Steering Committee Conference Call Summary

ASERL Collaborative Federal Depository Program
May 28, 2008; 3 p.m. EDT

ATTENDING:
David Vidor, Emory University
John Burger, ASERL
James Staub, Tennessee State Library and Archives
Laura Harper, University of Mississippi
Sandee McAninch, University of Kentucky
Valerie Glenn, University of Alabama
William Sudduth, University of South Carolina

1) Follow-up Comments/Reactions to GPO Study of Challenges to Regionals
The letter from the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) was very similar to the ASERL letter. Comments from the American Association of Law Librarians (AALL) were quite different. [see http://www.fdlp.gov/repository/regional-depositories/aall-letter/download.html]. AALL takes issue with the ASERL project's investigation of collection responsibilities that might cross state lines, and they disagree with ASERL’s description of the current FDLP regional network as overly redundant:

“In light of the Joint Committee on Printing’s decision on the proposed Kansas-Nebraska merger, we are very concerned about multi-state plans such as that being proposed by the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries (ASERL). This coalition of research and state libraries across ten southeastern states, from Virginia to Louisiana, works to develop successful inter-institutional resource sharing and other collaborative efforts. Their proposal for collaborative collection management partnerships across state lines for the regionals in these states raises very serious questions, however. We fail to see how it will improve public access particularly given the public’s need to have ready access to official and authentic federal documents. ASERL members
seem to also believe that the current network of regional depository libraries is overly redundant. We respectfully disagree. We believe that when GPO collects and compiles data from the regional libraries, you will find that the current system is working well.”

The AALL comment concludes:
“...We look forward to further discussions about how we can all work together to ease the burdens of the regionals that are having difficulty meeting their requirements, perhaps along the lines of the Indiana model or other shared housing agreements within the region. We do not support a model, such as that proposed by ASERL, for collaborative collection management partnerships across state lines. We are aware of efforts to seek a legislative fix to reduce the burdens on regional libraries. However, we are concerned about opening up Title 44 at this time, particularly when there is no consensus on what changes to the current structure would be acceptable and meet the goal of enhancing the public's access to federal government information.”

After discussion, Steering decided not to rebut the AALL letter at this time.

2) Scope/Wish List for Paratext Trial of FW Cataloging Data
Discussions with Paratext have gone well. ASERL staff will draft a document to describe scope of potential agreement for use of Paratext data in FW test bed project.

Previously the Committee agreed to exclude Y 3s from the recent survey of Regionals. Did we miss some FW docs that are classified as Y 3s? Univ. of Alabama only has agency arrangement, so they could not measure only the FW class. Univ. of South Carolina will provide their agency list and a report from Innovative for our review/consideration of the project’s scope.

3) Initial look at data from our collection profile survey
Steering discussed the compiled spreadsheet of ASERL Regional responses to our survey.

4) Confirm Date/Time for Next Conference Call
JUNE 25, 3 PM EDT

5) Anything Else?
ASERL Membership Meeting report: Feedback concentrated on Directors providing input to GPO. Directors appear pleased with the progress to date on FW/ED project.

Adjourned at 4 p.m. EDT.