



Catholic Research Resources Alliance

Agenda CRRA Board of Directors

Wednesday April 20, 2011
3:30 – 5:00 p.m. Eastern
2:30 – 4:00 p.m. Central
12:30 – 2 p.m. Pacific

Monday April 25, 2011
4:00 – 5:00 p.m. Eastern
3:00 – 4:00 p.m. Central
1:00 – 2:00 p.m. Pacific

Audio call-in
Call: 1-866-469-3239
Attendee access code: 216 605 75

1. Welcome, review of agendas and participants on April 20 and April 25
2. Confirmation of March 30, 2011 minutes (attached)
3. Discuss draft proposal for NEH Challenge Grant (draft attached)
Desired outcome: Decide yes or no on submitting a proposal to NEH.

Recommendations to Board from Jennifer and Pat

1. That we not submit a proposal to NEH at this time
2. That we develop a 5 year strategic plan to provide a framework for carrying out next year's goals (see next note) and to enable development of a compelling proposal of building capacity to carry out our vision, mission and strategic plan
3. The top priority goals identified at the membership meeting on March 30, 2011 for FY2011/12 are: draft a plan for increasing digital content in portal, facilitate continual updating of member records and content, and develop a sustainable business plan
4. Report of the Membership Dues Task Force and proposed dues structure (proposed dues structure rev 04-07-11 (2).pdf attached)
Desired outcome: Discuss and adopt recommendation of TF

Recommendation in the CRRA Board Agenda and Minutes of 3-30-11): 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*.

Minutes April 20, 2011

1. Members present April 20: Tom Leonhardt, Janice Welburn, Tom Wall, Stephanie Clark (for Artemis Kirk), Terry Ehling, strategic consultant, Pat Lawton and Jennifer Younger
Members present April 25: Theresa Byrd, Steve Connaghan, Tom Wall, Janice Welburn, Pat Lawton, Jennifer Younger
2. March 30 minutes confirmed as posted.
3. Jennifer opened the discussion with a summary of comments from the NEH Program Officer and Terry Ehling. Jennifer noted they offered some specific suggestions appropriate to the intent of the NEH Challenge Grant program. Overall, the proposal is pretty good but in light of the question that would be asked in the NEH proposal review – is the CRRA ready for this? – Jennifer and Pat suggested we – the CRRA - would benefit from doing a strategic plan before submitting the proposal. This would allow us to create a bold and even stronger proposal of what we can do over the next five years in supporting the needs scholars on our own campuses have expressed in focus groups and usability studies. Second, we could develop a more appropriate financial target to build the capacity for what we intend to do. There was general consensus supporting the recommendation.

The discussion turned to strategic planning. Key questions and observations follow.

- 3.1. It is a wise course to address strategic planning first.
 - 3.2. It is a good idea to involve Terry Ehling, retained for her expert advising.
 - 3.3. Two institutions – St. Edward’s and Boston College – are surveying their collections and assessing digitization needs and priorities.
 - 3.4. An environmental scan by CRRA of hidden collections of rare, unique and/or uncommon Catholic research resources held by Catholic as well as by secular colleges, universities, seminaries, diocesan and religious archives is a good first step. Determining the desired and possible granularity of an environmental scan should take into account what local institutions will do locally, and how a national and institutional scans fit together. What do local institutions want to know about North American hidden collections and digitization prospects? What data is best gathered in local scans?
 - 3.5. The portal appears to be moving from a “referatory” to a “repository” for digital content such that assessing infrastructure, technology, capacity and so on is in order.
 - 3.6. Becoming a repository should come out of our strategic plan.
4. Janice opened the discussion on membership dues with a brief summary of the work of the Task Force and the discussion among Board members, Task Force members and other library directors on March 30 at Saint Joseph’s University. She noted the revised recommendation would base the dues on the library budget and that all dues paying members would be full members. She mentioned library directors at the recent AJCU meeting at Loyola Marymount welcomed the broader range of levels of the dues. General consensus was to adopt the recommendation from the Task Force in its current form with the following comments.
 - 4.1. It is important to incentivize content contribution by members although members also recognized the need to maintain a sufficient revenue stream. While one option might be through a dues reduction, what other options could be considered? Not necessary to review as part of adopting the dues structure or setting dues for the next membership year but important to revisit in the future.

- 4.2. The difference between full and associate membership is that full members have voting privileges while associate members do not. To date, the Board has not put issues such as selection of new Board members, the dues or the budget before the membership so currently there is little or no practical impact on being a full or associate member. As governance practices evolve, some issues could go to the membership for a vote.
 - 4.3. A firm dues structure is needed. There should be no shortcuts to becoming a sustaining member. Becoming a sustaining member is aspirational and should not be diluted.
 - 4.4. Dues from the current 21 members would result in \$109,000. With the anticipated financial support from Notre Dame, revenue would be sufficient to cover basic expenses.
 - 4.5. Assessing the suitability of the proposed budget categories and corresponding level of dues should use a conservative estimate of the anticipated average dues per member. If all new members paid the minimum of \$500, 30 new members would yield \$15,000. If all new members paid an average of \$1,000, the yield would be \$30,000. If all new members paid an average of \$1,500, the yield would be \$45,000. The practice has been only to set a budget based on existing members. The purpose here is only to understand the future revenue capacity of this dues structure.
 - 4.6. The level of dues is not set for all time, but increases other than inflation or other index-based measure should come from the strategic plan.
 - 4.7. There are no budget projections for what will be needed in 3 to 5 years. Terry noted a target might be \$350,000 - \$450,000. To reach 100% of the \$450,000 through dues, CRRA would need 225 members to pay an average of \$2,000 each.
 - 4.8. Dues should be increased on a regular basis. Consider using HEPI or other index as basis for annual increases.
 - 4.9. A sustainable business model built on a hybrid income stream is a good idea. A target might be that dues would provide 60 – 70% of revenue.
 - 4.10. Jennifer review next steps: inform current and prospective members of dues for next fiscal year, draft a budget for next year for Board review and approval, and subsequently send out invoices.
5. A short discussion on strategic planning ensued. The following comments were made.
 - 5.1. Mellon planning grant? To fund strategic planning?
 - 5.2. A core group could lead a strategic planning initiative including Jennifer, Pat, Terry Ehling, one Board member plus two library directors from outside of the Board.
 - 5.3. Ask members to start the process by identifying the top 3-5 things they want the CRRA to do in the next 3-5 years.
 - 5.4. Important to address the value question: what value does the CRRA add?
 - 5.5. Set a clear vision of what we want to be in five or even ten years.
 - 5.6. What is the “portal?” Does it drive CRRA or does CRRA drive the portal? Is there a service element to the mission that is “beyond the portal?”
 - 5.7. Identify the benefits of joining the CRRA.
 - 5.8. Target six months for completion in mid-November and Board adoption by end of 2011.
 - 5.9. Suggestion that Jennifer and Pat send a plan for proceeding to the Board with a target date for reply. Jennifer will send by May 9 with a response date of Monday, May 16.

The meeting adjourned at 5 p.m.