

2007 Florida Federal Depository Library Meeting 10:45-11:15 Session Minutes (DRAFT)

Cindy Etkin (Program Planning Specialist, Office of the Superintendent of Documents, GPO) was not available to host session. Session was hosted by Jan Swanbeck in Cindy's absence.

- Planned topics were mentioned briefly:
New FDLP Desktop: <http://www.fdlp.gov> (handout was provided)

Plans for pre-1976 cataloging: (handout was provided)

- Dean Judith Russell emphasized that Cindy is an excellent resource for specific issues and can be emailed for assistance at cetkin@gpo.gov. Dean Russell also indicated that she too is a good resource and will gladly assist when she can.
- The scale of the contract was inquired about. Some points of interest include:
 - Contract was rebid due to affordability.
 - Strategies:
 - Digitization of shelf lists to create “digital skeleton” record that could go into the catalog of government publications.
 - Cooperative cataloging/record harvesting.
- GPO is working with CIC (Committee on Institutional Cooperation) on cooperative cataloging <http://www.cic.uiuc.edu/>
- This project is a multi-year project with a minimum of three years dependant upon adequate funding.

- **State Plan**

History:

State plans go back to the early 80's. There is not one currently in place for Florida. It was the intent that State Libraries would lead the way in formulating a plan.

Where we are currently:

Topic has been brought in other meetings of similar nature in recent years to no avail. Feeling seems to be “if it's not broken why fix it”

Is there a need?

The intention is that a state plan would help regionals better fulfill their function as statewide coordinators. A need may be arising with current conversations regarding shared storage facilities, ASERL project, and other things that need a written/formal agreement beyond title 44. (handout was provide on how to develop a state plan)

Open discussion

- State Library of Michigan lists plans available by state at:
http://www.michigan.gov/hal/0,1607,7-160-17449_39356-132742--,00.html

- Benefits: Per Dean Russell, other states have found a plan to be helpful and have been a catalyst for focusing on the depository collections as a statewide asset for working out collaborative arrangements. While not a requirement, benefits may also include exploration of arising issues and management. Other advantages may include:
 - More coherent view statewide of federal documents collection, and a more orderly process of holdings
 - Distribution of materials (affordability, advantageous locale, etc)
 - Awareness created at institution due to authority signature/support required
 - Legacy collection

- Who approves plan?
All members involved, State Library, group as a whole, and all directors in the state and is then recorded with GPO.

- ASERL Proposal (Statement of objectives): Could we take their model and make applicable to our own state? Their model creates “Centers of Excellence” in different parts of the state according to geographical strategy and/or specialization.

- Discards: Is there a better system than what is done currently?

- Would virtual reference be included in plan?
This kind of thing could be included in the form of chat reference, but was pointed out that the response to this kind of service historically has been very low and burdensome. Another issue is that patrons often do not know that they are needing information from this kind of service as they come looking for information, not necessarily knowing they are needing a government document.

- Storage facility: Might use of a shared storage facility be a viable option for all selectives (not just SUL’s)?
 - Delivery options
 - Digitization vs. hard copy availability
 - Storage facility may contain some elements of state plan

- Time involved to cultivate state plan:
This process will take time to accomplish as there will need to be several drafts and discussions. The hope in this discussion is to gauge interest for volunteers to get the process started. More than likely this process will take years rather than months.

- Space Needs: All areas are running out of space and some have concerns about delivery.

Outcome: There doesn’t seem to be an interest in getting this process started at this time. Conversation will be re-visited at a later time.