Steering Committee Conference Call Notes
ASERL Collaborative Federal Depository Program
July 25, 2012 - 3:00pm EST

Attending:
Chelsea Dinsmore, University of Florida
Cheryle Cole-Bennett, ASERL
David Durant, East Carolina University
Mary Clark, Chair, Library of Virginia
Sandee McAninch, University of Kentucky
Stephanie Braunstein, Louisiana State University
Winston Harris, University of Florida (Guest)

AGENDA
1. Contributed records for the State Department
Cheryle Cole-Bennett gave a brief overview of the project as explained in an email from Judy Russell - the University of Florida is working on a proposal to compare available records from Vanderbilt University and the University of Virginia (both Centers of Excellence for State Department) with records from the Library of Virginia (selective with a fully cataloged federal documents collection) and the University of Florida. In addition, State Department records from Minnesota, Berkeley and Utah State will also be contributed with the hopes of identifying additional documents for the “comprehensive collection.” The library at the State Department may also provide records. Vanderbilt and UVA will use ASERL’s COE database to run gap analysis reports to complete the inventory of their physical holdings and create a needs list of missing print items to build two comprehensive collections of State Department documents. As Vandy and UVA conduct their inventory, they will supply any additional records for items they hold but not identified through the initial gap analysis, thereby improving the definition of the “comprehensive” collection for the State Department.

Records will also be contributed for State Department publications from LLMC, Internet Archive and HathiTrust to compare the available digital files with the print to see what portion of the print collection has already been digitized and generate a “needs list” for publications that still need to be digitized. This will also help identify the overlap among the three sets of digital files for this agency.

Steering Committee members briefly discussed the proposal. It was mentioned that the database will no longer be strictly an ASERL database – it will ultimately be the “universe” of records. These additional institutions that are contributing records are doing so to provide a more complete picture of a comprehensive collection – they are not expected to serve as a COE. It was also noted that access to some materials identified through these uploads may be limited. For example, HathiTrust may have membership limitations, whereas Internet Archive is open access.

2. Review of the ASERL COE Database
   • Sandee indicated the layout and functionality it is more elegant than the previous version. Chelsea Dinsmore found the upload process to be extremely easy and was pleased with how quickly she could load records, fix any errors and re-upload. Sandee agreed.
• Sandee reiterated her desire for an OCLC search or a SuDoc search feature. If a user is searching for a single record, that is the best way to retrieve it (particularly for fixing errors in the record or in updating the record). To prevent accidental deletes, it may be possible to associate this feature with the login – so that not everyone can go in and edit any record. Only the person who uploaded a particular record could edit it. Winston clarified that this is a possibility.
• Cheryle noted that with the ease in uploading, comes ease of choosing incorrect abbreviations or other errors. The database needs some way to define acceptable codes and to prevent the use of un-recognized data.
• Gap reports – Any known issues with functionality? Members agreed that it would be helpful if something would come up on-screen (an hour glass, for example) that would indicate that the program was responding to the request.
• An agency in the database could be associated with more than one stem or an item can be associated with more than one COE. How to handle items that fall into this category?
• Also issue with assigning filters – currently if there is a recognized agency abbreviation (according to http://libguides.ucsd.edu/content.php?pid=275227&sid=2289435) that is the one that is assigned. If there is no predefined abbreviation, the COE creates one. The first COE to choose the agency defines the abbreviation. Is that the best approach?
• Subject-based or topic-based COEs may need other, yet-to-be-determined ways to perform gap analysis since their items may not show up in without a way of defining more than one filter.
• It was suggested that possibly some sort of translation table can be incorporated to identify the SuDoc stems that are associated with a particular agency.
• Until a process is established for handling multiple agency filters, it would be helpful to have the agency filter added as a column in the conditions report – not currently present in the reports.
• Steering Committee members were asked to review the layout of the columns in the reports. Do the columns need to be re-sorted so that the most “relevant” fields are showing on screen without scrolling?
• Steering Committee members identified future enhancements to the database, and assigned a priority order for implementation:
  1. Ability to delete records, including an OCLC # search/ SuDoc search. It was suggested that a separate tab be added to the database for updating/fixing errors in records. This would include a search by OCLC # but display will only return items associated with the institution of the user login.
  2. Ability to insert agency abbreviation during upload
  3. An indicator that the database is responding to the request - an hourglass, etc.
  4. Add agency filter column to the Holdings Condition report (this feature is not included in any of the reports other than the item marc record. It might be helpful to just include the column in all reports)
  5. A method for allowing more than one agency filter to be applied – and searched.
  6. A method for blocking the upload of records with a non-standard OCLC symbol and/or a non-standard agency filter. Maybe some way of returning these as an error when the code entered does not match a list of acceptable codes?

Meeting adjourned at: 4:10pm

Next conference call is Wednesday, August 22, 2012 at 3:00pm EST