



Catholic Research Resources Alliance

Agenda for CRRA Board of Directors

March 30, 2011

University of Saint Joseph's, Philadelphia

12:30 – 1:45 p.m. Eastern

11:30 – 12:45 p.m. Central

Audio call-in

Phone: **1-866-469-3239**

When prompted, **enter the attendee access code 929 560 668**

1. Welcome and introductions of Board, Membership Dues Task Force members, guests
2. The Membership Dues Task Force led by Janice Welburn, Marquette, will present two models for a new dues structure and lead the discussion. The attached documents will be used in the discussion:
 1. CRRA proposed dues structure dated 03-23-11
 2. CRRA Membership Dues TF proposal and recommendation to the Board March 23 2011
 3. CRRA Membership Outreach in 2010/11 report to the Board March 25, 2011

Minutes of Meeting

Attendees:

Board: Theresa Byrd, Steve Connaghan, Tom Leonhardt (call-in), Janice Welburn, Jennifer Younger

Task Force: Joe Lucia, Evelyn Minick

Guests: Jonathan Bengston, Carol Johnson (call-in), Susan Ohmer

1. Jennifer welcomed all and thanked Evelyn for the wonderful lunch.
2. Janice opened the discussion of the recommendation, observations and implementation questions sent via email to the Board and library directors (see below). She reviewed the current membership status, with special mention of the growth from 8 to 21 members and additional prospective members, and briefly reviewed the prior work of the task force. The purpose today is to get input on the proposed model and discuss a time line. It is desirable that the board establish the dues so that invoices for the next fiscal year can be sent in May.

Janice noted two points in the recommendation: that minimum dues be \$500 and all members be full members. She also reviewed the principles in context of immediate and longer term future. Evelyn noted one question is what “total budget:” the general/main library or the total institutional investment (budget) for all libraries, including law, medical and/or others that are not administratively part of the general/main

library? Janice reviewed other questions of implementation. In regard to membership growth (how many, how fast), she noted that the Principles of Membership came out of earlier Board discussions for the purpose of grounding growth strategies in the purpose and expectations of membership.

Discussion points

- Capacity basis is important. It is important for everyone to feel they are paying a fair share and their fair share. Tom decided to pay sustaining dues because it fitted the local situation: participation and recognition from home institution, value of belonging to the group.
- Members can pay more than required for their budget category. If so, how can this be recognized?
- Tiers give more predictability in planning and more “forgiveness” than do precise budget numbers.
- What is sustaining membership? The term “sustaining” replaced “founding” as a category and is set at \$7,500. Another option was proposed: for each budget tier, double the current level of dues so that there is an incentive for more members to choose a higher level of dues. It was felt that doubling of the \$5K and \$7,500 would result in levels that are too high.
- The sustaining membership dues levels originated from a need for additional revenue and some members sent voluntary contributions for FY2010/11. This could be done on an ongoing basis with the expectation this would likely be cyclical, up in good times and down in bad times.
- Discussed what would be gained from affiliate members who could only pay less than the minimum dues. Answer: content. Decided that “affiliate” relationships should not be membership relationships.
- Agreed important not to set too low a threshold for dues. Ask institutions who don’t feel they can pay the minimum dues to make a proposal with specific budget numbers and suggestion of what they can pay. The Board reviews and works out a plan. We would not have to publish a too low fee structure and provides a flexible approach as needed.
- Discussed what total budget to use as the basis for dues. The point was made that the main library director usually has no control over the library budgets of law, medical or other professional libraries on campus. Agreed to use the university library budget as the “total library budget” for setting dues. Amend recommendation to say “total university library budget (excluding professional school libraries such as medical and law but including branches that are part of the university library)”.
- Agreed the member would then be the main, general or university library but that membership could include contributions from other libraries and archives at, or closely related to, the institution. The main library could sponsor bringing in collections from others with whom they work closely, such as university, diocesan or religious order archives. This would enable more local collaboration and advance the goal of greater collaboration among Catholic institutions.
- What about international inquiries? Current emphasis is on United States and Canada although earlier the focus was on the Americas. Suggested putting intentional outreach beyond the United States and Canada, such as to other countries in Central and/ or South America into the 2-5 year goals. Many religious orders have a presence in Rome and so might be a potential network node there in regard to religious orders.
- The impact of the changed level of dues would result in slightly less revenue next year based on current members but would result in slightly more revenue if the expected prospective members join.
- Revised recommendation: We recommend the Board adopt the proposed dues structure with 5 tiers of dues, ranging from \$500 to \$7,500, based on the total university library budget (excluding professional school libraries, such as medical and law but including branches that are part of the university library), and that all dues paying members be full members with the rights and responsibilities defined in the current *Bylaws*.

**CRRA Membership Dues TF proposal and recommendation to the Board March 23, 2011
sent via email March 25: CALL-IN info for CRRA Board meeting, Wed. afternoon, March
30 AND Documents**

To: CRRA Board of Directors

From: Membership Dues Structure Task Force: Janice Welburn, chair; Joe Lucia, Evelyn Minick, Bob Seal, Steve Connaghan, Jennifer Younger

Re: Proposal and Recommendations for a dues structure

Date: March 23, 2011

On behalf of the Task Force, I am pleased to send our recommendation to adopt a multi-tiered dues structure together with the principles and observations used in developing the proposed model. The Task Force discussed models used in other organizations, took into account previous Board decisions that every member should be expected to pay dues and that multiple levels of dues are needed, and collected budget data from current as well as some prospective members.

Recommendation

We recommend the Board adopt the proposed dues structure with 5 tiers of dues, ranging from \$500 to \$7,500, based on the total budget, and that all who pay dues be full members.

The proposed two models (multiple tiers and a sliding scale) are based on principles and observations.

1. The criteria in the *Principles of Membership* focus on holding collections relevant to the scope and themes of the Catholic portal and having sufficient capacity to support the CRRA through dues and participation, including contribution of metadata and content.
2. The potential pool of members from the community of Catholic libraries and archives ranges from 200 to 300 institutions, making it important to find a model broadly applicable.
3. The first question addressed was what model and level of dues based on current members will result in sufficient revenue for the next year. We used a revenue target of \$100,000 to \$110,000, slightly below this year's revenue of \$113,125 which covers expenses and is expected to result in a small cash carry forward for next year.
4. The second question focused on developing an appropriate dues structure for the future. We compared multiple tiers with the sliding scale. Going forward, an affordable dues structure for a wide range of institutions will increase membership and provide for ongoing sustainability.
5. We believe the sliding scale at .0001 is affordable at the low end but too costly at the high end although it could be modified with a cap at the high end.
6. We recommend minimum dues of \$500 for membership. If institutions holding collections relevant to the Catholic portal cannot afford \$500, then other avenues can be pursued: dues reduction based on hardship, collaboration with the institution to seek funds from their parent institution, or subsidies from contingency or grant funds.
7. We believe full membership for all dues paying members provides greater incentive for content contribution and mission support.
8. Current memberships include all libraries and archives at an institution. While much of the participation may come from the general library at any institution, the institution-wide approach is both efficient and effective in attracting relevant collections from across an institution.

Questions of implementation

1. Can an institution join at a level of dues lower than indicated by their budget? If not, some assistance may be needed to ease the transition.

2. In the survey, some members reported budgets for all libraries and archives while some reported only for the general library. We developed a model based on the total budget in support of the institution-wide membership. Another option is to develop a dues structure based on the institution budget, on institution student and/or faculty FTEs. In either case, the TF suggests continuing to work through library directors.
3. Would a non-member “affiliate” category be useful to allow institutions to invest financially in the portal for mission support? If so, this can be developed next year.
4. What will membership targets be for next year? Will there be a limit to number of new members per year? If so, what number?