

CEAL Executive Board II

Thursday, April 03, 2008, 4:00 – 5:50 pm

Lenox Room, Hyatt Regency, Atlanta

Attending: Jade Atwill (Committee on Membership), Rob Britt (Committee on Library Technology), Su Chen (Member-at-Large), Cathy Chiu (Member-at-Large), Vickie Fu Doll (Statistics Coordinator), Sarah Elman (Committee on Technical Processing), Hana Kim (Committee on Korean Materials), Joy Kim (Vice-President/President-elect), Gail King (JEAL editor), Yasuko Makino (Member-at-Large), Toshie Marra (Treasurer), Ellen McGill (Secretary), Kuniko Yamada McVey (Member-at-Large), Philip Melzer (Past President), Eiko Sakaguchi (Committee on Public Services), Yunah Sung (Member-at-Large), Kristina Troost (Chair), Hong Xu (Member-at-Large), Kuang-tien Yao (Committee on Chinese Materials).

Welcome, Introductions, and New Member Orientation: Kristina Troost provided a handout for new members. She reminded chairs that committee members must be CEAL members in good standing (i.e. AAS member with JEAL subscription). Balance between large and small institutions and broad geographical representation is important. Chairs should send a tentative committee membership list to the Board for approval. Occasionally, Board members may have suggest changes, such as adding another member from a particular area, etc. If a potential committee member is not sure about their status, they can check themselves from the CEAL directory. There is no formal deadline to assemble committees, but it is usually done within the first month after CEAL.

Contact List: Kristina Troost passed around a sign-up sheet for contact information. A list will be created and sent out by email; please hit reply all so that everyone can see all the responses.

Special Committees:

CJK capabilities in local systems: Work has not really started yet. Joy Kim asked when this group was formed and whether there is Korean representation. The taskforce focuses on systems more than languages; Martin Heijdra sent out calls for participation on eastlib and assembled the group.

Bylaws revision: the special committee hopes to be done soon. We will be having a vote on changes to the bylaws. Please vote and encourage your committee members

(and everyone else) to vote. There was some discussion about the need for a quorum. According to Article 9, section 2b of the bylaws, revision requires 2/3 majority of the votes cast. Yunah Sung asked if Wooseb Jeong will write the program for the balloting. Rob Britt replied that the Committee on Library Technology would look into how best to handle the vote.

LC-CEAL cataloguing internship: Philip Melzer and Joy Kim will talk more about this.

Pre-conferences: There were no additions to the list of proposed pre-conferences. It would be a good idea to think ahead and have a calendar, so our events don't conflict with other events many people will want to attend. Kuniko McVey asked if there isn't some funding for committee meetings if you have a good proposal. Kristina noted that this funding (\$500) is in rotation and not provided every year to the same committee.

Items of business remaining from the first Executive Board meeting:

Membership report: Jade Atwill reported that the committee had held 3 roundtable sessions to which over 50 people came. These went well, and they got good feedback. Otherwise, she focused on issues needing discussion. Highlights of last year included moving the directory to the new CEAL website. She thanked Rob Britt, who was on membership and library technology. There is some confusion over whether information is current and what membership status is. Not all institutions realize they have someone to update the CEAL directory. The committee will regularly send out a call for people to update their information. They are looking for suggestions about the best way to deal with the overlap with the Treasurer in maintaining information. The directory could also list membership, but some members are concerned about privacy. People also have trouble tracking when their *JEAL* subscriptions and AAS memberships expire; this generates a lot of questions to both membership and the treasurer. This may not have to have to be answered tonight, but it seems like we should use the website somehow to convey this information. Rob Britt offered to look into adding a field for the date of membership expiration. Jade agreed that Membership, Library Technology, and the Treasurer can work together to figure out the best solution. Vickie Fu Doll noted that we have defined expiration by the last issue of *JEAL* subscribed, but it would be simpler if we go by year. We could then collect fees year by year at the conference and show the AAS badge. There was wide agreement that most members would find it easier to remember membership by year instead of by *JEAL* issue. As far as privacy, Kris

mentioned that you can select “CEAL members” as a searchable item and get a list. It requires an extra step. Rob added that pdfs are created since some people want a print directory. Sarah Elman asked if changing the name of the directory would clarify matters; the CEAL directory is a list of librarians, etc., and not a list of CEAL members.

The possibility of moving to a single renewal point by sending a call to eastlib, followed by a reminder to those who haven’t responded, was discussed. It would be a lot of work for the Treasurer during the transition period since some people have already paid for several years. Rather than making a motion tonight, Toshie Marra said she would send a proposal to the Board for approval after thinking about the complexities. As for the list of CEAL members, Jade hoped that a simpler subscription and renewal system might help people to keep track of their own information, since going through the whole list is not intuitive. Rob noted also that the information is always already out of date since the list is static. It was agreed to keep the name CEAL directory, since people are used to it and it is difficult to think of a better name. Yunah Sung suggested we add language that clarifies the membership / subscriber definition. Once the bylaws revision is complete, we may have language for this.

Eastlib subscription: Non-CEAL members who wish to subscribe to eastlib can contact Wooseob Jeong. One reason signup is not automated is to prevent vendors from using it for advertising. It was noted that some vendors have subscribed as individuals. Kristina Troost stated that in the event of vendor advertising on eastlib, the chair should contact them to inform them that this is not permitted and that in general vendors are not supposed to subscribe.

Statistics Coordinator Report: Vickie Fu Doll’s report on developments with CEAL statistics received much applause for the committee’s ongoing hard work. An ebook module is being added. The total will be added to table 1 (volumes) in conformity with ARL practice. Otherwise, although the committee does not normally take late entries, an exception was made due to several requests. She added a column to check “not published” – the information is thus in the total but not published and not used in rankings.

There has been ongoing debate over having separate CJK / non-CJK totals. The committee is experimenting to see what can be done while keeping the report legible; perhaps other items can be combined or eliminated (e.g .CDs, which almost no one is

reporting any more). It is possible to mix and match elements, display different things, compare, etc. This year a field was added for Year of Establishment; if not there, you can fill it in. A Notes field will be added. All statistics are now online in pdf and numbers from 1957. CEAL totals (eg. physical support, staff, volumes, etc.) are added in every 3 years, every 5 years, etc. It takes a few seconds for the table to compile. Committee members did the data input for the 1990s, while Vickie handled earlier data. She had some student help and was fortunate to have a good programmer to help out. Now there are 3 modules, 2 of which are already connected together. One leftover from 2002 is the CJK description part; it is together with program information and library information. Vickie created a periodization table in consultation with her faculty and welcomes comments and suggestions from users. About 10 institutions have filled out the program information form. An announcement on H-ASIA provoked some interest from European libraries, so that module has been opened to them; they have their own statistics publication. To update the description, you can log on and make changes.

There was some discussion as to whether statistics should move to the CEAL website. Vickie and Rob Britt agreed that this would require a test site on www3 or somewhere else plus sufficient security measures to prevent someone from downloading all the data. Currently, University of Kansas has the database locked and security in place, whereas with a commercial provider we may not know as much about security.

Publications: Gail King reported that 3 issues of *Journal of East Asian Libraries* came out in the last calendar year. Digitization of back issues is a goal, but the archive is not finished.

Possibilities for future *JEAL* publication might include moving to a commercial publisher or to open source software hosted by libraries. This year several groups approached CEAL on this issue. We are still in an information gathering stage, since we are fortunate that BYU is willing to host *JEAL* while Gail is editor. Several people noted expectations that libraries will move increasingly into academic publishing, especially for smaller journals.

Philip Melzer informed the Board that Kimberley Martin of Maney Publishing had met with himself, Kristina Troost, and Gail to discuss publication and distribution of *JEAL* with editorship remaining with CEAL. Maney works in a number of countries including the UK, US, and China; most of their printing is done in the UK. Many of the publications they handle are small, specialized, limited subscriptions. They offer

online and print versions, work with CrossRef, and can digitize back issues. They are familiar with non-roman scripts and use Unicode. Video clips, etc. are not a problem. Maney would leave the individual subscription price unchanged but raise the institutional price since it's on the low side. They would be aggressive in marketing. Transparent financial management is promised. Rights would be owned by CEAL. Usually they start with a 5 year contract with one year of notice if either side wants to pull out in which case we can retrieve individual issues. They can give sample license and pricing and might have suggestions for presentation and format. The fact that *JEAL* is not refereed is not a concern for them.

Gail King reported that the scholarly publications center at Brigham Young University, where *JEAL* is currently housed, was approached by several journals on getting help with open source software. BYU Library found a software called Open Journal system developed Simon Frasier University. The scholarly publications center plans to move all its journals to this software. They approached Gail about *JEAL*, even though it's not a BYU journal, because she is editor and at BYU. They are willing to support it with server space, etc. According to the Open Journal Software public knowledge project site, it is intended for online journals, although you can have both print and online, or have a print-on-demand option. There is a subscription module and a setup for peer review. Submissions can be made on site. Switching to OJS would be free, so *JEAL* prices would not change. The online issue might look a bit different since they have a standard format, although this can supposedly be customized. People can log in to see the issue when it's ready. For print, it might also be possible to contract with a third party to print, bind, and mail for a flat fee; this might save us money.

Vickie Fu Doll wondered if raising institutional subscription costs might lead to cancellations, since serials budgets are tight. Might individual subscription prices be raised in the future? Will printing in the UK raise costs due to increased postage costs? Also, having a local operation makes turnaround time faster.

It was agreed that we would continue to explore both commercial options such as Maney and perhaps Brill and that Gail will look more into OJS. She will go ahead and prepare the June issue of *JEAL* as usual.

LC-CEAL cataloging internship: Philip Melzer reported that Library of Congress had received two candidates and were close to finalizing all details of the internships. Since it's a two-year pilot and will expire at the end of the 2008 calendar year, the

Board might want to discuss the program's future at the 2009 meeting. Joy Kim responded that the internship taskforce planned to make a recommendation about program continuance based partially on the evaluations by the interns of the experience and by the Library of Congress of the interns' performance. Discussion will have to be conducted by email. This year there were two applicants, both of which Library of Congress approved.

Phil remarked that CEAL may want to try to get a grant to provide further support to the interns. CEAL's \$500/person allowance covers some but not all of the costs, especially for housing; a room located far enough away to require a subway and bus ride is still easily \$700-\$800/month. Last year a Library of Congress employee generously provided housing at her home to an intern, but we neither expect nor encourage this to be a regular practice. One of this year's candidates is managing through support from her home institution and from friends in the DC area. There is support for the program by the LC team leaders, but some practical issues will need work. Kris suggested we try to figure out more precisely the costs of living in DC for a couple of months so we understand better what is involved.

Shape of future meetings: Kristina Troost raised the issue of plenary and panel organization. Should we look into sharing a plenary session with COLSALD and CORMOSEA, possibly moving the time to later in the day (but still before the CEAL dinner so we can give out directions to the dinner!)? As chair, she would like to continue having substantive plenums, rather than just business and reports. We could try to get dynamic speakers – not necessarily CJK people – who could bring up complex issues. For example, we could invite a provost, a university press person, and a university librarian to talk about academic publishing. Some commented that overlap between committee sessions can be strong, such as public services/library technology. Rob Britt asked if we need a library technology panel, noting that membership doesn't have one. He and Jade Atwill asked if we might expand the roundtable approach to panels, leaving more space for questions and discussions. Sarah Elman brought up the possibility of joint sessions. Phil suggested last year that the 6 chairs meet and consider whether some could shorten their panels, providing time for a joint session. However, it is awkward for the president to demand time. Yasuko Makino brought up the option of rotating panels among smaller and larger groups and controlling slots. Vickie Fu Doll wondered whether we could reorganize committees as well as panels along functional (rather than CJK) lines. She also recommended that committees avoid letting vendors use panel time to push their products and pointed that people from smaller institutions have to attend

all the panels and it can be exhausting. Eiko Sakaguchi sympathized but stressed that individual committees have an important networking and information exchange function as well. Vickie asked if we could alternate through Chinese, Japanese, and Korean over three years, having one CJK panel, one general panel, and rotate through. Sarah Elman brought up the separation of the business meeting from the main panel. Kris remarked that we need substantive topics – would there be interest in a comparative panel on publishing in CJK? Yasuko Makino thought this would be very helpful for library heads and administrators, since we tend to be specialized in one area but may have to manage others. Yunah Sung noted that we no longer have an RLIN session; could we expand panels to use that time? Several people felt that the schedule is already too tight and leaves little time for attendance at AAS panels. Eiko reminded the Board that usually we also have tours, which use a further half day of time. Kris suggested that we think of ourselves as having Tuesday night – Thursday night plan accordingly. Around September we can talk among ourselves about what we might want to do; this gives the chairs time to assemble their committees and figure out their programs. We can also solicit ideas for panels from the membership – these do not always have to come from committee members.