Responses, Questions, and Concerns

the Board and committees

rather than intellectual freedom issues that might be occurring in every chapter and how that issue plays out differently in every state.

Would it work to have additional assemblies on values and issues (e.g., privacy) and the membership would be made of representatives from chapters, round tables, divisions, and affiliates? This might be an additional structure that would bring us all together to think about and address our values and larger issues.

How will the work of the assemblies be sustained from year to year so that they offer more than ad hoc conversations?

How will the recommendations of the assemblies be finalized and the substance of the debate as well as the final decisions be communicated to the Board? What is the timing on this? Will the recommendations go directly to the Board, rather than an appropriate standing committee (if there is one)? Is there a danger of bypassing and undercutting the committees? Will the recommendations have to be prepared before Board face-to-face meetings to allow them to be considered, which means that the assemblies will

members find to ALA, and they are the greatest opportunity for many members to engage in collaborative professional work and learning around specific issues. Setting a minimum number of members to maintain a round table undercuts the value of round membership.

How will round tables be supported, given minimal involvement now by staff?

Communities of Interest/Practice and Membership Initiative Groups
How will these work in a new structure?

## **Advisory Groups**

These are a problem. They seem to be a replacement for committees, but with no dout. The Intellectual Freedom Committee seems to have been reduced to an intellectual freedom advisory group.

This plan conveys the assumption that interest in intellectual freedom and professional

o Many members only get funding if they are on official committees. How will	