

CEAL 2007 – Executive Board Meeting I
Tuesday, March 20, 2007, 7:00-9:00 PM
Boston Marriott Copley Square, Hyannis Room

Attending: Keiko Yokota Carter (Committee on Japanese Materials); Jim Cheng (Membership); Vickie Fu Doll (Statistics Coordinator); Ellen Hammond (Member-at-Large) ; Martin Heijdra (Member-at-Large); David Hickey (Committee on Public Services); Mikyung Kang (Committee on Korean Materials); Gail King (JEAL editor); Sun-Yoon Lee (Member-at-Large) ; Mary Lin (Committee on Technical Processing); Toshie Marra (Treasurer); Ellen McGill (Secretary); Kuniko Yamada McVey (Member-at-Large); Phil Melzer (Chair); Hideyuki Morimoto (Member-at-Large); Zhijia Shen (Committee on Chinese Materials); Kris Troost (Vice-President/President-elect); Xian Wu (Committee on Library Technology); Hong Xu (Member-At-Large); Abraham Yu (past CEAL president).

Recognition of outgoing Executive Board members:

Jim Cheng, Membership Committee Chair
Ellen Hammond, Member-at-Large
Sun-Yoon Lee, Member-at-Large
Abraham Yu, Past President

Much applause

Election results

The Nominating Committee consisted of Hong Xu (chair), Kuniko Yamada McVey, and Phil Melzer (*ex officio*). Since Hong Xu was delayed, Kuniko Yamada McVey presented the results:

Member at Large (general): Su Chen
Member at large (Korean); Yunah Sung
Chair, membership: Jade Atwill

The voting rate was 49%; 100 votes were counted of a total of 203 ballots issued. There are only three incoming members to replace four outgoing ones because one of the latter is the former president, Abraham Yu. The president can serve a total of five years as vice-president, president, and past president. Next year there will be a new president-elect by the end of the meeting.

The board offered thanks to the committee for organizing the elections and to Ellen Hammond for her help.

Orientation for incoming Executive Board members

Phil Melzer said he would try to bring new members up to speed on issues under discussion, probably on Thursday afternoon, and get them the relevant documentation as soon as possible. Kris Troost noted that in the past, this work was sometimes split up among different people on the board. While it might result in an uneven orientation, it

spared the president extra work. It was agreed that Kuniko Yamada McVey would orient Su Chen; Vickie Fu Doll would work with Jade Atwill; and David Hickey would talk to Yunah Sung. This arrangement will also have to be announced at the Plenary Session.

Statistics Coordinator position

Phil Melzer nominated Vickie Fu Doll to continue Statistics Coordinator; he noted that he had already consulted with her, and she is willing to stay in the position. Acclamation and unanimous approval followed.

Statistics Coordinator's report

Vickie Fu Doll reported that she might need a few more minutes than expected at the Plenary Session. The retro database has been built and the data input. Committee members entered data from 1991 to 1997, while she herself did 1988 to 1990. There is accumulated data from 1975 to 1980. This was published in 1980 and 1982 in tiny print along with a lot of notes that are problematic to input. Data entry is on an ongoing basis; the committee hopes to finish in another month or so. Scanned images are already available.

New interface: Tomorrow at the Plenary Session the committee will show the new and old interfaces. Soon it will be possible to go in and choose the year, so the interface knows which database to look at. Functionality is similar: one can see ranking; pull up data in table and graph views; and pull across years. One can also split the screen to see data from both databases lined up. This year several users from the California system notified the committee of the need to add a CJK total appropriation line. Now there are separate CJK and non-CJK money lines.

Ebooks: Many users have requested that ebooks be added to the form. Vickie Fu Doll will lay out what ARL is doing for ebooks and provide details about the information that would be needed. She and committee members will consult with places which hold ebooks and will make provision for these in the fall.

Print version: Do we still want to have a print issue? Every time there is a form change, this is a problem; each new form means smaller print and the data is harder to read; adding in the growing number of new fields creates more work. Increased length also means increased printing costs. Size and forms will continue to change. If most CEAL members are now comfortable with the online form, could we drop the print issue?

Discussion: Martin Heijdra noted that at Princeton they use print to do comparison with peer institutions, while Jim Cheng commented that UC only uses the online version. Vickie Fu Doll mentioned that users can also print out the statistics themselves. Martin followed up that he would have to help those not familiar with the online form to use it.

In regards to using forms, Vickie recommended that the membership committee educate people in using the membership forms as well. Currently, only the coordinators tend to know how to use these. Perhaps we should also demonstrate these.

Zhijia Shen noted that faculty take an interest in statistical information, and they are accustomed to the print format. Phil Melzer suggested that for the coming year, we might focus on educating people in printing out the online version. Kris Troost thought that, at least at institutions which catalog databases, it could be catalogued and a link provided to direct faculty towards the online version and let them know it is available. Martin Heijdra raised the possibility of a selective printing with just the most important figures, such as total holdings, and the caveat that more information is available online. Phil wondered if information could also be broken down into smaller tables. Vickie commented that more tables means more work. If users to go to ranking in the database, they can choose relevant information and export to Excel. She also suggested that users could download a full print version but not have one mailed to them. Hikeyuki Morimoto asked if we hadn't discussed having a special JEAL issue on statistics. Vickie replied that the special issue would be ready when everything was online, including all the retro issues. At that point, she will also need people to write articles. She will work with Gail King, but if you like to write something for the issue, please volunteer or let yourself be asked! Martin thought that senior people such as Eugene Wu and Amy Heinrich might be invited to contribute articles.

Treasurer's report

This was moved to the end of the meeting since Toshie Marra's plane had been delayed. Thanks were offered to Sarah Elman for her help in the transition between treasurers.

Membership status issues

Executive Board and committee members are required to be CEAL members. In the process of the election, however, it was found that not all are in good standing. Membership asked the committee chairs to submit lists of all members of their committees, as well as for lists of task force members. All Executive Board members are in good standing, but Membership did not receive member lists from all the committees and task forces. Still outstanding are membership lists for:

- CEAL bylaws special committee
- Committee on Japanese materials
- Membership
- Technical processing
- Public services
- Committee on Chinese
- Library Technology

Martin Heijdra noted that special committees are allowed to have outsiders. Toshie Marra also requested that people let her know if they have members who are not CEAL members in good standing.

The following have some non-CEAL members:

- Special committee on CEAL bylaws
- Committee on Japanese Materials

Membership
Technical Processing
Committee on Korean Materials

It was noted that the Committee on Japanese Materials has people in advisory status; these don't have to be CEAL members. Mikyung Kang asked if we will be checking every year. Toshie agreed that we should check annually, perhaps in February.

LC/CEAL internship

Mary Lin noted that last year the Board agreed to offer \$500 to each recipient. One candidate has asked how she could get the money. Is there any paperwork? What is the process? Who should it go to?

Toshie Marra replied that perhaps the subcommittee chair can notify her as Treasurer, and she can send the money. Kris Troost noted that probably the home address and social security number (or tax ID number, since at least one candidate is a Canadian citizen) will be needed for the paperwork. We might also want to consult with AAS if the check comes from them to confirm that nothing else is needed for non-US citizens.

Standing Committee reports

Membership

Jim Cheng covered a variety of topics.

Brochure: During summer, the committee designed a CEAL promotional brochure, which was sent out to 86 North American ALA-accredited MLS programs. There has been no feedback, but perhaps we will see results this year.

Directory: With the help of Vickie Fu Doll, they also converted the CEAL directory to a pdf file; the committee also conducted a survey to find out how many people want a print version. According to Gail King, at least 50 subscribers must be willing to pay for the print version in order to cover costs. The committee received only 21 positive responses for the print version, so the decision was taken to move the directory to online only with free download. During the conversion, they also decided to update every two years.

Mentoring: The committee continued its mentor-mentee programs. A few people have joined, and there are 28 CEAL members participating. The new chair will continue this program, and he hopes that the new chair can also do a survey for feedback. Up to now, the basic mentoring relationship has been for one year, although the people can continue after that if they so desire.

Roundtable: The roundtable was the last one for their committee. Publishing with or without a Ph.D was the most popular; others included managing the outsourcing of CJK cataloging and working with faculty. These will be tomorrow night.

Membership database: Currently Jim Cheng has been piggy backing his database on UCSD, but they are not going to do local hosting anymore. He hoped CEAL can have its own server. They have paid \$197/month for a server.

Discussion: Kris Troost noted that not all institutions update the CEAL directory entries regularly. It can be hard to find people, especially in years when many people switch positions. Jim Cheng acknowledged that it is handled by volunteers, but it would be too difficult for the membership committee to track everyone. Kris suggested that whenever someone posts an announcement to eastlib regarding a new appointment, s/he could get an automatic response reminding him/her to update the CEAL directory.

Jim commented that the directory now has new technology which allows individuals to update their own entries. Your email account is your password ID. The webmaster and president will also still have access. Vickie Fu Doll thought that perhaps the membership committee could post twice a year to remind people to update their information.

Meeting scheduling for the 2008 conference

Phil Melzer sent out requests for suggestions about scheduling CEAL meetings next year. Every few years we tinker with our approach. Ellen Hammond suggested that we might shorten each session to carve out another period for a joint session among committees. If we tried it once, it would let us experiment with another space and time without making major changes to the standing committee structure. Currently, sessions are 110 minutes each with 20 minutes in between, and lunch. In order to have appreciable time for an extra session, committee sessions would have to be reduced to about 75 minutes each.

David Hickey commented that he was open to this idea and thought that there was already some movement among committees to move towards joint sessions. Would the additional session be in a different format, for example, more interactive?

Ellen Hammond speculated that perhaps there could be different sessions in different places. For instance, library technology and public services could have a joint session on one topic, while Korean and Japanese materials might organize a session on another topic. That would of course require more organization and prior planning.

Martin Heijdra asked if it would necessarily be current committees still filling these slots. Zhijia Shen also wondered if the purpose was to set aside a time slot that everyone could attend. Ellen Hammond thought that it would primarily be for experimentation to break down barriers between committees, and also maybe reduce the size of meetings, since large size makes it hard to be interactive. Vickie Fu Doll mentioned that members-at-large might play a role in setting these up. Zhijia Shen noted that it would be yet another meeting for people to attend. One question is how many days we need to have meetings. In the past, Friday was set aside for RLIN, Saturday for OCLC. Could we now use Friday? If people have common interests, they could make a presentation. Other professional associations hire recorders to provide video or abstracts when there are concurrent sessions, but to do this we would likely have to pay higher membership fees. Zhijia noted that we do post Powerpoint presentations and other meeting materials on the

web now; David agreed that committees also post minutes or provide some follow up. Vickie commented that OCLC will move to Friday. Kris pointed out that we are welcome to put together panel proposals for AAS, and that there is an inter-area library committee in AAS. Replies countered that there is no guarantee that AAS will accept the panel, and it might be scheduled for the Sunday sessions, which not everyone can attend. She liked the idea of experimentation and smaller numbers and favored combined thematic sessions. Could CJK panels be reduced to an hour or so with remaining time on topics of common interest, such as copyright, GIS, or colonialism? Zhijia stated that this would need more communication among committee chairs. It can be hard to balance a substantive program with reports and announcements, especially if you want to encourage audience participation. The Committee on Chinese Materials this year is hosting a large number of presenters (6), each of whom will speak briefly since their papers have been posted ahead of time along with suggested questions. Half the time is left for questions.

Martin also favored trying new things, but people at smaller institutions may have to go to all committee panels and may have trouble if they overlap. There is also the issue of distinguished but long-winded speakers – can chairs really enforce time limits? Attempts have been made, but it is difficult.

Phil noted that in the past, we have tried to give people as much time as needed. Breaks were lengthened because members found things too frantic. Perhaps as we see agendas come in, we could start discussions about areas of possible cooperation. One approach could be to have chairs of standing committees come up with a list of people who want to make presentations or topics for panel discussions and prioritize these. Areas of common interest could be identified along with lists of proposals; these could be brought to the whole group and the time divided up to accommodate the highest priorities.

Ellen Hammond requested that he clarify whether people would be vying for time in the whole session. He replied that we have two days and could divide up time. This will work only if people are able to accept that they may not get as much time as in the past. Each committee has a constituency which will have to be satisfied. Ellen commented that it was almost like a refereed journal. Zhijia Shen felt that in this case, if we can identify a common topic, we could rework the sessions to make a new shared one. Phil asked if it can be done realistically, since it could put chairs in an awkward position. Mary Lin thought that if it is doable, we should focus on this year rather than next; either we should cut down time for each committee or stay with the current form. In the past, there was only CJK technical services, and there was more time to ask questions from LC presenters and discuss issues. As the organization has gotten bigger and we have more committees, we have already cut committee time to fit them in.

Martin wondered if we can combine panels. Each committee gets a default 60 minutes and can apply for more time. For example, in AAS, if there are two groups for the same topic, chances of acceptance are better.

Mary mentioned the possibility of extending group discussion, then splitting into other groups in breakout sessions. These approaches would also encourage crossing boundaries.

Zhijia asked whether the problem is the quality of the panel sessions or their length. Could cross-boundary approaches be built into the plenary session? Besides just having reports, we could select one program. Kris questioned whether the plenary session really needs to be mostly reports. Phil commented that he had the same idea, till he had to put together the agenda. There is a certain amount of business that has to get done in the plenary session. However, he would be willing to try to rework the plenary session a bit. If we schedule and adjust time after committees have submitted agendas, we may also not know the final schedule until February. Mary stressed that it is not good to extend meetings into lunch. Unless the topic is really compelling, are people willing to listen from 12 to 12:30?

Vickie asked whether the CJK materials presentations could be combined. Collection development is all in one piece at many institutions. Breakouts could be held Thursday or Friday night for specific languages. Kuniko Yamada McVey emphasized that collection development also requires specialized subject knowledge, and we need a space for that. Vickie countered that a collection development session might also focus on general issues. For example, how to work with vendors, rather than having vendors present. It was asked whether the plenary session could be cut to one hour. We could invite guest speakers recommended by board members. Reports could be held at another time; anyone could attend, along with board members. Phil asked whether in that case we should move the plenary session to the beginning of the second day. This will be revisited later, perhaps in November.

Proposal for an award in the name of Karl Lo

Jim Cheng reported that besides the award proposal, there had been other suggestions for remembering Karl Lo.

Award: A professional award to be given regularly in future has been proposed. While everyone agreed that it would be appropriate to honor Karl Lo, there was some concern that others in the field who also deserve to be remembered not be ignored. Martin suggested that a named award be given for professional achievement and service in a particular field, and the award might be given in honor of different people for different fields. There might be a CEAL distinguished service award. A symbolic monetary gift would be attached, but it is unclear whether the award would be given annually, every other year, or on what time schedule.

It was pointed out that named awards are more likely to attract donations from family, friends, coworkers, vendors, etc. of the individual named. Several people noted the need for a committee or task force to administer the award, as well as for guidelines or standards to govern it.

Phil Melzer moved the creation of a special committee:

“Be it resolved that a special committee be created to investigate a CEAL award for professional achievement, especially the nature of the award, the selection process, and the question of whether it should include a monetary award or simply be honorary in nature.”

Kris Troost seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

Jim and Martin offered to help out, but neither could chair the special committee. Phil will look into finding a chair. The chair would not necessarily have to be an Executive Board member. Kris thought it would be helpful if the committee includes at least one person who has been in CEAL for some time and is familiar with organizational history and membership. She also suggested that the committee take up the issue of whether contributions eligible for award must be to CEAL or simply to East Asian librarianship in general. Some sentiment was expressed in favor of East Asian librarianship, but it was agreed that the special committee could decide on guidelines.

Karen Yoshimura Smith: Martin brought up the fact that with the merger of RILIN and OCLC, Karen Yoshimura Smith will be moving into the research division and no longer dealing with East Asia specially. It will be her last CEAL since East Asia is no longer under her purview. He thought it would be appropriate to say a few words. Phil agreed and said he planned to say something at the end of her presentation.

Past East Asian librarians: Phil noted that Vickie Fu Doll had suggested adding a portion to the CEAL web page honoring deceased East Asian librarians. We could go back through JEAL and compile a list. The possibilities of writing something for the web page or having a commemorative JEAL issue were entertained. Gail King agreed that this was doable, but members will have to submit articles. Sentiment was expressed in favor of a special issue devoted to a theme that related to Karl Lo’s interests and contributions.

Special Committee reports

A. Special Committee on Tax Exempt Status

Kris Troost reported that she had emailed Michael Pascal. CEAL now has tax-exempt status in Utah, where JEAL is produced.

Relationship with AAS: Kris reviewed concerns about our relationship with AAS. There is some feeling that by bringing over 200 people to the meeting each year, we contribute more to AAS than we get back. Issue where we could use more AAS assistance include meeting rooms and website hosting. She and Ellen Hammond attended as East Asian librarian liaisons, where similar concerns came up. Of course we also benefit from meeting with AAS (e.g. book exhibits, hotel rates, panels). Can we parlay numbers into any greater benefits for us? What would we want? Do we want greater representation of librarians on AAS committee?

Martin Heijdra pointed out that Hideyuki Morimoto's memo contains relevant information on affiliation, committees, etc.

Wu Xian added that the Committee on Library Technology has a proposal regarding web hosting and will bring it up tomorrow. Vickie Fu Doll noted that several years ago they had looked into AAS hosting of the CEAL site and the answer was no. It was agreed that universities are increasingly unwilling to host due to security and other concerns.

B. Special Committee on CEAL Bylaws

Phil Melzer commented that the special committee had submitted a detailed report with recommendations. Given that there are only fifteen minutes left for the meeting, should we go through point by point and vote, or put off the entire discussion for the next meeting? Martin Heijdra suggested that we might differentiate the items that have more alternatives from those where the committee had a unified recommendation. It was agreed that we could then go through point by point and either approve a specific recommendation or vote to do something else.

Kris Troost asked if we could move discussion of the bylaws and multiscrypt to the beginning, then have committee reports at the end. Martin announced that multiscrypt would be covered in the plenary session. It was agreed that we could decide final agenda arrangements at the second Executive Board meeting.