

CEAL 2007 – Executive Board Meeting II
Thursday, March 22, 2007, 4:00-5:50 PM
Boston Marriott Copley Square, Vineyard Room

Attending: Jade Atwill (Membership); Keiko Yokota Carter (Committee on Japanese Materials); Su Chen (Member-at-Large); Vickie Fu Doll (Statistics Coordinator); Martin Heijdra (Member-at-Large); David Hickey (Committee on Public Services); Mikyung Kang (Committee on Korean Materials); Gail King (JEAL editor); 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); Yunah Sung (Member-at-Large); Kris Troost (Vice-President/President-elect); Xian Wu (Committee on Library Technology); Hong Xu (Member-At-Large).

4. Standing Committee reports on activities of the past year and plans for the coming year:

- A. Technical Processing (Mary Lin)
- B. Public Services (David Hickey)
- C. Library Technology (Xian Wu)
- D. Korean Materials (Mikyung Kang)
- E. Japanese Materials (Keiko Yokota Carter)
- F. Chinese Materials (Zhijia Shen)

5. Report on LC-CEAL Cataloging Internship (Hideyuki Morimoto, Philip Melzer)

6. Special Committee reports

- A. Special Committee on Multiscript Capabilities in Local Systems (Martin Heijdra)
- B. Special Committee on the 2006 IFLA Preconference (Philip Melzer)
- C. Special Committee on CEAL Bylaws

Agenda Review

Phil Melzer began by asking for changes to the agenda. He proposed moving reports up to the beginning with a request to be brief. Reports by standing committee chairs could wait until the end of the meeting. All agreed.

Bibliography of Asian Studies into Unicode: Kris Troost noted that Frank Conlon had requested CEAL endorsement to move BAS into Unicode. Costs are estimated at \$21,000. Martin Heijdra mentioned that BAS has wanted to convert to Unicode for some time, and he had written a defense of it. This might come up at the next AAS. In the meantime, the chair of the advisory committee would like 3 different library groups to ask for a vote on the idea. Martin would not formally request the CEAL vote, because he's on the BAS advisory committee.

Kristina Troost asked if we needed a vote of the Executive Board or of the entire membership. Martin was not sure, so it was agreed to simply have an Executive Board vote. Timing of the vote for this AAS or next is not crucial, since BAS Unicode conversion didn't make it onto the agenda for this AAS. Kris recommended that it be moved to the next meeting; Kris will pass emails on to Phil.

CEAL 2006 Minutes

Although the Secretary was sure she had sent them out that past May, almost no one received them. They will be resent by email for review and approval.

Introductions and welcome to new board members

Su Chen (Member-at-Large)

Yunah Sung (Member-at-Large)

Jade Atwill (Member-at-Large)

Communications and email list of all board members

New members should send their email addresses to the president. He will add them to the list and also send the information to everyone else. Kris Troost noted that typically everyone on the Executive Board is cc'd on all communications, so that all members know what is going on.

Special Committee on Multiscript Capabilities in Local Systems (Martin Heijdra)

Martin noted that there is not much to add to what was said at the Plenary session.

He has approached the Queens Public Library on the issue.

Bibliography of Asian Studies Unicode conversion: Kristina Troost added that BAS has had a strong request to migrate the database into Unicode. The advisory board would like endorsement from library groups to help secure funding. She will forward the request and draft a letter for the Board to review.

Special Committee on IFLA Preconference.

Again, not much to add, as Joy Kim's report was comprehensive. It was successful. Philip Melzer noted that advice from on how best to apply from people with IFLA experience helped get the application through smoothly. We hope to do this again and make the opportunity to present available to as many people as possible.

Committee Reports:

Committee On Technical Processing: The committee reported on RDA review at the regular session. They are still working hard on this. Shi Deng, who is coordinator, tries to facilitate the flow of information.

Workflow for ACR2: Creation of examples of descriptive cataloguing of East Asian materials for chapter 12 has been going well, and it is hoped that next year there will be a good harvest.

LC CEAL internship : – More discussion is needed on the goals and future of the program by both LC and CEAL. Philip Melzer may also comment on this. Mary Lin felt that in future we will need training programs for technical services people, especially in cataloguing. We are currently in a transitional period and may need broader training. She hoped that in the next few months we can find something to address this need.

Committee on Public Services: David Hickey reported that the committee will add links to the presentations on the committee webpage, along with an executive summary on the committee blog. Work on the webpage is ongoing, and comments and suggestions would be appreciated. The committee is talking seriously about applying for funding for a public services workshop in 2008; CPS would normally rotate into preference for funding that year. However, the Committee on Korean Materials is also interested in having a workshop for 1.5 to – 2 days. Public Services is therefore considering whether to attempt a briefer workshop (single or half day).

Small Collection Roundtable: The roundtable went well, and notes will be available and linked to the Committee on Public Services webpage if appropriate. A roundtable on genealogy and diaspora was being held simultaneously with the Executive Board meeting. David Hickey will try to get feedback on that.

Committee on Library Technology : Xian Wu distributed a handout regarding the committee's proposal for the Executive Board to acquire server space and a domain name. This has been an ongoing discussion, and an earlier proposal was submitted to the Board in November 2005. The committee did try to contact AAS to see if they could sponsor the CEAL website, but there has been no response.

The committee proposes that CEAL go ahead on its own and suggests Parcom, which has been recommended by Rob Britt as reliable and relatively inexpensive. For the moment, 3 GB should be more than sufficient, as they are not looking at moving the statistics database at the moment. There also needs to be more discussion with committees about their space needs and what they want. The server space can be expanded if other committees put their sites on this server or as need arises.

Two years of space - \$60
One year of space - \$48

Increasing space will also increase the price. If approved, the committee would move the CEAL website to the new space and then talk to committees who need to or want to move.

Xian Wu then moved:

“On behalf of the Committee on Library Technology, I propose to purchase a domain name for a stable home for the CEAL website at the cost of \$28 for two years and also purchase a web storage space of 3 GB at the cost of \$96 for 2 years. The total cost would be \$124 for the initial two years.”

Martin Heijdra seconded the motion.

Discussion: Will 3 GB be sufficient to hold the membership directory? Should we start with a bigger space to accommodate programs as well as content, instead of waiting to see if problems arose? Or is this was not necessary as long as no very sizable sites, such as the statistics database, would be moving over for the foreseeable

future? Security and access are also issues which will need to be explored over the next two years. Philip Melzer asked if these questions might be better addressed through a separate proposal.

Xian Wu outlined several steps. The main concern at the moment is to find a home for the main page. Each committee will have own web master/administrator. As committee pages feel the need to move from their present homes, we can investigate options. The Internet Service Provider will not provide programming. Committee chairs could also have access rights but keep the committee website in its original home if they prefer.

Vickie Fu Doll stressed that the immediate concern should be finding a place to host the membership database. We should also talk to Wooseob Jeong about the elections data. Membership, dues, payments, elections, etc. can also be based on the membership database. Programming will take a year because of the need to test, etc. Hideyuki Morimoto pointed out that elections are annual. Vickie felt that as long as everything is in one place and connects to the membership database, balloting will be easy to do. Zhijia Shen argued that two years is a reasonable period to try out this approach, and CEAL can then reevaluate.

The motion passed unanimously.

Domain name: Martin Heijdra asked about the domain name and if the committee planned to follow Grace Wiersma's proposal as presented at CEAL. Philip Melzer suggested that this could be handled by email. Xian Wu asked if he should first talk to the members of his committee, ask for suggestions, and then pass these on to the Board. Vickie suggested asking for suggestions for all of eastlib before making recommendations to the Board.

Committee on Korean Materials:

The committee is planning a pre-conference workshop for the 2008 CEAL meeting. This might be 1.5 – 2 days. The target participants are non-Korean speaking librarians who handle Korean materials. One was held 7 years ago at Chicago. There have been lots of changes, especially in formats, so an update is needed.

The committee is also planning to publish a second edition of *Korean Librarianship Outside of Korea: a practical guide and manual*. Hopefully by the time of

publication there will be a best practice for romanization and word division. Tomorrow they will hold discussion roundtables for Korean book and electronic resource vendors, perhaps with a focus on future services. There will also be a lunch.

Committee on Japanese Materials:

Last year the committee held a panel discussion on Japanese resources available internationally. In Japan, this would be co-sponsored by JANUL (the Japanese Association of National University Libraries) and PULC (Private University Libraries Consortium), while in North America it would be the North American Coordinating Council on Japanese Library Resources (NCC) and the Council on East Asian Libraries Committee on Japanese Materials (CEAL CJM).

The committee is also focusing on Japanese newspaper resources, for which there have been some improvements. This year two newspaper representatives are attending CEAL and talking about relevant issues. The committee would like to continue international cooperation and work for further improvement in digital resources.

Committee on Chinese Materials:

The committee took a roundtable approach this year; they have had some positive feedback and think it's worth trying again. Presentation materials are put up on the committee website early to promote discussion. They have also been working on a Chinese librarians' training program along the lines of the Luce program, which was very popular and generated many requests for more sessions. The committee hopes to offer such programs more frequently, as CKM and NCC do. To this end, they have been planning and raising funds with an eye to the summer of 2008.

Committee members also attended the Luce Fellow alumni reunion and got constructive ideas from Luce summer institute alumni.

One issue on which they would like feedback is timing. The set-up process is lengthy: site selection, fundraising, preparation. By the time the program is implemented, it will be past the current CCM term, but committee members would like to complete the project with the involvement of the new committee chair.

Philip Melzer noted that it can be awkward when a project goes beyond the term of the committee or Board. In the past, projects usually get taken up by the next committee or continue independently. Xian Wu suggested that an Adhoc committee

might be formed. Vickie Fu Doll asked if it is necessary to use the committee name for the project. Zhijia Shen stressed that committee involvement and support would be helpful. Philip Melzer brought up the possibility of establishing a taskforce with a life of two years. The bylaws state that a taskforce can be created and / or abolished taskforce with approval of president, etc. Taskforce chairs can be appointed by the committee chair. Zhijia Shen agreed that this might be the best approach.

LC / CEAL cataloguing internship: Hideyuki Morimoto reported that last year's Executive Board approved a 2-year trial for an LC / CEAL cataloguing internship for up to 3 persons/ year with \$500/participant. There was some discussion on email about selection criteria. The Committee on Technical Processing was asked to take over the task of actually collecting and evaluating applications. The committee established a subcommittee, which developed an application form based on the criteria approved by the Executive Board, announced program, solicited applications, and evaluated them. Results were submitted to the chair of the Committee on Technical Processing, who passed them on to the Library of Congress.

Three applications were received by the deadline, and after careful review, it was determined that all met the criteria and should be supported. This recommendation was made to LC, which agreed and communicated with the applicants. One finalist said she could do the internship this summer for one month; another replied that she might not be able to do it this year, and in that case she wished to do it next year; and the third definitely can't do it this year and wants to do it next year. The subcommittee, however, recommends that we should not carry over candidates from year to year, but rather have them reapply.

The subcommittee also proposes the following adjustments to the criteria.

1. Current criterion: Each intern should be working at a collection with less than 50,000 CJK titles.

The subcommittee feels this may have deterred good applicants and proposes to eliminate this requirement.

2. Current criterion: The intern should have a limited language proficiency for the materials they catalogue.

The subcommittee recommends: "The intern is proficient in at least one CJK language."

The subcommittee also received some comments from CEAL members about the program. Their response was that they were only responsible for selection of applicants, not for the validity or effectiveness of the program itself. The comments included some opposition to funding up to \$1500 for two years.

Kristina Troost asked if the inability of finalists to take up the internship this year was a function of the timing of application and notification. Hideyuki Morimoto noted that time was not specified when the call for applications went out. However, since it's a two-year trial program, carrying over finalists might involve turning down other applicants and compromise the trial. Martin Heijdra agreed; he also noted that because years of experience is a criterion for consideration, deferral might compromise eligibility. Philip Melzer suggested that finalists be called on the telephone to see if discussion changed their perspective of what is doable, and / or ask on the form when the candidate would take up the internship if selected. This might make applicants think concretely about feasibility.

Length of internship: There was some discussion over how long the internship needs to be (one, two, or three months) in order to be useful. Philip Melzer noted that someone who works in a very specialized library with a specific group of things to be catalogued could receive useful training in a one-month period. Mary Lin suggested specifying a flexible period (1-3 months) in the announcement to encourage more applications. She pointed out that it can be hard for employees to leave their jobs for several months. Philip Melzer responded that for a new cataloguer, one month might not be very helpful. Martin Heijdra proposed phrasing timing in terms of experience; those with no experience will do a three-month internship, while those with some experience will have more flexibility.

C. Special Committee on CEAL Bylaws

The Special Committee report on CEAL Bylaws addressed 13 issues, some of which were identified by the president, some by the Executive Board, some by CEAL members, and some by the committee itself. They examined both CEAL's current bylaws and those of other organizations. For some items, the committee had a unified recommendation; for others, they presented two different suggestions. The latter included item 4.3 on voting rights and 4.6 on the number of candidates on the final slate. Due to time constraints, the Board decided to address these two items in the meeting and leave the other recommendations to discussion and vote by email.

4.3 *Voting rights of JEAL editor*

This issue was brought up by past CEAL president, Abraham Yu. The JEAL editor, like the statistics coordinator, is an appointed member, but only the JEAL editor lacks voting rights.

The Special Committee thought that there should be equal treatment of both positions in terms of voting rights, since both are appointed. The current CEAL bylaws do provide a rationale for this imbalanced treatment: the statistics coordinator is also chair of the statistics committee. However, the special committee did not think this is sufficient, since other non-committee head members (secretary, members-at-large) can vote. The appointment is not limited to one term but is renewable. Strongly thought it should be balanced.

Special Committee recommendations:

1. Make offices of JEAL editor and statistics coordinator elected rather than appointed with the possibility of re-election
2. Leave these offices to be appointed by president for renewable terms, but exclude incumbents of both offices.

Kristina Troost commented on how impressed she was by the report. However, for this point she thought we should look for other options. People should not have to sit through meetings without being able to vote, but the ability to appoint people for specialized functions, especially candidates who serve well, is also important, as is continuity is also important. Because the group is large, she was less concerned that incumbents would have an inordinate amount of control.

Martin Heijdra noted that one might see the appointments as the president having 3 votes on the Board. As an alternative, could the positions have voting rights and be renewable, but be elected by the Board? Kristina Troost suggested this might be modified to “appointed by the Board,” and Vickie Fu Doll modified this to “nominated by the president and approved by the Board.” Philip Melzer confirmed that this seemed to be existing practice; last year he had nominated Vickey for statistics coordinator and the Board had approved.

Martin proposed that the positions of JEAL editor and statistics coordinator continue to be appointed but that they both have voting rights. David Hickey seconded this motion. Vickie Doll indicated that she was amenable to this change.

Kristina Troost then formally moved that “the positions of JEAL editor and statistics coordinator shall be appointed by the CEAL president and have full privileges as a member of the Executive Board, including the right to vote.” Martin Heijdra suggested the following motion be amended to read: “the positions of JEAL editor and statistics coordinator shall be nominated by the CEAL president, approved by the Executive Board, and have full privileges as a member of the Executive Board, including the right to vote.” This amendment was friendly. Xian Wu seconded the revised motion. It passed unanimously.

Philip Melzer commented that he is really happy with the outcome, since these positions are a lot of work and contribute a great deal to CEAL. They shouldn't be subject to vote but should be able to participate fully.

Number of candidates on final slate

The Special Committee noted that there is currently no limit on the number of candidates standing for election for a given CEAL position. Some CEAL members felt that at times there are too many final candidates for given slots. The committee's review of other organizations found that some specify a cap for each vacant office; some do not.

The Special Committee thought there were pros and cons for each approach.

Special Committee recommendations:

- 1: Leave the current CEAL bylaws as is (no cap specified).
- 2: Limit final candidates to 2 to 3 per position.

The Special Committee noted that even if we leave the bylaws as is, by not specifying the number of candidates who can run for each vacant office, it is still possible to let CEAL members know informally at various points how many people have been nominated for a given position, since people might not nominate more candidates if they see that there are already a lot of people nominated.

Philip Melzer requested that Hong Xu and Martin Heijdra comment on how things have happened with the most recent past elections.

Hong Xu reported that although the nominating committee got quite a lot of nominations, perhaps 5-8 names per position, some had to be eliminated due to lack of membership status and the majority of people declined due to other commitments.

In the end, it was hard to get enough candidates. Sometimes, people who declined nomination for themselves nominated others. Kuniko Yamada McVey agreed that it had been difficult to get a sufficient number of candidates.

Martin Heijdra noted that Ellen Hammond had done the telephoning to nominees. He felt it is a difficult task, so the person should have as much leeway as needed. The degree of recruitment difficulty of course depends on the position; it is easier to get people to stand for member-at-large. Nominating committees sometimes also move people around, telling them that they have been nominated for X but asking if they could consider Y instead. Some nominees also ask who else is running. Although they did not give specific names, they might say which areas the others candidates represent. He stressed that the more freedom available for the nominating committee, the better, even if sometimes you end up with 5 people running for one position.

Vickie Fu Doll commented that it had also be difficult getting people to run 4-5 years ago, even when there were a lot of nominations. David Hickey added that he was not sure about the connection that too many people running one year means they are discouraged the next year and it's harder to recruit.

Jade Atwill asked how we word calls for nominations. Do we ask people, as some organizations do, to get approval from the proposed candidate before nominating them?

Hideyuki Morimoto asked if it is correct that the Executive Board agrees that we don't need to have a cap?

Martin Heijdra said he can understand both sides, and perhaps we should let the nominating committees have the choice of whether to impose a cap or not

Philip Melzer suggested a proposal could be put forward, and Martin agreed. Vickie noted that one would have to specify the number, and that it might depend on how many positions were vacant that year. Hideyuki Morimoto clarified that the cap would be for each position, and that it is not a cap on the overall number of nominees.

Other bylaws issues

Philip Melzer outlined the process to deal with the rest of the outstanding bylaws issues. Each proposal would be sent out by email with a specified period for

discussion, and then he will ask for a vote on what the committee recommends. He will try to phrase clearly in terms of the committee recommends a, b, c. As we discuss each proposal, if someone puts forward another proposal, we will see if there is movement to adopting recommended language. He will put forth the options and ask what the Board prefers. We should strive for consensus if we can. Proposals will be brought forward one at a time, so Board members can think each one through. Much of what needs to be considered is also in the Special Committee's report.

He then closed the meeting by thanking everyone for their work.