Fall 2009 FDL Regional Meeting Washington, D.C. – October 20, 2009

Dan Barkley (NM), Chair of REGIL, called the meeting to order, welcomed those present and initiated round robin introductions.

Minutes of the Spring 2009 Regional meeting were approved.

- 1. Announcements (Barkley):
 - Ithaka S+R consultants were thanked for the balanced geographic distribution of regionals surveyed in the report http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/documents-for-a-digital-democracy.pdf.
 - Barkley queried regionals regarding institutional budget conditions. Most indicated budget challenges. Peggy Jobe (CO) announced that UC-Boulder is hiring a staff position as liaison to govpubs dept.
 - Ann Sander (MI) noted that regional web information to a large extent needs to be off State
 Library of Michigan servers by Nov. 1st. She will send notification when all documents have been
 moved.
- Suzanne Ebanues (GPO) Superseded Guidelines Update:
 http://www.fdlp.gov/component/docman/doc_download/1114-guidelines-for-depository-libraries-superseding-depository-publications
 - The Guidelines have been revised as the result of discussions during past regional meetings and represents a best practices approach to superseding materials. There has been no change to supersession criteria rather it prompts questions to consider when applying criteria. No updates to the current Superseded List will occur after the Guidelines' revision has been approved, although it will remain accessible for reference purposes only. Regionals will continue to be the primary contact for interpretation of the Guidelines. The next step will be to post the revision on the FDLP Desktop for community comment.
- 3. Stephanie Braunstein (LA) asked for clarification regarding regional retention requirements for items designated by "R" and the Regionals' Supersede Lists http://www.lib.uiowa.edu/govpubs/supersede.html of additional retention commitments as agreed to by regionals. Cindy Etkin (GPO) stated that selectives may discard "R" items and that the List had served as examples only. Discussion ensued. Ann Sanders pointed out additional agreement lists and clarified that selectives may receive "courtesy" retention requests from their regional. It was the understanding of most regionals that "R" designation implied a mandate to retain while GPO staff indicated that the there has never been a legal requirement to retain those items. David Cismowski (CA) pointed out that titles with the "R" designation are of significant research value. Robin Haun-Mohamed (GPO) recommended waiting to change local policy until GPO verifies the interpretation of the "R" designation. Dan B. asked if the Regional Supersede Lists should be maintained or rely solely on Superseded Guidelines? Discussion followed. Issues raised included the importance of individual institution needs over sanctioned lists; significant revision is needed; reducing the number of copies nationally is desirable while maintaining integrity of individual

institutional research needs. Questions asked: Should superseded material be digitized? Should lists be combined? Beth Rowe (NC) will investigate how closely aligned the two list are.

- 4. Cindy Etkin Action items ("low hanging fruit") from regional libraries study http://www.fdlp.gov/home/repository/doc_download/564-regional-depository-libraries-in-the-21st-century-a-preliminary-assessment.:
 - It was noted that outcomes between operational issues vs. strategic plans differ and that another working group will/should look at future Program models. Actionable items include 1) tangible items 2) training opportunities 3) serving libraries without regional libraries 4) cataloging for union list 5) online catalog reflecting libraries' holdings 6) improve item selection process 7) develop propriety for digitization efforts 9) improve digital deposit in libraries. Discussion followed regarding cataloging issues. It was noted that many OCLC records are available; an inventory is needed for every piece although the number of uncataloged depository publications is unknown. Jennie Burroughs (MT) asked how best to make cataloging go faster? Jan Swanbeck (FL) suggested sharing experiences with cataloging. A call for volunteers to form working groups (strategic or operational) will be posted on Regional-L. Cindy E. will look at items in the budget request and prioritize need; some actionable items discussed may fall within budget priorities. GPO welcomed regional input on needs.
- 5. Kirsten Clark (MN), Geoff Swindells (IL-Northwestern) C IC documents Google digitization project: Questions were invited regarding the pilot program to partner with Google to digitize 85,000 pieces originating from Minnesota. Parameters for the project are similar to Google Book project including size requirements with the ultimate goal to digitize the complete FDLP collection. Materials in the pilot are duplicates. Other CIC libraries are working in consultation with Regionals. The plan is not yet publicly available, but has been sent to CIC Directors. Google's pick list determines what gets digitized first getting although the first wave includes processing as many cataloged publications as possible, then digitizing uncataloged materials although the indeterminate size of the final collection is acknowledged. Bill Sudduth (SC) questioned the meaning of "duplicates" and "completeness" and expressed concern regarding the unknowing of the Terms of Agreement. CIC Task Force is grappling with these concepts. Also acknowledged is the need to develop a mechanism to determine what has been digitized in the Hathi Trust. It was noted that this project may impact other projects (ASERL) and a comparison of digitization projects may help determine "completeness". Issues involving serial versus monographic titles were raised.
- 6. John Phillips (OK), Dan B.: TRAIL (Technical Report Archive and Image Library) gaps: The technical reports group is looking at digitizing additional technical reports series. About 1 million pages have been digitized. However, gaps exist in the inventory of technical reports and the group is seeking additional sources to complete the series'. Gaps in collections are known internally. Overlapping projects are a concern. Examples are on TRAIL site: http://digicoll.manoa.hawaii.edu/techreports/, a collaboration of GWLA and CRL.

- 7. Bill S. and Valerie Glenn (AL): ASERL IMLS grant award:

 The ASERL grant, awarded in Sept. 2009, was described. The grant's goal is to create collections of excellence as a model for completeness on a small scale by targeting specific agencies and classes. Levels of complication include multiple formats. The project will involve cataloging U. Kentucky's collection of WPA materials and compare with other ASERL libraries to measure completeness. Paratext comparison with libraries inventory will be measured against bibliographic databases including piece level in series. Carmen Orth-Alfie (KS) noted that she is using Proquest with its noted limitations. Kathy Brazee asked about staff expertise and knowledge of collection to determine expertise. Bill expects to broaden the pool of expertise by involvement in collections of excellence. The ASERL Steering Committee plans to develop an MOU for expectations.
- 8. David C., Gwen Sinclair (HI), Ann S.: Plenary session on Disposal Process vs. N&O process: Comments on the plenary session were solicited. An important take-away from the session was that it is not the regional's responsibility to collect retrospectively prior to the time they became a regional (1962)—there is no legal requirement. Cindy and Robin noted that supplement the collection is not required, but rather to replace and maintain depository resources particularly the most often used and most relevant to the region, then build collection as best as possible. Each regional collection will reflect different needs. It was recommended that Council address this issue.

Two new members of REGIL are Gwen Sinclair (HI) and Peggy Jobie (CO) (terms through 2012) to replace Dan B. and Jennie B.

Respectfully Submitted, Marianne Mason University of Iowa