CEAL Plenary Chat Q&A (Insert response where applicable)		
Question	**Response from Greg**	**Response from Damon**
Strangely, one thing we found during the pandemic, is that two responses (sharing collections, and ebooks) currently are in opposite: ebooks legally cannot be shared. How to correct hat? I'd like to hear **Greg**'s comment concerning the question above.	Important observation, and great question. I like this observation about the digital resource space: "Two digital revolutions do in fact coexist, one enabling the technical locking down of access to and distribution of content, the other allowing the breakdown of these barriers. This double digital revolution can be seen in the recent history of libraries, as well as the wider domain of online information selling and sharing." – Matthew David, Sharing: Crime Against Capitalism (Polity, 2017). Licensed resources are gated/toll access by design, and our ability to get ILL rights for them will likely always be limited. This is why I believe in investing in OA publishing models, such as the TOME (Towads and Open Monograph) program - digital content we want access to needs to be born open, if you will.	
A general question: the Pandemic has boosted ebook purchase and usage in academic libraries which cost much more than its print equivalent, do you foreseen this trend will continue or might be swing back thereafter? What is your suggestion to keep the balance and use limit budge more effectively?	When it comes to digital monograph content, I would like to see much more investment in OA mongraph publishing models, rather than in toll access to licensed content. I do expect the trend to more resources going to digital content to continue - the question is, is it towards toll-access e-resources, or OA content? Each library will make different decisions on where to invest, but I am big proponent of supporting models that bring libraries and university presses together to publish OA content (eg. TOME, MIT Direct-to-Open)	
Staffing cut vs. material cut, you have to choose one. Which would you pick?	You can't have one without the other (staff/collections); any reduction in resourcing has to be made in regard to systems-wide effects/impacts	It depends on the context. In many libraries, it has been the culture to cut operations/staffing to protect the collections budgets. We are now is situations where there is not eenouh staff to do the work. If there is another big cut in my library, we will have to cut collections because operations/staffing are already too thin to do the necessary work.
For **Damon**: If the disfunction in the big package market is as big as you say, why do we then not cut these packages now?		This is a great question. As you know, our faculty and students rely on the content in these big packages, so canceling has to take those needs into consideration. For me, this issue is figuring out what we can do to alter the terms of engagement with the big publishers. We need to change the nature of our relationship with these publishers. The UC system has recently announced a publish and read deal with Elsevier that does this. The Big Ten schools are negotiating in similar ways with other large publishers. The hope is that the next generation of deals reset the terms that lead to open access as the norm and cost containment.

CEAL Plenary Chat Q&A (Insert response where applicable)		
Question	**Response from Greg**	**Response from Damon**
Question for **Greg**, what impact does the pandemic have on Post-colonial environment? Does it deepening the global knowledge inequality? What could area studies collections/libraries contribute to point out a new solution?	One of the most important opportunities for Area Studies librarians to actively contribute to a more equitable and healthy knowledge commons is to become more engaged with the push towards Open Science, Open Data, and Open Access. Specifically, I would love to see more Area Studies community members at COAR annual meetings - to give one example. Although I see advocating for responsible investments in print formats to be an important issue, at times I worry that the Area Studies community, broadly defined, focuses energy on this topic while missing opportunities to more robustly engage with organizations such as COAR and the movement to build an open knowledge ecosystem beyong print and analog formats. I am working to position CRL, as a home to Area Studies librarianship, to serve as a platform for the Area Studies community to become more engaged with open knowledge, open access initiatives (eg. COAR, TOME) https://www.coar-repositories.org/about-coar/; https://www.openmonographs.org/	
In your context of preserving marginalized voice vs marginal voice, how can we avoid conscious or unconscious censorship which is part of our duty of stewardship of being a librarian?	Intentionally designing processes to surface, course correct, and/or minimize the baleful effects of bias are essential. I have found that finding ways to make collection/curatorial decisions visible is helpful. For instance, creating forums for curators and staff (and others) to talk about what/why/how they are building collections, and getting feedback from others on what might be modfied, improved. A curator working in relative isolation without multiple feedback loops is a recipe for bias to thrive. Visibility and transparency is key.	