



ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEASTERN RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Steering Committee Meeting
Washington D.C.
Monday, October 18th, 2010

Attending:

Mary Clark, Library of Virginia
Cheryle Cole-Bennett, ASERL
Chelsea Dinsmore, University of Florida
David Durant, East Carolina University
Valerie Glenn, University of Alabama, program chair
Laura Harper, University of Mississippi
Sandee McAninch, University of Kentucky
Judith Russell, University of Florida
Bill Sudduth, University of South Carolina

Agenda:

1. As the November conference call falls on the day before Thanksgiving and the December call falls near Christmas, both calls have been cancelled and a replacement call will be scheduled for early December (Doodle poll forthcoming). Discussion of the 583 field (condition) will be on the agenda.
2. Master List: discuss process for development of and to recruit volunteers for, Best Practices documentation for MOU.
 - a. Cheryle will coordinate a list of volunteers — to collect the names of interested participants and their topic of interest. A call for volunteers to participate in the drafting of the Best Practices document will be announced at the Regionals lunch Tuesday 10-19 and announced on the ASERL Regionals/Selectives listservs.
 - b. Supporting documentation for formatting/exporting of records from various ILS systems will be the responsibility of the first library to submit records for that system. To date we have:
 - i. Aleph—Chelsea Dinsmore
 - ii. Voyager—Sandee McAninch/Nancy Lewis
 - iii. III/Millennium —Bill SudduthNote: David Durant will provide documentation for the use of Symphony (Sirsi/Dynix) when contributing records in the future.
 - c. Chelsea will act as the lead and liaison for cataloging practices—draft to be ready for December phone call. It was suggested that prompt cataloging of items acquired from disposition lists should be included in the best practices cataloging documentation.
 - d. LibGuides/Finding guides will be produced by Bill, Sandee and Chelsea for their agencies. Each will create boiler-plate language/layout formats that can serve as templates for future COEs. The guides will be ready by mid to late November.
3. Parking Lot: Discussion covered general feeling of comments and whether consensus was strong enough to form a recommendation for the ASERL Deans. Items were discussed in the following order.

1438 West Peachtree Street NW / Suite 200 / Atlanta, GA 30309-2955
TELEPHONE 404.592.4830 **TOLL FREE** 800.999.8558 **FAX** 404.892.7879
www.aserl.org

- a. Who pays for shipping? General agreement seemed to be that up to the point where the cost to add an institution to the billing system was met— generally quoted at \$25-\$40, it made more sense for the sending party to pay and then after that point the two parties could negotiate. *Based on a review of the discussions, the committee's recommendation to the Deans: Each shipment costing less than \$50 should be covered by the sending institution; shipments costing more than \$50 should be negotiated between the sending and receiving institution.* [Editor's note: adding a vendor to the system only costs \$25-\$40 once, after that, they are in the system. If a number of transactions are anticipated, that might also trigger negotiations.]
- b. Explore digitization models to facilitate digitization efforts. Valerie will be posing this as a question rather than a debate. There is no recommendation at this point.
- c. Number of days items should be listed on the Needs & Offers lists. *Based on a review of the discussions, the committee's recommendation to the Deans: Items should be listed for 45 days as long as all institutions can view the list from the beginning and with the hope that a kind of pre-marking by selectives is available. It is also suggested that a 6-month trial be done and then this decision be reviewed.*
- d. How to Handle ILL requests: David is sending this discussion out on the boards immediately after DLC. The points of discussion were confirmed as covering efforts to reduce fees charged for out-of-state requests which ties into the suggestion that institutions digitize ILL requests when possible, rather than send out their material and risk the integrity of their collection. No recommendation at this time.
- e. What are the differences between a "Center of Excellence" and a "Comprehensive Collection?" After much discussion it was decided that it was a "difference without distinction." However it seems to have derived from an effort to introduce a second tier of members who collect without agreeing to catalog. It may have originally come from language in the Deans proposal. *The committee recommends that the Deans remove the Comprehensive Collection language from their report and use Center of Excellence instead. Also, it was generally agreed that without some sort of plan to catalog, an institution cannot claim COE status. Institutions selecting agencies should be asked to provide a provisional time line for cataloging. It does not have to be a quick timeline—just an indication of intent.*
- f. Who is responsible for long-term implementation/oversight of the Deans proposal? After a great deal of discussion it was agreed that the Dean's Task Force will most likely continue to play a role and that a steering committee of some sort will be needed. The Steering Committee is likely to be made from a combination of regional and selective document coordinators.
- g. Microfiche: This topic has generated an enormous amount of discussion. In light of the various policies across the region is it the *recommendation of the committee that discards of microfiche be listed/posted as aggregates by stem, regardless of the number of fiche or whether the fiche are dual-distribution or fall into other categories. An aggregate listing must include the SuDoc stem, the number of fiche or a measurement in inches (or feet). Where reasonable, a date span is requested, but not required.*

The meeting adjourned at 9:00pm.