that the proposed structure will not allow the committees to be effective. Without policy-making committees that are not specialized in the areas of social justice, intellectual freedom, and sustainability, we are concerned that these important issues will get lost in the shuffle. I would suggest that saving money at the cost of the association to be able to do its work is not good for the long-term health of the association, as members will leave if we are not seen as relevant to the concerns of our times.

(Chase in chat) It would be incredible to let your group have the time to do its work. Do its work FULLY.

(Dobbs in chat) Yes, required homework is the FT Financial Analysis Working Group. I tried to summarize - see the ALA Council Connect Group - but it definitely needs a lot of eyes and minds considering it

(Palmer in chat) It seems to me that we need an agreed upon path forward, a deep fiscal analysis, and then a final look to make sure we can sustain what we believe the structure should be.

(Brady in chat)…. I would really like to see a financial analysis that assumes that all ALA member positions are all-virtual unless they have a specific reason - eg conference related work.

(Dobbs in chat) FWIW, the conversation here really needs to happen in the Council meetings so everyone can hear it and consider things

(Chase in chat) I’ve said for a while that Council Forum time just needs to be included as Council meetings so we actually have the time to talk about stuff ;)

(Baeza in chat) The cost of the hybrid council meetings has been brought up, but implementation could decide on just virtual meetings or just in-person meetings for council and the board as Jack touched on.

(Chen in chat) I cannot speak now but I would say that we do need to pay the expenses for ALA Board members because people who cannot afford to pay to play (like school librarians and entry level librarians) need help to participate and have a voice. The executive board meetings are draining and I support continuing to enable a richer diverse group of board members

(Schneider in chat) … it’s an equity issue to fund Board participation

(Boettcher in chat) Going back to having fewer Committees, as combined committees are creating, you are also creating MORE work for those fewer committees.

(Hand in chat) Jack's perspective is definitely important, and fewer in person meetings would be great. However, we probably don't want to forego ALL in-person opportunities. I don't have a clear vision of what that means, but I do think in person continues to have some advantages for some meetings. All in-person opportunities should definitely be hybrid to support those who can't get the travel time to participate in governance. And true that we cannot afford as much financial support of Boarad participation as we have until now.

(Martin in chat) ... I think there’s a business solution to all of it…Again…chicken or the egg.

(Chase in chat) …! We must keep in mind the equity benefits that come with EB/BOD support

(Neal in chat) Most members want to learn, share, network, enjoy.

(Rodriques) Potentially too much put on the Professional Values Committee, recognize that Garner will be submitting an amendment

(Garner) doesn’t believe that Professional Values will be able to take on all that it has, he will be speaking to this on the floor

(Hand in chat) Yes, Jack. And yes, Diane, we do need to enable participation from folks with financial and geographic challenges to in-person attendance.

(Neal in chat) And to have an association that effectively advocates for libraries and library workers, and champions and represents core values.

(Delaney in chat) … advocacy is the key!

(Toni Negro in chat) I thought the issues was about Professional Values

**Code of Conduct**

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/e/2PACX-1vR6WXRsogsUMRZkcC67xH-z06q8dirwVxVzawdul2xg00C5AHBJtPNj3zIPBcQo67kasGtkWN7j0Ybq/pub?urp=gmail_link>

(Jessamyn West) Unofficial task group – staff didn’t believe they had the tools they need to moderate an online forum while also maintaining principles of free speech, yet also noting that , this draft has been open for public comment, most important aspect in ALAs dream world, this would be used in most if not all online spaces where ALA has a platform, gives moderators and an ongoing working group of staff and members a framework for how to usefully communicate online, COO will be bringing up a vote to create a standing committee to oversee and revise the Code of Conduct at Council II, the Board has voted for it

(Karen Schneider) needed because not a mechanism, urged on by David to have it as member driven, lots of codes out there, but needed one to represent all ALA

(West) important that you have the ability to report anonymously, where does the committee land in FWT

(Schneider) it lands in ALA with the ALA committee, but important to have it now without waiting on FT

(Gonzalez) How will this be disseminated to membership, exhibitors, people who visit, people who aren’t in leadership roles, important document needs to be disseminated wide

(Schneider) clarify that this is for online spaces only, already a code for conferences, dissemination question good, will look for clarification on how disseminated

(West) like the one for conference where you have to read and check a box before you can progress, ALA ability to more reasonably moderate spaces, ALACOnnect login process has been changing, looking for a single sign on, hope that this will be a one time click through

(Schneider) has been reviewed by legal several times, will be reviewed at least at each conference, but can be more often

(West) consequences to infrations – it depends, originally hoped for being able to remove offensive content, steps on how it will work will come after it is approved

(Schneider in chat) This applies to all ALA online spaces “All online platforms used by ALA”

(Schneider in chat) COO will present the proposal at Council II Board voted for it! HUGE work. \*applause all around\*

(Sheryl Reyes in chat) David Sheffieck is ALA's Community Engagement Manager =)

(Erin Berman in chat) Erin Berman - Chair of the IFC Privacy Subcommittee (not a councilor yet). Want to say that the committee is deeply concerned that there will be no place for us to do the work that we do year round in the current structure with only 6 standing committees. As a subcommittee we do A LOT of policy and advocacy work around privacy all year long. We don't even have enough bandwidth to do everything we plan every year as is. Would love to see a structure where we the experts in our fields that represent our core values have the resources they need to complete the work that membership is requesting. Thank you!

(West in chat) <https://connect.ala.org/communities/community-home/digestviewer/viewthread?MessageKey=758936ce-6f4f-4f7e-ab35-865746252a57&CommunityKey=c235def7-8884-4b09-96f6-9c7a2e516789&tab=digestviewer#bm758936ce-6f4f-4f7e-ab35-865746252a57>

(Hand in chat) All great - assuming FWT moves ahead successfully, where does this committee land in that structure? This is a great document and definitely needs ongoing management and support. Just trying to understand. That makes sense - I just needed to ask.

(Boettcher in chat) Could you break up "religious or political beliefs, including lack of religious beliefs" I don't like putting church and state in same line.

(Hand in chat) Hearing that differentiation, I would hope these two Codes of Conduct would be managed in similar ways, posted in similar locations, and over time coordinated for consistency of language. That would be much easier for the membership to remember.

(Palmer in chat) If moderators are to be ALA members will they be covered by ALA re potential liability?

(Brenda Pruitt-Annisette in chat) I may have missed the discussion on consequences to these infractions. Are there any at this time?

(Lorelei Sterling in chat) Will this be applicable to online continuing ed/webinars from ALA?

(Schneider in chat)This is discussed in the CoC See “What to Expect When Reporting”

(Meg Delaney in chat) And if you build in a staggered committee structure, it becomes another opportunity for member engagement.

**Library of Congress – 2 Resolutions**

(Violet Fox) Have endorsement from SRRT, Black Caucus, Reforma, ALA Washington office not in favor, SAC voted to not endorse, Washington Office has been in contact with crongressional staff, they believe that the headings should be changed

2 resolutions change, 2016 requesting to change heading before they did, 2017 asking congress to respect LC make these decisions on subject heading changes, its been 5 years, so they think it is time, the only thing holding back is fear of right wing backlash, Washington Office want to keep things quiet, afraid that making a bigger deal will mar the work that WO is doing or that a politician will make this a hot item,

(Lori Fisher) bigger piece – congressional staff who are instrumental in making the change occur wanted this to be quiet, don’t want to jeopardize WO relationship with staff\

**Resolution on Replacing the Library of Congress Subject Heading Illegal Aliens Without Further Delay**

*Resolved, that the American Library Association, on behalf of its members:*

1. *reaffirms the positions it took in two previous resolutions*
   * *2015-2016 ALA CD#34\_11216 (Resolution on Replacing the Library of  Congress Subject Heading "Illegal Aliens" with "Undocumented Immigrants,"  https://alair.ala.org/handle/11213/1301, adopted January 12, 2016)*
   * *2015-2016 ALA CD#39\_6816 (Resolution on Support of the Professional  Cataloging Processes and Determinations of the Library Of Congress,  https://alair.ala.org/handle/11213/5794, adopted June 26, 2016)*
2. *urges the Library of Congress to change the subject heading Illegal aliens without  further delay*
3. *encourages libraries to dedicate staff time and capacity to addressing and  remediating problematic metadata, either through official channels with the Library  of Congress, discovery platforms, or publishers, or implementing local and  alternative solutions*

(Gina Kromhout in chat) we've had previous resolutions on this topic before. what's the current status of any of those?

(Eileen Palmer in chat) Thank you Violet. This is an issue many in my chapter care about.

(Kromhout in chat) …ok so we need to bring this back up and tell LoC again to change it, yes?

(Lorelei Sterling in chat) can you discuss why SAC voted not to endorse this?

(Jennifer Boettcher in chat) What is the Washington Office reason?

(Jessamyn West in chat) Yeah I think we understood maaaaybe why they didnt’ make this change under the last administration, but agree entirely now is the time.

(Palmer in chat) And SAC?

(Muzhgan Nazarova in chat) this is bold statement about a fear

(Kromhout in chat) tbh, we're so far into the "liberal indoctrination blahblahblah" rhetoric that there's no point in staying back

(Aaron Dobbs in chat) Similar to the previous time a similar resolution was passed, this has the potential to reprise the opportunity for one side side to inflame their base against this.

(Boettcher in chat) So this might happen without this Resolution?

(Ana Elisa de Campos Salles in chat)Did they give a reason, Lori? Are they working on it through their channels or afraid it will jeopardize other things in motion?

(Anchalee (Joy) Panigabutra-Roberts) this is the first time we have had to address this, lot of work going on behind scene, need to support congressional staff, Can congress tell LC what to do? I don’t think so

(Nazarova in chat) I believe LC is aware and we have to respect their decision

(Leroy Lafleur in chat) I’ve heard that the PPA office is engaged with Congressional staff on a “quiet” approach and anticipates motion in a few months, probably in concert with the FY22 appropriations cycle.

(Nazarova in chat) which will be the right one

(Palmer in chat) No one but ALA has the credibility we do to speak on this issue. If we fail to do so now what message does it send? That's what I struggle with when balancing staff concerns with member concerns

From Amber Williams (she/her) to Everyone: 08:50 PM

(Fox) Everyone agrees subject heading should change, but it is a matter of strategy

(Nazarova) LC is aware and they are working on it, Joy is right, they will respect and make decision, we need to let them make the decision

**Resolution on Greater Transparency in the Library of Congress Subject Headings Revision Process**

*Resolved, that the American Library Association (ALA), on behalf of its members,*

*1. requests the Library of Congress, with ALA’s backing, advocate to increase the staffing allocated to the Policy, Training, and Cooperative Programs Division, ensuring that questions are answered in a timely manner and regular reviews of problematic topical headings take place;*

*2. requests that the Library of Congress ensure transparency by revising the Cataloging and Acquisitions webpages and all documentation to ensure that outdated, inaccurate information is removed and relevant information is easy to find; and*

*3. requests greater openness and transparency in the Library of Congress Subject Heading proposal process, with regular status reports to the Subject Analysis Committee on anticipated timelines for future work, specifically in regard to ongoing or special projects.*

(Fox) Asking for greater transparency in the LC subject heading proposal process, even if the change happens there is a lot of issues around the proposal process, this resolution would clarify the process

(Nazarova) LC staff are going through the same procedure, staffing is not under their control need to reach out, good resolutions, but some factors impeding the process

(Fox) doesn’t seem to be transparent to people who don’t have relationships with LC or people who work with LC, objections to resolution come down to whether ALA has the right to tell people what to do

(Kromhout in chat) … it's just that us regular folks get questions about this and we don't know how to answer them regular patrons ask us about LCSH

(Natalie DeJonghe in chat) I think the idea is that we want people to understand how this process works so there is respect for whats happening but also so that people don’t have to individually reach out to understand how the process works. Being more transparent about how the process works doesn’t necessarily translate to somehow creating expectations that it’s fast or easy.

(Anchalee) new pilot but not open because they want to make sure the procedure will work. LC has a new strategy plan, a lot of conversation going on to engage process, a lot of development going on.

(Elisa de Campos Salles in chat)So perhaps clarify the wording in this resolution to specify other library workers outside of LoC and the public at large.

(Violet Fox in chat) violetfox@gmail.com