ASERL Collaborative Federal Depository Program (CFDP)
Depositary Library Council Conference Luncheon Meeting
Pentagon Room, Doubletree by Hilton Hotel Washington DC - Crystal City
300 Army Navy Drive, Arlington, Virginia, 22202-2891
Tuesday, October 20th, Noon-1:30pm.

Attendees:

Bosman, Renee (University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill)  Johnson, Phyllis (University of Mary Washington)
Braunstein, Stephanie (Louisiana State University)          Kenly, Patricia (Georgia Tech)
Butler, Marcia (University of Mary Washington)             Kuyper-Rushing, Lois (Louisiana State University)
Canfield Wood, Jane (Pontificia Universidad Católica)      McAninch, Sandee (University of Kentucky)
Clark, Mary (Library of Virginia)                         McClain, Tasha (Louisiana State University)
Cole-Bennett, Cheryle (ASERL)                             McManus, Helen (George Mason University)
DeSoto, Abigail (Louisiana Tech)                           Montgomery, Darlene (George Mason University)
Dinsmore, Chelsea (University of Florida)                 Obenhaus, Bruce (Virginia Tech)
Durant, David (East Carolina University)                  Pritchett, Carla (Tulane University)
Eckert, Betsy (University of Memphis)                     Pritchett, Hallie (University of GA)
Fischlschweiger, Tom (Broward County Library)             Rustomfram, Perveen (University of Memphis)
Gause, Rich (University of Central Florida)               Selby, Barbie (University of Virginia)
Guss, Samantha (University of Richmond)                   Sproles, Claudene (University of Louisville)
Harper, Laura (University of Mississippi)                 Sudduth, Bill (University of South Carolina), Chair CFDP Steering Committee
Hill, Wendy (Defense Technical Information Ctr)           Swanbeck, Jan (University of Florida)
Hutson, Doris (Louisiana State University)                Walker, Kevin (University of Alabama)
Ireland, Sonnet (University of New Orleans)               Weisbrod, Liza (Auburn University)
Johnson, Anna Marie (University of Louisville)            Yannarella, Phil (Northern Kentucky University)

Bill Sudduth, chair of the CFDP Steering Committee, called the meeting to order at 12:07pm. Welcoming comments were made and attendees introduced themselves.
Bill gave a brief overview of the CFDP program, noting that 2016 will mark the 10 year anniversary of what has become the Collaborative Federal Depository Program. The CFDP has grown from the 3 initial Centers of Excellence - the Works Progress Administration (University of Kentucky), the Panama Canal (University of Florida), and the Department of Education (University of South Carolina) – to encompass 38 COEs, covering 227 SuDoc classifications and five cabinet-level agencies. Of the 38 COEs, 27 are Selective Depositories and six are non-ASERL members. Publications from 13 federal agencies are being archived by a second Center of Excellence.

One of the most visible tools developed for the CFDP, the ASERL Documents Disposition Database, continues to be extremely popular and well used. In 2014-15, 312,567 documents were offered for adoption by FDLP libraries in the Southeast Region; 21,174 documents were claimed. Of these, 14,986 documents were within the scope of the library’s Center of Excellence collection.

As the CFDP closes in on this 10 year milestone, Bill explained that the feedback shared at the meeting will assist the CFDP Steering Committee and the FDLP Deans’ committee in taking stock of the program and what the ASERL government documents community envisions for the future. Has the CFDP reached maximum capacity of COEs in the Southeast, or might there be additional opportunities? Within the ASERL region or beyond? Bill emphasized the importance of hearing from each of the participants. Comments / ideas after the meeting are also welcome.

**Agenda:**
**Success stories - What has worked well?**

- Chelsea Dinsmore initiated the conversation by sharing their experience with the television series - *The History Detectives* – who contacted UF for their Panama Canal collection in an attempt to find provenance of a steam shovel located in Baltimore MD that was thought to have been involved in the building of the canal.

- Barbie Selby discussed the relationship she has developed with the Department of State. Her personal contact with the DOS raised awareness of the materials in her collection, such that they contacted her to help fill a request from a patron located in Poland seeking a repair manual for an armored tank.

- Mary Clark explained that she had joined the program fairly early, choosing the Board of Publication prior to NTIS as their COE. In building their collection, they have identified a non-depository series published by the Department of Commerce with international war partners. The Library of Virginia cataloged the series, making it available on OCLC Worldcat where it has received international attention.
• Stephanie Braunstein discussed their COE for the Army Corp of Engineers. By virtue of participating in the program, they have cataloged 8800 titles; including several fugitive documents, and contributed content to the Louisiana Digital Library.

• Tom Fischlschweiger from Broward County commented on the ASERL disposition database, noting that the database has made it much easier to process content - both needs and offers - for his understaffed unit. He explained that, prior to their registration in the database, they would process 2-5 documents a month, maybe 8-10 per year - and the database has allowed them to process up to 70 in a single month.

Challenges - What has proved difficult?
• Doris Hutson noted a challenge with the exported discard list in the ASERL Documents Disposition Database. When exporting a list of offers, the format is not included in the print out. Another participant commented that the format is included in the email alert that the Regional gets when their Selectives post a new discard - however that report does not show the comments (which is included in the discard export). In either case, neither report provides the complete picture. Jan Swanbeck and Cheryle Cole-Bennett will follow-up with the programmers at the University of Florida to see if a solution can be found.

• David Durant commented on the challenge of retrospective collection building for his COE for the House on Un-American Activities. Some documents are extremely difficult to locate and to acquire, and it can be difficult identifying very specific documents via the disposition process where the offered documents might be too broadly described.

• Rich Gause commented that he feels pressure to capture materials that are being discarded where no COE has been identified, to ensure a copy is retained before they are no longer available. He expressed concern that discsards are moving more quickly because of the database, much faster than ingests.

There was some discussion that Government Documents are in a transition between the tangible and the digital realm and that we risk losing materials before a COE can be established. Bill commented that the CFDP was focused on tangible, print collections, but digitization efforts are also encouraged. He asked the group if we should begin to think more digitally? Some attendees suggested that an organized digital effort might allow people to feel better about letting stuff go - offering a digital surrogate for hard-to-obtain or at-risk publications.

In discussing space concerns, Barbie Selby noted that Virginia has established a selective housing agreement to relocate some of their Regional FDLP collection to one of their Selectives. The materials are clearly stamped with “depository copy” to help ensure retention commitments are followed.

Impediments – what is preventing depositories from joining as a Center of Excellence?
• Most common impediments were available space and resources, and many express the fear of making a commitment when a change in library administration could easily force them to withdraw from the program.

• It was noted that some of the smaller libraries in the program continue to use typewriters and are struggling to just maintain existing collections let alone consider expanding collections. Also, some libraries are choosing to go all-digital and dismantling print collections altogether.

• Shipping costs for supporting offers/discards can be daunting to some libraries.

• The requirement in the MOU to create a master list of all titles for the COE is a scary prospect as a library envisions the amount of time/energy it would involve. This task can be perceived to be too onerous to take on. At the same time, being a COE allows you to be proactive on behalf of your collections. It was suggested to change the wording for this requirement to indicate that the master list involves a collection building process and the list is created incrementally as items are discovered.

• There was some concern with funding for digitization being a detriment. Bill reiterated a point from the earlier conversation that while the CFDP does not require digitization, it is encouraged.

Next steps?
• Existing COE participants encouraged their colleagues to consider participating on a very small scale – identify one small step they could do that might move the program forward without a huge commitment of space, time and resources.

• Some “small step” suggestions included
  o If taking on an agency as a COE is too great of a commitment, maybe the library could offer to pay one-time shipping charges.
  o Serve as a second COE for part of an agency that is held by a larger institution – partnering to help cover the content of an agency.

• The group asked Cheryle if any efforts have been made to expand the program beyond the ASERL region to identify interested partners. ASERL has reached out to member organizations similar to ASERL, but did not receive much interest. Cheryle noted that the lack of participation by other organizations shouldn’t be seen as little interest in the government documents program overall, but rather each group has to determine priority programs among many options and limited resources. It is possible the environment could change as government documents coordinators work with their deans/directors to raise awareness of the program.
• It was suggested that if ASERL is unable to get participation among an entire association/consortium, might we look for individual volunteers, opening up the CFDP to individual depository libraries outside the region? Cheryle cautioned that this could create conflicts with the retention periods built into the Disposition Database. At what point would the out-of-region depository have access to materials being offered - within the initial 6 week period, or once the regional review has been completed? And if we extend the 6 week period to accommodate out-of-region depositories, does the extension pose a hardship for libraries seeking to discard in a timely manner? She noted that these are not unsurmountable conflicts, just something that would need to be addressed. There might also be an ability to expand use of the Disposition Database beyond the Southeast, being built on an open source platform could facilitate its adoption on a broader scale.

• Cheryle asked participants for suggestions on ways to improve communication and information sharing within the region. She reminded the group of the various ASERL lists that can be used to generate discussion (Regionals, Selectives, COE, etc.) noting that the Selectives list does not include every Selective in the ASERL region by default – each person/library must subscribe to the list. She offered to distribute the list of Selectives listserv subscribers to the Regionals so they can promote the lists to those not currently subscribed.