



ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEASTERN RESEARCH LIBRARIES

**ASERL Collaborative Federal Depository Program
Oversight Team Meeting Notes
August 3, 2010 - 1:30pm EST
Main Conference Room - LYRASIS Office, Atlanta**

ATTENDEES:

John Burger, ASERL
Cheryle Cole-Bennett, ASERL
Valerie Glenn, University of Alabama, Steering Committee Chair
Bill Sudduth, University of South Carolina (COE – Department of Education)
Chelsea Dinsmore, University of Florida (COE – Panama Canal Zone)
Sandee McAninch, University of Kentucky (COE – Works Project Administration)

AGENDA

1. Discussion of Challenges/Opportunities for the Project

Correct formatting of the MARC records for the Masterlist database has been an issue. We need to provide clearer instructions for the specific fields/subfields to be included in the record, how they are to be edited/formatted and the export process per specific ILS requirements.

Request to:

- a. Create a list of contributing libraries that will be posted on the CFDP Sharepoint page. The list will include the assigned holding code for the contributing library, a contact name, the contributing library's ILS, their COE status, and will identify the Federal Agency (or Agencies) for which records have been contributed. The information on the local ILS system will serve to provide a contact point should another library using the same ILS need help extracting/exporting records. (Note: This list has been created and posted to the CFDP Sharepoint page).
- b. Create and post tutorials for extracting MARC records using the various ILS systems. Initial contributing libraries will be asked to submit a brief tutorial on their process to be posted to the CFDP Sharepoint page. These will be updated as needed.
- c. Create and post a listing of the specific fields/subfields required by the Masterlist, including specific formatting requirements (Note: This has been posted to the CFDP Sharepoint page).

2. Review of contributed records in the CFDP Masterlist

Discussion of a method for reviewing Phase I records to determine if we are collecting the "right/best" data for generating the gap reports. A recommendation was made to solicit a working group from the Steering Committee to review the records and to make a recommendation for Steering Committee consideration. This issue will be addressed at the next Steering Committee conference call.

3. Expectations for frequency of loading/updating records in the CFDP Masterlist.

The team discussed the expectations for loading/updating of CFDP Masterlist records to determine if there was a need to establish a standard expectation. The consensus was that this would be left to the contributing library to determine.

4. Items needed to launch expert reference service.

Discussion regarding any outstanding issues for the COE's readiness to initiate subject-specific reference service to their collections on October 1. All COEs indicated they were ready, and have mechanisms in place for collecting use statistics (either automated or manual). Sandee also indicated that UK was building a WPA specific Libguide. Both Bill and Chelsea agreed to also prepare Libguides for their respective collections. A request was also made to collect use stats from these webpages.

The question was raised for clarification as to whether the expert Reference service is about the collection or the subject. Is our expectation that the COE will be required to ensure subject-specific expertise on staff or is the expertise focused on the collection/Agency? Consensus is that expertise would focus on the collection and access rather than requiring subject-specific expertise.

5. Marketing the Expert Reference Service.

Discussion regarding the best way to advertise the specialized reference service. The suggestion was made to ask Mary Clark to forward information to GIO (The Library of Virginia is the only Steering Cmte member that participates in the GIO program). It was also suggested to publicize the service via GovDocL and ALAConnect and in DttP (Documents to the People). A suggestion was made to also take advantage of conferences for promotion/education. Chelsea and Valerie are preparing a presentation proposal for the DLC Conference in October.

6. Process/procedure for filling gaps in collection – January goal of posting collection analysis process/procedures to the web. Also how to document the process for seeking/acquiring missing materials? General discussion, more input needed to make decisions about future actions.

7. Status of GPO agreements

Brief discussion on the UofF partnership agreement with GPO and the hope that we can append the CFDP program to that agreement. If not, it may be possible for Bill to initiate an agreement for the program. John has asked GPO staff about creating an agreement directly between ASERL and GPO – this would require a policy change and may take time.

8. Miscellaneous discussions

Regarding Partnership Agreements/Memorandum of Understanding - The MOU needs to address a contingency plan for a library that would need to withdraw as a COE. Need to address the issue of "archival copy" – what do we mean and in what context is it being used.

Regarding the Conditions report – This report feature needs work. What is it actually showing and what is the value of the information in 583, subfield a? Need more standardization for this report to be of any value. Sandee had sent a listing of UK's guidelines for use of this field and standardized language – we'll look at this again and determine if this can be adopted as our standard. The recommendation was made to add this standard as a requirement in the MOU.

9. Set a preliminary date for next meeting

Recommendation to schedule during the Spring DLC conference in April but date not finalized.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:30pm