MPLA Communications Committee **CO -4**

Report to the Board

The committee has drafted an entry for Wikipedia (below), reviewed MPLA Bylaws relevant to the work of the committee, and prepared a summary of alternatives to the traditional summer board meeting.

Wikipedia entry:

The entry is modeled after the ALA entry, with some categories eliminated as we are not as political an organization. I'll circulate a copy of the entry, members of MPLA are encouraged to edit the entry as they see fit, keeping in mind that it should be of an informative, rather than promotional, nature overall. Wikipedia has fairly strict "notability" standards, which our organization may or may not meet. One question to address is whether our logo is a free image – copyright free – and we are happy to share via the wikicommons.

Review of bylaws:

Goal VI – MPLA will facilitate communication utilizing appropriate technology to bridge distances among members.

Objective A - The Communications Committee will promote the functionality of MemberClicks and MPLA 2.0 for accomplishing the work of the association.

Activities:

1. The Communications Committee or its designee will provide instruction about MemberClicks and MPLA 2.0 for each incoming board member. (Annually)
2. The Communications Committee or its designee will provide articles for the MPLA Newsletter on ways to use MemberClicks and MPLA 2.0. (Each issue)
3. The Communications Committee will review, update and revise as needed instructional information on MemberClicks and MPLA 2.0 provided to new members and by the Executive Secretary. (Ongoing)
4. The Communications Committee or its designee will evaluate the usefulness of MemberClicks and MPLA 2.0 as a tool for MPLA and report to the Board. (Every other year, starting in 2005)
5. The Communications Committee or its designee will provide information regarding alternative forms of communication for the board as requested.

Online alternatives for summer meeting

There are a number of resources available that can serve as alternatives to the face to face summer meeting. A good summary of the best and the worst can be seen at http://www.webconferencing-test.com/en/webconference_home.html. Among the questions we need to address, if we feel a traditional summer meeting is too costly, is which functions would be most important; do we need a

video interface? What about traditional meeting functions, such as a “white board?” Certainly it will be valuable to be able to poll participants. Of course, cost is one consideration when selecting an online web-conferencing interface – but even the most expensive option (approximately $700) would provide significant savings over a face to face meeting (most recent two years: $3000 to $4000). An additional benefit to the purchase of an annual contract for one or another of the web-conference options would be the chance for committees to make use of the interface. Those committees that struggle to meet in a meaningful way may prefer to have an online interface within which to meet.

Respectfully submitted,

Annie Epperson

11 April 2010