

**ASEE Engineering Libraries Division
Extended Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
Chicago, Wednesday, June 21, 2006, 4:30-6:30 pm**

Present: J. Van Fleet, O. Pozo, A. Van Epps (recorder), L. Thompson, T. Volkening, J. Powell, K. Drees, C. Brach, M. White, J. Bhatt, J. Teleha, K. Thomes, A. Shimp, C. Beard, M. DeSart, B. Heyer-Gray, B. Schwarzwald, S. Stitch, J. Cook, L. Whang, K. Andrews

Meeting called to order at 4:27 pm

Reading of the agenda:

- 1) feedback on this conference
- 2) status of the information literacy SIG
- 3) possibility of salary survey
- 4) conflict of interest issue
- 5) writing/mentoring group
- 6) next program ideas

New additions:

- identifying EEC members
- awards committee members for poster judging (only for that session)
- update about services to Canadian membership meeting on Sunday

The goal is to finish with agenda items by 5 pm so the rest of the time is available for discussion of Hawai'i program.

- 1) Thoughts and/or comments and reactions about this conference

Several issues were raised, including:

- ASEE seeming to have a memory lapse about the size of our group and the room sizes we need, we continue to work at getting rooms large enough to handle the group and get assurances from ASEE that they are doing the best they can
- For sessions where we have a sponsor providing a meal, we need a place for everyone to sit at a table to eat. There were some folks on the edges in just chairs during the business meeting.
 - i. - Committee meeting session, we need to have enough space to accommodate groups. This year was sort of an experiment. We could discuss if this worked well. There were enough chairs. The ability to move things around was helpful.
- Requesting that all of our posters during our session time be kept together and that there be tables available at the posters for papers, etc.

- 2) Information Literacy SIG

We disbanded the listserv, but there was some interest in having a web space for training tools, web objects, etc. that would be available for other members to use/adapt, etc. We could make it happen fairly easily. We're looking into having parameters created for what would go in the space.

- 3) Salary survey possibility

There has been some interest expressed for getting benchmarks on salaries of Engineering Librarians. We'd want to be sure to collection information anonymously and include certain information that effect salary, such as: 9 mo / 12 mo; tenure-track; public / private; yrs of experience; standard statistical measures. Jim Van Fleet would be willing to develop an

instrument. General interest was expressed. Jim will begin pulling together some parameters and send to the group for review.

4) Conflict of Interest (COI) issues

In past years some people were not attending the banquet due to support of vendors and university COI statements. Do we need to have a larger discussion about this / is this an issue?

A suggestion as a way to air this issue and concerns: without actually taking away the sponsorship option.

1. For the people who have a conflict of interest, they may pay for themselves to avoid having to accept the gift
2. We already have a mechanism in place for handling non-ELD people, so we need to enunciate this clearly for the membership so they know there is this option
3. This seems to be a good plan and Kate thinks we should move ahead in this direction

5) Writing/mentoring group

Came about as several members became more sensitized about the writing level all of us possess.

The intention of this group is not to point fingers or make people uncomfortable. The mentoring committee has a new service where they will provide some initial reviewing of papers. There will be a call for these reviewers at a later date.

What we see is that the SmoothPaper timeline is directing the program in odd ways. When abstracts are submitted to SmoothPaper they go to a panel of judges for conference inclusion. If a paper goes first to the mentoring committee, then we are getting feedback from colleagues prior to submission.

The mentoring committee discussed this for several months. They will be putting together a website that describes the service, to be clear that it's a review service, not a rewrite service.

Posters – The awards committee was hoping for a criteria or checklist of what makes a good poster. Most of the content was very good, but some of the display was not as strong as they could be, and the criteria could be posted on the mentoring page as well. There is also a potential for creating/adding a blind review process as part of this.

A concern was raised that it should be made clear what the paper submission process is, there is a mentoring aspect and a review process. We need to make sure people know which parts are mandatory (SmoothPaper and reviewing) and which are voluntary (mentoring and preliminary review).

Issues we anticipate having to deal with in the next year

One suggestion about Get Acquainted Session: at least one group had some people who didn't contribute due to other dominant people in the group. Ideas for the next Get Acquainted Session moderator:

- pre-assign group facilitators
- enforced note taking wasn't positively received
- possible ground rules of everyone speaking once – round-robin style
- have everyone introduce themselves, not just the new people

Accreditation And Standards committee

- a. There was a request for a potential bylaws revision to clean up working and explain a little more about what they're doing. It was clarified that committee descriptions are in the addendum to the bylaws and final vote on acceptance is with the EC. Kevin will draft the proposed new language and send that to the EEC for review.

Feedback on what went well for poster judging

- b. Working as a group so all judges saw the same presentation of the information
- c. Having a timekeeper to keep them moving since they only had 5 min on each poster so they could get through them all
- d. May have an upper limit of 20 posters in that session for purposes of sufficient interaction for judging
- e. Having the opportunity to go back to them when there was no one else around
- f. Could be better:
 - i. Let the person know they only have 5 minutes so they can be ready when the committee gets there
 - ii. Coordinate a bit more with the poster session moderator about some of these things
 - iii. Identify the committee members in some way
 - iv. When in the paper submission process do things get designated as a poster or presentation?
 1. some people actually stated they wanted only a poster
 2. ASEE has no distinction between the poster presentations and papers
 3. Kate was able to pull out some of the abstracts for John and the committee for a bit of pre-review, which also helped

Online voting: we had 88 of 249 members voting

While this is not a significant difference from what we would have had in person at the business meeting, there is still a benefit to having this done in advance, including the ability for active members who can't make the conference in a given year, to vote. Pictures of candidates on the webpage were quite helpful.

Update on the Canadian members meeting

Council of zones meeting with the topic of how ASEE can enhance services to Canadian members. Currently only 350 members are from Canada of the 13,000 members in ASEE.

Some ideas for increased Canadian participation:

- i. Canadian members didn't feel much ownership
- ii. Very low visibility
- iii. Prism articles are very American centric
- iv. ASEE needs to collect more data before taking any real action
- v. We lost members at one point because of the exchange rate, and when it was not in their favor a lot and it's not their primary group, they drop

Do we need to identify the EEC and who the members are?

Perhaps the need is for further description of the organization, rather than just identifying a particular subgroup. There is nothing wrong with little stickers to identify the group.

Ideas to help:

- Have the conference buddy program participants to create a list of what makes sense for these people to know.
- Include information as part of the welcome packet to new members

- First time attendees can get some kind of information to orient people to the process
- Bring back the ribbons or some way to identify the new attendees
- For some of the receptions we have: lets try and find quieter locations

7) Planning for Hawai'i

Jay opened this section of the meeting by having Bob Schwarzwaldner provide some information about options and venues in Honolulu.

Bob has an interest in setting up some workshops and a reception at the library.

The University is about 2.5 miles from the convention center.

Things to think about:

1. side trips – lots of nature opportunities: recommendation: Hanauma Bay
2. Historical stuff: Pearl Harbor
3. Lots of shopping

Meal Options:

Figure out what ASEE is doing – probably a luau for the picnic

If ELD does a luau, it's about \$100-\$125 a head; it would be cheaper going the University

Keep in mind that lots of people don't like Hawaiian food, so really look at the menu.

Monday reception option – at the University, in the library with a tour; also there is a little restaurant about a mile away – Wai'oli Tea Room – could probably get the whole place.

Banquet – Waikiki beach; hotel spaces looking out at the water

Program options : local stuff

Greenstone digital repository program

Disaster planning: Bob is a little tired of this – could get locals for this

- a. New Mexico; Washington; New Orleans

Distance and distributed education

Additional thought: outside perspectives/speakers – could be limited due to travel expense to Hawai'i

Perhaps once we have better program ideas, Bob could really help us find local expertise and good speakers, thus limiting travel expenses for ELD.

Since Hawai'i is centrally located in the Pacific Rim, so can look at other speakers we wouldn't be able to draw to a continental location

Question from Carol – from Elsevier as a sponsor

Do we think the number will be up or down in Hawai'i?

We have no way to predict the number of attendees. The last couple years have been pretty consistent, so provide those numbers.

Ideas about travel to Honolulu and information ELD could provide:

Let people know some real cost estimates so people don't think the travel costs are too high.

Would it make sense to try and set up a site for this year?

Going to Hawai'i tips, planning ideas – wiki would be a good application for this

Jay got more than 20-25 suggestions

- ii. Mentoring session – panel discussion between expert and new librarians
 - i. How do you do various things about the job, etc
 - ii. Challenges and opportunities for new engineering librarians
- iii. Marketing and liaison work – how to make the contacts
 - i. Relationship building
- iv. Systematic downloads and problems with areas (IP ranges) cut off
 - i. Agreement between publishers and librarians on what this is
 - ii. Some researchers do this as part of their research, to find patterns, not because they're trying to steal content
- v. National Engineering regional library
 - i. Fragmentation of engineering literature and how the silos are related to what the students are trying to do
 - ii. In the past we had a full conference on this issue – this concept comes up periodically and now it's digital not print
 - 1. this may just be possible now
 - 2. perhaps a mini-plenary idea/topic
- vi. Information resources in engineering
 - i. Gray literature
 - ii. Sources of technical reports and how faculty and students can use them
 - iii. Business information needs of engineering students – how do we address this need
 - 1. Collaboration with entrepreneurship, etc.
- vii. Scholarly communication
 - i. Panel or presentations from our division committee
 - ii. The committee group passed that along as well and has some ideas
- viii. Emergency preparedness
- ix. Faculty status and if librarians should have this
 - i. “done in the 70s”
 - ii. What ‘counts’ toward preparing your document
- x. Information literacy
 - i. Future of instruction
 - ii. Still want to see a session on this
 - iii. Integrating course management systems in to instruction and teaching – techniques
 - iv. Distance education

Group reaction to a workshop before the conference: review of pedagogies that are effect for engineers and engineering students

- review of what is known about that research body
- exploration of applications of those pedagogy

Bob S. said things get booked quickly, so we need to move rather quickly. Get a space booked with at least rough numbers early.

Respectfully submitted,
Amy Van Epps
ELD Secretary/Treasurer