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Interview Summary

Rachael Anderson and Alison Bunting served on the Medical Library Association Board of Directors, with their terms overlapping for two years, 1983-85. They also worked together in the Association of Academic Health Sciences Libraries (AAHSL) and other activities. This joint interview represents their experiences and the insights gained from their professional service together.

Alison served as MLA treasurer during her board tenure so part of the interview covers the needs for and the challenges of obtaining MLA dues increases. They were on the board in a period when the issue of MLA headquarters staffing and MLA leadership support came to a head and important changes took place as the headquarters role increased and matured. This was also the time when strategic planning had been introduced to the board’s functioning and it was beginning to play a bigger role in board meetings and the association.

Rachael and Alison were involved with the MLA Nominating Committee dubbed the “Nominating Committee from Hell” during the period when the association was having a very difficult time finding candidates for the office of president. The interview goes into detail about the nomination process and its evolution, and supplies anecdotes about how it worked and why it sometimes did not.

Alison and Rachael discuss the role of AAHSL and a document important to and influential for academic health sciences libraries: “Challenge to Action.” They also talk about their service on the National Library of Medicine’s Planning Panel on Education and Training of Health Sciences Librarians and their participation in the UCLA Senior Fellows Program.

Their joint interview gives the reader some good insights into the challenges faced by our professional associations and their members during the time Rachael and Alison played leading roles together.
RACHAEL KELLER GOLDSTEIN ANDERSON

Brief Biographical Statement

After receiving a master’s in library service at Columbia University in 1960, Rachael Anderson took her first library position at the City University of New York as cataloger and later a reference librarian. In 1964, she moved to the Mount Sinai School of Medicine and Medical Center Library, serving as cataloger, acquisitions librarian, head of cataloging, associate librarian and finally as director from 1974-1979. She then became the director of the Health Sciences Library at Columbia for eleven years (1979-1991); while at Columbia she also served as acting vice president and university librarian for 7 months in 1982-1983. In 1991 she became director of the Arizona Health Sciences Library for ten years (1991-2001), where she was also an associate director of the state’s Telemedicine Program (1996-2001). Rachael has held teaching appointments at the University of Arizona in the School of Information Resources and Library Science and the College of Pharmacy; Columbia University Center for Medical Informatics; Queens College Department of Library Science; and Mount Sinai Department of Medical Education. She retired in 2001.

MLA has benefited from Rachael’s support for many years. In addition to serving on a multitude of committees, she chaired the Janet Doe Lectureship Jury (1991-1992), the Brodman Award Jury (1988-1989), the National Program Committee (1982-1985), the Nominating Committee (1999), the Recruitment Committee (1975-1976), and the Committee on the Status and Economic Interests of Health Sciences Library Personnel (1980-1981). She was a member of the task forces that developed "Challenge to Action" and "Platform for Change." She served on the MLA Board of Directors in 1983-1986 and as president in 1997-1998. Rachael was also active in the New York- New Jersey Chapter, chairing numerous committees and serving as chapter chair in 1978-1979. She
was president of the Association of Health Sciences Library Directors in 1991-1992 and chaired its Committee to Review Accreditation Program for Medical School Libraries in 1987-1989. She was also active in the American Medical Informatics Association, American Library Association, and the Southern California/Arizona Chapter of MLA.

Rachael has worked with the National Library of Medicine in several capacities, She was a member of the Board of Regents 1990-1994, board chair from 1993-1994, and chair of the board's Subcommittee on Extramural Programs from 1991-1993. She was also chair of the Biomedical Library Review Committee (1987-1988), chair of the Special Review Committee for Health Sciences Education and Training (1995), and a participant on over 15 other NLM committees and panels. She has made presentations at local, regional, national, and international conferences on topics such as the status of women in library administration, consumer health, telemedicine, health sciences education, IAIMS, digital libraries, and strategic planning. Her publications are equally wide ranging.

Rachael has been honored with election as a fellow of the Medical Library Association in 1995, and also as a fellow of the American College of Medical Informatics in 1993 and the New York Academy of Medicine in 1990. She presented the MLA Janet Doe Lecture in 1989, and in 2000, received the Noyes Award, the association’s highest honor.
ALISON BUNTING

Biographical Summary

Alison Bunting received her library degree from the University of California, Los Angeles in 1970. Her first professional position was as an Interlibrary Loan and Reference Librarian at the Louise Darling Biomedical Library at UCLA. Her career continued at the Biomedical Library as Head of Interlibrary Loan, Head of Consulting and Training Services with the Pacific Southwest Regional Medical Library Service, Associate Librarian and then Director of the Library and the RML from 1984 until her retirement in 2002. In addition, Alison served as Associate University Librarian for Sciences from 1991-2002, Co-Director of the UCLA Info-Share Project from 2000-2002 and, delayed her retirement to serve as Interim University Librarian in 2002.

Within the Medical Library Association Alison was on the Board of Directors from 1982-1985, chaired the Continuing Education Committee in 1980-81 and the National Program Committee in 1979-1982, and was elected to the Nominating Committee three times. She served as Representative to the SLA Competencies Survey Advisory Committee in 1997-1998, as Representative to the Association of Academic Health Sciences Library Directors from 1988-1991, and on the joint AAHSLD/MLA Task Force to Develop Guidelines for Academic Health Sciences Libraries from 1983-1987. Among other committee appointments, Alison was on the Fellows and Honorary Members Jury, the Janet Doe Lectureship Jury, and, from 1989 through 2001, was Editor in Chief of *Current Practice in Health Sciences Librarianship*.

She was also active in other professional organizations. She served the Southern California and Arizona Chapter as President, Program Chair, and Member of the Advisory Council, and served the Librarians Association of the University of California, Los Angeles Chapter as President and Representative to the Advisory Committee for Strategic Planning for Information Resources in the Research University. She was the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) Representative on the Council of Academic Societies and on the AAMC Information Resources Program Committee. Her support for the Association of Academic Health Sciences Library Directors(AAHSLD) included serving as President, 1990-1991, as Chair of the Finance Committee,1991, Chair of the Program Committee,1986-1987, Chair of the Search Committee for the Annual Statistics Editor, 1993, and on the Board of Directors from 1986-1989. She was involved with the National of Medicine as Chair of the Board of Regents in 2002-2003, Chair of the Biomedical Library Review Committee, 1996-1997, and as a Consultant for the

Alison’s UCLA academic service career was also varied and prestigious. From 1984 until her retirement she served as Adjunct Lecturer at the UCLA Graduate School of Library and Information Science. She served on a wide range of UCLA academic committees, the UCLA Research Science Advisory Board, and the Deans Education Council; and chaired the Copyright Committee, the Public Service Council, the Physical Plant Committee, and the Library Computers, Information Technology, Telecommunications Committee.

Alison has published broadly and received numerous honors and awards. She elected UCLA Graduate School of Library and Information Science Senior Fellow in 1989, and received the Librarians Association of the University of California, Regional Medical Library Program Research Award in 1985. She received the Medical Library Association President’s Award in 1988, presented the Janet Doe Lecture in 1993, and was elected a Fellow of the Medical Library Association in 1998. In 2001, she received the association’s highest honor, the Marcia C. Noyes Award.
Medical Library Association Interview with Rachael K. Anderson and Alison Bunting

Diane McKenzie: This is the first joint interview that we have done in the MLA Oral History Program. We are back in Rachael’s kitchen in beautiful Tucson and it is April 4, 2003. The interviewer is Diane McKenzie. We have never done a joint interview before so we are on new ground. We have a list of all of the people that were on the [MLA] Board of Directors between 1981 or 1982 through 1986, which is when Rachael and Alison were on the board. Now the first question that I came up with was talking about what it was like to run for the board and you did talk about this a little yesterday and made it sound even more interesting. How were you asked to run? What was it like? What happened? Do know a better place to start? Suggest.

Rachael K. Anderson: Well, I remember; the way nominations were handled, and I guess we will talk about that a little bit later when we get to talk about the 1979 nominating committee. Several years before I actually ran, I had been asked whether I would be willing to run for the board by somebody who was on the Nominating Committee. This was well before the annual meeting or the first meeting of the Nominating Committee. I indicated “yes, I would” and gave that person my CV and background information, but I wasn’t nominated. This may have been two years before the first time. The first time that I did run was in 1980, I don’t remember who it was who asked me, which member of the nominating committee who asked me to run.

M: But it was in person?

A: No, I was asked ahead of time.

M: But not by letter or was it by..?

A: No, no, by phone call by the individual. [They] called and asked if I would be willing to run and I did run that first time. I lost and then ran again two years later and I was elected.

M: Now you weren’t on the same ballot though?

Alison Bunting: No, I was, I believe, a year after the first time Rachael ran. I think I was asked to run at the annual meeting by one of the Nominating Committee members. I, of course, needed to check with my institution, but I gave a tentative yes to that because running for the board was something, of course, I would be very interested in and I did receive the support of my institution.

M: So in both cases you were just asked to run somewhat informally but not with a specific letter?

B: Yes, that’s correct.

M: Okay. And so what was running like? Did you have to write a statement?
A: Yes, I had to answer questions and those were published then in the election materials and I had to supply some brief biographical information listing past jobs and the work done previously for MLA.

B: I believe at that time all of the statements and the CV-type information were mailed with the ballot. In subsequent years they changed that to just include that information first in the *MLA News* and now on the web, so all you receive is the ballot and you need to go and consult the information elsewhere.

M: Now, Rachael was saying that as a candidate you came and…

A: Yes, in those years, in the early 1980’s, the board met I believe twice a year. The two meetings, pre- and post-conference, were in conjunction with the MLA annual meeting, and the mid-winter meeting, which was usually around December. I remember both times when I was a candidate, I was invited to come, at my own expense, if I wanted, to the mid-winter board meeting. I don’t know when the meeting schedule for the board was changed to two meetings a year in addition to the [two] meetings that are held in conjunction with the annual meeting. Now, there is a meeting that follows the election and so the successful candidates are invited to come to that meeting. That’s why I came to an end of February meeting after I was elected president in 1996.

M: But you also described that you could come but not speak.

A: Oh yes, there was a difference between 1980 and 1982. When I came to the 1980 meeting we had to sit in a separate section, not at the table, and it was made very, very clear to us that we were there only as observers and we were not to speak. I ended up presenting that motion for the salary survey at that meeting so I was invited to come forward, present the information as chair of the Status and Economic [Interests of Health Sciences Library Personnel] Committee with the motion to start the salary survey, but then I went back to my seat and was not allowed to speak. By the 1982 meeting the strategic planning process had changed. We were invited to sit at the table and participate in the small groups that were doing strategic planning.

B: Yes, I came on the board the year before Rachael did at the transition between Charlie Sargent and Nancy Lorenzi. It was very clear at the pre-conference board meeting where I was an observer. I had been elected, that was 1982 in Anaheim, we had to sit at the side and we weren’t allowed to speak because we were not yet officially members of the board, and immediately, at the post-conference meeting, Nancy invited everyone to the table. Of course we were part of the board at that time, but at the mid-winter meeting, when candidates came to observe, she invited them to be part of the table and to be part of the discussion. So there was a very big change.

M: Do you think that was a change from old guard to new guard people or do you think it was because of strategic planning?
A: I think it was a change in philosophy and the way of managing groups and group process that Nancy, who was very well-versed and well-trained and very interested in that area, brought to the board deliberations. That meeting that Alison mentioned, that first mid-winter meeting, was the one I referred to earlier where I was one of those who came as a candidate and we were invited to participate fully in discussion. Not in voting, of course, but in discussion.

B: But I also believe that in side conversations over dinner that Nancy, at least, told those of us who were new to the board that she very much, resented may be too strong of a word, but did not like the “sit on the side and don’t say anything” that she experienced when she was coming in as a candidate for the association [presidency]. So I suspect that yes, strategic planning was certainly a big part of it, but it was also a reaction to how she felt when she observed as a candidate.

M: And didn’t see that as having to be the way just because it had always been. You said you had a similar reaction and when you were president you invited…

A: I invited the [MLA] staff to come when we had strategic planning discussions. We weren’t doing full strategic planning, but at our planning sessions I invited the staff to come and I tried to encourage them to participate, saying that they had knowledge about things we were talking about that the board did not have. I was partially successful. I think some of the staff were a bit shy about participating, but they did start to participate some. I don’t know to what extent that is continued to this day.

M: So there really was a shift…

A: Oh yes.

M: …in how meetings were run?

B: Very much so.

M: Now, the election is held. Do they call you when you win or when you lose and tell you?

A: Yes. They call you either way.

B: Either way.

M: Either way?

A: Yes, and as president, I had…

M: Is it the president who does it?

A: Yes, it can be the president or the chair of the nominating committee, who is the immediate past president, and sometimes I think they divvy up the responsibility with the
president calling the successful or unsuccessful presidential candidates. So there may be some division of responsibility there. It’s both fun and also difficult at times to call people about it.

M: I would imagine, especially at the presidential level that could be very difficult when you call.

A: Yes.

B: Yes.

M: The fun of being a president I guess.

B: It’s not unlike talking to unsuccessful job applicants after you have made a decision.

A: It certainly is easier than letting somebody go.

M: Well, yes. We already went over who were the various presidents and who were people who were on the board, and I mostly did that so that when their names come up we will know why we are talking about them. I happened to read a 1984 State of the Association address that Ray Palmer gave. It is sort of in the middle of this period so I made some notes of things that looked like they were important issues, and I think you have also made some notes. One of the things that just amazed me is he talks about the board having to communicate with email and then, after two years decided that they should continue communicating with email. We were talking about this a little before. It is so important to us now.

B: Well, it was very new. I believe also that there was an expense to the association. It was before the Internet. We were probably using Arpanet or one of those early networks…

A: I remember when I was first elected to the board, I was told to use email and this was totally new. It was my first use of email and I had to go into the audiovisual center to use that old Texas Instruments terminal to dial in.

B: So I think that’s why it appeared in Ray’s message because it was an expense to the association. It was a different way of operating and it was before we all had email access within our own institutions, so it is kind of hard to compare it to what we do today where everybody seems to have access to it. It also meant at headquarters adding the equipment and also the staffing who would have the expertise to even manage those systems. So it was a major commitment for the association.

A: I remember one issue that was discussed within my time on the board because email was just getting to be used and several of us within a year or so did start having email accounts. I know at Columbia we were using Bitnet. Now there’s Arpanet and Bitnet and some of us started to have our own email accounts and were using it, and it was a controversy as to whether or not our email addresses should be published in the directory.
It took quite a while before they were, and there was resistance as that way people would have too easy access and would be bothered and that would cause an extra expense to one’s institution if people were sending a lot of email messages.

M: That was 20 years ago.

A: Yes, it is hard to believe now with Internet and email being so ubiquitous and everybody having at least one email account. When I tell people that I have been using email for 20 years, since 1983, they are absolutely amazed. But it really did change the way we worked. Just being on committees, even if just a small one, you had to get assigned to special email. I remember being on the NLM planning panel and we had some special email protocol. But what it did for committee work and for developing documents and proposals and recommendations, just communicating directly. I don’t know what it is going to do for the archive. That is something that I was concerned about because if you look through the MLA archive, you have drafts and printed copies of communication among board members and among committee members, and that doesn’t exist anymore because virtually all of it is now being done via email. I remember looking through my files before I retired to see what should be sent to the MLA archive and there was really very little there. The official documents and reports, there were copies [of those] at headquarters and there was very little correspondence in print.

B: That’s true. The other thing that was introduced at that time was word processing. Headquarters had purchased a very special type of word processing system which we were able to use, I think, and it was before many of our institutions had easy access to microcomputers. That was a big innovation and it was a very clunky system that you had to use via remote access to their computer.

M: When you look at archives you can just see when word processing came in. Prior to it there are lots of handwritten notes and the minutes are scratched and often handwritten. All of sudden they become very official. It was quite a difference. I know what many groups, many archive groups, and the archive roundtable at MLA discussed with great interest, but no solution, is the issue of the email and electronic communication and the effect on the archive; and what do you do and how do you save and how should you save and what should you save. I don’t think anyone has come up with a very good solution.

A: When I was on the board most recently, during my three-year presidential term, email, of course, was very commonly used in a lot of board discussions, and voting sometimes took place via email. But any vote that was done via email then had to be repeated in person. I think that was the advice of the legal counsel to make it legal. And so we repeated it.

B: At the board meeting?

A: At the board meeting.
M: Well, I am sure there will be a little dip in our archive but I suspect in a few years we will have solved how and what you want to keep electronically. We are kind of focusing in on what one keeps.

B: Is headquarters archiving any email work?

M: I don’t know what archiving is being done. We are talking about it in our chapter at length, so I am assuming they are.

B: I suspect that some people are printing significant email, which is certainly what I was doing at my institution.

A: I was doing that too, but to what extent do you keep it in perpetuity? I mean sometimes I would have it as working files, like having various drafts. I would print out a document or report, but then when the work was all over, or some years or so after it was all over, and in the final document, when I got around to cleaning up, I got rid of this stack of ragged computer printouts.

M: Yes, I think that the person who is the real archivist, our archive is at the VCU [Virginia Commonwealth University] for our chapter, she does not want electronic, she only wants print at this point, and for our website we have a date each year when we print off what is on the website. We have come up with sort of an interim solution. We are not archiving the listserv. These are just some decisions we have made. But as more people make decisions I think we will know more. Well that got a little more cumbersome than I thought it would. Well, you each have your own list of things that came up so…

B: Well, one thing that I think was pretty significant about that period of time began when I joined the board in ’82 and Nancy Lorenzi became president. One reason I think Nancy instituted strategic planning is that the association had really had a great deal of difficulty getting a dues increase approved. We had not had a dues increase since 1976 and it was becoming more and more difficult to manage the affairs of the association. I tried looking back in the association record and my memory was that at that time in order to get a dues increase approved the bylaws required that the entire membership vote on the increase via mail ballot. I believe that prior to the time I came on the board there had been an unsuccessful attempt to raise the dues. What came out as a result of that failed effort was the fact that there was a real disconnect between those individuals who attended the annual meeting and were active in the association, and the large majority of the association, many of whom were hospital librarians, who felt that they were unable to attend the annual meeting. In fact, they probably were unable to attend the annual meeting because they didn’t have financial support or they were in one-person libraries and it was very difficult for them to leave.

M: And now they were being asked to give more dues.

B: Exactly. So one reason I think that Nancy wanted to institute strategic planning was to really develop a mission statement, focus on what was the future of the association.
What were we going to do and also to improve communication with the membership, because there was a strong feeling at that time that MLA was run by a small group of individuals who were out of touch with what was going on in the field with the diverse types of libraries that we had in the institutions. That it was primarily run by directors of academic libraries. So Nancy instituted the planning. It was also a time when the association had been restructured, so one thing that I remember about our tenure on the board was getting used to having chapters and sections and having chapter and section representatives on the board. The first two representatives were Holly Buchanan and Joan Ash. They were ex-officio non-voting members. Later on the chapter and section representatives became full voting members of the board. I think that they were non-voting for the transition period until the chapter and section organizational structure could be set up, and they could actually have a formal election of their representatives to the board. That was a very interesting time to become accustomed to those particular activities.

A: It got more input then into the board deliberations from the chapters and the sections. Board members then started getting reports, along with our reports from committees, on their activities, on what the chapters and sections were doing as well. Getting back to the dues increase, I was not the finance chairman so I was not as involved in finances at the time as Alison was, but what I remember was when we did bring, in ’85 I think, a dues increase proposal to the membership. I remember the tremendous amount of preparation we did in advance of that. Rehearsing, in terms of the slides, to show what the financial picture was and what the needs were, and whether we over prepared or not, we were very successful. It was better to be over prepared than unprepared.

B: Well, one thing that we did, and it was part of a strategic planning process, was to propose a bylaws change to have the dues increase be approved by a majority of those present at the annual meeting. There was a great deal of preparation and work to get that approved. There was a lot of discussion at the annual meeting when the bylaws proposal was made. It did pass and then we were able to get a second dues increase, because I believe we did get one in ’82-’83 by a majority vote by the mail ballot process, but that dues increase that was approved in 1982 was really not sufficient. It was in a way old, it didn’t reflect the level of funding that was needed for the association programs, and, of course, the strategic planning process was beginning to outline new programs and new areas of interest.

A: Picking up on something you said before. There was a greater dichotomy between those people who were very actively involved in the association, who came to the meetings, who were active participants in the association work in one way or another on committees, and those who were more passive, who had a membership but for one reason or another were not active participants. I think there was the feeling on the part of some of those who were active participants that because there was not sufficient money for the association and to support headquarters’ activities adequately for the full range of programs that MLA was very ambitiously trying to deliver, whether it was continuing education or anything else, that they were called on and therefore their institution paid more in terms of supporting them to do work that really should have been done by
headquarters and that some of the membership who were benefiting and were very eager to have a lot of this ambitious program were not willing either to put in the time and effort themselves or to pay the higher dues. So it was a real split and I think that came out, was it at the 1988 meeting in New Orleans, that there was also a rather heated discussion about a dues increase?

B: I believe so, yes.

A: I think those were some of the points that came out at that meeting during that discussion, in terms of sharing the load, that a certain group within the association should not be the ones who are bearing the load of doing the work to be sure we had this extensive program and doing much more work than they really should be doing, and therefore their institution and they were contributing because there was not enough support for headquarters to have the staff to carry out some of that work.

B: To put it in the record, in ’84-’85 the bylaws were amended to allow those in attendance at the meeting to pass the dues increase, and then the dues increase that Rachael referred to where we did all this preparation was in ’85-’86. Another thing that happened in that period as it related to the finances is that every year the board would present to the membership the fact that we were going to be in a deficit situation at the end of the year, and in fact, we were not, partly because investments came in or programs didn’t move along as quickly. So there was a fair amount of distrust that “do we really need this dues increase?”

M: Well, looking at the proceedings in your report it says, “Alison Bunting reported that you will recall that we had a 4% deficit of close to $40,000 in 1982. In 1983 the deficit was about $400.” It was like, what? But then down further it says that “in 1984 there was a 2% deficit of $22,000.” It is very, all over the map.

B: It was. Of course, some things were always difficult to project. Whenever MLA prepares the budget they look at, for example, how much income are they going to receive from the annual meeting and it is all projection in terms of what will our attendance be and how many exhibitors we will have. In some years, the attendance is much higher, especially if it’s held in a large metropolitan east coast city where a lot of people can come into the meeting for a day.

A: The income from the annual meeting is a major component, is a large percentage of the association’s income. It always has been and…

M: The meeting and the CE [Continuing Education] as well?

A: The meeting is, I think, a much larger component than continuing education. I don’t have the numbers in front of me now, but I don’t recall that CE is seen as a major money maker.

M: It is at the chapter level.
A: Yes, but at the national level I don’t think it has been. They certainly want to break even and show it in the positive column, but it is the income at the annual meeting that really makes or breaks whether the budget is going to be in the red or the black. And, of course, the investment income is significant too.

B: The other thing relating to finances that happened during our tenure on the board was the establishment of the Association Stabilization Fund, a formal fund. So this was something that I think Ray Palmer brought in and instituted and the board was quite supportive of it. Another thing that went into explaining to the membership was, “Yes, we might have a positive balance at the end of the year but a certain amount of money always needs to be on hand in case something terrible happens and we have to close down the association, we need enough funding for a year, to continue activities and be able to phase out in an organized fashion.”

A: The number that I recall, at that period, we tried to keep a reserve fund of about 25% of the annual operating budget so that we could close down the association and finish up those activities should worse come to worst.

M: I know at the chapter level we have a $40,000 reserve fund that we keep which seems terribly high to me. But there is a concern that we would have an annual meeting, there would be a hurricane, and we still would have to pay all of those things.

B: Exactly.

A: That is why it is important to have those kinds of reserve funds.

M: That is huge!

A: That is something MLA had not had before so it was kind of skating along on thin ice.

M: You were doing it month to month or year to year?

A: No, we hadn’t had that kind of a crisis, but prudent organizational management calls for having that kind of a reserve fund.

B: Before that time, the amount of staffing at headquarters was much lower, so if you stop to think about the fact that if we had to close down the headquarters and lay off the staff, we would want to be able to provide severance packages to phase it out. Just the amount of expense that would be required for that and contracts that would have to be paid are very important.

M: So this is another step sort of in the coming of age of the association.

A: Yes, the maturation of the association. If one looks back, you and I talked a little bit, and I don’t know whether or not it was on tape yesterday, about the changes, that I know what
I did, that I think that all the Doe lecturers do, is look back. I looked back not only at the Doe lectures, but I went back into the earliest volumes of the MLA record, the *BMLA* and its predecessor journals and really got a sense of a history of the association and how it started off just being very small and the institutional membership being…

[End of Tape I, Side A]

[Tape I, Side B]

**M:** An interview with Rachael Anderson and Alison Bunting, April 4, 2003. And we ended…

**A:** Well, I was saying that over time the personal membership in MLA became the predominant form of membership and while institutional category membership continues, it is not the dominant force that it was at the inception of the association. Headquarters support and the kind of professional or permanent workforce there would be for the association has changed over the years. I don’t have exact details, I am just stretching my memory because I remember at the time that Al Brandon came to Mount Sinai [Hospital Library] he had been very active and had been an MLA president. I recall there was some committee or some recommendations coming at that time, late 1960s or around 1970, in terms of expanding the staffing at headquarters. I would think that others have talked about this because Helen Brown-Schmidt had been running the MLA office. It was probably just a two-person office at that time. So when we talk about the maturation of the association, it has come a long way in the last 30 or so years.

**M:** Having MLA headquarters actually be staffed was a big issue at the time, taking it away from being a volunteer organization; so there have been many steps.

**B:** One thing I remember distinctly from my period on the board was that prior to Ray Palmer’s arrival at headquarters, I believe that all headquarters staff personnel reviews were reviewed and approved by the board. One change that Ray made was that he, as executive director, was responsible for doing the reviews and making decisions on any merit increases that were due to the staff and that the board’s involvement would be for the executive director and no one else. That definitely was a very positive change because that used to consume a fair amount of board members’ time going through this personnel review aspect of it and they weren’t there every day. How would you know particularly well how somebody was doing?

**A:** I think what this leads to is these were some of the major issues that were identified by the nominating committee in 1979 at the Hawaii meeting. That was a watershed crisis for the association, for the future of the association and for the association leadership. Alison and I were both elected as members of that 1979 nominating committee which we subsequently came to refer to as the “Nominating Committee from Hell”. It was the first and only time in the association’s history that a nominating committee held an open meeting for the full membership.
M: Do you want to jump and talk about that now?

A: I think it leads directly from what we were just talking about.

M: Okay, then we can come back and talk about these other issues since we have…

A: Because this is in that same period. This was 1979 and it was just a couple of years prior to Alison and I being on the board and dealing with these issues of staffing. Because the nominating process, up to that time, as we had alluded to earlier, was that the members of the nominating committee sort of lined up potential candidates before they even came for the meeting or held their first meeting. Members of the nominating committee would think of who might be appropriate candidates to run for board or president and prior to the annual meeting, contact them, ask them if they would be willing to run and, if yes, to supply the member with appropriate biographical material that could be used in the nominating committee’s deliberations. Before that 1979 committee met in Hawaii, all of us were busily on the phone contacting those we thought would be appropriate board and presidential candidates. While we did line up quite a few people who were willing to run for board, we were not able to get anyone who was willing to run for president and we needed two candidates. I think we had asked 18 or 20 or 23 people, former board members…

M: Was that a rule then that you had to have been on the board?

A: No, there were no rules, but it was just natural to look to people who had association experience and people who had served on the board or were serving at that time on the board and were going off the board, or people who had done significant work for the association in other capacities were just naturals, or even other people who had demonstrated leadership in the profession in some other way. We approached somewhere in the area of 20 or so people and several of us approached the same person. They had been called multiple times by various members of the nominating committee trying to convince them to agree to serve. In Hawaii, after we had held our first meeting, we then asked to meet with the current board to apprise them of the problems we were having. The most serious problem was that the potential candidates felt it was just too arduous a job, that what the president was called on to do was an enormous amount of work because there was not sufficient back-up support by headquarters. Some [former presidents] had their [institutions] pay for an extra staff member because there was so much paperwork to do and so much correspondence.

M: You mean their institutions provided…?

A: Their institutions paid if they were elected president. Some people said, “Well I can’t accept this until I check with my dean or vice president or to whomever I report to see if I can get at least some part-time extra clerical help in my office in order to handle this extra load of work.” As I said earlier, we thought this was an important issue for the association as a whole. Therefore we called this open meeting at the annual meeting in order to apprise the full membership, to say that people are not willing to serve as
president because the association does not have enough funding to support an office, a
headquarters office to do the work, and it is calling on the president and his or her own
parent institution to carry too much of the load and this cannot continue. We cannot have
this extensive program [without headquarters support] and that is why it is related to the
question of dues increases and the size of the staff.

M: So what happened at this open meeting? It was an open meeting of the board?

B: Of the membership, which later on has been done quite a bit at MLA meetings, when there
is a particular topic that is controversial or of interest to the membership, they will have
these special forums. It was in the evening and obviously not everybody attended, but
quite a few people came to hear. The tradition at the time was that the nominating
committee was supposed to come up with a slate that could be announced at the second
business meeting.

M: So you met at MLA, came up with a slate and it was announced?

B: It was announced.

A: That’s why so much of this work to identify candidates willing to serve was done before
you got to the meeting.

B: I think also that one reason they wanted to announce it at the second business meeting was
there is a provision in the bylaws for nominating additional candidates by petition. If you
think of the time before email, before the communication that we have now, the only way
you could effectively do that would be if you were there in person at the meeting. So that
was an additional pressure. So we were basically saying to the membership, “We are not
going to have a slate to announce at the second business meeting.” Partly because some
of the individuals did agree to say, “I’m going to go back and see if my institution will
support me to run for office.” But we knew that we would not have definite
commitments from them.

A: But we did identify the basic issue which we felt transcended that and was of major
importance. We wanted to call it to the attention of the full membership that the
association was not being adequately funded and one of the outcomes was that there was
therefore a paucity of people willing to take on that responsibility because they could not
get the support from the association.

B: It was especially critical, I think, getting to the issues of the divisions within the
association between academic and hospital. If you were in a hospital library it was
absolutely impossible to take on the presidency unless you had your institutional support.
I am vague on the timing, but Gertrude Lamb is a good example of somebody whose
institution did provide her with a full-time secretary to assist when she ran for president.
But that was very, very unusual to have that kind of support from a hospital or, for that
matter, from any academic library.
M: So what was the outcome? I mean, what happened? You had this open forum and people I guess talked and...?

A: It did raise the issue, and there was a dues increase that you mentioned, a year or two years later. One of the changes made was that the nominating committee did not have to announce the slate at the annual meeting and to this day the slate is not announced until sometime afterward, giving the nominating committee time to work. But that whole process changed. I was elected to the nominating committee and served several years earlier, back in the 1980s, and then I chaired the nominating committee as immediate past president a few years later. What we started to do was look at what were the criteria, what we were looking for, what was the association engaged in, and, therefore, what kind of a person was needed for the board.

M: And when did that come in? Was that…?

B: It really came in, and it was I think part of strategic planning. I don’t recall that we talked about it specifically, but given Nancy Lorenzi’s bent, and of course she was followed by Nina Matheson who continued in that fashion and Phyllis Mirsky, and they all became committed to strategic planning and communication with the association. I believe one of the association records, it may be when Nina was describing the nominating committee that she chaired, she described to the members that the process had been to sit down and talk about what is it that the association is working toward in the coming year, what are the qualifications, the qualities of the individuals that we need on the board and for a presidency. It was out of that process, that when you mentioned the rules, the guidelines are there, and in fact previous board experience is very important for a presidential candidate.

A: Not vital, not mandatory but very useful.

B: Very useful. For board members, being active in chapters and having contributed to the association through committees was the type of background that we looked for in individuals who were good candidates for the board. Also we wanted board members who could eventually become good candidates for president because they would gain from that experience.

M: Can we back up just a little more? What was the process for being elected or put on the nominating committee in ’79? Did that change or is that still the same?

B: There were some changes with the chapter and section changes in MLA. Now the chapter council, the section council and the board suggests a certain number of candidates each.

A: There are 18 candidates who run and each chapter and each section has a potential nominee for the nominating committee and then these names go respectively to the chapter and section council and from those names each council selects six nominees for the nominating committee and the board selects six nominees.
M: At large?

A: Yes, for nominating committee and then you get a slate of 18.

B: I think the board came up with the names but I don’t really remember.

A: I think it may have been that the board came up with the full slate back then.

B: And that pointed to the concern that existed amongst the members that it was a very closed circle.

A: And that it was a self-perpetuating group.

B: Because if the board was the group that was putting up the candidates for the nominating committee then they were identifying people that they knew thought in concert with them. So when the association structure was changed, the chapters and sections suggested names and there was much more variety of candidates. We had more hospital librarians elected to the nominating committee because there were more recommendations of hospital librarians for board membership.

A: And also greater geographic diversity and diversity of people from types of libraries as well. The process, when I chaired the nominating committee a few years ago, actually started the work of the committee ahead of time using email, contacting the members of the committee and asking them to start working on some of the tasks. One being to identify the criteria for the people that were important to the association, to start thinking about and putting together what they thought the association needed in leadership at this particular juncture in its history, and to start identifying what we wanted to ask the candidates for in their written statement - what we wanted them to write about or what they wanted to respond to. So when we came to the first and only nominating committee meeting, at the annual meeting, we had some drafts ready to go and people were presumably thinking about it. And we spent some time discussing those items, and it was a way to familiarize people on the nominating committee with what was happening to the association, what the issues were, and what some of the problems were. That’s why I think it is very good that it is the immediate past president who is chairing the nominating committee, who is not a voting member of a nominating committee, but in a way brings that experience and can educate the members of the nominating committee as to what [MLA] really needs, what really happens in a board meeting, what kind of dynamic there is and what kinds of people it would be good to have, keeping in mind who is continuing on the board and what issues are before the board or likely to be before them at this time. What seems to happen too is that usually a couple of people are elected to the nominating committee who have fairly recent board experience because they are known and they are leaders and they have been leaders in the association. So they can also bring that experience to the discussion before you come up with names. The way we ran it is we came up with names that people presumably had not checked with because it is supposed to be all held in confidence. Through a series of voting mechanisms we came up with a ranked list of candidates and then assigned people from the nominating committee to
approach these individuals in the course of the annual meeting, if they were there, or by phone if they were not, to ask them whether or not they would be willing to run. There was no pressure on the committee to get it done within three days so that they could present the slate at the second business meeting.

B: But if you are a potential candidate, especially for president, one thing that you learn when you are at the annual meeting is if you get a phone call to, “Could you come and have a drink with me?” and you…

M: And that person’s on the…

B: On the nominating committee. It is very likely that somebody is going to be asking you to run for president. “Would you be willing to run for president?”

M: Well, you said it’s a ranked list so you start out up here...?

B: Well, you are at a reception and people are hanging around trying to get you off on your own. You quickly become suspicious as to what is this all about and usually it is [a nominating committee member.] You can actually observe that happening sometimes at MLA social events if you pay attention.

A: I had been keen on trying to get Bob Braude to run for president and when you and I were on the nominating committee I invited Bob to come up to my hotel room. He came to the door and he walked in and then I sort of came clean and he said, “I should have known that’s why you invited me up to your room! You’re on the nominating committee,” but he didn’t turn me down.

M: Are you able to talk about who was running on this [slate] and how you ended up coming up with people?

B: In 1979?

M: Yes.

B: Well, there was one individual, Charlie Sargent, who actually became the president, who had agreed beforehand to…

A: And Sam.

B: Sam Hitt.

A: Sam Hitt was also on that committee. It was chaired by Gertrude Lamb.

M: We didn’t ever really say who was on that committee so…

A: I just remember C.K. Huang was on it, Sam was on it, you and I…
B: And I really don’t remember.

A: Who was the past president..?

B: Gertrude Lamb was and she chaired it.

M: How many people were on the committee?

A: I don’t remember how many were on it. I am sure the record would show.

B: Sam, following the process that Rachael described, had, I believe, contacted Charlie ahead of time and he was willing to run for president. So we had one name, but we were having trouble with the second name.

A: The second candidate.

B: Actually, an interesting aspect of that is that I remember being in Louise Darling’s room and she was rooming with Betty Sawyers and this was after we had had the open forum and we were talking about the difficulty in getting somebody to run. I believe Betty, in a very quiet voice, said, “Well, I would be willing to run.” I then passed on that information.

A: She really came to the rescue for the association. She was at Ohio State; she was the director of the medical library at Ohio State.

B: She agreed to run for president I believe after that. So that became our slate and Charlie was elected.

M: Now was she well-known?

B: Relatively well-known.

A: She had been in the association quite a while.

B: She had started her career as Louise Darling’s secretary and then went on to library school and then worked at the National Library of Medicine for a number of years before she went to Ohio State.

M: I am just going to ask this. I don’t know if you want to answer or not. There is a little mythology that surrounds the elections and one of the big myths is that men cannot win who run against women. Another big myth is that if you are a hospital librarian, you will be elected because there are so many hospital librarians. You must have heard these. I don’t think I am telling you anything new. I don’t know if anyone has ever gone back and actually looked to see if these are legitimate myths.
A: I have heard the same myths. When I was putting together slates, the times that I was on the nominating committee, it did not come consciously into play. I know we tried to get some diversity of membership on the board, but I think if you look back in history not every hospital librarian has won. You have elections for board where medical school people have won and hospital librarians have lost. I think... I don’t know maybe I am being too much...

M: I am thinking that men only run against men or something.

A: Well, they have had men who have been elected to the board even in recent years and some women on the slate who have not been elected.

M: What about as president?

A: I don’t know.

B: I do think that many of the male members of the association do believe that and will not agree to run unless their opposing candidate is another male.

M: We need another Rachael to bring this up as a paper.

A: I think that myth is strongest among the men and it has resulted in what Alison just described. I hope that the dichotomy, or whatever, between hospital librarians and the academic librarians breaks up, because something I know I have tried to encourage and talk about, when talking about recruiting, telling hospital librarians, “You can move from being a hospital librarian into academic librarianship.” As a matter of fact, a point I used to make was that you get much more experience in management as a one- or two-person hospital librarian than you do working as a reference librarian in a large academic library because you get to interact and have to deal and negotiate with administration. You have to manage finances. You have to deal with staffing issues, other resource issues, space issues, so you start getting that experience even though it might be on a much smaller scale. You do get that experience that being a reference librarian doesn’t give you. So it is possible to make that transition, and I would hope that some of that distrust or animosity is beginning to dissipate.

B: I am an example of somebody who ran for president against a hospital librarian and lost. Jacque Doyle was my opponent, but as I look back on that particular situation it was a choice between two very qualified individuals and Jacque did a wonderful job as president of the association. So yes, I think every time we vote we are trying to decide between the two presidential candidates. In recent years the nominating committee has done such a good job, but for me, at least, it has always been a very, very difficult decision because it is choosing between two very qualified individuals. It boils down to analyzing it from the perspective of what does the association need, or who do I know better, who do I have the most confidence in?

M: Well, as a voter, I think that may be huge, both of you were from the same region.
B: Yes.

A: I have to share with you that Jacque, when she found out that she was going to be running against you said she was so upset, because for years she had wanted to be sure that you ran for president. When she had been on the nominating committee she really wanted you to be a candidate and, for one of many times, you had turned down the candidacy.

M: Oh, you had done the little isolation with the drink at MLA so you…

B: Yes, well I had been asked before and the timing just wasn’t right. It is a major commitment even though we have made tremendous strides in the support that is provided to the president from headquarters. Depending on what is going on in either my personal life or my institutional commitments, at times when I was asked to run, I think shortly after I finished my board tenure, that was when I had just been appointed director of the Biomedical Library at UCLA. I had a lot of major commitments there and so I declined nominations at those particular times.

A: I declined nomination for president several times. Again, for personal reasons and what my other commitments were in terms of time. As Alison has said, headquarters is providing much more support. I remember years ago, since it is the president-elect who appoints people to all the MLA committees, there was an enormous amount of work because the president-elect had to write and send all of those letters of appointment. Even with word processing it was just a lot of correspondence to handle. If somebody turned it down, it was just a lot to deal with. Whereas, when I was president-elect a few years ago, while I got all the forms with people’s requests for what committee they would like to serve on and I checked and did the communication with the incoming chairs of the committees and came up with the rosters of who should be appointed to which committee and made sure we had enough people on each committee, I did not have to do the correspondence. I then passed that information back to headquarters’ staff and they were the ones who communicated with all of the potential committee members. That was an enormous workload that was removed from president and president-elect.

[End of Tape I, Side B]

[Tape II, Side A]

Diane McKenzie: We stopped the other tape early, so we are starting a brand new one so we don’t interrupt any of the discussion. You were going to talk about the strategic planning that was going on when you were on the board.

Rachael K. Anderson: Yes, I believe it started that first year that you [Alison] were on the board, before I came on.

Alison Bunting: In 1982, yes.
A: Was it at the post-conference meeting? I remember that it was sort of in the initial stages of strategic planning when I came as a candidate for the board to that mid-winter meeting in 1982.

B: That’s correct. We started at post-conference when Nancy [Lorenzi] became officially president. Then at that first mid-winter board meeting, which would have been in December of ’82, I think we had our first planning session.

A: I remember we broke up into small groups, each of us had a different focus on a different topic and were doing the usual, identifying the problems, the weaknesses, the strengths, the opportunities. I can’t remember what the topics were though. Do you remember?

B: I don’t. Well, one topic we were to envision was what should be the membership base of the association and Nancy was…

A: She was rather expansionist.

B: …expansionist. And that was looking at should we try, as one way to help solve the finances of the association, to attract more members. It was at the beginning of the period where some libraries were starting to hire individuals who didn’t just have the master’s in library science, so we were starting to have audiovisual programs. Some institutions had hired people with instructional technology backgrounds and computing. [Nancy] envisioned that the Medical Library Association could become an association that would be attractive to all types of information professionals. There was a little bit of controversy about that. How would we have to change in order to make it attractive? How would that affect the programs and services that we delivered to our traditional members?

A: I think then we also started working on a mission statement for the association that underwent quite a bit of revision in subsequent years, fine-tuning it. Was it also when we started strategic planning that we started to think of a role for the fellows or for more senior members?

B: I think that was at a later stage.

A: I think we then had ideas about fund raising, doing fund raising to an extent and of a type that the association had never undertaken before.

B: The strategic planning during our tenure on the board was really run by Nancy Lorenzi followed by Nina [Matheson] and then Phyllis Mirsky. If you look at the association record, we did have some forums at the annual meetings to present the mission statement and to talk about the categories of memberships.

A: And to get input from the membership. But it was very much an internally driven process that we did. We were very fortunate that we had the leadership who had all had training
and experience in running groups for planning. Nancy Lorenzi, Nina Matheson, and Phyllis Mirsky were all experienced in that area.

B: And I believe actually Nancy brought her husband, who was active in strategic planning and had a business in that particular area. He was a management-type consultant and he provided some background for it. His first name is Bob…

A: Bob Riley. He just died recently.

B: Yes.

M: Isn’t he the person that you said, because of his contributions, was going to have a formal obituary in the BMLA?

B: Yes, in the BMLA.

A: There was an announcement of his death, I think, in the most recent issue of the [MLA] News that he had worked with us. This kind of planning became a regular part of board activity at our meetings. What I remember at my last meeting as a board member, at the pre-conference meeting in Minneapolis in 1986, the board was introduced to a gentlemen whose name was Jai [Dr. G. K. Jayaram]. I can’t remember his last name. MLA was going to embark on a more extensive strategic planning process that Jai would lead and coordinate. He was a professional in that area. I can’t speak to it because that started just as I was going off the board.

M: Now was that a board recommendation or did that come out of (inaudible)?

A: I can’t remember. I think it was probably initiated by Ray Palmer who was the executive director and…

B: Probably Kent Mayfield, who was the director of education at that time and had had some experience in that area. I suspect that from their perspective they were beginning to see the need to continue the planning process…

A: And to take the planning process to a different level, but I think you would really need to talk to some of the people who were involved with the planning at that stage who were on the board from 1986 on.

M: And so was the board all work?

A: Well, at board meetings themselves it was very serious and we would put in long days, there was no question about it. Although when Phyllis was president, the meetings didn’t start quite as early in the morning as they did when some other people were president because she made it very well known that she was not a morning person.

M: How many days did you meet?
B: Usually the mid-winter board meeting was at least two days, two and a half days. Sometimes if, for example, I was on the finance committee we would meet ahead of the general board meeting and then bring recommendations to the board.

A: And the executive committee always met for a few hours or half a day before the general board meeting.

M: And that was the president?

A: The president, past-president, president-elect, the chair of the finance committee and the executive director would meet. Those were intensive. Those were hard days of work, but I can’t say it was all work and no play because there was mealtime; there were dinners, some of them quite memorable in terms of the conversation that went around. Alison and I were just remembering one mid-winter dinner in Chicago. We were at a restaurant that was not right near the hotel, some distance away, and we were sitting at a round table and some of the candidates for board were there. There must have been about seven or eight of us around the table. After we had had a glass or two of wine the conversation focused on what was the most unusual job you have ever had in your career. We started laughing so much at some of the descriptions that we very nearly got thrown out of the restaurant. Rowdy librarians…

B: Now we also formed fast friendships, and I have seen that repeated by individuals who have been on the board of directors because you spend so much time together.

A: And you tend to room with people and get to know them.

B: Mary Horres and I were elected to the board in the same year and we ended up rooming together as board members and there was encouragement of that because of the association finances at the time.

A: Yes, and Phyllis Mirsky was elected president at the same time that I was elected to the board and so we frequently roomed together as well. Of course, the best arrangement I thought was at the old Palmer House because they had some rooms that had two bathrooms. If you got one of those rooms you had all the advantages of rooming together, the companionship, the conversation, and none of the disadvantages. The main disadvantage of rooming with somebody is that you have to share a bathroom and when everybody is trying to get ready to go to an early morning meeting there can be a little contention for mirror and shower time.

B: And board members, for example Mary is a chocoholic and…

A: Well, some of the rest of us can do very well with the chocolate.
B: But she lived for the little mints that were left on the pillows and so other board members who didn’t particularly like them would bring them to her in the morning so she would have a little pile of them at her place.

A: Then there was one board meeting when we were staying at either the Ambassador East or the Ambassador West and you and Mary were rooming together and I had a room on another floor to myself. We would sometimes have, I wouldn’t call it homework, but we had little tasks to do. The board was broken down, usually in conjunction with strategic planning, to meet as small groups and then would bring the results of that work back to the board the next day. We had decided we were going to get into our pajamas or nightgowns and meet in Alison and Mary’s room. So I went and changed, put my coat on over my nightgown and traipsed down to Mary and Alison’s room. As we were there working on whatever our assigned project was, the housekeeper came to turn down the beds and leave the chocolates on the bed. Mary answered the knock at the door and she said, “Oh, we don’t need the beds turned down, we are working now, but we need the chocolates.” So she [the housekeeper] gave her the chocolates and we went back to working. A few minutes later there was another knock on the door and it was the housekeeper, back again with some more chocolates. She said “I saw others in your room, so here is some chocolate for your friends.”

M: That’s nice.

B: The other fun memory I have is that Jana Bradley, who was on the board, had written a Harlequin novel one year when her husband was on sabbatical and she went with him to England and needed something to do. She had taken a class on how you do it, it is very formula driven, and had written one and it was just published. I had a copy of it. And Nina Matheson…

A: She wrote it under some pseudonym.

B: Yes, it is under a pseudonym. Nina Matheson was just fascinated by this so I lent her the book and the next morning Nina looked rather haggard at the meeting because she had stayed up all night reading the novel and finished it.

M: And you also have, it’s not exactly a silly story, but about you and Judy and your…

B: Oh right, Judy Messerle and I were nicknamed the “Bobbsey Twins” because we both have a calm demeanor and we were the ones who were frequently elected to make presentations at the annual meeting on controversial topics. We would remain calm and deliver this information. That was one memory I have.

A: I have an impression of you when you were finance chair during… you being one of the first people I ever remember being courageous enough not to have written notes when you went up to do your presentation before the full membership. You had your little computer screen that you brought up with you and you used that, and as the finance chair, of course you
had to use that to prompt you for the numbers and you relied on the computer for that and I thought that was very, very brave.

B: And that was very handy. It was some form of an early laptop. Rachael mentioned earlier that when we were planning these presentations on the dues increase we were frequently working on those extensively at the board meeting prior to the meeting and rehearsing them so that we were delivering a good message. It was very handy to have had that computer so we could make the changes as we worked on it.

M: Do you want to talk about these jobs? I thought it was so funny when you were telling me about people’s early jobs…I think it is cute and…

A: Well, the one I remember is Holly Buchanan. She talked about her early job as a dog groomer. She went into more detail about what she did, none of which I can remember or repeat. And then…

B: Gary Byrd really had us in stitches talking about the fact that he sold pots and pans that were designed for the young woman who was about to be married, for her trousseau.

A: And he went door to door doing these sales jobs.

B: That’s right. And part of the sales pitch was that you had to show how durable these pots and pans were. You turned the big pot over and you danced on top of it.

A: And Sheldon Kotzin, who was a candidate for board then, talked about when he was selling glass tabletops and the adventures he would have parked on a hill, when the glass tabletop would slide out of the back of his station wagon. Fueled by a glass or two of wine, they were even funnier.

M: It’s still pretty funny. Okay, I think we have kind of covered the board experience pretty well and we have a couple more things. Would you like to talk about AAHSLD next or Challenge to Action? Which…?

A: Well, Challenge to Action was a joint project of both MLA and AAHSLD.

M: So maybe start with AAHSLD?

A: We can talk about AAHSLD and the nature of the association. Alison and I overlapped on that also.

M: On that board?

A: Yes.

M: And just for the record, what does AAHSLD stand for?
B: Association of Academic Health Sciences Library Directors - at that time.

A: And that’s what it was originally. Its name has subsequently been changed to drop the D and become Libraries rather than Library Directors.

M: So it’s AAHSL now rather than AAHSLD?

A: Now it’s AAHSL, then it was AAHSLD.

M: Okay, I always want to put an American in there with those two A’s.

B: Yes.

M: And this group was started...?

A: In 1977. It just celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary. We had an interesting session at the last AAHSL meeting this past November in San Francisco. The program was called “AAHSL at Twenty-Five, Looking Back and Looking Forward.” The morning session had several of us old timers focusing on different aspects and looking back at the 25 years that had elapsed. The early founders of AAHSLD were Gerry Oppenheimer, Sam Hitt, Peter Stangl, Nina Matheson, and Glenn Brudvig, who at that time was the director of the biomedical library at University of Minnesota and subsequently left medical libraries.

B: The thing I remember about the board membership, I believe I was on the board and then was elected president shortly after that, was an early concern by the association about the questionnaire that was distributed to libraries by the Liaison Committee on Medical Education or LCME as it is called. Whenever a medical school is up for accreditation or re-accreditation they are required to do a self-study of all aspects of the medical school.

M: What year was this?

B: This was in the ‘80s.
A: It was in the ‘80s. I chaired the task force that was asked to look into it and see if revisions could be made.

B: I was on the board of directors from ’86-’89 and became president-elect in ’89, so I went continuously through that. The LCME committee, which is the body that manages this accreditation process, is a joint committee of the Association of American Medical Colleges and the American Medical Association. There were two chairs, one from each association.

A: Dr. Donald Kassebaum and Dr. Harry Jonas.

B: The general feeling [by the AAHSL membership] was there had been some approaches to the LCME to see if we could make some changes in this particular questionnaire, and I think it is fair to say that we were somewhat rebuffed at that time. When I came on to the board, one of the things that I offered to do was to talk to a senior faculty member at UCLA who was a member of the LCME committee and was aware of its background. I did that and he provided some very valuable advice to us politically on how to approach getting things changed. He told us that we shouldn’t come in with strict recommendations on what we wanted, that we should come up with a draft of what we might want to see asked and then work with individuals who were on LCME accrediting teams at our own institutions to run it by them, see how they reacted to it so that we could politically get it accepted. So when I became president of AAHSL one of the things that I did was appoint a committee to come up with a revised questionnaire and Rachael was the chair of that committee and Bob Braude…

A: And Bob Braude and Roger Guard, who was at Cincinnati. We elicited input from other members of AAHSL in terms of what they thought should be on the questionnaire and should not be in the questionnaire. We revised it. We came up with a much lengthier document that included some of the same information in terms of the standards and the size of the collection. We tested the questions on a few colleagues in AAHSL to see how they worked. What we tried to do was to change the focus from just the statistics of how many of these and how many of those that you have in the library and more to the service and to the educational [aspects], to measure the educational role of the library within the medical school. When we had finished we were very fortunate because the dean of Mark Hodges’ medical school at Vanderbilt was either chair or incoming chair of AAMC or was a senior member of the LCME committee that year, I don’t remember. Mark spoke to him and we had a meeting with him. Through his intervention we had a meeting at the AAMC meeting in Washington and we had found out that the LCME was also looking into making some general revisions in the self-study document. So we had a very good meeting with Dr. [Donald G.] Kassebaum and Dr. [Harry] Jonas at the AAMC meeting. We told them what we were doing. They were very, very interested in seeing it, and subsequently I ended up corresponding mostly with Dr. Kassebaum, sending him our draft. And it was very much along the lines of what he was interested in terms of library automation and what the library was doing to provide access to automation and for education. He made a few modifications in the work that we had done, but essentially accepted it and that became the library portion of the self-study questionnaire from then on. But then Alison, do you remember I succeeded you as president of AAHSLD and I think it was the year you were president and I was president elect, we were in Washington for another meeting that we went over to AAMC headquarters and met with Dr.
Kassebaum. What we had wanted was to try to get a librarian on the LCME visiting committees. It was made clear to us that we would not be able to do that because every department and every unit in the medical school really wanted to get representation. What we did work out was that they invited us to submit a list of our concerns that libraries had about issues to the LCME every year and they would share that with the LCME accreditation team to alert them to what was going on in libraries and what they should be looking for.

B: And I think one of the first issue statements that we did that came out, I believe, under your presidency had to do with the rising cost of scientific publications and the journal cancellations that individuals were going through, so…

M: This is early ‘90s?

B: Yes.

A: Yes. I think I was president in ’90-’91 because I think I was president the year I moved to Arizona.

B: Right, because I was past president in ’91-’92 so I think that would have been correct.

M: We see that as one of the years that there were a lot of cancellations as we look back we can tell that.

B: And so he [Dr. Kassebaum] wanted us to come up with issue statements that would be educational for the visiting committees so when they visited libraries they would be able to ask about how they were coping with journal cancellations as an example.

A: Dr. Kassebaum was very enthusiastic about these changes and what we wanted to emphasize in the library. What was interesting is that several years ago, here in Arizona, when the medical school was up for accreditation, he was still working for them [LCME] and I think he subsequently retired. The library wasn’t due for a visit, but he came down because he saw my name and he remembered the work that we had done, so he just came down very briefly to talk.

M: Were there other items that..?

B: That was the primary one that I can think of from our tenure, certainly my tenure on the board and as president. Rachael, you…

A: What would come up periodically from the start, one of the original goals and one of the reasons that AAHSL was formed, was to forge some links between this library directors’ group and the AAMC itself. It took several years till we were able to do that, and during recent years we have had some good representation. First it was Bob [Braude] and then Shelley [Bader] who served on the Council of Academic Societies, CAS.
B: Actually I served as a representative to it because I think we were admitted in the late 80s. The very first representatives to the Council of Academic Societies were the president and the past president. Then AAHSL decided to make it an appointed...

A: Somebody who would have a much longer term so they could build up relationships with the other people on the CAS, and that has been quite successful.

M: But who is on it, and what type of organization?

A: The various specialties like microbiologists and physiologists and a whole bunch of other groups that are subgroups within the AAMC are part of this Council of Academic Societies.

B: When AAHSL was first founded the initial goal was to be accepted to the Council of Academic Societies which existed as a body within the AAMC. At that time, politically it was not possible. Then in the late 80s we were allowed to become a representative group within the association.

A: I was on the program committee during its early years. One of our objectives with the programming became to have sessions that would have speakers and be on topics that would be of interest beyond the interests of the librarians. That’s what we started to do. I remember we had a very successful one on the pricing of journals. We had an economist from Stanford talk about that. We would try to have sessions with broader [appeal], and we did. We were very pleased when we started attracting people at the AAMC who were not librarians. We would look around the room when the program was on and see how many faces we didn’t recognize. We were pleased when there were a significant number of such people.

B: In fact, the program committee would develop a special flyer announcing the general session that AAHSL was going to have on a topic such as the one Rachael just mentioned. We would then, at each of our own institutions, distribute it in advance of the meeting to those administrators that we knew attended AAMC to say, “You might be interested in this, why don’t you put this on your calendar.” It was quite effective in bringing in other members.

A: Questions did come up from the very beginning. I think they have subsided by now. Why have AAHSL? Was it just to be an elitist association? Why couldn’t AAHSL do what it was doing as part of MLA? I think it has proved its worth. I know it did to me personally, because part of what we wanted to achieve by having this role at AAMC was to develop the relationships within our medical schools with the other administrators and the chairs of the departments to get recognition for both the librarian as a colleague and for the educational role of the library in the medical school. It was really important to make those connections.

M: You mentioned yesterday when we were talking about directors and what was the role that this was a very, very important...

A: It is a very important role. You know, for us internally, it was a chance. MLA meetings had gotten so large and so diffuse that the library directors really had not had time to focus on the issues they had in common. Being at the AAHSL meeting, as part of AAMC, also gave us
the opportunity to have a smaller group [of directors] that would focus on our common issues. I think that one of the important things was being seen by the people from your own medical school at that meeting and getting that recognition. I know what happened to me at Columbia is that the dean had a dinner and invited (tape shuts off).

[End of Tape II, Side A]

[Tape II, side B]

M: A joint interview with Rachael Anderson and Alison Bunting. And we were just talking about the dinner at the AAMC.

A: Yes, when the dean found out that I was going to be there too I was invited to join this group of about two dozen people from the Columbia medical school. Then I was invited in subsequent years. It gave me an opportunity to form relationships and for people to get to know me and for me to get to know them better. It was especially important at Columbia, where at that time as I had mentioned on the individual oral history that we did yesterday, I was not part of that administration. I reported to the University Library. So this gave me a chance to develop those relationships that were very beneficial to me and for the library to be seen as having a role in medical education.

M: Now, do directors go and also associate directors? Who is on AAHSL?

B: AAHSL is a representative membership so the director would be the official member. The program meetings are open to other individuals. Depending on the topics of the programs, in more recent years I have seen more associate directors attending the meeting but…

M: Oh that’s right, it is of libraries.

A: Yes.

B: Right, right.

A: But there is one designated official representative.

B: Voting member.

M: Sure.

B: But I think of late I have seen more associate directors.

A: I think a few more have come, and I think there were more people at this most recent meeting because this was going to be where they were having the orientation for the new AAHSL leadership program. So there were several people there who were more junior but who had been selected for that training program.
M: Are the boards of MLA and AAHSL very, very different when you are meeting?

B: Absolutely. AAHSL is a very much more informal association. It is more like MLA probably was years ago. I guess perhaps during our tenure was when we did move from, I had forgotten about this, but for many years Richard Lyders at the Houston Academy of Medicine Texas Medical Center Library, his institution provided what you might call office support for the association. There was a small fee for that and his institution was responsible and he was the editor of the Statistics [Annual Statistics of Medical School Libraries].

A: And so that role in doing some of the other…

M: At least the Statistics?

A: Yes, because the Statistics were one of the major activities of AAHSL and his role in providing some administrative support for the association grew out of the administrative support that they were providing for the Statistics. It was during my term as president that it became clear the association was growing. The range of activities and programs that AAHSL had undertaken had gone far beyond this tremendous focus. While the Statistics were still important, there were quite a few other programs. So we put out an RFP to get proposals for some other way to manage, for some other management group. We looked at a variety of options and we got some competitive bids. I remember Lynn Kasner Morgan chaired the task force that we had to manage the process of selecting management. That was when we selected Shirley Bishop to do it. We chose Shirley Bishop and I guess the contract with Shirley Bishop has been renewed several times. AAHSL is not the only association that she manages so this is why it was affordable. AAHSL is not large enough to need a full-time manager and her office supports several different associations including AAHSL. She can provide varied support because she has some support staff.

M: And AAHSL will not grow in membership in any great leaps because…

B: That is correct.

A: Because it is a finite group. It is conceivable it would shrink if a number of medical schools in the country closed.

B: I actually think, perhaps during our tenure on the board and both as board members and presidents, the decision was made in the association to formally accept as associate members chiropractic libraries, different types of medical schools, because in the original founding it was your institution had to be formally part of the AAMC in terms of membership in order to be a member of AAHSL. Then we did develop an associate membership category; for example, the National Library of Medicine is an associate member of AAHSL.

A: I think in more recent years, although the Canadians pointed out how the Canadian medical schools are really kind of associate members of the AAMC, the nature of their membership in AAHSL changed as well.
M: So there was a time when it grew with the associate members but…

A: Yes, but not a lot…

B: Not a lot.

M: And that’s not one of your missions, like at MLA we want…

B: Exactly. One of the primary reasons these institutions wanted to be part of the association was so they could participate in the *Statistics* because that is such a valuable product. The other thing I think that happened during our tenure on the AAHSL board was that we became more formal in terms of the budgeting process for the *Statistics*. When I first was a member of the board I could remember that Dick Lyders would say, “Well, it will cost about this much.” Then he would come in for a budget supplement later on for the *Statistics*. So eventually we moved to the need to have a firm budget, and we needed to be communicating with our members how much this is going to cost because you were an institutional member and it was an expense for individual institutions to participate in AAHSL.

A: It was also during this time that AAHSL undertook some important programs jointly with MLA, the legislative program being one. That became a significant budget item because both MLA and AAHSL contributed funding to support the professional assistance that we got with our legislative program. AAHSL had half the membership of the legislative task force and the president served a year term just as the president of MLA served a year term.

M: Now, that kind of moves nicely into some of these joint programs. I think the one that you served on is one of them, what was the taskforce *Challenge to Action*?

A: We developed the document called *Challenge to Action*. What we were originally called upon to do was to develop guidelines for evaluation. What was the official name?

B: Its official name was Task Force to Review the LCME Accreditation Program for Medical School Libraries. I’m sorry, that’s the wrong…

A: That’s the one we talked about.

B: That was the one we just talked about. I have it here. The Committee on the Development of Standards and Guidelines.

M: Ah, okay.

A: That was a joint taskforce.

B: That was the predecessor for it and then it became the AAHSL/MLA Task Force for Academic Health Sciences Library Guidelines. Just as background, in 1965 the AAMC published, as a supplement to the *Journal of Medical Education*, the *Guidelines for Medical School Libraries*. And Estelle Brodman was the chair of that and at that time AAMC was
looking for things like how many seats should be in the library and what should be the square footage.

A: How many volumes.

B: How many volumes, those kinds of things. So the idea was that we were supposed to update those guidelines so that there would be a new document that was available for the LCME and other institutions. When we started we quickly realized that that type of a document would no longer work for medical school libraries. We were so different, one from another, you could have a library like at the University of North Carolina or Columbia or UCLA that served multiple health schools, sometimes the life sciences as well. Then you could have a small, two-year medical school program, a community-based medical school, which would have a library with totally different needs. So we decided to do something quite different.

A: We started off trying to update the guidelines and quickly became frustrated for the very reasons that Alison just mentioned. It took a while until we found our way, until we established a direction and what shape this document and these guidelines, so called guidelines, would take. We were, all of us were medical school library directors, both the AAHSL and MLA representatives, except for Kent Mayfield who was a staff person from MLA who was appointed to the committee. I remember Alison had just become a director at that time as the taskforce was getting underway, okay we can have Alison on now as an MLA representative. And Erika Love was the chair. The rest of us who were on the task force were people who had led various efforts, who had chaired, who had been on boards, who had presided over things, and we needed somebody with a good strong hand to keep us moving. Erika was definitely the right person and she did it. It was an excellent group to work with, people who had experience in a couple of different kinds of libraries in different parts of the country who had faced different issues. There was Joan Zenan who was in a very small library, Alison from UCLA, I was at Columbia, Ursula Poland, Erika, and Karen Brewer who then was at Northeastern Ohio, which was a very different kind of medical school than the rest of us. Betty Sawyers, who had been president of AAHSL, became like the staff liaison or board liaison and became a full-fledged member of the group. And Virginia Holtz, let me not forget Virginia Holtz, was on that also.

B: Actually, one reason Betty was on or was involved was that we received a grant to do some of the work for that and AAHSL had to appoint a fiscal agent and Betty served in that particular role. One of the things that I had completely forgotten about Challenge to Action until I did this article that we talked about briefly in my oral history on the vision of AAHSL, is that we had visioning exercises conducted in three parts of the U.S. that brought together administrators from academic health science centers, university library administrators, and directors and staff. The participants were asked to create a future scenario that described the library and its environment in the year 2004.

M: So close!

A: That was 20 years in the future.
B: We held them in three parts of the country. One was in Los Angeles at UCLA, one was in
the middle of the country, probably Chicago.

A: And one was in Washington, DC, because I was involved with that one.

B: This effort led to the refinement of the initial guidelines that we had begun to develop
because the participants critiqued the guidelines in light of the scenarios that they had just
created.

A: It was an interesting process. As we started to develop ideas how we would go about it,
one phrase that sticks in my mind I remember Erika talking about the “golden arches.” You
remember that?

B: Yes.

A: Yes, I can’t remember now how we used that but I remember that became part of what we
were talking about, the “golden arches” and so that…

M: I think of that as McDonald’s.

A: Well, what happened was when we finished, and this was hard work. Erika really did a
bang-up job of getting us to produce and come up with a document. So every year, for a
couple of years, we would have a reunion at MLA of the Challenge to Action group. When
we finished this, as a thank you gift to Erika we bought her two shares of McDonald’s, from
the “golden arches.”

B: The other thing that Erika brought to the work of the Challenge to Action Task Force is
that she was instrumental in organizing an external advisory committee that was chaired by
Richard Janeway…

A: Who was then at Winston-Salem.

B: Bowman Gray School of Medicine. And also the vice chair was Roy Schwartz from the
AAMC, the vice president for medical education. When Challenge to Action was published,
Dr. Janeway included an introduction and wrote a cover letter that went to all of the deans,
because the final document was sent to all medical school deans throughout the country. So
that it was a document that wasn’t just created by a group of librarians, but one that had been
vetted and had the imprimatur of medical school of deans.

M: I think I knew it was that major a document at the time it came out.

B: It was an interesting document that shifted from relying on prescriptions, having
guidelines that told you exactly if I meet this I will then be considered a really good library. I
have to say that a lot of directors at the time really wanted that type of a document because
they wanted something…
A: They wanted to be able to walk into their administrator and say, “See, I need a budget increase because I don’t have enough journal subscriptions,” or, “I don’t have a staff that meets these standards.”

M: It’s easier.

A: Oh, yes.

B: Much easier. So what we tried to do, what we realized as we discussed, was that what we had already as part of the association were some major documents that would allow us to create this kind of an argument without relying on some static guidelines. I have to say that there were other directors who were very much against guidelines because even if you label the minimum guidelines, if you are an institution that has more than what is the minimum there was always the danger that somebody would say, “Minimum becomes maximum.” So we emphasized the AAHSL statistics, which addressed the situation of different types of institutions. You could go and look at the statistics and select cohorts of institutions that perhaps your institution compared itself to or that were similar. How many schools did you serve? Then you could do your own analysis of how do we meet up as it relates to journal subscriptions? Those kinds of questions. It is more work, but it certainly proved to be more meaningful I think, especially as medical schools started to have financial vice presidents or vice deans who really never wanted to look at how do I compare to this other institution but wanted more meaningful comparisons.

The other document that we did make a lot of reference to was the Matheson/Cooper report. It laid out a vision of what kind of involvement should the library have in the institution. So some of the guidelines in Challenge to Action include, “it is important to have membership on medical school committees, it is important to be involved in key decisions…”

A: A lot that we had already started to learn from the early plannings and implementations of IAIMS in some of the institutions. As Alison said, we took this approach in part because of the diversity that already existed among the medical school libraries and medical schools. Since then diversity has increased even more as automation has been brought in, as medical schools have taken different tacks to deal with community issues, diversity issues, financial issues of their own and the technology issues. I think the diversity has just continued to increase even more. We used to be able to make an assumption that in every medical school library you would expect to find certain things in it and certain things would not be in it, or it would be doing certain services, and certain things just would not be within the library’s portfolio. That has changed. You see some libraries being responsible for all of the information systems within their institution, some having a greater role in the management of clinical information, some having education programs where students are sent out statewide or have absorbed or are using technology as part of their education. There is a great deal more variation now among the medical school libraries than there used to be even 25 years ago.
M: We see, in many things, that diversity is less so it is very nice to hear that it is more I think.

A: So that is why, I think, if we had taken that original tack and just come up with some updated guidelines they would have been useless within two weeks.

B: When you think about what the impact was of the publication Challenge to Action, it certainly would not have that kind of impact had we issued new guidelines, as they would have become outdated. If we had issued guidelines and they had been adopted by the LCME as something that was important to accreditation that would have had a certain type of impact. The impact, to my mind, was more that it was an educational process for directors. It was a very useful document for those directors who took advantage of it and used it. I mentioned that it was mailed to all deans. Now in many cases that document made its way immediately to the library director with a note saying, “I thought you would be interested in this.” And you can tell...

A: This is in your department and it doesn’t relate to me.

B: But...

M: Yes, I know about this.

B: Some directors took that opportunity and called up, made an appointment and went to talk to the dean. [They] reviewed it in a brief meeting; how this is important, and there are a few things in there that I would like to point out. For example, it would be very helpful to the library to be members of the curriculum committee because we could provide better programs and services. So in instances where individuals took advantage of the document, worked with it, I think it was very effective.

A: But there is no doubt there are many institutions in which it was completely ignored. But that is inevitable in any situation.

M: I keep thinking how nice this would have been as an approach for the JCAHO [Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations] and how libraries are visited or not visited. This really would have been a much better approach. It’s too bad that it didn’t. It has gone back and forth with the JCAHO.

B: I actually think that the document that made libraries much more integral in the medical school was one that the AAMC issued and I mentioned in my individual interview which was the GPEP report. Because that report came from the faculty who were really making a change in the curriculum and the role for the library, especially in education, was so clearly spelled out.

A: And I think what many of us then did, because I know I did, that is just point to that and say, “That is why we need this. This is why we should be doing that.”
B: The environment now is so very different, certainly at UCLA, and I think at most of the major medical school libraries there is now an involvement of the library in the planning and in the education in medical schools that we always wanted to do. When I started at UCLA we were begging to be allowed to come in and give lectures to classes on how to search Index Medicus. Now it is just an expectation in almost every school.

M: The other group that I have down that you both participated in was the NLM Group on Education for Health Sciences Librarians.

A: That’s right. That was in the middle ‘90s. It was when I was on the NLM Board of Regents and that was a planning panel that…

M: I called it a group, maybe it was a panel.

A: It was the National Library of Medicine Planning Panel on Education and Training of Health Sciences Librarians. It was in 1993-1994 and that came out of NLM’s growing recognition, from issues that MLA and AAHSLD and others had raised, about the problems in staffing. It also probably was primarily driven by recommendations in *Platform for Change* which dealt with that. Among those recommendations was one that said NLM should play a role. So they convened this planning panel and Alison and I were both appointed to it, although my role was different. I was on the [NLM] Board of Regents and I was appointed as the board liaison from the regents to this planning panel and, therefore, had to report back on its recommendations to the National Library of Medicine. That was an interesting panel to be on because it was chaired by Dr. Tom [Thomas] Detre from University of Pittsburgh. He was chancellor or vice chancellor or vice president in charge of the health sciences there. He was a psychiatrist by training and practice, originally from Hungary, and a dynamic person. You could not let your mind drift during the meeting because it was like being with one of these teachers who called on you when you least expected it. You didn’t have to volunteer. He solicited your input on various things. By appointing him, and appointing this panel, NLM showed that it did have a concern and was willing to play a role in making some changes. Among the recommendations of that planning panel was that NLM help support some new models for education of health sciences librarians. So they put out an RFP afterwards and I chaired a review panel that looked at those proposals. One of them came from the University of North Carolina where you worked. Several schools and universities did get funding to try out some new models of education for health sciences librarians.

M: Those were written up in one of the bulletins, summaries of the different programs.

A: Yes.

B: Another recommendation which was implemented by NLM was to expand the number of associates. These are the individuals who receive training at NLM. The numbers of slots were increased. Also they added the optional second year which allowed these individuals to go out and work in a health sciences library, and University of North Carolina certainly had a number of those associates. It was very beneficial in terms of raising the issues that needed to be addressed in the education and training of health sciences librarians.
A: Hopefully we helped stimulate some higher quality education. There were contentious issues. The educators had one set of opinions and the potential employers had some other expectations for graduates of these programs. So it was good we had some expert panels that testified before the planning panel and gave us input and that was useful. I think it was also important to show that NLM had an interest and was going to help support the training of health sciences librarians, because I think what had grown up in the profession was some idea that NLM was not interested in that, that they just would support training of people in medical informatics and librarians didn’t have an opportunity.

M: Yes, they were beginning to grow.

A: And NLM was going to change their focus.

B: Actually, I am remembering another outcome of the planning panel recommendations was that NLM expanded the Woods Hole Informatics Program to two times a year to provide more slots and really encourage librarians to apply.

A: Quite a few librarians have taken advantage of that. I didn’t go, but people I have heard from who did go found it very, very helpful.

M: Yes, I know people that have gone and they were most impressed. They said it was a wonderful…

B: Yes, a number of librarians from the Biomedical Library at UCLA have gone over the years and it’s been a wonderful, eye-opening experience for them. [They] brought back a lot of wonderful skills for the library as well.

M: So do you have any other joint comments to make?

B: I think the one other joint activity we did was that we were both in the UCLA Senior Fellows program in 1989?

A: The summer of 1989, that’s right.

B: Maybe you should describe the senior fellows program and its intent.

A: It was developed primarily by the Council on Library Resources to identify potential leadership for academic libraries and to provide a training opportunity. This was done in conjunction with the library school at UCLA to start with. In more recent years they have moved on to some other library schools. You had there some directors of ARL libraries, associate directors, and some people in leadership positions in some of the federal libraries and there had been one or two people from medical libraries. They ran this every other summer. You had to be nominated by, I guess, your ARL director or university librarian and apply for this or be asked to apply.
B: And then you are selected from amongst all of them.

A: There is a group that selects.

B: It was actually primarily for general academic…

A: It was for general academic librarians. It started in the early 1980s, 1981 may have been the first year, so there was a class in 1981 and 1983. I remember Phyllis was a member in the earlier year, but she was an academic librarian.

B: Phyllis Mirsky.

A: Phyllis Mirsky.

B: And Fran Groen.

A: Fran Groen had gone. I think they were probably the only medical librarians who had been there. So came the class of 1989 and it turns out there are three medical librarians, Mary Horres, Alison and me. We had not planned this at all. I think Phyllis may have been behind it. She may have nominated us or put our names into contention so that we would be invited to apply but she didn’t tell any of us. The three of us were accepted and it ended up being a very fortuitous circumstance. We were good friends before but that...

[End of Tape II, Side B]

[Tape III, Side A]

Diane McKenzie: A joint interview with Rachael Anderson and Alison Bunting, April 4, 2003. And we were just in the what?

Rachael K. Anderson: We were talking about the senior fellows program at UCLA. We were put up in graduate student housing on the UCLA campus. Even though there were two members of our class who actually lived in Los Angeles, they also lived in the dormitory. It wasn’t a dormitory, we each had a suite. It was graduate student suites. There were two per suite and we made a decision early on that we would not room with one another, that we would room with other people.

M: A mature decision.

A: That was very mature. I think that was a very right decision to make and we certainly got to know others. I roomed with Karen Wittenborg, the other person from Los Angeles, who was at that time an AUL at the UCLA library. She is currently dean of libraries at the University of Virginia.

M: Was this all women?
A: No.

B: No, we had several men.

A: Men and women and, because again you are dealing with university library, college library administrators. [Alison] roomed with Shelley Phipps from the University of Arizona. We had three-room suites: large living room with a refrigerator and two bedrooms and bathroom facilities. It was really very, very comfortable. I think we made an impact in that very few of our classmates had had much exposure to medical libraries. I think in addition to our being educated, we took formal classes in the morning in financial management as the major focus, I think we also educated our 17 other classmates on medical libraries. We weren’t quiet about it as you can imagine with Alison, Mary and me. We were not quiet about medical library issues.

B: It was interesting because in health sciences libraries we had moved along by that time to getting beyond the importance of the collection that you had on site. Of course, having NLM and a regional network where we could share, where we could rely on NLM for example to be the archival repository of the major journals for preservation, we didn’t have to repeat that. That was very different from what the Association of Research Libraries, ARL-type directors, were still in the mode of “the quality of your library is based on the size of its collections and (inaudible)…”

A: Although they were beginning to look elsewhere because financial stringency had begun to cramp that style.

M: But they don’t have an NLM.

A: No, they don’t have an NLM. They certainly did not have as much of a collaborative environment in which to work as the medical libraries had developed, in part because of NLM and the Regional Medical Library Program. Others were not as well developed. So that was a very interesting opportunity. Again, we had classes in financial management; we had other planning sessions, groups. Shelley Phipps was certainly the leader in getting focus groups going. But we also had fun. It turned out to be by and large a “foody” group and so we took advantage of being in Los Angeles and tried a variety of restaurants. In front of our residence hall was a volleyball court. The first night we borrowed a volleyball from a student center nearby. When we came into class the next morning many of us were black and blue on our forearms because this ball was just so hard. So we decided to make an investment and as a group we bought a new volleyball for the group and just about every evening before we went out to dinner we were out there on that volleyball court playing. That’s where the differences between the men and the women really showed up, on the volleyball court in terms of the competitiveness of the men. When the men were on the court the rest of us hardly had a chance to get at the ball.

M: But you played as a group or as individuals?
B: Well, most of us played as a group but there were a few members of the class who were very individual.

A: Very individualistic and kind of hogged the ball.

B: At the end of the class we all signed the volleyball and we actually had nicknames, some of us, from our volleyball…

A: Yes, I was the Brooklyn Bomber because I had a really powerful serve.

B: I still have the autographed volleyball.

A: Alison used to have it in her guest room at their house in Los Angeles.

M: How were you chosen to have the ball?

B: I said that I would be willing to keep it for archival purposes and I was also local. Actually I tried to pass it off when we were preparing to move to Arizona, but everyone encouraged me to keep it, so I do still have it with me and will have to find a suitable archive for it at some point.

A: In succeeding years more medical librarians have participated in the senior fellows program, even when it moved to the Palmer School [of Library and Information Science, Long Island University, C.W. Post Campus, Brookville, NY].

M: And are there other activities…?

A: There was one other activity we both did together, but it wasn’t major because as I was looking though my CV I said, “Oh yes, Alison was on that also.” When we were reviewing grant proposals for the Digital Library Initiative Phase II, remember we were cooped up in that hotel in the Washington area, it wasn’t even in Washington itself, for days and Nina [Matheson] was there too.

B: Yes.

A: And Nunzia [B. Giuse] and her husband were in that group.

B: That was for the National Science Foundation.

A: The National Science Foundation Digital Libraries Initiative Phase II.

B: I think I mentioned in my individual history that that experience led me to never want to do an NSF review group again because it was so, to my mind, poorly organized as compared to the way the National Library of Medicine…
A: Yes, it made me really appreciate how we did grant reviews. I mean they sent the grants to us barely a week before we were to meet. It was a substantial pile of grants and a lot of them were quite technical and were not necessarily easy reading. I remember I was traveling to an engagement party for our son in the Bay area and I took a pile of them with me and I was sitting in the hotel there and on the airplane.

B: We received them the Wednesday before Thanksgiving so we had to spend the whole Thanksgiving weekend reading these proposals and we were due the next week.

A: The next week, the following week, Monday or Tuesday to review them. There were other aspects too that were disorganized. I remember there were some observers there; Milt [Milton] Corn from the extramural program at NLM was there too and somebody else was there also from the extramural program. I remember I shared my opinion that the logistics were poorly done.

B: I also think it appeared to me that there was much more of the type of discussion that did not go on deliberately within the Biomedical Library Review Committee, deliberations where people would get into personalities or abilities of individuals based on their own personal knowledge which was really not appropriate for a grant review process. Of course, when you are bringing in people who aren’t trained in any sort of way or kept on, every one of their review groups, I believe, is an ad hoc type of a review, so you don’t have that cohesiveness and policy that NLM is able to achieve by the BLRC procedures.

M: Well, anything else you want to talk about?

A: I think that’s all.

M: You have been very interesting and very exciting.

A: Well, thank you very much Diane.

M: Thank you very much.

B: It has been fun.

A: Are you willing to take on a larger group interview at some point, for instance, the whole Platform for Change Task Force?

M: I think we should try it. It really is fun isn’t it?

B: Yes.

A: And it really did work that some things I had forgotten about and Alison mentioned and I said, “Oh yes!” It brings it back.
B: Yes, it brings things back because you have different memories and perspectives on what was going on.

M: I think it went very well. Thank you very much.

A: Thank you.

B: Thank you.
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BUSINESS ADDRESS (till 2/01):
Arizona Health Sciences Library
University of Arizona
1501 N. Campbell Ave.
Tucson, AZ  85724

EDUCATION:
Barnard College, 1959, A.B. cum laude
Columbia University, School of Library Service, 1960, M.S. with honors.

LIBRARY POSITIONS HELD:
University of Arizona
   Director, Arizona Health Sciences Library, 1991-2001
   Associate Director, Arizona Telemedicine Program, 1996-2001
Columbia University
   Director, Health Sciences Library, 1979-91.
   Acting Vice President and University Librarian, July 1982-Jan. 1983.
Mount Sinai School of Medicine and Medical Center Library
   Director, 1974-79.
   Acting Director, 1973-74.
   Associate Librarian, 1971-73.
   Head of Cataloging, 1969-72.
   Acquisitions Librarian, 1967-69.
   Cataloging Librarian, 1964-69.
Hunter College (City University of New York) Library
   Reference Librarian, 1964.
College of the City of New York (City University of New York) Library
   Cataloging Librarian, 1960-62.

HONORS AND AWARDS:
Noyes Award, Medical Library Association's highest honor, May 2000.
Fellow, American College of Medical Informatics. Elected 1993.
Academy of Health Information Professionals, Medical Library Association. Distinguished Membership, 1990-
Senior Fellow, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of California, Los Angeles, 1989.

GRANTS AND CONTRACTS AWARDED:
"Improving Access to Health Information for Consumers of Pima County, Arizona." National Library of Medicine
sub-contract, 2000-01. Principal Investigator.
"Preliminary Electronic Information Security Policy and Firewall Implementation for the Arizona Rural
"Arizona Health Sciences Statewide Network Development." National Science Foundation grant, 1992-94, Principal
Investigator.
Planning Grant. The Flinn Foundation, 1992-93, Co-Principal Investigator.
"Phase III IAIMS Implementation at Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center." National Library of Medicine grant,
1988-91; Co-Principal Investigator.
"IAIMS Model Development at the CPMC." National Library of Medicine grant, 1985-88; Co-Principal
Investigator; 1987-88.
"Integrated Academic Information Management Systems (IAIMS) Strategic Planning-Phase I." National Library of
"Library Mobilization for Continuing Education." National Library of Medicine grant, 1977-79, Principal
Investigator.
ACADEMIC SERVICE (partial listing):

University of Arizona:
- Arizona Health Sciences Council, 1991 - 2001
- College of Medicine Education Group, 1991 - 1997
- Search Committee for CIO of University Medical Center, 1998.
- Search Committee for Dean of the College of Medicine, 1999-2000.

Columbia University:
- Provost's Committee to Review School of Library Service, 1989-90.
- Data Processing Security Committee, 1985-86.
- Faculty Affirmative Action Committee, 1981-83.

Columbia University Libraries:
- Administrative Organization Task Force, 1984-86.
- Professional Review Committee, 1981-84.

Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center:
- College of Physicians and Surgeons, Dean's Committee on Academic Strategy, 1990-91.
- IAIMS Project, Executive Committee, 1985-87.
- IAIMS Project, User Needs Committee, Co-Chair, 1983-85.
- College of Physicians and Surgeons, Curriculum Committee, 1979-91.
- College of Physicians and Surgeons Institutional Self-Study Task Force, Library Subcommittee, Chair, 1987-88.
- School of Dental and Oral Surgery, Strategic Planning Internal Assessment Committee, 1986-87.
- Harlem Hospital Library Committee, 1979-91.

Mount Sinai School of Medicine:
- Page and William Black Postgraduate School of Medicine, Advisory Board, 1975-79.
- Clinical Excellence Committee, Task Force on Medical Center Goals and Objectives, 1974-76; Subcommittee on Continuing Education, 1974-76.
- Academic Council
  - Elected member, 1972-76; 1978-79.
  - Bylaws Committee, 1972-74.
- Bookstore Committee, 1973-79.

TEACHING:

Faculty Appointments:
- Professor, School of Information Resources and Library Science, University of Arizona, 1991 - 2001
- Librarian, College of Medicine, University of Arizona, 1991 - 2001
- Adjunct Professor, Pharmacy Practice, College of Pharmacy, University of Arizona, 1996- 2001
- Associate Research Scientist, Center for Medical Informatics, Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons, 1987-91.
- Adjunct Assistant Professor, Department of Library Science, Queens College, City University of New York, 1975-79.
- Assistant Professor, Department of Medical Education, Mount Sinai School of Medicine, 1969-79.
- Medical Library Association, Continuing Education Program, CE 39; 1978: Chicago, IL; Snowbird, Utah; Madison, WI; Annapolis, MD.
- Hunter College Institute of Health Sciences, Medical Laboratory Sciences Program, Seminar "Library Methodologies." Annually, 1971-73.
LIBRARY NETWORK AND REGIONAL PROGRAM ACTIVITIES:

Research Libraries Group:
- Medical and Health Sciences Program Committee, 1982-1989; Chair, 1983-85.
- National Network of Libraries of Medicine, Pacific Southwest Region, Regional Advisory Committee, 1993-96.
- National Library of Medicine, Regional Medical Library (Region I) Regional Advisory Committee, 1983-89; Chair, 1986-89.
- National Library of Medicine, Regional Medical Library (Region 2) Advisory and Planning Committee:
- Arizona Health Information Network, President, 1995; Vice President, President-elect, 1994; Past-president, 1996.
- New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency (METRO):
  - Board of Trustees, 1980-84; Executive Committee, 1982-84; Vice President, 1983-84.
  - Membership Committee, 1989-91.
  - Medical Library Services Advisory Council, 1984-90.
- Medical Library Center of New York:
  - Board of Trustees, 1975-76; 1983-91.
  - Subcommittee on Membership Fees, Chair, 1990-91.
  - Strategic Planning Committee, 1987-89.
  - Librarians Advisory Board, 1973-76; 1982-85; Chair, 1984-85.
  - Interlibrary Loan Subcommittee, 1983-86.
- Council of Chief Librarians, City University of New York, 1973-79.
  - Committee on Technical Services, 1978-79.
  - Committee on Coordination of Public Services, Chair, 1976-78.
- Biomedical Communications Network (BCN):
  - Nominating Committee, 1979.
  - Board of Directors, 1976-78.
- Associated Medical Schools of New York and New Jersey, Task Force on Technical Services, Chair, 1972-74.

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY ACTIVITIES (partial listing):

Medical Library Association:
- President, 1997-98; President-elect, 1996-97; Past president, 1998-99.
- Board of Directors, 1983-86.
- Task Force on Knowledge and Skills, 1989-93.
- Search Committee for Executive Director, 1991.
- Brodman Award Jury, 1987-89; Chair, 1988-89.
- 1985 National Program Committee, Chair, 1982-85.
- Nominating Committee, 1979; 1988; Chair, 1999.
- Committee on Status and Economic Interests of Health Sciences Library Personnel, 1978-81; Chair, 1980-81; Consultant, 1981-83.
- Recruitment Committee, 1972-76; Chair, 1975-76.

New York-New Jersey Chapter/Medical Library Association:
- Chapter Chair, 1978-79.
- Bylaws Committee, Chair, 1981-82.
- Nominating Committee, 1973-76; Chair, 1975-76.
- Program Committee, Chair, 1970-71.
PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY ACTIVITIES (partial listing) (continued):

American Medical Informatics Association:
  Finance and Audit Committee, 1996-99.
  Public Policy Committee, 1994-97.
  Symposium on Computer Applications in Medical Care (SCAMC), Program Committee, 1992-93.
  American College of Medical Informatics, Scientific Affairs Committee, 1999-2000.

Association of Academic Health Sciences Library Directors:
  President, 1991-92; President-elect, 1990-91; Past President, 1992-93.
  Finance Committee, Chair, 1992-93.
  Board of Directors, 1983-86.
  Committee to Review Accreditation Program for Medical School Libraries, Chair, 1987-89.
  Joint Legislative Task Force (with Medical Library Assn.), 1987-92.
  Joint Task Force (with Medical Library Assn.) to Develop Guidelines for Academic Health Sciences Libraries, 1983-87.
  Nominating Committee, Chair, 1981-82.
  Committee on Medical Education, 1979-81.
  Program Committee, 1978-79.

Member (as of 1/01):
  American Library Association
  American Medical Informatics Association
  Arizona State Library Association
  Association of Academic Health Sciences Library Directors
  Association of College and Research Libraries
  Central Arizona Biomedical Librarians
  Medical Library Association
  Southern Arizona Biomedical Librarians
  Southern California and Arizona Chapter, Medical Library Association

OTHER PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:

National Library of Medicine, Board of Regents, 1990-94; Chair, 1993-94.
  Ad hoc consultant, 1994-95.
  Extramural Programs Subcommittee, 1990-93; Chair, 1991-93.
National Library of Medicine, Biomedical Library Review Committee (Study Section), 1984-88; Chair, 1987-88.
National Library of Medicine, Special Review Committee for Health Sciences Education/Training Planning Grants, Chair, 1995.
National Institutes of Health, Special Study Section, 1981.
National Library of Medicine, Long-Range Planning Panel on Obtaining Factual Information from Data Bases, 1985-86.
National Reference Center for Bioethics Literature (Kennedy Institute of Ethics, Georgetown University) Advisory Board, 1985-93.
OTHER PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES (continued):

Health Communications and Informatics. Board of Associate Editors, 1978-80.
Excerpta Medica, Advisory Board, 1978-82.
Handbook of Medical Library Practice, 5th ed. Advisory Committee, 1990 -
Consultant to various universities, hospitals and academic health sciences centers, 1974 to date.

PAPER PRESENTED OR SPEAKER (partial listing):

Medical Library Association, International Cooperation and Public Health/Health Administration Sections.
“Providing high quality, knowledge-based information to health care providers in rural areas: the library as a partner in delivering a full complement of telemedicine services.” Orlando FL, May 27, 2001. (With J. McCray et al.)


North Atlantic Health Sciences Libraries. Bethel, ME, October 18, 1994. "Challenges to health information librarians: threat or opportunity?"


Fourth European Conference for Medical and Health Libraries. Oslo, Norway, July 2, 1994. "Challenges to health information librarians: Threat or opportunity?"


University of North Texas, School of Library and Information Science, Denton, TX, March 11, 1994.

dialog between education and practice."
Central Arizona Biomedical Librarians/Southern Arizona Biomedical Librarians, Joint Meeting. Tucson, AZ,
Medical Library Association, Joint Chapter Meeting. Scottsdale, AZ, March 6, 1991. "Health sciences libraries and
informatics: aligning visions and realities."
the health care organization: Life in the fast lane."

(videoconference panelist)
Columbia University, School of Library Service. New York, NY, March 5, 1990. "The IAIMS project and medical
informatics." (with P.D. Clayton)
13th Annual Symposium on Computer Applications in Medical Care. Washington, DC, November 7, 1989. Panel:
"IAIMS -- Moving from model development to full implementation."
institutional setting: the CPMC experience."
and responsibilities --Panel: National Library of Medicine."
Eighth Annual Dunning Memorial Symposium -- Information Transfer in Dentistry: Opportunities and Concerns.
Columbia University School of Dental and Oral Surgery and School of Public Health. New York, NY, April 29,

New York Academy of Medicine Symposium on the Future of Information Systems for the Medical Sciences. New
resource sharing for integrated information management -- IAIMS."
databases on a campus mainframe computer: cost and policy implications."
"Sources of outside funding for libraries: government funding -- the application and peer review process."
new information services." (co-author)
Fifth World Congress on Medical Informatics. Washington, DC, October 27, 1986. "The integrated academic
information management system (IAIMS) project at Columbia." (co-author)
"Technical services in the electronic library: survival? evolution? extinction?"
decides and why."
National Library of Medicine. Symposium on Support of Health Sciences Education by IAIMS. Bethesda, MD,
March 12, 1986. "The role of IAIMS in stimulating educational change at the Columbia Presbyterian Medical
Center." (co-author)
proliferation of journals and resulting problems."
Bethesda, MD, October 17, 1984. "Strategic planning for information management in academic medical centers;
the Columbia Presbyterian Medical Center approach." (co-author)
approaches to online information management at Columbia: IAIMS and CLIO."
"Networking for a new era: What color is your coupon? Views from a resource library."
libraries in changing medical information systems."
quality." (co-author)
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CURRICULUM VITAE
ALISON BUNTING

EDUCATION
University of California       B. A., 1969
Irvine, California          Major: French

University of California       MLS, 1970
Los Angeles, California     Major: Librarianship

HONORS AND AWARDS
▪ Medical Library Association, Fellow (elected), 1998.
▪ Academy of Health Information Professionals, Medical Library Association, Distinguished Member, 1990, renewed 1995.
▪ UCLA Graduate School of Library and Information Science, Senior Fellow, 1989.
▪ Medical Library Association, President’s Award, 1988.
▪ Librarians Association of the University of California, Research Award, Regional Medical Library Program: 1965-1985, May, 1985.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
▪ Interim University Librarian, UCLA Library, July 2002-December 2002.
▪ Acting Associate University Librarian, Research and Instructional Services, UCLA Library, April 1990-July 1991.
▪ Co-Director, UCLA InfoShare Project, University of California, Los Angeles, March 2000-December 2002.
▪ Assistant Dean for Library Service, UCLA School of Medicine, May 1984-December 2002, Acting Assistant Dean, October 1983-May 1984.
▪ Associate Biomedical Librarian for Public Services, Louise Darling Biomedical Library, University of California, Los Angeles, July 1979-May 1984.
- Acting Associate Director, Pacific Southwest Regional Medical Library Service, Louise Darling Biomedical Library, University of California, Los Angeles, February-June, 1979.
- Head, Interlibrary Loan Services, Louise Darling Biomedical Library, University of California, Los Angeles, July 1972-September 1974.
- Interlibrary Loan Services/Reference Librarian, Louise Darling Biomedical Library, University of California, Los Angeles, June 1970-June 1972.

CONSULTING AND TEACHING

- Chair, National Library of Medicine, Board of Regents, 2002-2003, Member, 1999-2002.
- Chair, National Library of Medicine, Biomedical Library Review Committee, 1996-1997; Member, 1993-1996.
- Strategic Planning Consultant, University of California, Collection Development Committee, 1989.
- Adjunct Lecturer, UCLA Graduate School of Library and Information Science, GSLIS 471: Health and Life Sciences Libraries, 1984-.

PUBLICATIONS (selected)


Volume 5: Morse DH. Acquisitions in health sciences libraries, 1996.


UNIVERSITY SERVICE (selected)


Librarians Association of the University of California (LAUC), Los Angeles Chapter:

- Advisory Committee for Strategic Planning for Information Resources in the Research University, Representative, 1986-1990.

UCLA Information Technology Planning Board, Member, 2002.

**UCLA Library**
- Administrative Conference, Member, 1984-.
- Copyright Committee, Chair, 1987-1989.
- Task Group to Study ILL and Related Issues, Chair, 1983.

**UCLA Research Service Advisory Board, Member, 1998-1999.**

**UCLA School of Medicine**
- Advisory Committee to the Medical Education and Research Center, member, 1989-1991.
- Association of American Medical Colleges, Group on Information Resources, Representative, 1998-.
- Committee on Computing Policy, member, 1983-85.
- East of Westwood Steering Committee, member, 1998-.
- East of Westwood Library Committee, Chair, 1998-.
- Follow-on Committee for Strategic Planning, Member, 1987-1989.
- Medical Informatics Committee, member, 1988-1990.


**University of California, Heads of Public Services**


**University of California, Library Council**
- Subcommittee on Interlibrary Lending Statistics, Chair, 1974.

University of California, Office of the President, Advisory Committee for an Animal Alternatives Center, Member, 1989.

University of California, Search Committee for the Director of the California Digital Library, member, 1997.
PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES (selected)

Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC):
- Group on Information Resources Program Committee, Member, 2001-02.

Association of Academic Health Sciences Library Directors (AAHSLD):
- Board of Directors, Member, 1986-1989.
- Finance Committee, Chair, 1991-.
- Program Committee, Chair, 1986-1987, Member, 1985-1986.
- Search Committee for the Annual Statistics Editor, Chair, 1993.

Medical Library Association:
- Representative to the SLA Competencies Survey Advisory Committee, 1997-1998.
- Fellows and Honorary Members Jury, Member, 1994-1995.
- Representative to the Association of Academic Health Sciences Library Directors, 1988-1991.
- Board of Directors, Member, 1982-1985.

Medical Library Group of Southern California and Arizona:
- Past-President and Member of the Advisory Council, 1978-1979.
- President, 1977-1978.
- President-Elect and Program Chair, 1976-1977.

January 2003