



The Committee on Research Materials on Southeast Asia
A committee of the Southeast Asia Council (SEAC) of the Association for Asian Studies
(AAS) www.cormosea.org | www.asian-studies.org

CORMOSEA Technical Services Meeting Minutes

6th Floor, Montpellier Room (LM619)

James Madison Memorial Building

Library of Congress

Thursday, March 22, 2018

1:30 pm – 4:30 pm

Present: Jade Albuero (University of California, Los Angeles), Ellen Ambrosone (Emory University), Larry Ashmun (University of Wisconsin--Madison), Carole Atkinson (Cornell University), Antony Boussemart (École française d'Extrême-Orient, Paris), Elena Clariza (University of Hawai'i at Mānoa), Karen Stoll Farrell (Indiana University), Jeffrey Ferrier (Ohio University), Paul Frank (Co-lead BIBFRAME Trainer, Library of Congress), Clément Froehlicher-Chaix (École française d'Extrême-Orient, Paris) Ralph Gabbard (Arizona State University), Aparna Ghosh (Cornell University), Fe Susan Go (University of Michigan), Gregory Green (Cornell University), Paul Min Soo Hahn (Library of Congress), Lauran Hartley (Columbia University), Gary Hausman (Columbia University), Judith Henchy (University of Washington via Skype connection), Akihiro Kameda (Kyoto University), Cheng Yen Khoo (Ohio University), Richard Lesage (Harvard University via Skype connection), Aruna Magier (New York University), David Magier (Princeton University), Apikanya McCarty (Cornell University), Philip McEldowney (University of Virginia), Zoe McLaughlin (University of Michigan), James Nye (University of Chicago), Rohayati Paseng (University of Hawai'i at Mānoa), Ryan Perkins (Stanford University), Jeffrey Petersen (Cornell University), Chan Phan (Harvard University), Edward Proctor (Duke University/University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), Mary Rader (University of Texas at Austin), Sarbjit Randhawa (University of British Columbia), Richard Richie (**Chair**, Yale University), Jeffrey Shane (Ohio University), Virginia Shih (**Recorder**, University of California at Berkeley), Antonio Terrone (American Theological Library Association, Chicago), Mara Thacker (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), Laura Tuck (University of Washington), Jodi Williamschen (Senior Technical Metadata Standards Specialist, Network Development and MARC Standards Office, Library of Congress), and Laura Wong (National Library of Medicine)

Richard Richie welcomed CORMOSEA and CONSALD (Committee on South Asian Libraries and Documentation) members for a joint session on Ithaka report.

I. Southeast Asia Web Archiving Efforts

Jade Albuero shared her web archiving project at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) with her assistant who did most of the collecting and archiving work. Jade demonstrated the *Archive-It* and its public interface. She highlighted the archive on the passing of the late King of Thailand, Bhumibol Adulyadej. Most of the web archives are in English. The audience raised the copyright questions about the web archive that UCLA collected. The response was that the UCLA Library will take down any of the web archives if there is any concern for public access.

II. BIBFRAME Panel & Questions and Answers

Paul Frank and Jodi Williamschen offered an update on the second pilot of the Library of Congress BIBFRAME and non-roman scripts. It is still an experimental project at LC. The first pilot of BIBFRAME was in 2015 to provide catalogers a BIBFRAME editor for their description of resources. Catalogers created profiles for RDA cataloging without having an interactive database during the first pilot of BIBFRAME. It was discovered that BIBFRAME and RDA vocabularies did not match so LC needs to update the vocabularies for the second pilot.

Paul Frank discussed a few BIBFRAME projects: Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Strategic Plan, Linked Data for Production (LD4P), SHARE Virtual Discovery Environment (SHARE VDE), Center for Expanded Data Annotation and Retrieval (CEDAR), Bibliotek-o (a BIBFRAME Extension Ontology), and LC BIBFRAME. **For details, please see the attached *LC BIBFRAME Update*.**

Jodi Williamschen reported that the Library of Congress was preparing for the data conversion for BIBFRAME 2.0. 18 million MARC records were converted to BIBFRAME Works, Instances, and Items. 1.2 million uniform title and name-title authority records were converted to BIBFRAME Works. LC continues to convert MARC records and title and name-title MARC authority records from ILS database to BIBFRAME on a daily basis. LC created 19 million BIBFRAME work descriptions, 23 million BIBFRAME instance descriptions, and 4 billion triples.

Jodi offered a demo of BIBFRAME database which is designed for catalogers' use rather than for the general public. She went over the next steps of BIBFRAME: continue to match and merge data and adjust editor profiles to meet catalogers' needs and to include the upcoming changes of the RDA Toolkit Restructure and Redesign (3R) Project; continue to update data conversion; download LC's BIBFRAME file for others to explore; and concentrate on mapping from BIBFRAME to MARC. **For details, please see the attached *BIBFRAME at the Library of Congress*.**

For further information, please see <https://www.loc.gov/bibframe/>

III. Ithaka Report (Karen Stoll Farrell, Mary Rader, Judith Henchy, and Richard Lesage)

Karen Stoll Farrell offered an overview of the Ithaka report before panelists presented their findings at their respective institution. It is the first time that Ithaka S+R (a non-profit academic consulting service) conducted Asian studies interviews with faculty members at each of the participating institutions. Ithaka collected the transcripts of the interviews and will write up their findings. A final report is not available yet but individual institutional reports are almost complete. Karen reported on Indiana University case study. A team of two people interviewed eleven faculty members. They focused on three major themes:

- Defining Asian studies: How it would impact the publishing outcome to some scholars as it relates to promotion and tenure.
- International scholarly conversations: How they differ in the US versus Asia.
- Academic networking: It is essential even for experienced scholars to build new networks when they switch to new research topics.

Mary Rader mentioned that her institution did not ask library-oriented questions but broader questions to engage faculty participation. A three-people team conducted the following interview survey questions with fifteen faculty members:

- a. What did we hear based on our findings?
- b. What do we recommend based on that?
- c. What is different and what is the same across institutions?

The University of Texas at Austin (UT Austin) grouped the findings as follows:

Asian studies faculty members insist on multi-disciplinary nature of Asian studies. To meet the publishing requirements of prestigious publishers, researchers would have to conduct research in English and non-English languages. Researchers travel to Asia regularly or annually. In some cases, they spend a few months there at a time. Many resources are available only in Asia. Asian studies scholars are very active through their local and global network. Interlibrary loan has been an ongoing discussion to better serve users' needs. Collaboration and engagement beyond academia is essential. Asian studies researchers appreciate assistance and more staffing support in the research process beyond time and funding. UT Austin Library will never have a comprehensive Asian studies collection so collections will need to be selectively curated for local research needs. Asian studies as a discipline will continue to evolve and change over time. The Library needs to support all format of materials (analog, digital, archival or ethnographic) for research access. Information sharing among the scholarly community is crucial to assure the success of meeting all users' needs.

Judith Henchy reported on the University of Washington case study. Twenty-four faculty members in South, Southeast, and East Asia were interviewed. There are five members from Southeast Asia including one South/Southeast Asia sociologist.

State of the field observation includes: a) China studies is more accepted as a center of Asian studies especially in linguistics, religion, and economics; b) Humanities scholars felt more connected to cultural studies and Asian American studies than Asian studies; and c) People on harder edges of social sciences (archaeology, sociology, and medical anthropology) were more critical of constructions of Asian studies and Southeast Asian studies. Regardless of the close collaboration with colleagues in the region and constant contact with local government for permits, people in social sciences did not feel closely connected with Asian studies. Due to lack of linguistic proficiency, some people felt that they are not part of Asian studies and they are not accepted by the Asian studies community and publishing in *Journal of Asian Studies*. Another divide is between theoretical/cultural practitioners and international relations practitioners.

Some questions/concerns were raised:

- What does Asian studies bring to the wider field of social science scholarship?
- How are resources particular to Asian studies?
- Why aren't dissertations easily accessible?
- Multiple foreign language translation in Google Translate is problematic while English continues to be a language of hegemonic practice.
- Many people are interested in public scholarship while others are concerned about archiving data.
- The future of Asian studies is not optimistic since many retirement positions would not be replaced.

Richard Lesage shared the report on the Harvard case study. Both researchers and authors are librarians. Harvard interviewed sixteen faculty members of various disciplines and expertise. People thought Asian studies should receive more attention in academia in the US. They take their subject discipline as the primary discipline and Asian studies secondary. They value the interdisciplinary/multi-disciplinary nature of their research but they do not always communicate with each other well. Textual analysis is primary research methodology and travel to the region is vital. Most practitioners still apply their traditional research methodology and do not engage in digital humanities. Strengths of print and digital resources are included. Southeast Asia is a weak area of research at Harvard. Publishing in peer-

reviewed journals is a popular venue for scholarship production. Online journal publishing is popular for tenured faculty. There is concern that there won't be enough viable journals for untenured faculty to publish their work in the future. Participation in open access is uneven due to lack of prestige. More data in any format is highly desirable and it should be well-organized and indexed for information retrieval. It is expected to have more Asian studies scholarship translated into English.

IV. Guided Tour of Asian & Middle Eastern Division, Northeast Asia Section of the Library of Congress

Paul Min Soo Hahn, Head, Northeast Asia Section, Asian and Middle Eastern Division, Library of Congress welcomed CORMOSEA members and offered an informal orientation to the Asian and Middle Eastern Division where all technical services are conducted. Jack Panko, LC senior Thai cataloger shared with CORMOSEA members the cataloging workflow of Southeast Asia materials. LC Jakarta Office has been cataloging all Southeast Asian language materials in Jakarta and sending shelf-ready materials to LC Washington DC. The behind-the-scene tour was informative and enlightening.