

MLA Task Force on Committee Structure
Draft Recommendations January 2008

FEEDBACK

MLA members are encouraged to send comments to task force members via this email address: JMorrow@NewEnglandConservatory.edu

At the annual meeting in Newport, President Phil Vandermeer will lead an open discussion of these recommendations on Saturday, February 23, at 7:30 a.m., during the “Presidential Q&A on MLA Committee Structure.” Comments and questions raised during this session will be considered as the task force finalizes our recommendations to the Board of Directors.

CONTENTS

Task Force Charge and Membership	page 2
MLA Mission Statement	page 2
Preface	page 3
Recommendations	page 4
Appendix 1: Methodology and Timeline	page 15
Appendix 2: Publicity & Outreach Officer position announcement	page 16

TASK FORCE CHARGE AND MEMBERSHIP

Charge: with the goal of ensuring effectiveness in MLA's committee structure and responsiveness to current trends in music librarianship, the task force will undertake a review of the association's current committee structure. The group also will review committee charges and charges of special officers as appropriate. Seeking broad input from MLA's members, the task force will report to the Board at its Fall 2007 meeting. The report will include a summary of the review process and recommendations for changes in the committee structure and/or charges.

Members: Paula Elliot, Bruce Hall, Amanda Maple (co-chair), Kevin Medows (January–November 2007), Jean Morrow (co-chair), Nancy Nuzzo, and Dan Zager.

MLA MISSION STATEMENT

Our recommendations are guided by the following draft MLA Mission Statement, which was reviewed by the MLA Board of Directors in September 2007.

Mission

The mission of the Music Library Association is to provide leadership for the development and enhancement in libraries and archives of services that foster the collection and preservation of music and provide universal access to music and information about music, thereby promoting music in society and preserving the cultural heritage.

To achieve this mission, we

- develop and deliver programs that promote continuing education and professional development in music librarianship;*
- ensure and enhance intellectual access to music for all by contributing to the development and revision of national and international codes, formats, and other standards for the bibliographic control of music;*
- ensure and enhance access to music for all by facilitating best practices for housing, preserving and providing access to music;*
- promote legislation that strengthens music library services and universal access to music;*
- foster information literacy and lifelong learning by promoting music reference services and library instruction programs; and*
- collaborate with other groups in the music and technology industries, government, and librarianship, to promote our mission and values.*

To meet these goals, our association is led by an elected board of directors whose role is to ensure the efficient and effective operation of the association.

PREFACE

Based on our study of all MLA committees, subcommittees, and special officers, we note that:

- A. MLA is at its best when focusing on our area of expertise within librarianship: music. More general library topics should be carefully considered before being assigned as the primary focus of any ongoing group, such as a committee or subcommittee. Some standing groups and officers, such as the Bibliographic Control Committee, the Legislation Committee, and the representative to NISO, routinely address professional issues on behalf of MLA that, though not unique to music, have potential impact on music librarianship. We refer rather to continuing education within MLA: librarians have many ways to locate information and workshops about library challenges not specific to music, such as hiring and supervising staff, dealing with problem employees, qualities of excellent leaders, and managing budgets. We recommend that the Education Committee keep a list of general library topics and sponsor sessions about selected topics every three years or so, in rotation (either pre-conference workshops or program sessions), so interested music librarians have access to such programming occasionally, in addition to the external resources provided by other library organizations and management experts.
- B. Assignments to develop standards are better dealt with by a task force within a finite period of time, rather than by an ongoing committee.
- C. The “visibility” of MLA is a welcome byproduct of achieving our goals of providing valuable services to the profession and to society. When we noticed language in committee charges about promoting visibility, we sought to identify the underlying objectives that might have been in play when they were written.
- D. The implementation of some of our recommendations (if they are agreeable to the membership of MLA) will initiate a period of transition to a partially new committee structure. This change will provide new service opportunities for MLA members. We share everyone’s concern that all MLA members, including those currently serving on committees and subcommittees, will continue to have the opportunity to serve under a new organizational structure. Our task force has discussed issues of transition and implementation with MLA’s President, who confirmed our confidence that all currently serving MLA committee/subcommittee members, if their assignments are changed during their term of service, will have the opportunity to self-select membership on a new or ongoing committee or subcommittee. There is much useful work to be done for MLA, and there is plenty of work for all. Our task force has concentrated on envisioning an optimal organizational structure for MLA in the future, one that will enable MLA to meet its strategic goals. Once we have general agreement on that near-future “picture” of MLA, we are confident that a smooth and steady implementation plan can, and will, be developed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Education Committee and Subcommittees

Recommendation: revise the charge to the Education Committee to more explicitly include outreach education to targeted audiences outside MLA, as well as continuing education of MLA members, and eliminate the Subcommittees for Outreach and Library School Liaison. Suggested wording of revised charge:

devise and coordinate activities related to 1) continuing education for music librarianship, and 2) outreach education to generalist librarians (in academic and public libraries) whose responsibilities include music, and to other audiences external to MLA, such as students and faculty in professional librarianship degree programs, and MLA's chapters. Activities can include, but are not limited to, coordinating the development and maintenance of websites that share MLA's expertise on various aspects of music librarianship; developing and sponsoring workshops; and developing and sponsoring conference and pre-conference sessions. Maintain a rotation of session topics useful for music librarians to know, but not unique to music librarianship (such as hiring and supervising staff, managing budgets, problem employees, qualities of effective leaders), and sponsor programs on those topics every few years.

Rationale: outreach education is integral to the work of the committee as a whole. The committee's chair and members can organize themselves appropriately from year to year to achieve optimum effectiveness, and mandating the existence of a subcommittee is unnecessary if outreach is a clear focus of the charge to the committee. Faculty and students in professional library degree programs are one subset of MLA's outreach audience, as described in our proposed committee charge.

Aspects of the current charge to the Library School Liaison Subcommittee are problematic: "enhancing MLA's visibility" with professional librarianship degree programs and educators, if desired, is a publicity function better assigned to the Publicity & Outreach Officer rather than a subcommittee. The development of "standards," if desired, is a finite activity that should be assigned to a short-term task force with a deadline. "Bringing continuing education programs to a wider audience in conjunction with the established library schools" is an outreach education activity already covered in the charge to the Education Committee. A separate subcommittee charged to "serve as a vehicle for communication between library educators and music librarians" is unwieldy. If regular and ongoing communication is needed, a specific individual within MLA should be designated to handle it rather than a subcommittee whose membership changes from year to year. But what message does MLA want to communicate to educators in librarianship in this way? Is it a message that the Publicity & Outreach Officer is not equipped to handle?

Recent activities of the Library School Liaison Subcommittee have been the occasional publication of a directory of professional librarianship degree programs with music courses or emphases; and most recently providing consultation services to an institution, or perhaps a consortium, about curricular content for a new online course in music librarianship. The directory, if still desired, is an outreach education activity already a part of the charge to the Education Committee (the target audience is primarily external to MLA). An entire

subcommittee is not required to update the directory, if it is still considered useful in light of the online information every higher education institution makes available about its programs. Providing a consultation service to an institution or consortium that is developing content for an online course is a finite task (rather than an ongoing one) most appropriate for a task force.

External Organizational Liaisons

Recommendation: move the coordination of external organizational liaisons to the Publicity & Outreach Officer (rather than a member-at-large of the Board of Directors). Focus the charge to external organizational liaisons on publicity and outreach (rather than on bringing news back from other organizations to MLA).

Note: the Administrative Structure refers in three separate places to different types of external liaisons: 1) “Liaisons and Representatives” to several ALA groups that address bibliographic control issues (listed in our Administrative Structure under the Bibliographic Control Committee); 2) “Representatives to Other Organizations,” listed after the Joint Committees and comprising a representative to ALA and a representative to NISO (the National Information Standards Organization); and 3) “External Liaisons,” listed after the Representatives to Other Organizations, comprising a liaison to MOUG (Music OCLC Users Group) and a distinct group of 25 “Organizational Liaisons.” Our recommendation refers only to this last group of 25 “Organizational Liaisons.”

Rationale: according to the four most recent annual reports, only two of our twenty-five external liaisons have reported activity in a given year over the past four years. We are recommending a fundamental change in expectations of external liaisons: under the guidance of the Publicity & Outreach Officer, take MLA’s publicity and outreach message to your liaison organization. Report annually to the Publicity & Outreach Officer about the communications you have sent, the flyers you have distributed, the poster sessions and booths you have staffed at your liaison organization’s conferences, and the meetings you have attended of your liaison organization.

The Publicity & Outreach Officer is the primary officer responsible for MLA’s publicity and outreach messages. This officer is the best person to provide the messages and offer consultation to liaisons regarding new material for distribution to targeted outreach audiences. This officer serves for a longer term than members-at-large on the Board, providing more stability, and is directly relevant to the external liaisons’ role. We feel this is a better solution to coordinating the external liaisons than coordination by committee (such as the Outreach Subcommittee) or by a Board member who serves at most a two-year term. This coordination role should be written into the duties of the Publicity & Outreach Officer, and that officer should include a report of external liaison activities in the officer’s annual report.

Publicity Officer

In addition to our recommendation about external liaisons, we forwarded to the Board this officer’s recommended revision to the job description/charge in the Administrative

Handbook. The Board recently renamed this position the “Publicity & Outreach Officer” and posted a revised position description and call for applications. See Appendix 2.

Membership Committee

Recommendation: eliminate the Membership Committee. Retain conference-related programs for targeted groups of MLA members (for example, the Conference Buddy and Work-for-Registration programs, and the New Members’ Forum/First-Time Attendees functions) under a different part of the organizational structure.

Rationale: the primary charge to the Membership Committee is recruitment of new members. Thanks to their efforts and one-on-one promotion by enthusiastic MLA members across the organization, the pool of logical target groups for recruitment is saturated with MLA members. The most recently created membership class targets paraprofessionals (though this group might not have the financial support to attend conferences in large numbers). Ongoing work to identify additional target audiences for recruitment is not likely to yield growth in membership numbers. The chair of the Membership Committee wrote a very thoughtful response to our task force. He mentioned that recruiting beyond the traditional professional music library community is difficult because others can’t afford to travel to annual meetings, and MLA doesn’t offer much for its dues dollars beyond that:

Frankly, I don't see that there are a significant number of professional music librarians who are out there who are not members of MLA for the Membership Committee to focus its energy on recruiting them into the Association. I think the Board and the membership as a whole realize this and that contributed to the initiative to create a paraprofessional category of membership. We understand our charge as Membership Committee to be to recruit new MLA members from communities who have not been included previously in our self-identity. In addition to paraprofessionals, we have been including library staff (paraprofessional or MLS) whose responsibilities for music are only a part of their jobs, in our committee's consideration.

However, since there are no significant remaining target audiences for recruitment, our task force has observed that assigning a group of talented, energetic MLA members to continue recruiting new members year after year is frustratingly fruitless for those folks, and they have naturally started coming up with other ideas for how to use their talents and energy. Those other ideas have been outreach-oriented rather than recruitment-oriented. “Outreach” is educational programming for audiences outside of the MLA membership, a free sharing of MLA’s expertise as a service to society, while “recruitment” is marketing MLA to get people to join. The Membership Committee has been looking for something to market, and has tried to develop outreach programming as a way to create value that people will want to pay for with their dues dollars. But as the committee’s chair thoughtfully noted in his message to the task force, “The Membership Committee is not responsible for creating MLA’s value.”

Increasing our membership base is not in itself a strategic goal for MLA; increasing our numbers is not our *raison d’être* (we hope). MLA needs to be valuable to its own members, and to relevant external audiences, by offering products and services that are useful and perceived by those audiences as valuable. We cannot “enhance our visibility” otherwise (by

fiat, nor by creating a committee charged to do that). Our task force recommends that charging a committee to recruit new members is no longer appropriate for MLA, which should be so valuable that a committee is not necessary to make recruiting happen. The other part of the Membership Committee's charge is to retain existing members. The Membership Committee now manages several excellent conference-related programs for newer MLA members that encourage retention (Conference Buddy, New Members Forum, Work-for-Registration). But again, if MLA is successfully meeting its own goals, our members shouldn't need the efforts of a committee to be convinced to renew as their careers progress. We recommend that the conference-related programs targeting newer members be managed elsewhere in the organizational structure.

Our task force has observed, on the other hand, a significant need for more outreach programming of various kinds, in addition to the heavily used music-copyright website. For example:

- developing and delivering presentations to state library associations, MLA chapters, and other interested groups about listening facilities, streaming audio, and other music-related library services
- developing new websites about preserving (care and housing of) music formats, and best practices for archival descriptions of music (appropriate metadata schemas, etc.)
- producing a white paper on how the ILS of the future needs to be structured to meet the needs of music users
- updating and maintaining a site like the DW3 Classical Music Resources link that was discussed over MLA-L within the past year

These would be excellent services provided by MLA that would be used widely by non-members, as well as members, and would create value—not for the purpose of additional dues from new members, but to meet our strategic goals. Transferring the energy and talents of the current Membership Committee to the development and coordination of additional outreach programming (if they are interested in such an assignment) seems strongly worth considering, and is our recommendation. An alternative choice for this committee's members would be to continue leadership of conference-related programs for newer members through service on a different committee.

Administration Committee and Subcommittees

Recommendations:

- Rename the Personnel Subcommittee the Career Services Committee, a stand-alone committee with a new charge.

Rationale: programs (websites, conference sessions, etc.) developed by the newly charged committee would focus on helping music librarians find employment and receive career mentoring through different phases of their careers, from new professional through retirement. The resume review service would be under the purview of the Career Services Committee. Fostering a positive conference experience for new music librarians is an important mentoring service, so programs such as “conference buddy,” New Members Forum, and “work-for-registration” would be under the purview of this

committee. The Placement Officer would sit *ex officio* on this committee and would still handle the Placement Service.

The Personnel Subcommittee has also sponsored programs and services related to library management. As explained above under Preface A, we recommend that responsibility for occasional programs and services about library management topics be the purview of the Education Committee.

- Rename the Integrated Library Systems Subcommittee the Library Systems Subcommittee and move it under the purview of the Bibliographic Control Committee with a new charge.

Rationale: new charge (under BCC) would be to address issues related to the public manifestation of bibliographic control and the intersection of the conceptual background for cataloging with public display and searching problems and solutions; new intellectual access models and tools beyond the traditional library catalog.

This group would speak on behalf of MLA regarding the presentation of music cataloging data to the world. Our task force considered this recommendation independently before receiving the same recommendation from the chair of the Bibliographic Control Committee.

Assign the former charge (to identify requirements for integrated library systems) to a task force, since this is a finite task more appropriate to a task force than an ongoing group. With FRBR and RDA on the horizon, library catalogs will be focusing on the concept of the “work” as the basis for their organizational structure. Catalogs will provide new ways to represent expressions and manifestations of the work, and the concept of the item will be redefined. These changes could be wonderful for music access and retrieval: we will be better able to help users distinguish between content and carrier. Though many (most) works in the bibliographic universe exist in just one manifestation, for music the situation is quite the opposite.

MLA should participate in helping to shape the next generation of library catalogs, which will be based on the “work” and will demonstrate relationships among works, expressions, manifestations, and items. An MLA task force, with representation from Public Services and Bibliographic Control, including the Library Systems Subcommittee, would provide MLA an important opportunity to reflect on these concepts *and their implications specifically for music materials*.

The task force should produce a written document directed to the broadest possible audience within MLA (many music catalogers are already grappling with the implications of FRBR and RDA, but it is not clear that these concepts have necessarily penetrated the thinking of all music librarians). Such a written document should be seen as an educational service to the members of MLA (with possible publication in *Notes*) as well as a paper that could be useful in articulating the access and retrieval issues for music materials to various external constituencies, including but not limited to other

professional library associations, librarians who are not members of MLA, and designers and vendors of library systems. The document should consider such questions as:

- 1) What do library users (specialists in music as well as non-specialists) want to find in the way of music works, expressions, manifestations, and items? What are their expectations for an ideal library catalog that will make it possible to find music materials efficiently?
- 2) Given current cataloging procedures, how do they find it? How well are our current catalogs working for access to and retrieval of music materials?
- 3) In light of FRBR and RDA how can music libraries provide better means for access and retrieval of music materials?

In convening such a task force MLA might consider asking some of its members who have moved out of music librarianship to the broader world of cataloging and bibliographic control. People who come to mind are Jennifer Bowen (University of Rochester, River Campus Libraries), Joan Swanekamp (Yale University), and Jane Penner (University of Virginia).

- Convert System User Groups into official roundtables.

Rationale: we studied the System User Groups as part of the ILS Subcommittee, which noted in a recent annual report that it “hosts” the user groups at conferences. As roundtables, the system user groups will have a formal, official status within MLA’s organizational structure and will be able to propose and deliver formal programs about how their systems handle music, similar to programs the ILS Subcommittee has sometimes sponsored. The system roundtables could propose programs jointly with other system roundtables or with the proposed Reference and Access Services Subcommittee to discuss the Access Services functionality of various ILSs such as circulation, reserves, etc. As roundtables, they could also host informal roundtable discussions about these issues without proposing a program. The conversion to roundtables should follow the process already in place for creating any roundtable (described in the Administrative Handbook).

- Appoint a task force to investigate and make recommendations about whether MLA needs statistics (and if so, what kind) to meet its strategic goals. Include recent chairs of the Statistics Subcommittee on the task force.

Rationale: this subcommittee’s members have devoted a great deal of time and effort every year to produce its product. Our task force’s comparison of the subcommittee’s charge and activities raised several questions about statistics related to MLA and music libraries. The Statistics Subcommittee’s product has been an annual survey to gather data from music librarians about institution, facility, services, staff, resources, and expenditures. This activity is not in their charge, which instead is to evaluate the collection of music library statistics in light of national standards and propose standards

for collection of statistics. The stated charge has not been achieved, to our knowledge. Because the questions we identified are beyond the purview of our own charge, we recommend that a task force be appointed (including recent chairs of this subcommittee) to investigate and answer the following questions, and bring recommendations to the Board:

- Would the MLA officers (president, et al.), and others, such as the Legislation Committee or the Development Officer, find certain data about our profession useful for their own advocacy and outreach efforts? For example, how many music libraries are in the U.S.? How many U.S. citizens consult music libraries every year? What does it cost annually to develop music library collections? What data would be useful to MLA leadership in terms of meeting its own strategic goals--the goals in our mission statement? (in contrast to data for use by individual MLA members for local institutional purposes).
- A rationale for gathering data using the subcommittee's most recent questionnaire has been to enable music librarians to compare their own institutional support with that of others, to advocate locally for increased support. However, several of our task force members, upon trying to use the data gathered by this subcommittee, found the data not useful for this purpose because it does not enable comparison with peer libraries. The size of a data pool affects its usefulness, and it is unclear whether the number of libraries responding has been sufficient to create a useful data pool. The amount of labor involved in administering the survey is significant and warrants the most useful outcome possible. These observations led to the following questions: who developed the subcommittee's survey and decided what data should be gathered? Is a particular statistical software program used to store and export the data? Is the data input manually by subcommittee members? How much work (in terms of hours, and in any other terms) does the annual survey involve? Of the seven or eight subcommittee members, is the workload borne primarily by one or two, or is the work spread among various subcommittee members? How many members of MLA feel the survey outcomes are useful to them, and are willing to spend their time gathering and contributing their local data to the pool?
- When the current charge was written, the Board felt the need for an investigation of national standards for library statistics and an informed recommendation of standards for the collection of music library statistics. Is there still a need for this type of investigation and recommendation? If so, would a task force with a finite term and deadline be the appropriate type of group to conduct it?
- What is missing from other available data pools (ALA, ARL, etc.) about music libraries or librarians that might require MLA to gather data itself?
- Gathering and analyzing data usefully requires expertise in designing questionnaires and software to process the data. Should this type of expertise be expected from MLA committee members, and should this type of work be assigned to a committee as an ongoing project? Is data about music libraries needed annually, or every few years? Is such work appropriate to assign to an ongoing committee, or rather to an *ad hoc* task force as needed? Or, should MLA hire a consultant if/when MLA wants useful data about music libraries?

Answers to these questions would inform future decisions about whether MLA should invest in gathering data about music libraries, and, if so, how frequently that data should be gathered, and by whom. We recommend eliminating the Statistics Subcommittee. Based on the report of the proposed task force, the Board might decide later to create a new group with a new charge related to statistics.

- Make the Facilities Subcommittee a stand-alone committee and eliminate the Administration Committee.

Rationale: our task force studied the “umbrella structure” evidenced by a few committee-subcommittees in MLA, in which the parent committee is comprised solely of the chairs of its subcommittees, plus an overall chair. The “umbrella” structure has not worked for the Administration Committee (a conclusion confirmed by the chair of the committee). The subcommittees in this case were too disparate in focus to form a cohesive group that had a reason to meet together under one chair. According to the current chair, “I haven't felt like I've been ‘chair’ of a functioning committee. During my tenure, I have tried to bring together the four subcommittee chairs to devise a common project, without success. It's my impression that the last chair also had this difficulty.” Additionally, as explained in Preface A, we recommend that MLA no longer charge ongoing groups (committees or subcommittees) to focus on aspects of librarianship, such as administration, that are not unique to music librarianship. For these two reasons, we recommend eliminating the Administration Committee.

Placement Officer

In our review of recent annual reports, our task force noted a lack of focus on employers. This officer is well-placed to push information to employers about core competencies of music librarians and the value a music librarian brings to their organization. In 2003, this officer reported contacting all ARL libraries to inform them of the placement service; 2003 is the last year this type of outreach was reported. We forwarded to the Board some suggestions for minor revisions to the charge/job responsibilities of this officer, as well as a recommendation to consider a stronger focus on outreach to employers.

Reference and Public Services Committee and Subcommittees

Recommendation: Change the name of the Reference and Public Services Committee to the Public Services Committee, with three subcommittees: Instruction, Reference and Access Services, and References Sources. Subsume the currently relevant portions of the charges to the current Subcommittees on Information Sharing, Electronic Reference Services, and Reference Performance into the charges to the two new subcommittees, and eliminate the Subcommittees on Information Sharing, Electronic Reference Services, and Reference Performance.

Rationale: The current subcommittees produce highly useful products and outcomes (such as relevant and well-attended conference programs). The charges to some of the subcommittees were drafted before the Internet and the proliferation of electronic delivery of both resources and services. Re-organizing the subcommittees around music librarians' primary public-service functions, rather than on particular methods of delivery or

technology that can become dated, will allow greater flexibility for programming. We anticipate that the Reference and Access Services Subcommittee will incorporate and expand upon the types of programming provided in recent years by the Information Sharing Subcommittee (including new modes of delivering audio for course reserves, as one example of an “access service”), as well as the work on reference assessment/evaluation of the Reference Performance Subcommittee. We expect the Reference Sources Subcommittee to incorporate and expand upon the types of programming provided in recent years by the Electronic Reference Services Subcommittee, and the “reference refresher” aspect of the Reference Performance Subcommittee’s programming. The Reference Sources Subcommittee will have the flexibility to address all formats of reference sources, their evaluation, and use. The Reference and Access Services Subcommittee will be able to address the evaluation of reference services as well as all types of reference and access services relevant to music libraries, including cutting edge use of blogs, RSS feeds, chat, and emerging Internet 2 functionality.

Our task force studied the “umbrella structure” evidenced by a few committee-subcommittees in MLA, in which the parent committee is comprised solely of the chairs of its subcommittees, plus an overall chair. In the case of Public Services, the “umbrella” structure works. The committee and subcommittee chairs all endorsed retaining this structure for Public Services.

Bibliographic Control Committee

Recommendation: move the Integrated Library Systems Subcommittee under the purview of this committee, as described above.

Discussion: our task force had several conversations and communications with the current and incoming chairs of this committee. Significant changes are occurring nationally and internationally in standards for bibliographic control and metadata, and in library catalogs themselves. Ideas we discussed with these chairs included

- a new group devoted to metadata issues to move MLA into an active role in non-RDA, non-MARC developments nationally, such as a plethora of metadata schemas and application profiles; new or non-traditional information formats; changes in the music publication market
- the need to focus on the technical issues of subject access as well as terminologies for subject access, considering the multiplicity of controlled vocabularies in development within libraries and more broadly in information retrieval
- possibly combining the Authorities and Descriptive Subcommittees once RDA is implemented
- the functionality of MLA’s liaison structure to ALA bibliographic control groups and the need for the chair of MLA’s Bibliographic Control Committee to be funded to attend ALA meetings

Even while the library profession at large, and MLA’s Bibliographic Control Committee, are planning for implementation of FRBR (Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records) and RDA (Resource Description and Access), completely different mechanisms and tools for discovering and retrieving information (beyond traditional catalogs and cataloging

protocols) are being developed and used by society. We recommend that the Board continue to review all of these issues with the committee, and proactively direct changes in committee structure, including potential new committees, based on such developments.

Our task force studied the “umbrella structure” evidenced by a few committee-subcommittees in MLA, in which the parent committee is comprised solely of the chairs of its subcommittees, plus an overall chair. In the case of Bibliographic Control, the “umbrella” structure works.

Resource Sharing and Collection Development Committee

Recommendation: re-focus the charge on all aspects of developing music library collections, regardless of whether the content is “owned” or “leased” or otherwise made available, and whether it is developed locally or via consortia or other partnerships. Continue to focus on the unique aspects of developing music collections. Shorten the name of the committee to “Collection Development Committee.”

Development Committee

The current charge overlaps with the responsibilities of the Publicity & Outreach Officer and the Membership Committee with references to public relations, preparing promotional material, and attracting members to MLA. We were told that our new Development Officer is leading this committee’s assessment of its role and charge, so our only recommendation is to consider areas of potential overlap with others’ charges and responsibilities.

Program Committee

The Administrative Structure contains no charge for this committee. Our task force forwarded to the Board of Directors suggestions from the chair of the Program Committee about programming for annual meetings. We recommend that the Administrative Structure include committee’s charge and the formula used for populating its membership roster.

Publications Committee

Our task force forwarded to the Board this committee’s suggested revisions to its charge, and the chair’s recommendations for consistency among MLA publications.

Awards Committees

Our task force forwarded to the Board a few suggestions for minor tweaks to the charges.

Legislation Committee

We were informed that this committee is in the process of revising its charge in collaboration with the Board.

Preservation Committee

We forwarded to the Board this committee’s proposed revision to their charge.

Archives Joint Committee with the University of Maryland

Our task force was informed that this committee is addressing its role and its charge directly with the Board.

Advertising Manager

We forwarded to the Board this officer's suggestions for revising the charge/job description for this office.

Finance Committee and Investments Subcommittee

We forwarded to the Board a recommendation from the subcommittee's chair for a minor revision to its charge. No other recommendations.

Public Libraries Committee

No recommendation.

Joint Committees with RILM, with AMS for RISM, with MPA

No recommendations.

Appendix 1 Methodology and Timeline

January 2007: Task force appointed.

February–May 2007:

- Reviewed charges to all committees, subcommittees, and special officers listed in the Administrative Structure with these questions in mind:
 - Is this charge still relevant to the profession (broadly)? to the organization (specifically)? Has technology rendered the charge unnecessary?
 - What is the expected product or outcome of this charge? Who is the target audience for the product or outcome?
 - Is this more appropriate for a task force? (i.e., is it a finite task that might need to be reviewed or repeated every few years, or is it work that needs to be continuous and ongoing?)
 - Would a subcommittee fit better under a different committee, or be better standing alone? Would some of the activities fit better under a different committee or subcommittee?
- Studied each group's annual reports for the past four years to see if reported activities meet the charge, exploring a variety of possible solutions when problems were identified.
- Studied the Administrative Handbook and minutes of Board of Directors meetings as necessary for background.
- Distinguished types of assignments best suited to task forces versus standing groups such as committees.
- Identified language in charges that is outdated or has the potential for vagueness, misinterpretation, or possible overlap with other groups or officers.
- Studied recent annual meeting programs for content and programming activities of roundtables and committees and roundtables.

June 2007: Compiled lists of issues and crafted questions for committee and subcommittee chairs and special officers, to solicit more information from them and benefit from their insights.

July–August 2007: Distributed the questions to committee and subcommittee chairs and special officers, studied their responses, and drafted an interim report to the Board of Directors.

September 2007: Submitted an interim report to the Board of Directors' September meeting.

October–December 2007: Considered the Board's remarks while writing a first draft of recommendations. Distributed the draft to committee and subcommittee chairs for comment.

January 2008: Incorporated responses from committee and subcommittee chairs into a revised draft of recommendations. Posted this draft to all MLA members and called for feedback.

February 2008: Open discussion scheduled during Presidential Q&A in Newport on February 23. The Board of Directors will consider all feedback during their final meeting in Newport and decide how to proceed.

Appendix 2

Publicity & Outreach Officer Position Description posted October 2007

The Publicity & Outreach Officer promotes the activities of the Music Library Association through informational campaigns and exhibits. The Publicity & Outreach Officer is an ex-officio member of the Development Committee, the Publications Committee, the Membership Committee, and the Outreach Subcommittee (though these relationships and duties may change slightly based on the final recommendations of the Committee Structure Task Force); reports to the President and Board of Directors and prepares relevant budgets and annual reports. Within the first year of service, the successful candidate will assess the effectiveness of MLA's current publicity, outreach and marketing efforts and, within the first year of service, will recommend to the Board ways to expand and enhance those efforts.

Responsibilities:

- Provides general oversight of all the Association's publicity related activities including public relations, outreach and marketing.
- Increases the visibility of MLA activities, including awards, publications, services, and the annual meeting.
- Writes and distributes announcements and press releases to the MLA membership and to related organization listservs and publications as appropriate.
- Arranges and coordinates an MLA exhibit at several conferences each year in addition to the MLA meeting, usually attending these additional conferences to help staff the exhibit.
- Provides publicity materials for outreach events. Works with various MLA committees and the Business Office to keep publicity materials current and engaging.