



Oversight Team Meeting Notes

1:30pm, Sunday April 3, 2011

Crowne Plaza Riverwalk, Executive Salon 5

DLC Conference

Attendees:

Cheryle Cole-Bennett, ASERL
Chelsea Dinsmore, University of Florida
Santee McAninch, University of Kentucky
Bill Sudduth, University of South Carolina

1. Year 1, Lessons learned.

a. University of Kentucky

How to protect only copy? If we say we'll protect a copy, how do we do this? UK is going the 2nd copy route. Will be doing this until a 2nd COE is found or volunteers. They may be building that 2nd collection along the way. (Raised question whether Bill should be keeping 2nd copies – or digitizing a second copy?)

Do we have a place for all these digital things that we are building – how are we going to store and manage this collection?

Difficult to create the “things we don't own” list. Looking through Paratext, Worldcat, Monthly Catalog (though this isn't easy because there is a limit of 500 item searches). ProQuest may be of help with this.

For items that have not yet been cataloged in OCLC or Paratext and don't have SuDoc #s. How do we get SuDoc #s? Send surrogate to GPO and they create one?

Could really use a copy of the old state cutter tables. Issue with older materials and availability of full cataloging information. Need to make a partnership with GPO so they will allow library to create SuDoc numbers. Will we allow library to add records to the database without SuDocs? If no SuDoc can you not use a stem level SuDoc without the cutter. Can also use LC/Dewey call numbers (not all items housed in Docs). There may be an issue with this depending on if/when/how we plan to tie in with the FL Disposition database – the SuDoc number is a required field in that system.

Time spent searching for this type of information is on top of other job duties, plus time needed to manage the collection over all. Staff training and turn-over is a continuous issue.

b. University of South Carolina

New COEs that have accepted to collect for agencies will be surprised at how much they don't have and how much work it will take to inventory, catalog and acquire. Thinking that you have everything (or most everything) and seeing that you don't. Identifying, cataloging, barcoding, are lengthy processes. This will vary by agency, format, age and size of collection. Thought that post 1976 agencies will be easy isn't always the case – particularly due to the various formats in which documents were released.

What are we willing to substitute for? Is the electronic version the lendable copy? Multiple versions of the same piece – are they different things or are they just multiple copies of the same thing? Is it object or content? Content is where we started.

New COEs need to fully understand their obligation and we need to hear their interpretation of their responsibility. For example, UGA and their selecting the format of maps. For example, will they collect loose sheet, tear-outs that accompany other publications, pamphlets? How to define the parameter of the collection? Suggestion to start with SuDoc stem assigned to maps – or to start with a pilot, maybe War Department, old series or new series?

Same issue relates to those who choose a subject – what parameters are you going to collect so others can stop building a collection in that area.

In cataloging the EDs, Bill was surprised to find quite a bit of material that was on the shelf but not in the catalog. The universe of the collection keeps expanding.

c. University of Florida

Also echoes Bill's comments on the assessment of the volume of time and work involved.

Need to pay attention to the metrics and the measureables of the grant.

Need to have someone working on this project that is a cataloger. Multi-departmental project – not just a Gov Docs project, involves people from across the organization as a whole.

Doing presentations about the program is helpful – having to explain the program to others helps you understand what is left to be done.

2. Grant review – budget/timeline expectations:

a. Budget –

Bill and Sandee were provided financial statements for their programs.

Both are in compliance with budget expectations, though it should be noted that UK is well above their expected level of contribution to date. We have not been collecting UF contribution (other than Steering Committee) but Chelsea has a rough estimate of time should this be needed in the future. UF joined the project after the grant had been awarded, as such their contribution is not specifically identified in the grant budget (again, other than as members of the Steering Committee).

b. Timeline expectations -

Sandee asked that I send a list of the grant measurables back out to the Steering Committee for review at our next meeting – may have lost track or may not be recording everything we are supposed to be measuring.

The question was asked, going forward – how are we to measure the COEs who are coming on board? Does the implementation plan handle assessment?

Sandee is loading items records into excel then using MarcEdit to prepare for cataloging but there is no specific date as to when this will take place with Nancy leaving. Hope to compare the Monthly Catalog to local catalog and to Paratext. Her GA is doing some citation searches but that is a means for trying to identify fugitive items and is a long-term, ongoing process.

Discussion of ProQuest product – electronic version of Monthly Catalog – expensive at \$30,000 but good resource. Though, it was noted that some of the early 1900-1920 materials (when there was no SuDoc #) have been left out.

Bill will be sending an update of his records for the database in May. He will do a complete load. Chelsea will send an update on when they may do a load of records for both Education and WPA. A request will also be made at the ASERL Regionals luncheon for volunteers to contribute additional records. An email request has been sent to libraries that had indicated an interest in being a COE (or had already signed the MOU) also making a plea for records.

UK and UF are done with their inventories. Bill is still working his way through the fiche (they are about 40% through an inventory list after 2 months working on it. Hopes to be finished by the end of the summer.

Chelsea mentioned increased visibility of the PCZ collection due to the publicity of the program and sited a PBS series – History Detectives – who contacted them for assistance with a Panama Canal story they were researching.

3. Gap Analysis Methodologies/Best Practices/Checklist:

Bill and Chelsea provided draft copies for review. In discussing the processes, we chose to merge the three into a single document rather than working on them individually due to the amount of overlap and coordination required between them. After the Team review, Bill and Chelsea agreed to have a draft ready to share with the Steering Committee at the April 27th meeting.

The Team felt it was important that the best practices documentation be shared with the Deans/Directors so they fully understand what they are agreeing to as COEs.

The submission of records to the database without an inventory was briefly discussed. It was agreed that changing the requirement for contributed records having a bib record rather than an item record was helpful because if the library has not barcoded the full collection, some materials would have no item records, where they would have bib records – this will help enhance visibility and potential for discovery of fugitive items.

Bill indicated that in preparing for the grant there had been a survey that asked about cataloging practices and suggested that it was time to review that document and possibly run the survey again. This will be added to the agenda for discussion at the next Steering Committee.

The Database Fields document needs to be updated to reflect the addition of the 583 subfields 3, l, l, and x. It was also suggested that we have a listing of the agency abbreviations (WPA, ED, PCZ) posted on the website. This information is needed in contributing records and is currently not easily identifiable. The COE list was recommended as the best source for this information.

4. Disposition list:

This topic was not discussed in any great detail due to time limitations. The primary concerns are the confusion of the disposition process as it relates to the grant project – and that items will be discarded prematurely and more quickly due to ease of use.

Concerns:

The grant project is intended to test a model for managing FDLP collections while the Dean's Task Force implementation plan (based on this model) is moving forward at the same time – there is a concern that this is creating confusion between the two.

As expressed earlier, there is concern that the UF disposition database is premature in its roll-out to the Depository community. There are a large number of unassigned Agencies. The success achieved by the streamlined disposition process may jeopardize the ability to build complete, comprehensive collections for the Agencies yet to be assigned.

The Oversight Team indicated the need to address the Chair vacancy on the Steering Committee. They asked that this be put on the agenda for discussion at the next meeting. They recommend that the Chair position not be filled by one of the existing COE libraries so as to remain more neutral to the grant.

Ideas:

Enhanced supporting documentation – scan the cutter tables and post on the website. Chelsea may be able to digitize and load (will check on this). Help build a resource list of hard to find cataloging tools/resources (such as the tables) or encourage members to use the listserv to post and/or ask for help with locating similar resources.

Need for another summit? Maybe a program that walks through the COE process – inventorying the collection, locating and acquiring materials, cataloging, building the “titles we don't own” list, adding records to the database, etc.. Also another opportunity to educate Deans/Directors on the process.

Might be helpful to have a graphic of some sort to show the percentage of agencies that have not yet been assigned. There are still a lot of un-claimed agencies – if we continue to assign through volunteering in a piecemeal fashion, there is much concern that we may never get all agencies assigned. Maybe a COE needs to be responsible for the full cabinet agencies as well as their subagencies?

It was suggested that a quarterly meeting of COEs is needed. Maybe the first week in August? It was suggested that we could provide the checklist/gap/best practices documentation early in May, have the COEs read/complete the documentation and then have the meeting in August to address concerns/open issues.

Action items:

- Best practices recommendation for protecting the only copy of an item? 2nd copies or digitizing a second copy?
- Storage and management of digital collections long-term?
- How to obtain missing SuDoc #s?
- Best practices recommendation regarding multiple versions of the same piece. Is it object or content?
- List of the grant measurables sent to the Steering Committee
- Does the implementation plan handle assessment of COEs?
- Draft of Gap Analysis/Cataloging/Checklist prior to the April 27th meeting
- Cataloging practices survey?
- The Database Fields document updated to reflect the addition of the 583 subfields 3, l, l, and x.
- Listing of the agency abbreviations (WPA, ED, PCZ) posted on the website.
- Address the Chair vacancy on the Steering Committee, next meeting April 27th.
- What would you like to see done about the concerns with the disposition list and/or implementation plan as well as possible next steps regarding the ideas section?