



# Catholic Research Resources Alliance

<http://www.catholicresearch.net>

**To: CRRR 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 CRRR 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?