

## CEAL Executive Board Meeting II

Thursday, March 26, 2015

7:45 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.

Columbus A

Chicago Sheraton Hotel and Towers

Attendees: Tomoko Bialock (Member-at-Large), Rob Britt (Committee on Library Technology), Erica Chang (Committee on Technical Processing), Xi Chen (Treasurer), Hong Cheng (Committee on Chinese Materials), Jim Cheng (Vice President), Sharon Domier (Committee on Public Services), Sarah Elman (Membership), Vickie Fu Doll (Statistics), Charles Fosselman (Member-at-Large), Ellen Hammond (President), Michiko Ito (Committee on Japanese Materials), Hana Kim (Member-at-Large), Gail King (JEAL Editor), Kenneth Klein (Outgoing Secretary), Miree Ku (Committee on Korean Materials), Dawn Lawson (Member-at-Large), Tang Li (CLT designee), Toshie Marra (Outgoing Member-at-Large), Michael Meng (Member-at-Large), Hyokyoung Yi (Member-at-Large)

Absent: Adam Lisbon (Secretary),

7:45 a.m. President Ellen Hammond called the meeting to order.

**Introductions.** Hammond introduced three new Executive Board members: Xi Chen (Treasurer), Charles Fosselman and Hana Kim (both Members-at-Large). She said that Adam Lisbon, newly elected as Secretary, was not able to attend this year's meeting. She then asked for self-introductions from the rest of the Board members.

**CEAL Budget & Financial Planning.** Continuing the discussion on the CEAL budget from the previous day's Executive Board meeting, Hammond began by summarizing the discussion so far for the benefit of the new members of the Board.

Hammond intends to ask the AAS Board whether the idea of tiered membership for CEAL would be acceptable. She also said that perhaps, by calling vendors payments "donations" rather than fees, we might be able to avoid taxation. If CEAL pursues grants, we would have to coordinate with AAS, which is likely to be reluctant to take on the administrative burden of additional CEAL grants. So, for now, we should back off from any new grant applications. What we will pursue is the idea of charging registration fees for CEAL meetings. She also noted that it might not be politic to raise membership fees so soon after removing the benefit of the print journal.

For the reception, Hammond asked whether we had resolved not to have CEAL pay for it out of its budget. At this year's reception, held Wednesday (3/25) evening, \$2395 was received from with a net \$1935 (accounting both for sponsorship from vendors and the event's expenses). We gave out about 60 "free" tickets for conference presenters and vendors. Ellen suggested that the vendor income might be better spent on the CEAL program, rather than for the reception. Vendor payments are actually for the advertisements on the program, so we might be justified in not providing them free reception tickets.

Hammond asked the committee chairs whether they thought the \$500/3-year term was a necessary CEAL expense. She also suggested that CEAL did not have to continue to support so many speakers and such rich programs every year. Sharon Domier said that the Committee on Public Services has discussed the idea of giving honorariums for speakers. She also said that it used to be the practice for pre-conference openings in the annual schedule to be rotated between committees, but that recently these have been taken up by the Committee on Technical Processing, due to the many changes brought about by RDA and linked access. Domier said that the \$500 had more-or-less been tied to the conducting of pre-conferences. Erica Chang pointed out that the turnout for this year's preconference was high and the committee received an unexpected amount of money, including a surplus.

Hammond asked whether it was necessary or a good idea to ask for feedback from the membership about what was most important to them and where CEAL should target its financial resources. She asked if the last survey, sent out by Wen-ling in 2013, was still available to serve as a model. ([CEAL SURVEY QUESTIONS.docx](#)) On the question Hammond asked whether we should ask the membership about the question of higher fees for membership or registration. One advantage about raising registration fees would be easier to get reimbursed. Ken Klein suggested that any questions about increased fees be tied to the need to finance some particular enhancements to CEAL's program.

Hong Cheng endorsed Hammond's idea that an informal reception period be tacked onto the end of the plenary meeting on Wednesday, with perhaps minor refreshments. Domier thought that that session might be more beneficial prior to the plenary meeting, rather than after. Dawn Lawson endorsed the idea of tying questions about higher fees to enhanced benefits, as it will yield actual budget opinions from the membership.

Tomoko Bialock suggested establishing a "vendor membership" category, tied to particular benefits, to which Jim Cheng replied that this will tend to entitle such vendor members to certain privileges, such as setting up displays right outside the meeting room. Vendors have noticed that librarians tend to stay not as long as before, especially since pre-conferences have become so commonplace. Sarah Elman suggested calling them "sponsors" rather than "members," in view of likely AAS objections. Hammond asked whether it would be better to have the reception on Tuesday evening.

Hammond then asked for a show of hands of Executive Board members who have registered for the AAS meeting, and all but one did.

Hammond asked whether we should continue scheduling concurrent sessions on Tuesday evening, which was something instituted when the grant-supported expanded plenary session model was introduced. Miree Ku said that Korean vendors would prefer to come on Tuesdays, since they have to set up for the exhibits beginning Thursday.

We will gather additional information, including from surveys as well as answers from AAS on some issues, and continue the discussion through email. Gail King suggested including a survey question about the length of the plenary session, which lasted all day this year, and Vickie Doll suggested some breaks be included.

(Supporting documents for this topic also include 1) [Task Force Executive Summary](#), 2) [CEAL Financial Models](#) and 3) [CEAL Financial Data](#) and 4) [Budget & Financial Planning Supplementary Agenda](#).

### **CEAL Fiscal Year and Membership Year**

CEAL has had a practice of regarding its fiscal year as dating from one conference to the next, whereas AAS uses the calendar year. This complicates coordination and communication about membership rolls and dues paying. Elman suggested that CEAL's fiscal year should be tied to AAS' fiscal year. Chang agreed, saying that it might clarify membership voting rights. Lawson moved that CEAL's fiscal year be officially made the calendar year. The motion was seconded and the Executive Board voted in favor. The question then was discussed as to when the dues should be paid and whether that was in conjunction with the advantages of membership. Hong Cheng suggested that elections be held in the fall and results announced ahead of the meeting.

### **Library of Congress Internship Update**

After the expiration of the initial internship program contract in 2013, the process of preparing a renewed contract took an extended length of time, so there is no intern this year.<sup>1</sup> Chang wanted to be able to tell the members of the Committee on Technical Processing whether we planned to continue with the internship program or whether we should wait for the financial discussion to reach conclusions. Rob Britt suggested that CEAL might have better uses for the \$1000/intern, quite apart from the value of the program, which is better paid for by the interns' institutions. Chang pointed out the value of the program benefits everyone by raising the value of cataloging records. Britt replied that the primary benefit redounds to institution. Hammond suggested that she take the Executive Board's concerns to the Library. For now, we will say that we have not yet decided. Perhaps this is something else to put on the membership survey.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:07 am.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hammond later added this note: "Approval by the Library of Congress (LC) was not actually the issue. They had already signed on to the idea of renewing the program. What we were going back and forth about with LC was the language in the agreement. As things now stand, Randall Berry confirmed that LC is interested in continuing (which we knew) but the final language of the agreement need to be agreed to by all parties (including the EB) if the EB agrees to continue the program. The issue with AAS was primarily the matter of who could sign the legal document. It took a while to get an answer on that, but Michael Paschal agreed that the CEAL President can sign the document. AAS also got involved in vetting the agreement language, as well (but was generally agreeable to the revised language.)"