MiALA Board Meeting Minutes
October 2, 2025 at 11:00am

Attendance: Julie Garrison, Mary O'Kelly, Mies Martin, Linda Miles, Jessica Hronchek, Edward Eckel, Samantha Minnis, Kelli Herm, Kyle Ceci, Gina Bolger, Jennifer Bowen Katie Edmiston, Kayln Huson

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 11:01am

Board Business Meeting:

1. Approval of Agenda – Mies Martin made a motion to approve the agenda and Jennifer Bowen seconded. The motion carried.
2. Approval of [Minutes from September Meeting]() – Edward Eckel made a motion to approve the minutes and Gina Bolger seconded. The motion carried.
3. Approval of Consent Agenda – Samantha Minnis made a motion to approve the consent agenda and Mary O'Kelly seconded. The motion carried.
4. Committee Reports
    a. Advocacy – The committee met on September 5, and discussed possible priorities and projects for the coming year.
    b. Communications and Marketing – See below.
    c. Conference Planning – No update.
    d. Executive – Via email, the executive committee agreed we would like to invite committee chairs to join us in strategic board discussions on specific topics: advocacy priorities and guidelines, promoting MiALA, and the mini-conference idea, to name three. We also agreed to schedule a standing Executive Committee meeting 2 weeks prior to the Board meetings, starting in October. These are place holders in case we need to organize work as a follow up from the last board meeting or prepare a discussion for the next board meeting.
    e. IDEA (Jennifer Bowen) Met on Tuesday, 9/9. Discussion on how our institutions are handling the rapid changes in government and any ideas on how to better support students. IDEA resource list reorg by topic rather than material type is underway. Outreach has begun to Future Librarians for Inclusion and Diversity (FLID) at Wayne State University and development of a "New Librarians and Students' Networking Event" for both WSU and UM students. Discussion on half-day workshop centered around mitigating the effects of AI. The Conference Accessibility Committee discussed feedback on the accessibility of the previous conference space. Discussion on creating a padlet where all individuals could reflect on how they are feeling right now in terms of the anti-DEI initiatives and to have that sent out via the MiALA session. Reminder for sub-committees to meet regularly.
    f. Membership – Met on 9/18. Discussed restarting the mentorship program depending on the survey feedback. Expressed a desire to reach out to library support staff. Perhaps we could offer a workshop and/or give scholarships for the

annual conference. We could also offer a reduced membership rate and conduct a survey to see what would interest support staff. Brenna will determine what work needs to be done for the job board. We brainstormed ways to support the strategic plan by focusing on outreach: tell our story with testimonials in the newsletter/website (My MiALA Story), give annual awards, write our history, send swag to new members, reach out to library students (IDEA might be doing this), encourage schools to send students to conference as a group, have first-time attendee meeting again at conference, and offer new member meetups.

   g. Nominating – No update (Mies Martin).

5. Partner Reports
   a. MCLS – No update.
6. Treasurer's Report – FY25 Annual Financial Review by Maner Costerisan beginning. They will present a summary of the review to the board in November.
7. Interest Group Coordinating Council –
   a. Met on Tuesday, 9/9. Hosted two training sessions for IG Leaders on 9/10 and 9/11. Approved a funding request of $500 from OER IG on 9/19.
   b. In regards to the MiALA goal for more professional development, IGCC members are worried that another mini-conference or mid-year event might be outside of people's bandwidth. What about other forms of professional development, like webinars, recorded trainings, etc? Could a group, such as Membership Committee, survey MiALA members to find out what type of professional development content they are interested in? We could pass that on to IGs to help them with their event planning.
8. Board Actions via Email – Opposition letter to HB4922 approved submitting to the House Committee on Education and Workforce.

Old Business

1. Confirm committee work (Julie Garrison)
   a. Membership: Create a job board and recommended guidelines for managing and providing access, and create a new member orientation experience.
      i. Both of these tasks are already in the works.
      ii. The committee will need to move forward with the job board in the current platform; the new website is a long-term project.
      iii. Kalyn is working with the committee chairs.
   b. Communications: Alongside Kalyn Huson, continue to work to resolve email configuration challenges in Memberleap. Prepare a summary for what issues, if any, still exist and potential next steps to resolving for the January 2026 board meeting.
      i. The email problem is definitely on the radar for the committee, along with website platform decision and website redesign.
      ii. Kalyn is waiting to hear from the committee chairs (their first meeting was just today).

New Business

1. Advocacy Priorities and Guidelines (Samantha Minnis)
    a. Requests for MiALA signature – how to handle requests?
        i. Desire for annual review of priorities. How to develop/refine association priorities for advocacy, and let that support the workflow for these requests
            1. One model: outgoing Advisory Committee (AC) develops a horizon report for the incoming AC and the Board; at the beginning of the year, the Board articulates general advocacy priorities; the AC and Board discuss; this discussion guides the AC in triaging requests for support; the Board ultimately reviews those that come forward and decides when to sign.
            2. One model for prioritizing: the Board provides the AC with categorization of issues: 1) association priority, likely to support; 2) issues that the board is less likely to support; 3) others, we can affirm that we will definitely not support. This would provide a template for the AC to potentially say “no thank you” to some requests. Anything that falls in a gray area would be passed up to the Board for review.
            3. On the other hand, having the Board still vote on all requests provides the AC with cover for these decisions.
            4. Action item: the AC will frame draft guidance on parameters for the Board to consider or dismiss issues, or categories of issues, based on recent instances where the board has voted (e.g., does it specifically impact MI? Would we want to narrow down by state, regional, or national level?). We may need to see more of these come through the process before we get a good sense of our priorities.
        ii. One idea that has come up in the AC is to develop a form for interested persons/bodies to fill out, which would spell out the Board’s guidelines. We would require the “asker” to justify their request based on the specifics of our priorities.
        iii. The AC is preserving language from past responses to requests; hoping to get 2-3 committee members to serve as communications persons to handle drafting text for these requests.
    b. The AC is interested in furthering existing partnerships (e.g., with MLA), and developing new partnerships with other organizations around advocacy.
        i. Action item: Samantha Minnis will bring this back to the AC for more framing.
    c. Question: we know that requests come in from others, but where do we want to lead in the area of advocacy? Possibly lead the way on issues that are not surfacing from other groups?

        i. Julie Garrison reported on a conversation led by MCLS with stakeholders from both Michigan and Indiana and the idea of commissioning/conducting research on specific issue(s) and creating a policy brief related to impacts on libraries. This would require financial investment, but that wouldn't be on us alone.
        ii. This is still rather undefined–which issues? What stakeholders would contribute? Julie will update us if/when momentum on this moves forward.

2. Strategic discussions with committee chairs - is there an order we would like to pursue? Specific topics to address? (Julie Garrison)
    a. Proposal to the Board: inviting committee chairs to attend Board meetings for conversations about their work
    b. General affirmation of the idea, to keep us in the know about what's happening.
    c. Should we prioritize getting certain groups in for conversations earlier? General discussion included thinking about the timeline for planning the 2027 conference; matching priorities to the strategic plan priorities.
    d. Action item: since these priorities are spread across committees, Julie will ask chairs what their preferred timing/availability might be.
3. 2027 Conference planning – need potential dates and cities identified for start of RFP process by December board meeting, how do we want to prepare for this? (Julie Garrison)
    a. New schedule for conference planning–to have 2 possible dates and 2 possible cities for consideration by the December Board meeting
    b. Kalyn Huson is already set up to submit the RFP; questions have been created; someone needed to suggest cities/dates based on what we've done in the past; there are notes from last year that may be helpful.
    c. Kelli Herm, Ed Eckel, and Kyle Ceci volunteered to research past choices and prepare for that December discussion.
    d. Action item; Julie Garrison will send the volunteers the link to documentation.
4. Next steps in determining whether to pursue the mini-conference idea (see IGCC feedback in Consent Agenda) (Julie Garrison)
    a. Context (Mary O'Kelly)--this idea came out of past planning discussions and conference feedback. Many individuals cannot attend the in-person conference for a variety of reasons, and the logistics of a hybrid event are untenable. So the idea of a virtual mini conference has come up in multiple instances. This could be a half-day or ¾-day event, allowing for a deep dive beyond individual webinars. This would benefit both presenters and attendees who have barriers to in-person attendance.
    b. IGCC input (Katie Edmiston)--IGCC is in full support of this idea and will actively solicit proposals from the IGs, but a separate working group is needed for planning this type of event.
    c. Next steps (Julie Garrison)--working group charge followed by recruitment for working group members
    d. Action item: Mary O'Kelly will develop a draft charge.
5. Communications and Marketing (Edward Eckel)

a. Questions about swag requests for the 2026 conference
    i. Committee wants to get a sense of existing inventory–Kalyn Huson reports a handful of both pens and mugs; fuller accounting would require an inventory.
    ii. It's a little early for input from the Conference Committee, but good that this is coming up early; there have been last minute scrambles in the past.
b. The committee is considering dropping Facebook and X (Twitter) social media accounts due to low engagement from users.
    i. The committee hasn't yet come to a decision about closing accounts.
    ii. Low engagement makes it seem like the organization may be dormant or defunct.
    iii. They could switch to forwarding/liking posts from other relevant accounts to maintain activity.
    iv. Discussion:
        1. The Board would want to be notified and weigh in before the accounts were closed.
        2. Since the strategic plan surfaced the idea of a new campaign to boost MiALA awareness, we may want to wait to shut down social media until that plan plays out.
        3. Should this responsibility be moved to a different committee (Membership)? (Kelli Herm, via chat): I could see having some sort of discussion group if there was a need for that in social media. Maybe something like the ALA think tank group that I'm in on Facebook.
        4. Question: what would the committee need as support to make reenergizing social media feasible? Are there systems/workflows that are working well for other channels that could be put into place for social media?
c. Website questions
    i. Workflow: does the Board want Kalyn to continue as the only person responsible for making updates to the website, or would the Board like a member of this committee to serve in that capacity? Anything mission critical should still remain with Kalyn to make sure no delays in updates.
    ii. Discussion:
        1. Question back to the committee: what's the need for this proposal? Updating the website wasn't the main concern from strategic planning–it was more about review of content for currency and about UX, more big picture. Note that Kalyn is the systems admin for the platform, but is not responsible for content. She is quick to respond when something is sent to her for update–no log jam there. The organization needs to take ownership of the content.

2. (Kalyn Huson)–communication about updates doesn't always come to her in a timely way. She wants to be proactive, but not overstep. Committee chairs and other organizers need to follow timelines.
3. It would be great if the Communications Committee could track those timelines, reach out to folks with reminders to submit content and updates to Kalyn.

Mary O'Kelly motioned to adjourn and Edward Eckel seconded. The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 12:15pm.

Issue Bin / Future Agenda Items
- Website redesign
- Partnerships and how to formalize those

Upcoming Important Dates:
-

Upcoming Board Meetings:
- Nov. 6, Dec. 4, Jan. 8, Feb. 5, Mar. 5, Apr. 2, May 14, Jun. 4 at 11:00am

Upcoming Executive Committee Meetings:
- Oct. 16, Nov. 20, Dec. 18, Jan. 15, Feb. 19, Mar. 19, Apr. 16, May 21, Jun. 18 at 11:00am