RBMS Exhibition Awards Committee
Business Meeting, ALA Annual Conference, Saturday, 26 June 2010
Washington, DC: J.W. Marriott, Senate Rm.

Members Present: Richard Noble (Brown University), Chair; James Ascher (University of Colorado, Boulder); Tom Bolze (Yale University) (recording); Jessica Lacher-Feldman (University of Alabama); Caryn Lazzuri (Folger Shakespeare Library); Ed Oetting (Arizona State University); Molly Schwartzburg (Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas, Austin); Michael Taylor (Louisiana State University); Cherry Williams (Lilly Library, Indiana University).

Guests: Katie Carr (independent librarian); Mike Kelly (Amherst College); Jennifer Lowe (Saint Louis University); Jeffrey Makala (University of South Carolina and RBMS Member-at-Large)

Members Excused: Cynthia Requardt (Johns Hopkins University)

Call to Order: 8:05 a.m.

1. Designation of recorder

Tom Bolze was designated recorder.

2. Welcome, Introductions, Announcements

Richard noted that the Leab Awards will be presented tomorrow at 4:00 pm in Room 146C of the Washington Convention Center.

3. Review and Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the January 17, 2010 EAC meeting at ALA Midwinter were unanimously approved.

4. Update on Committee Membership

Richard noted that he and Tom are rotating off EAC at the conclusion of Annual. Molly has accepted an appointment as incoming EAC Chair. Two new members have been appointed to two-year terms: Jason Kovari (University of Mississippi) and Jennifer Lowe (Saint Louis University). Richard welcomed Jennifer and, in absentia, Jason.

5. Financial: Update on Leab Account, Current Year Expenditures, Etc.

The account's current status is as follows:
Principal balance as of 4/30/10: $29,955.85
Earned interest income, 9/1/09-4/30/10 $ 836.72
Bank charges, 9/1/09-4/30/10 $ 158.08

Balance available in spending account, 4/30/10: $ 678.64

Richard noted that all but about $20.00 of the spending account has been disbursed to the Chair to cover shipping and printing expenses associated with the 2010 awards cycle. But as interest has continued to accrue, there should now be a bit more money available for reimbursement to EAC members who may also have incurred shipping charges. All reimbursement requests, accompanied by **original** receipts, must be submitted to the Chair by August 15.

6. <u>Follow-Up to Action Items in 2010 ALA Midwinter Minutes</u>

Because the 2010 Midwinter minutes included many action item follow-ups from the 2009 Annual minutes that had not been fully addressed/resolved at Midwinter, some 2009 action items were again discussed. 2010 Midwinter action item follow-ups are listed after the 2009 items.

2009 Annual Action Item 2: Richard will create a formal report on the status of Leab archival holdings, to be posted on the EAC's web page. All EAC members should feel free to send relevant documents to Richard.
As at Midwinter, no action has yet been taken. Richard may continue as an EAC "volunteer" and catalog the Grolier Club's Leab Award holdings.

2009 Annual Action Item 3: Richard will send a follow-up thank you to each 2009 nominee, in which he will also ask nominees to comment on how they heard about the award and suggest venues for publicizing the award that might not be immediately obvious to the committee.
This was done for 2009, but Richard will also do it for the 2010 nominees.
New Action Item 1: Richard to send a follow-up thank you to each 2010 nominee.

2009 Annual Action Item 4: Richard will draft an article for Manuscript Society News.
This has not yet been done. Ed is no longer director of the *Manuscript Society News*, which he had been when this matter first arose.

2009 Annual Action Item 5: Riva [Feshbach] will review the listservs of various ALA divisions to see if there are any (besides RBMS) to which EAC should send Leab Award announcements.
As previously noted at Midwinter, Riva was unable to pursue this matter due to changes in her employment situation. Ed suggested possibly asking Leab winners to provide brief acceptance blurbs about the importance/significance of the award that we could use in EAC publicity.
Molly, in consultation with Richard, will work on this further.

2009 Annual Action Item 6: Richard will contact Megan Griffin about possibly publicizing the award in American Libraries.
As previously noted at Midwinter, not yet done.

2009 Annual Action Item 7: James and Chris [Smith] will further investigate options for electronic submission of award nominations.
As noted at Midwinter, this has been done and worked quite well for the 2010 cycle.

2009 Annual Action Item 8: Richard will follow up with Molly about the creation of table labels [for Preconference display of submissions], particularly with regard to label design.
As noted at Midwinter, this has not been done.

2009 Annual Action Item 9: Richard will create a list of recurring EAC Chair "to do" items, which can then be passed on whenever a new Chair takes office.
Richard is currently working on this.

2009 Annual Action Item 10: Richard will talk to Will LaMoy about whether the Publications Committee might serve as repository for EAC document templates (eg. logos, award certificates, labels, etc.) and take responsibility for producing these documents as necessary.
Richard provided a further update to information delivered at Midwinter, noting that Will is now personally the certificate template holder. The Chair will need to maintain contact with Will.

2010 Midwinter Action Item 1: Jeff will email Richard contact info for the ALA-SAA-AAM liaison.
Not yet done.

2010 Midwinter Action Item 2: James will send out a brief blurb to EAC regarding ALA Connect, how it works, and some of its uses. He will also investigate the "voting module" and report back to the committee about whether this presents a viable (and secure) tool for pre-polling of submissions.
James noted that Deborah Leslie is now using the ALA Connect voting module for some RBMS business, so there are no security concerns. General discussion of possibly using ALA Connect to do a "pre-selection" of potential winners for the next awards cycle, which would allow EAC members to indicate their favored nominees in advance of the judging session and thus save time in the initial winnowing of submissions. It was also suggested that such a system might allow the Chair to bring fewer of the catalogs to the actual meeting. Jeff and James, however, indicated that while it's possible to create a voting list that will be seen only by committee members, it is probably not possible to create a list in which the vote of any one member cannot also be seen by all other members, thus potentially skewing the list of preferred nominees. Consensus was that this pre-selection should instead be done by email, with each member sending a list of his/her preferred nominees to the Chair as soon as possible after reviewing the submissions. In response to comments by Ed, consensus was that committee members should favor nominees that they clearly believe could be potential winners but should not be bound to any particular number. Richard noted that the Chair should probably continue to bring all submissions to the judging session at ALA Midwinter, even if some nominees have more or less been eliminated as a result of the pre-selection.

2010 Midwinter Action Item 3: As part of his review of the functions of ALA Connect, James will also investigate and report back to the committee about the mechanics of having a detailed online conversation regarding guidelines for electronic exhibitions.
Richard noted that electronic exhibitions continue to evolve rapidly, so this is something that Molly will probably have to address. General discussion about the need for revising EAC's guidelines regarding electronic exhibitions, with these guidelines ideally representing the most current sets of best practices for online exhibitions. James and Molly suggested proposing a

RBMS Preconference seminar on electronic exhibition best practices; Richard suggested that such a seminar could be a joint one between EAC and the Publications Committee, with at least one presenter discussing the evolution of electronic exhibitions as seen by EAC to date. Tom suggested that we may want to ask for input from Sarah Goodwin Thiel, a former EAC member who wrote a book on electronic exhibition best practices.
New Action Item 2: Tom will put James in touch with Sarah Goodwin Thiel.

2010 Midwinter Action Item 4: Richard will contact previous electronic exhibition award winners to request permission to use screen captures of opening pages in the EAC online exhibit of winners.
Richard noted that he uses screen captures in the Leab Awards presentation at ALA Annual, but he was not certain whether a permission statement for such use was included in the current submission form. James believed that it was covered. [See below, including section 9 and New Action Item 3, for further information, as some of the issues surrounding this action item were not fully addressed until later.]

7. Further Review of 2010 Award Cycle and Anticipation of 2011 Award Cycle

Richard asked Molly to be more timely than he has in announcing award winners. The April/May issue of *C&RL News* is ACRL's preferred venue for announcing the winners, and deadline for submission of this information is about 6 weeks prior to publication. The first official announcement of winners occurs in an ACRL press release distributed through *American Libraries* online.

Richard asked whether there had been any problems with shipping of submissions for the 2010 cycle. Committee members agreed that the material had been very well packed, with no apparent damage to any of the submissions, and the boxes held up well; in addition, everyone received the boxes in a timely manner.

Richard will send James the his award submission database files and other EAC documents for storage and loading to ALA Connect. As a point of information, James noted that the Web Team would not normally assist with this type of activity, so in the future an EAC member may need to take responsibility for this electronic archiving.

Richard suggested that Molly, as Chair, try to attend the meetings of the Publications Committee whenever possible, as some of EAC's functions overlap considerably with those of Publications.

8. Other Business

Caryn said she had received a request for "feedback" from someone who had submitted a catalog/exhibition to EAC and requested suggestions on how to respond. Richard replied that EAC members cannot provide nominee-specific feedback, as the judging sessions are confidential; in addition, providing such feedback would place a tremendous burden on the committee, as detailed records would have to be kept on the discussion of every nominee. The Chair's remarks at the awards ceremony are the only permissible form of public feedback. Tom

suggested that individuals can also be directed to the EAC guidelines and the lists of previous winners for information about what EAC considers an outstanding catalog or exhibition.

Michael noted that he is an incoming member of the RBMS Diversity Committee and thus wondered whether there might be ways that EAC could work with Diversity. Richard suggested expanding EAC's guidelines to encourage exhibition topics that promote diversity, serve historically under-represented audiences, and help expand audiences; perhaps such a revision would be most appropriate in the "originality" section of the guidelines. Molly suggested that the effort to expose "hidden collections" could similarly be used to promote diversity.

Caryn inquired whether there has been recent discussion of what exactly constitutes an exhibition "catalog," particularly as the museum world is increasingly producing scholarly monographs that are associated with exhibitions but do not constitute catalogs in the traditional sense. Richard noted that the definition of brochures is relatively fluid, since many don't provide much detail about an individual exhibition, and even the changing nature of catalogs has caused the committee occasionally to revise its criteria and expand the number of categories. There was general consensus, however, that an exhibition "catalog" should provide at least a partial record of the physical exhibition, which monographic works associated with an exhibition often do not. In addition, because library material tends to be less visually dramatic than museum collections, it is important that catalogs show how such material can be presented in a way that attracts and engages audiences. Richard suggested that if a Preconference seminar on exhibitions is proposed, in addition to best practices for electronic exhibitions, one presenter could discuss the catalog formats that EAC believes best achieve the goal of promoting and documenting the exhibition of special collections material. Molly noted that as institutions shed "in-house" publication offices, fewer may do true exhibition catalogs and more may turn to the exhibition-associated monographs that will potentially have continued marketability long after the affiliated exhibition has ended.

9. Online Exhibit of Exhibition Awards Winners, Beta Version

Katie again showed the online exhibit of Leab Award winners that she and James first presented at 2010 Midwinter. She said that further development of the site will require assistance from EAC volunteers who can help develop crosswalks between MARC records and the Dublin Core records that will be entered into the site, along with help for actually entering this data. General discussion about where catalog records, cover images, and chair's remarks for older winners might be found, along with the problem that some winners may not have been cataloged at the item level (esp. brochures) and even those that have may not contain certain relevant types of information, such as design credits etc. There are currently no images of covers for the 1996-2008 winners; however, Tom said he thought he recalled Sarah Goodwin Thiel undertaking an earlier project to digitize precisely these covers.
New Action Item 3: Tom will contact Sarah Goodwin Thiel to inquire about images for award winners from 1996-2008.

Richard noted that assembling the data and images for this project will take some time, but we should be able to create a nice exhibit if we are "patient." Ed asked whether we should attempt to do anything to mark the upcoming 25th anniversary of the Leab Award, but Richard

recommended against such, believing the relatively short time frame would put too much pressure on the committee. Richard, Tom, and James all offered to assist with cataloging and crosswalking to the extent that each is able.

New Action Item 4: James will email EAC regarding further steps for the cataloging and image files.

Mike, Katie, and James all departed at about 10:10. After a 15-minute break, the committee reassembled for one final piece of business. To thank Richard for his many years of outstanding EAC service, both as member and Chair, the committee presented him with a few tokens of its appreciation.

Adjourn: 10:30 a.m.