Minutes - Draft
95th ANNUAL MEETING
CHANGES IN THE ELECTRONIC RESOURCES MANAGEMENT LANDSCAPE: A LIBRARIAN TOOLKIT
Friday, October 18, 2019
9:00am-4:00pm
Marymount University
Ballston Center
1000 North Glebe Road
Arlington, VA 22201

The 95th annual meeting of the Potomac Technical Processing Librarians (PTPL), "Changes in the Electronic Resources Management Landscape: A Librarian Toolkit" was held at Marymount University's Ballston Center in Arlington, VA. Registration began at 9:00am accompanied by a continental breakfast. The program commenced at 9:35am with a welcome and introduction to the campus from Meghan Burke, Metadata/Electronic Resources Librarian at Emerson G. Reinsch Library, Marymount University, and Virginia Representative for PTPL. PTPL Board Chair Vera Clyburn took the podium to welcome participants and thank Marymount University for their support. The keynote was pushed further back in the agenda due to delays, so Clyburn introduced the first two speakers of the day, Leigh Ann DePope and Amanda Echterling.

Usage Statistics and COUNTER 5: Too much data for decision making?
Speaker: Leigh Ann DePope

Speaker Bio:
Leigh Ann is the Head of Acquisitions and Data Services at the University of Maryland College Park. She coordinates the ordering and invoicing for all collection material and handles license negotiation for electronic resources. Her scholarship focuses on data collection and using data for collection decision making and resource performance assessment.

Presentation:
Presentation slides:
https://www.potomactechlibrarians.org/resources/Documents/Annual%20Meeting%20Presentations/PTPL%20presentation%202019_DePope.pdf

DePope began her presentation with an introduction to the University of Maryland, College Park's library, including the library's eleven million dollar collection budget. 90% of that budget is allocated to continuing resources, which she defined as journals, databases, and standing orders. Around 2010, librarians at College Park realized that the budget could not absorb price inflation, so they instituted a recurring serials review process using usage statistics. Originally they relied on data from EBSCOnet for this process, and they developed a survey for faculty to provide additional data. While this practice opened a dialogue with subject librarians and faculty over usage statistics, limitations to the data available in EBSCOnet led to the development of more granular Resource Review Worksheets that had to be created and edited by hand. These worksheets combined budget information and usage data. Not all of this data was COUNTER compliant, but they erred on the side of some data being better than no data. In 2017, data about ILL costs were added by the ILL department. This gave subject librarians a lot of data to work with, which necessitated training sessions.

Project COUNTER is a non-profit organization that “provides the Code of Practice that enables publishers and vendors to report usage of their electronic resources in a consistent way.” Under Release 4 of the code, there are four standard and four optional journal reports (JR) available. DePope mostly used JR 1 (successful full text article request) and JR 1 GOA. She also uses database reports (DR) and book reports (BR). With these reports as they were harvested, Excel formulas could easily be used to match ILS data and usage data. This process was a well-oiled machine for DePope’s department, and the subject librarians were very successful in using this data for their decision making.

COUNTER Release 5 changed things. Vendors are still working to meet this release; the code is a recommendation, not a mandate, and so some smaller vendors do not have the resources to meet the new code.There are now four master reports--Platform Master Report, Database Master Report, Title Master Report, and Item Master Report. Full text article requests and regular searches are no longer tracked in these reports; instead, there are investigations and requests. Requests are when content has been accessed (downloaded), and investigations are when content has been looked at. Both are broken down into unique and total. For instance, a user looking at five articles within one journal would count as five unique item investigations, five total item investigations, and one unique title investigation. This leads to a larger number of metrics for each individual user session than in Release 4. Also, usage can no longer be easily summed up by publication year.

There are definite benefits to Release 5. DePope’s favorite reports in Release 5 are the TR_J2 and the TR_B2 (Access Denied), which shows data for turn-aways and breaks down the reason for turn-aways, such as lack of license or the user exceeding their limit.

DePope took the audience through a Detailed Title Master Report, which had more than 124,000 rows of data for one vendor. These reports cannot be as easily shared with people in other departments, such as ILL, nor can they be as easily manipulated to manually add additional data. Other challenges from the new release include choosing which metrics should be used for continuing resources reviews, re-educating colleagues on the reports, and redesigning the review tool. While all this data could be useful, DePope questions if it is too much. Will this amount of data bog down the process that previously worked so well? How can all this quantitative data be married to qualitative data? This release is still relatively new, and DePope is still finding answers to these questions.

DePope then took audience questions and answered with the following additional information:

- 30-40 subject librarians review these reports.
- ILL colleagues created the formula for ILL cost, which includes searches by publication year, the creation of a standard cost within a five year guideline, and then some “magic” because it is not a straight cost.
- ILL data has been collected since 2017. They have been able to review their predictions for one year so far; the predictions were much higher than the actual ILL requests.
- She does not yet have a particular COUNTER5 metric that she thinks will be most useful for subject librarians.
- She would prefer to do the reviews in late summer/fall, but that has not always been the case. The process has to be flexible to fit in with the subject librarians’ availability.
- She does not use any other programs or tools to automate data collation, but she would like to.
- Unviewed/unused titles do not appear in the COUNTER5 reports, and she has not found a way to address that yet.
- Not all platforms provide turn-away statistics, but she does not have a firm number of how many do. Lots of large and mid-sized platforms and vendors do, and she will be asking for them from those that do not.

Risk and Transformation in eResource Licensing
Speaker: Amanda Echterling

Speaker Bio:
Amanda Echterling is the Head of Licensing and Acquisitions at Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, Virginia. Prior to VCU, she was a procurement officer at James Madison University in Harrisonburg, Virginia. Amanda has twelve years of licensing and contract experience focusing on library materials and information systems. Her current focus of inquiry is on trade-offs in the transformation of pay-walled resources.

Presentation:
Presentation slides:
https://www.potomactechlibrarians.org/resources/Documents/Annual%20Meeting%20Presentations/PTPL_Annual_2019_Risk%20and%20Transformation_Echterling.pdf

Echterling began being interested in this topic when, a few years ago, her library began to see an infusion of riskification in operations at VCU. In working on licenses, she was being asked to “describe [her] risks” and “control for [her] risks.” At the point of transaction with vendors, she was being asked point blank, “Do you, Amanda, accept business risks,” which struck her as odd. She has a background in both license law and non-profit work, but she was unclear what was meant by business risk and how she could determine if her sphere of control actually covered what was referenced in that language. Business risk, it turns out, can be anything. Her central questions became why do libraries not have language for this concept of risk even though our licensing partners do, and what are the risks we are dealing with?

Risk, according to the banking world where the term originates, is anything that cannot be diversified or anything that can block an institution's ability to afford ongoing operational expenses. The most common business risk is often referred to as operational risk, such as internal/external fraud; clients, products, and business practices; business disruptions/systems failures; and execution, delivery, and process management. We see these concepts in our license agreements, as our vendors try to control for them. For instance, a common control is allowing the library to recoup only the money that was paid in to a contract, even if the vendor was negligent. Vendors absolutely take to heart the operational risk of working with us--but what are a library's operational risks? How can we find and define them?

Operational risk is unique to every organization, so Echterling turned to her library's values and strategic framework. She found that these could define her operational objectives and thus the operational risks that she had to manage in contracts with her vendors.

Even now, library contracts do not meet us at common model license terms. Basic functions like perpetual access, archiving, self-archiving, and electronic reserves are often not available in baseline contracts. These practices are part of our operations, and so we need to continue to state our objectives and control for these risks. Our motto should be: A library's operational risk is valid (even though it is not based on profit), it should be controlled for in licensing agreements, and it does have monetary value.

The University of California system is an excellent on-going case study. They are presumably working with similar values to other academic institutions, and they realized that they were spending millions of dollars on closed access research, even when they were paying for the research in the first place. UC approached their licensing partners with rich data and set a monetary price for what they had put in to the product. Their process was a textbook example of the negotiating principle "getting to yes." They had their best alternative to their current situation, they defined their walk away plan before they came to the table, and they were able to explain their plan to their user base. Thus, they were able to walk away from their big deals, thus moving the negotiation process to a new stage. They may return to the table at some point, which is not a failure. They have their objective clearly stated and understood, and they can continue to work towards it.

A smaller example can be seen in any licensing agreement when it comes to monetary value. If a license does not control for one of a library's operational objectives (e.g. interlibrary loan), then the value of that product should go down. The library will have to expend its own manpower and resources to deal with a break in ILL services for one vendor's product; that work has value, and thus the value of the product is lower.

To work on these issues, VCU now has three transformative agreements (also known as read and publish agreements). These agreements have the library pay a fee for work that is behind a paywall, establish archival rights, and allow for all the research from the library's institution to be open access and available for publishing in the institutional repository. The transformative agreements work to varying degrees, largely dependent on whether or not VCU's faculty are actually publishing in the journals the vendor is licensing. Transformative agreements are not a panacea. The "read" portion of "read and publish" still presents operational risk. These agreements are a transitional tool, not an answer, and we have to keep working on this instead of sitting with them like we sat with big deals for 20 years.

So how did we get in a situation where our licenses do not acknowledge our operational risks? Something we have in common with our vendors is reputational risk. Reputational risk used to be a secondary risk, where a failure of operations impacted an institution's reputation. Now, however, reputational risk can be quantified on its own and often is in various ranked lists (Top 100 Public Universities in Pharmaceutical Engineering, ARL ACRL, AAHSL statistics, etc.) What would it look like if tracked our operational values against our actual usage/vendor statistics? For instance, if a value is open access, a library could track the number of open access articles licensed, the number of completely accessible videos with transcripts, etc. This comparison can be very useful.

Echterling then explored some examples of clauses that can be added to licenses to pursue these ends, such as statements to preserve authors' rights or to achieve ADA compliance. Our licenses currently lack warranty and any assurance that vendors will meet library needs. These statements offer a roadmap; vendors must agree that, for instance, accessibility is a shared value, that they will bake accessibility into their systems and report out how they do so, and that if they cannot, the library will have recourse to change the systems themselves. VCU has made a commitment to pursuing this, though they often only get assurances that they will be allowed to fix the end product on their own.

Another area of license disputes is user privacy. Libraries have clear guidelines on user privacy, such as purpose limited, storage limited, and data minimal principles. This is not just about personally identifiable information, but also the ability to use a product without declaring yourself (i.e. not registering with the system). One newer way this plays out is with sanction lists--for instance, VCU has a school in Qatar, which has sanctions from Saudi Arabia. One of VCU's contracts had a clause removing access from users on sanction lists, which was extremely troubling. Echterling was able to strike this from that contract. Libraries have the right to demand that these contracts meet our privacy needs, beyond just personally identifiable information.

A third area is diversity and inclusion. Due to the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, alteration/duplication/decompilation of systems is often forbidden by contracts in general; for libraries, translation is also often included. This is discriminatory, as it presumes English is enough for all a library's users. Echterling does not have language to deal with this yet, but she plans to pursue it going forward.

Echterling then took questions and provided the following additional information:

- Agreements with links to other agreements should not be used. The contract should meet the "four corners" principle--the full text of the contract defining the whole of the relationship between library and vendor should be within a single document. A collection of links (which could be changed at any time) is not a contract.

- She still has to occasionally bend on operational objectives, though she has walked away occasionally. The more she is able to tie her contract concerns to operational values, the stronger the case will be for walking away from contracts that do not meet them.
- User privacy is still complicated; allowing users to be guests to access materials is a start, but vendor tracking is still an opaque process. The library can work to help users understand what vendors are tracking, and the library can take responsibility for notifying users of any breaches in privacy.
- Communicating with users on the licensing process, such as UC did, can be helpful if there is a break or change in access. The default is to hide our business relationships, but that does not have to continue. Alma/Primo even has a way to show licenses to end users.
- UC may have more power in negotiating than small institutions, but everyone has the same rights to negotiate. No one will be completely successful all of the time, but licenses are meant to be negotiated, and no agreement is permanent.
- Discussing and sharing license language with colleagues is crucial. That said, just because another institution agrees to something does not mean your institution has to; your responsibility is to your users.

Electronic Resources Management on the Eve of 2020
Speaker: George Stachokas

Speaker Bio:
George Stachokas is the electronic resources librarian at Auburn University in Alabama. Previously, he served as head of resource services and special assistant to the dean for project management at Purdue University, and electronic resources librarian at Indiana State University.

Some of his relevant experience in electronic resources management and related areas includes past service as chair of both the ALCTS Electronic Resources Interest Group (ERIG) and the CMS Collection Management and Electronic Resources Interest Group (CMERIG), organizer of the ALCTS Webinar Series, Licensing Electronic Resources to Serve the Library's Mission (2018), program planning coordinator for the Great Lakes E-Summit, chair of the Academic Libraries of Indiana (ALI) Consortium's Resource Advisory Committee, as well as current service as chair of the Network of Alabama Academic Libraries (NAAL) Online Content committee, chair of the ALA information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC), secretary of the ALCTS Collection Management Section, member of the LITA Program Planning Committee, and member of the ALA Task Force on Online Deliberation and Voting.

His published works include articles appearing in *Collection Management*, *Technical Services Quarterly*, the *Journal of Electronic Resources Librarianship*, *Serials Librarian* and *Serials*

Review. Books include *After the Book: Information Services for the 21st Century* (Chandos Publishing, 2014), *Reengineering the Library: Issues in Electronic Resources Management*, editor (ALA Editions, 2018), and *The Role of the Electronic Resources Librarian* (Chandos Publishing, forthcoming in 2019). His research interests include electronic resources management, organizational change in libraries, and collection development.

Stachokas holds an MLIS degree from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, an MA in history from Indiana State University, and a BS in economics from Purdue University West Lafayette.

Presentation:
Presentation slides:
https://www.potomactechlibrarians.org/resources/Documents/Annual%20Meeting%20Presentations/PTPL_Annual_Meeting_2019_Stachokas.pdf

Stachokas began his presentation with the reminder that though electronic resources have greatly changed our libraries over the last 30 years (operations, staffing, tools, what we spend money and time on), our users' understanding of us has not necessarily changed. They still have the image of a library as a physical place, a repository of physical items. For a lot of libraries, most of their time and money is spent on electronic resources. Many users predominantly experience the library digitally, even if they do not understand such interactions as being with the library. The library is still relevant, and its place is transforming; some places do not need physical libraries anymore. For instance, take a health center--is a physical library the best use of place on a medical campus? They may need librarians, but not necessarily a physical library. Residential campuses do need physical libraries usually--they serve as a collaboration space for the campus, foster connection among librarians, and democratize access to technology (such as with maker spaces). Needing a physical library is mission-specific.

At all libraries, though, problems with electronic resources still plague us. How do we analyze usage? How do we license materials? How do we protect user privacy? Who is a librarian when resources are digital? (Other units subscribe to journals and databases as well.) How do we handle the business models for emerging media? (For instance, in Alabama they have to pay rental fees on streaming videos, and they have to deal with state-specific laws about vendor disclosures.) Everything is complicated and cannot be dealt with using national standards.

There have been some important milestones in the last 30 years of electronic resource management that can help us understand where we have been and where we are going. The first ebook came in 1971, and the first documented mention of an electronic resources librarian in 1992. Electronic resources librarians began in public services dealing with CD-ROMs. Stachokas went through some additional milestones as well (SFX link resolver, Serials Solutions, COUNTER, Electronic Resource Management Initiative).

The transition to electronic resources is not finished, has had uneven progress, and is still uncomfortable for some. Some disciplines (and librarians) are still tied to print, vendors have different standards, and pricing is still all over the place. Nevertheless, statistics show a significant drop in print circulation, and library budgets are moving increasingly to electronic resources.

Stachokas then went through the five key aspects of electronic resource management to measure effectiveness--library organizational structure and personnel, adoption of appropriate tools and best practices, discovery services and tools, capacity for assessment/analytics, and financial sustainability.

- For library organizational structure and personnel, there are problems that date from the beginning of these electronic resource librarian positions. For many, the transition was not particularly thoughtful--it was usually one specialist in the position, and the position was in public services, where it developed away from the rest of technical services. Over time, the position has mostly moved to technical services. But there are still problems with having enough support staff for the specialty, the organization of technical services departments overall, and broad competencies developing late.
- For adoption of appropriate tools and best practices, the main problem is a lack of options--libraries are not a particularly attractive market to sell to, so there are few vendors and few options. Open source options, such as FOLIO, are gaining steam, so there are promising developments to come. One Persistent problem is that knowledge bases are critical, but most are still proprietary. Open source knowledge bases, created by librarians for librarians, have been difficult to create. Tracking license data is difficult as well. How can we streamline our analytics, especially since we spend so much on these systems?
- For discovery systems and tools, vendor consolidation is higher, and so we have few providers. There are some alternatives (Blacklight, other open source projects). Of course, Google is still a much more powerful algorithm, and it is hard to argue with users that find it easier/more useful. It is frustrating that we do not have more widespread abilities to address our local needs and exercise influence over the function and quality of the metadata we work with.
- As far as assessment and analytics, things are going well, but there is still room to improve. Automation is highly desirable. OrcidID is helpful, but there is not consistent buy-in across libraries. Other systems and tools are also adopted sporadically. How can we improve the interoperability of our statistics with statistics from related disciplines? For instance, can you compare library usage statistics with statistics about faculty productivity?
- Finally, financial sustainability is a big problem and has been for decades, starting with print collections and following us to electronic resources. When cost increases from one year to the next by 25% with no discernible change in content, how do we deal with that? Some strategies are to make multi-year agreements, cancel big deals, share resources and buy collectively across consortiums (which can be particularly problematic with

electronic resources), and support and pursue open access. The implications of open access are difficult though, especially who is paying related fees and who is doing the work.

Stachokas then answered questions with the following additional information:

- Competencies for this work are often not part of LIS education. On the job training is important, and we have to improve our documentation to spread skills around. LIS education is “bad” to some extent, so while we want to hire LIS students, we also need to hire people from other specialties. Also, active practitioners should teach classes to get that day to day knowledge in the curriculum. The whole library, and indeed all students, need to be thinking about electronic resources, regardless of their specialties.
- We should be trying to revamp our librarian and staff positions to make sure position descriptions reflect the shift to electronic resources--but of course, this is difficult in a lot of institutions.

Lunch Break

After George Stachokas’ keynote presentation, Vera Clyburn thanked all the speakers and dismissed the meeting to lunch. During lunch, ballots for the advisory board member election were distributed.

Business Meeting

1. Opening of Meeting
   Vera Clyburn opened the meeting at 1:05pm and introduced and thanked the board.

2. Approval of 2017 Annual Meeting Minutes
   Minutes were accepted as is.

3. Treasurer’s Report
   Linda Wirth provided the report and included the context that due to the fiscal year ending in October, last year’s conference figures are not included. The organization is in good financial health, due in part to the generosity of our members, including board member Caroline Saccucci who taught the Spring 2019 workshop without compensation.

Checking Account Balance Oct. 2018	$39,184.34
Checking Account Balance Oct. 2019	$37,460.74

2018 CONFERENCE FIGURES

REGISTRATIONS	
41 @ 135.64	$ 5,561.24
1 @ 145.59	145.59
12 @ 140.00	1,680.00
1 @ 240.00	240.00

TOTAL	**$7,626.59**

2017 ANNUAL MEETING EXPENSES

Catering	2,709.06
Dinner	231.45
Rebecca Mugbridge	564.01
Nina Servizzi	462.77
Gina Solares	454.42
Jessica Schomberg	684.95
TOTAL	**$5,106.60**
ANNUAL MEETING DIFFERENCE	**+ $2,519.99**

SCHOLARSHIPS

2 @ $2,000	$4,000.00

4. Presentation of Academic Scholarships
   This year, PTPL provided two $2000 scholarships to future librarians enrolled in an ALA-accredited Library and/or Information Science program who demonstrated an interest in library technical services through employment, course of study, or research interests. Out of a phenomenal crop of applicants, two winners were chosen:

   Bonnie Shaw
   Originally from Chicago, Bonnie Shaw lives in Suffolk, VA and has been a Cataloging Assistant at the Earl Gregg Swem Library at William & Mary since March 2018. Her library path began in 2011 working part-time in the Youth and Family Services for Suffolk Public Library. Her passion for cataloging came when she got a full-time position for Portsmouth Public Library and learned how to copy catalog. On her future plans she says, "I hope that when I graduate with my Masters in the Summer of 2020 from the University of Alabama that I am able to work at a library, whether public or academic, as Cataloging Librarian in Virginia. I feel with my 8 years of library experience and my 25 years of customer service experience, I will be a highly marketable library employee once I graduate."

   Allison Jennings-Roche
   Allison Jennings-Roche is in the last semester of her MLIS at the University of Maryland. She currently works as a Library Services Specialist at Albin O. Kuhn Library at UMBC and is an intern at Loyola Notre Dame Library. She has a background in public libraries and student affairs and a previous Master's Degree in Legal and Ethical Studies. Her research interests include Open Access, Scholarly Communications, and Digital Humanities.

5. Election of New Executive Board and Advisory Council Officers

Ballots were collected and given to board members Mimi Games and Christine Dulaney to tabulate.

6. Call for Archival Material--Particularly 2003-Present
   PTPL's archive is housed at Catholic University. Anyone who has potential materials to add was asked to contact Vera Clyburn or Kim Edwards.

7. New Business
   No new business was brought forth.

8. Adjournment
   Clyburn thanked the current board members and adjourned the business meeting at 1:17.

Round Robin discussion
Attendees were invited to split among the eight break-out tables according to which topic they were most interested in: privacy, cancellations, ebooks, usage statistics, licence negotiations, cataloging, staff skill development, and workflows. The groups talked at their tables for 20 minutes, then each table took turns sharing out the highlights of their discussions to the larger group.

Vendor Panel

Vendor biographies:
Jane Burke, Vice President, Strategic Initiatives, Ex Libris, a ProQuest company.
Jane joined the Ex Libris business unit at the time of the acquisition, after ten years with ProQuest. Jane has responsibility for Ex Libris initiatives around discovery and customer value realization. Jane joined ProQuest in 2005, initially leading the Serials Solutions unit. Prior to joining ProQuest, she co-founded and served as President/CEO of Endeavor Information Systems until its sale to Reed-Elsevier. In addition to working as a librarian at Cook Memorial Library in Libertyville, Illinois early in her career, Ms. Burke served as President of NOTIS Systems. Jane earned master's degrees in Library Science from Dominical University (formerly Rosary College) and in management from the Kellogg School of Northwestern University.

Sheri Meares, Sr. Director, Knowledge Base, EBSCO
Sheri Meares is the Senior Director of the Knowledge Base at EBSCO Information Services (EBSCO). She is an industry thought leader with nearly 20 years expertise in Knowledge Base design, support and management. Sheri has been involved with the EBSCO Knowledge Base since its inception helping to develop it into a foundation for EBSCO's Management and Discovery Solutions, including Full Text Finder and Holdings and Link Manager. Sheri sat on the KBART Phase I, KBART Phase II working group and now is a member of the NISO KBART Standing Committee.

Matthew Ragucci, Associate Director of Product Marketing, Wiley
Matthew Ragucci provides insight on metadata sharing strategies for optimizing electronic resources and improving library customer experience at Wiley. He currently serves as vice chair of the NASIG Standards Committee and as a member of the NISO Content Platform Migration Working Group. He also holds a part-time position as a reference and instruction librarian at Brookdale Community College. Matthew earned his Master's in Library and Information Science (MLIS) from Rutgers University. His publications are "Evidence-Based Acquisition: A Real Life Account of Managing the Program Within The Orbis Cascade Alliance" and "MARC Metamorphosis: Transforming the Way You Look at E-Book Records." He takes an active interest in the latest developments in e-resource management and his interests include metadata, standards, reference, and user experience.

Bob Schulz, Director for Data Solutions, OCLC
Over his 15 year tenure at OCLC Bob has managed products and services with a focus on improving discoverability of library and publisher content. His current team is responsible for a broad array of data and services, including the WorldCat knowledge base, central index of article metadata, and search and indexing technologies used across all OCLC products. Bob also serves on the NISO Information Discovery & Interchange (IDI) topic committee.

Panel:
These vendors gave short presentations on their companies' latest projects, and then the floor was opened to questions. Questions covered a variety of topics, including factors in determining the cost of resources; knowledge bases and record quality; how libraries can help the larger electronic resources community; privacy; the future of open access; the future of electronic resources; and what librarians do not understand or appreciate when it comes to working with vendors.

Final Business and Historical Moment
Vera Clyburn retook the podium to thank all of the presenters. Mimi Games announced the results of the election: Rebecca Case, Arlington Public Library, will be Chair-Elect. Leigh Ann Martin, University of Richmond, will be Secretary (2019-2021). Christine Dulaney, American University, will continue as D.C. Representative (2019-2021). Aimee Plaisance, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, will be Maryland representative (2019-2021). Amber Jones, Virginia Museum of History & Culture, will be Virginia representative (2019-2021).

Lynda Aldana took the podium to share this year's Historical Moment on the history of the PTPL scholarship. From the 77th to the 81st meeting, PTPL donated $500 to ALA's Spectrum Scholarship program. Tom Ray suggested the switch to a $1000 scholarship specifically for students who had a strong interest in some area of technical services and lived or worked in the PTPL member area. To fund the proposal, Ray suggested a $5 increase to membership dues. The proposal was universally accepted, and the first scholarship was awarded in 2006. Ten students applied, and Cheryl Duncan, who worked at James Madison University and studied at Texas Woman's University, was the first recipient. Since then, PTPL has given scholarships to twenty five recipients, for a total of $29,000. The scholarship is now offered at $2,000. Many recipients still work in technical services, and some have gone on to serve on the PTPL advisory board, like Mimi Games. The scholarship has proven an effective way to cultivate commitment both to the profession at large and PTPL in particular. Aldana closed her speech by reading a charming excerpt from the personal statement of Michael Cardos, who still works in technical services at the United States Naval Academy.

After Aldana left the podium, Clyburn then passed the gavel to new chair Kimberley Edwards, and Edwards adjourned the meeting at 3:43pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Aimee Plaisance
PTPL Secretary