



association for literary
& linguistic computing

Founded 1973 UK registered charity number 2799

Association for Literary and Linguistic Computing Committee

Agenda and Minutes of Committee meeting, April 2000

Committee Meeting of the Association for Literary and Linguistic Computing held at King's College London on Saturday 29 April 2000 at 9:45am

Present: Harold Short (Chair), Jean Anderson (Treasurer), Lisa Lena Opas-Hänninen (Secretary), Lou Burnard, Elisabeth Burr, Marilyn Deegan, Paul Fortier, Laszlo Hunyadi, Espen Ore, Thomas Rommel, Antonio Zampolli

1. Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from John Dawson, David Holmes, David Robey and Michael Sperberg-McQueen.

2. Minutes and matters arising

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted as an accurate record of the meeting. There were some matters arising from the minutes.

(i) With respect to the Association archives (7), the Chair reported that the materials from Cambridge have arrived at King's College. The College Archivist at King's has begun to prepare a programme for attending to the archiving of all materials.

(ii) With respect to the new Thematic Network proposal (9), the Chair reported that a proposal had been put forward but was not accepted and it will now be reworked to include a follow-up to ACO*Hum. He also reported that some research proposals are being considered.

(iii) With respect to ELTA (9), the Chair reported that the discussion group has not been very active, but that various individuals were continuing to work in this area and to submit funding applications.

(iv) With respect to OHC and AHRB (9), the Chair reported that the proposal had been unsuccessful.

3. Finances

The Treasurer reported that the Association now has a total of around £70,000 in bank and building society accounts. She proposed and it was agreed that we seek the advice of a chartered accountant on the placement of the money for the best possible profit.

4. Journal

Marilyn Deegan reported on the journal. Unsolicited paper submissions are increasing and some special issues have been planned. There seems to be some lack of referees and it was agreed that the Editors will build a database of referees to which Committee members can suggest names; this database can then also be used for conference purposes. There is now a searchable archive of abstracts and table of contents and the editors are planning trials to produce one full journal in electronic format with various experiments to see how it would all work.

Fiona Tweedie is resigning as book reviews editor. The Committee would like to thank her for a job very well done and will look for a way to acknowledge her services. We will now begin a process for her replacement. Since there have not been many software reviews recently and with new developments in mind, it was agreed that the duties of the software editor should be combined with the book reviews editor into simply a Reviews Editor. The Committee agreed to look for someone suitable and then possibly to negotiate terms with said person.

Marilyn Deegan continued by reporting on the idea of regional editors for the journal. She noted that the Editors had contacted various people and now have a list of regional editors for a number of regions. However, some regions are as yet not covered. She also outlined some ideas for how to deal with regional editors and noted that we must produce guidelines for the said regional editors, so that their role is quite clear to both parties. The Committee agreed that this was a good idea.

The meeting was adjourned for a break at 11.00 and reconvened at 11.35.

5. Membership and publicity

The website was discussed. The Secretary had looked at the website and produced a list of shortcomings which were discussed. It was agreed that the Secretary would get in touch with honorary members asking for the missing information (pictures and biographies) for each one. It was agreed that the section 'reports, meetings and minutes' needs to be brought up to date. It was agreed that the past conferences need to be brought up to date. We should also produce guidelines for conference organizers regarding what we would like to have up on the conference websites (as a minimum) and what we would then like the organizers to provide us with in order for the Association to maintain some information re past conferences on its own website. It was also agreed that the bursary award winners should be publicized on the website. The Committee agreed that we need new sections on the website for each new activity, eg workshops, project funding and the postgraduate competition. It was also agreed that we need to establish a new section for the Busa award, including background and rules and information on the award winners. Finally, it was noted that the 'Officers and committee members' section of the website was not up to date. It was agreed that everyone must check their own information and provide the

Secretary with any missing or changed information.

Regarding membership, it was agreed that Marilyn Deegan would talk to OUP about acquiring an updated list of members at regular intervals; it would be most helpful if this could be provided in electronic form. The Committee also agreed that a flyer should be produced and a draft outline of what might be included in it (produced by Lisa Lena Opas-Hänninen and Thomas Rommel) was circulated.

6. Honorary members

The Treasurer had received a list from OUP of the Association's 'Honorary members' and queried it. It emerged that this in fact was a list of those persons receiving a complimentary copy of the journal and not the honorary members. It was noted that some honorary members had not received the journal although they were on said list, but this was due to the list being somewhat out of date regarding addresses. The list must be updated and this was entrusted to Marilyn Deegan, who will ask OUP to do so.

7. Conference bursaries

It was noted that there had been 11 applicants for bursaries for the 2000 conference in Glasgow and all five of the available awards will be given.

8. Conference 2000

Paul Fortier reported that the Programme committee and the Local organising committee have things quite well under control. There were 100 submissions and 60 papers were accepted. Jean Anderson suggested that we develop an ALLC review mechanism to run on the ALLC server, which should then be used by all subsequent conference organizers. Glasgow were offered the Brown mechanism but were not able to run it on their system.

Paul Fortier Reported to the Committee that his work as Programme Chair has been very easy since Jean Anderson and her team have worked very efficiently and always on time. He also noted that papers for publication should be submitted by the end of the conference. Finally, he suggested that posters should perhaps be reviewed in future, since they are becoming increasingly popular and in many fields are considered to be as important as papers. It would also be in the presenters' interests to have them reviewed. This issue should be discussed in Glasgow.

Finally, Jean Anderson gave the Committee an update on the conference arrangements.

9. Formal Association documentation

The Chair noted that the Constitution of the Association was written quite some time ago and perhaps should be revised in some ways, in particular with regard

to the aims of the Association. It was agreed that Lou Burnard and Antonio Zampolli would come to the Glasgow conference with a proposal for revisions to the Constitution.

Regarding the conference protocol, the Chair noted two things:

(i) It is a matter of agreement between the two associations that in those years when the conference is in Europe a selection of papers are published in L&LC and in the years when it is in North America a selection is published in Chum. This agreement post-dates the formal ratification of the current protocol, which has a 'placeholder' statement to the effect that the procedures for publication of conference proceedings is to be incorporated later. Since the currently agreed arrangements appear to be working satisfactorily, it would be appropriate to incorporate them formally into the protocol. It was agreed that a proposal for an additional paragraph to the protocol should be presented in Glasgow to the ALLC Committee and to the ACH Council for inclusion in the protocol.

(ii) There is provision in the protocol for 3 special sessions, one to be organized by each of the two associations and the local organizers. The protocol also says that these should be submitted as any other presentation and go through the reviewing process. However, the custom has been to organize these later, after the papers have been accepted and we have seen what the scope is. Perhaps this should be reflected in the protocol. These sessions should then be subject to the approval of the Programme committee. It was agreed that a proposal to change the protocol to this effect would be put forward at Glasgow.

10. TEI update

Antonio Zampolli reported on the state of the TEI Consortium and its foundation. The Consortium requested an additional transitional year and the Committee agreed to it.

11. ACO*Hum and humanities education

ALLC is increasingly involved in ACO*Hum, many of the Committee members being very closely involved indeed. However, the ALLC could also be involved in new suggestions for accrediting courses and training and will continue to cooperate with ACO*Hum.

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 13.15 and reconvened at 14.15.

12. Funding initiatives

The Chair outlined the general issues involved in funding initiatives and suggested a format for proceeding in the discussion. It was agreed that after general principles have been discussed the work will be distributed among different members of the Committee.

13. Workshop programme

The Chair outlined the general principles of what had been agreed earlier, including the fact that we would spend between £2000-2500 per workshop. We

need to produce some framework and guidelines for the programme.

14. Special projects fund

The Committee has discussed earlier the possibility of having some money available for special purposes, up to £5000. We need a review process and an application process. Perhaps past Officers and/or Committee members could serve as reviewers. There should probably also be an annual deadline for applications. Perhaps this should be intended as seed money for applicants to get on enough to be able to apply elsewhere for further funding.

15. Postgraduate competition

The Committee has discussed the possibility for a postgraduate competition earlier. The idea was to advertise for postgraduates to submit a paper and the prize would be cash and/or publication and/or attendance at the conference. The sum of £500 was mentioned.

A general discussion on all the funding initiatives ensued and it was agreed to divide the work as follows:

- (i) Espen, Marilyn and Lisa Lena will write up a general outline of workshops, something for local organizers and how to apply for a workshop.
- (ii) Harold will write up something on the special projects fund.
- (iii) Lou, Stuart and Jean will write up something on the graduate prize scheme.
- (iv) Thomas will deal with the flyer, but we will turn to a professional who will do the layout and design.

The next Committee meeting will be on Friday, July 21, at 2 pm. We will then decide on the next mid-year Committee meeting.

16. Any other business

There was no other business. The meeting closed at 3.30 pm.

