

# 2005 10 28 TLA/GODORT Annual Meeting

University of the South, Sewanee, TN

## ***Table of Contents and Briefs***

<b>Attendees.....</b>	<b>2</b>
19 members from 10 institutions attended	
<b>Acronyms and Oddities Used Below .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Handouts and Links.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>[09:45] Depository Library Council Summary of Meetings and “Visioning” – Reports from Tennessee’s DLC Attendees .....</b>	<b>4</b>
The attendees described the Council’s visioning process and noted several opportunities and stumbling blocks that will lie along the way. Attendees paid special attention to 1. GPO's misguided efforts to complete a massive retrospective digitization effort at the expense of fulfilling their duties in retrospective cataloging, 2. Bruce James' cavalier assertion that the time to re-evaluate Title 44 might be near, 3. the continuing quandary posed by GPO's business orientation, and 4. "Franklin," the GPO ILS/OPAC/National Bibliography.	
<b>[10:30] Tennessee's FDLP Visioning .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Adding Value - Expertise.....</b>	<b>6</b>
Saundra Williams offered to host a wiki on the University of Memphis Libraries Web servers. This software will provide an online space that will allow Tennessee's documents library staff to create project registries, collection registries, and registries of expertise	
<b>Non-Exclusive Environment.....</b>	<b>7</b>
Attendees discussed the incentives for our libraries to continue FDLP participation given that many of the GPO's online services now need not be delivered to patrons through libraries.	
<b>Managing Collections and Delivering Content.....</b>	<b>8</b>
Attendees discussed the feasibility of distributed digital deposit as a preservation strategy. The University of Tennessee Libraries is participating in the LOCKSS-DOCS pilot exploring this possibility.	
<b>Deploying Expertise.....</b>	<b>9</b>
Attendees focused on inspections and other methods that ensure quality of service to patrons.	
<b>[13:45] Recent Initiatives and Projects in Our Libraries.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>[14:25] Item Selection .....</b>	<b>13</b>
Attendees discussed GPO's proposed changes to the depository selection mechanism. Saundra Williams collected the expressed ideas and delivered a letter to GPO the week following this meeting.	
<b>[14:40] State Government Information – Status of Electronic State Government Information in Tennessee .....</b>	<b>13</b>
In a Web publishing environment, it is becoming increasingly difficult for the Tennessee State Library and Archives to effectively capture all state publications. Attendees discussed a recent meeting of TLA/GODORT, TSLA, and the State Documents Advisory Board which proposed concrete steps toward ensuring permanent public access to state documents. Several attendees committed to helping identify fugitive state documents on the Web.	
<b>[15:45] TLA/GODORT Business.....</b>	<b>16</b>
Prospective TLA Presentation .....	16
Minutes .....	16
Fall TLA/GODORT Meetings.....	16

## ***Attendees***

MB: Miriam Barrett, Nashville Public Library  
PB: Patrick Barnes, Nashville Public Library  
BE: Betsy Eckert, University of Memphis  
KE: Kelly Ezell, Tennessee State Library and Archives  
MF: Mary Freilich, University of Memphis  
BH: Bob Huguenin, University of Tennessee, Knoxville  
KH: Kassie Hassler, Tennessee State Library and Archives  
FL: Felicia Lott, Tennessee State Library and Archives  
RL: Regina Lee, Tennessee Tech University, TLA/GODORT Vice-chair/Chair-elect  
EM: Ester McShepard, Fisk University  
JP: Janette Prescod, University of Tennessee, Knoxville  
SP: Stephen Patrick, East Tennessee State University, TLA/GODORT Chair  
JR: Jennifer Rydell, Chattanooga Hamilton County Bicentennial Library  
KR: Kevin Reynolds, ALA Legislation, Government Information subcommittee chair,  
University of the South  
LR: Larry Romans, Vanderbilt University  
RR: Randy Raper, Tennessee Tech University  
JS: James Staub, Tennessee State Library and Archives, TLA/GODORT  
Secretary/Treasurer  
ASM: Amy Stewart-Mailhiot, Vanderbilt University  
SW: Saundra Williams, University of Memphis

## ***Acronyms and Oddities Used Below***

**\*: Asterisks indicate action items. Responsible parties are listed next to action items.**

ARL: Association of Research Libraries  
BAGELS: Big AGgregations of ELeCtronic Stuff, best served with LOCKSS  
BJ: Bruce James, Public Printer  
DLC: Depository Library Council  
FDLP: Federal Depository Library Program  
Franklin: the ILS/OPAC/National Bibliography set to be revealed to the world any day now.  
GPO: Government Printing Office  
ILS: Integrated Library System  
JCP: Joint Committee on Printing  
JCR: Judith (“Judy”) C. Russell  
LOCKSS: Lots of Copies Keep Stuff Safe, a software suite developed at Stanford  
National Bibliography: online replacement for the previous publication “Monthly Catalog” that should fulfill one of GPO’s primary statutory responsibilities.  
NLM: National Libraries of Medicine  
OPAC: Online Public Access Catalog  
PoD: Print on Demand  
ROI: Return on investment  
TMI: Too much information

## **Handouts and Links**

- TLA GODORT FALL MEETING, 28 October 2005, AGENDA. 1p.
- [TLA GODORT Meeting Minutes, October 8, 2004](#). 5pp.
- [TLA GODORT Meeting Minutes, April 8, 2005](#). 2pp.

### **Depository Library Council Fall 2005 Meeting documents:**

- [Depository Library Council Meeting Update October 2005](#). 12pp.
- [The Federal Government Information Environment of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Towards a Vision Statement and Plan of Action for Federal Depository Libraries. Discussion Paper](#). 19pp.
- [DLC Vision Outline and Discussion Paper](#) [the blog]. 5pp.
- Council Briefing Topic: Authentication. 4pp. [[Earlier Spring 2005 version](#) available online]
- Future Digital System (FDSys) Update. 2pp. [[Accompanying PowerPoint presentation](#) available online]
- [Library Voice of User Survey for the Future Digital System](#). 4pp.
- [FGI comments on DLC vision](#): freegovinfo.info. 1p.

### **Depository Selection documents:**

- [Depository Selection: History and Current Practice](#). 3pp.
- [Depository Selection Mechanisms: New Model for the Selection of Online Titles](#). 3pp.
- [Depository Selection Mechanisms: New Model for Selection of Tangible Publications](#). 4pp.
- [GODORT letter to Judith C. Russell](#) re: Depository Selection Mechanisms. 1p.

### **Preservation strategies for born-digital government information:**

- 2005 08 26 TSLA / TLA-GODORT / State Documents Advisory Board. 6pp.
- [GODORT Program Committee 2005 Annual Conference Program Announcement: Born Digital, Dead Tomorrow...](#) 2pp.
- [Illinois State Library: Capturing E-Publications \(CEP\)...](#) 2pp.
- [Illinois State Library: Preserving E-Publications \(PEP\)...](#) 2pp.
- [Preserving Electronic Publications](#). 2pp.
- [An Arizona Model for Web Preservation and Access. Draft v3a](#). 8pp.

### **Committee on Legislation documents:**

- Committee on Legislation Fall Retreat, October 2005: Access to Government Information. 2pp.
- Committee on Legislation Fall Retreat, October 2005: ALA Legislative Issues for the 109<sup>th</sup> Congress... 4pp.
- Committee on Legislation Fall Retreat, October 2005: Instructions on Using the Legislative Action Center. 2pp.
- Save the Date! 32<sup>nd</sup> Annual Library Legislative Day, Monday & Tuesday May 1 & 2, 2006. 1p.
- Bookmark these ALA Web Site [sic]. 1p.

### ***[09:45] Depository Library Council Summary of Meetings and “Visioning” – Reports from Tennessee’s DLC Attendees***

The delegation from Tennessee included Miriam Barrett, Stephen Patrick, Kevin Reynolds, James Staub, and Saudra Williams. The attendees described the Council’s visioning process and noted several opportunities and stumbling blocks that will lie along the way.

SW: These are challenging times for the FDLP and for libraries. In the non-exclusive environment the public wants to go to the web and agencies want to publish there. The public wants to be self-sufficient, and libraries tend to be their last resort when seeking information.

GPO’s massive digitization program should take a very long time to complete.

The DLC Visioning statement had three possibilities in the non-exclusive environment [[statement](#)] [[blog](#)] – fold, status quo, and proactive.

The idea of light and dark archives continues to be muddled and unrealized. The University of Indiana library has sought information about becoming a light archives, and has received no direction from the community or GPO.

[Title 44](#) was discussed by the Public Printer – that it might be time to re-evaluate the law, and that the community needs to decide where we go.

We are changing how we are providing information in this new environment.

KR: I think GPO’s priorities are out of line when they are placed with the legacy digitization effort. They should instead be focusing on the born-digital docs that are disappearing, rather than duplicating the digitization efforts of Google and the Open Content Alliance.

Regardless, the JCP has to approve any new movement in this direction. It might not be in their best interest to go forward with the retrospective digitization project.

Regarding light archives, there was some discussion of “ultra-light” archives. In this emerging vision, even a place like Sewanee could participate by collecting everything from a particular, small agency.

Regarding [Title 44](#), as BJ usually does, he made it sound as if Congress would pass whatever he brought them. Even though he implied the legislation might be ready to go “as early as this spring,” we should be aware that Congress can be a little tougher than BJ expects.

JP: It can be hard to put into words where all the puzzle pieces go.

GPO has not been approved by JPC to do retrospective digitization. GPO has the money and charge to do the retrospective cataloging, which we need more than digitized materials.

Each of us needs to look at our user group and decide where we need to go with our service. There is no doubt that the number of our walk-in users is down.

SP: Depository libraries are often the consort of last resort to our patrons. When reference cannot answer the question, they send the patron to government documents.

ETSU's catalogers are not creating records for the pre-1976 collection. Neither is GPO. Yet [Title 44](#) declares that we must provide access to these materials. We need the pre-1976 cataloging records placed in Franklin in order to provide appropriate service to our patrons.

KR: GPO is pushing hard to perform their own retrospective digitization so they can sell the resulting products. What does that mean for public access? Will there be tiered service to the public for these products? This is a serious concern. BJ has a background in business, and that's the direction of his leadership.

JS: I'm trying to crystallize my personal vision for the FDLP. Right now, two functions for the FDLP are apparent to me. We should serve as the GPO watchdog and ensure they continue to provide equitable access to government information. The FDLP should also serve – within their libraries and to the rest of the world – as a model of information distribution standing in contrast to a market of commodities.

KR: JCR is very careful using and repeating the statement “in depository libraries” when referring to no-fee, unrestricted public access to government information. Is she carving out the non-commodity arena for government information and limiting it to libraries? Is this dangerous?

JP: Which of the three DLC visions [[fold, status quo, proactive](#)] are we going to choose? What can we afford?

JS, JP, and others describe [LOCKSS-Docs](#) and its possible place dealing with pushed content in the electronic FDLP.

SW: ROI – how do we convince directors that we receive an adequate return on investment from participating in the FDLP? Training...

## Franklin

“[Franklin](#)” is the name given to GPO's soon-to-be-publicly-released ILS/OPAC/National Bibliography. It is an installation of Ex Libris' Aleph product.

MB: Franklin can show accurate current item selection, but not past item selection.

JP: Franklin doesn't get the number sort entirely right for SuDoc numbers.

SP: Typos in some records lead to strange results, e.g., improperly entered SuDocs numbers lead to apparent mis-sorts.

SW: GPO must not have historic item selection profiles for the depository libraries, otherwise MARCIVE could've gotten their record loads right from the get-go 😊

## **[10:30] Tennessee's FDLP Visioning**

KR: What do we want to come away with today?

JP: We should look at the state as a whole – the regional, the selectives, and how we're going to work together. What's the most important thing we can do for the state of Tennessee? Especially in the digital environment, what's the most important thing we can do?

JS: We should provide a report to council on what we're thinking and talking about.

KR: What order should our report to council follow?

SW SP: The order according to the DLC breakout topics: Adding Value – Expertise, Non-Exclusive environment, Managing collections and delivering content, Deploying Expertise.

### **Adding Value - Expertise**

[Some examples of concrete actions from the [DLC slides](#)]

Creating a registry of referrals

Online chat reference

Exceptional service to public

Fugitive Documents

Exploiting others' expertise – google et al.

[Other possibilities]

SW: Mentoring

MF: Cross-training

SW: Registry of projects

ASM: GPO was going to take on responsibility for maintaining a registry of projects, but ultimately backed out.

SW: We need to be concerned with the sustainability of projects – what, for example, will happen to the University of Michigan government documents projects when Grace York retires?

KR was able to display the DLC blog on Adding Value on the screen, complete with comments.

JP: The responsibility of each depository is to add value.

SP: If you don't want to do the work [i.e., adding value to your FDLP collection], then go away!

KR: Tennessee documents staff already maintain knowledge within the state of which institutions and individuals house what expertise.

ASM: I think we all do a lot of this within Tennessee, but it would be helpful to know where to go for, say, Arizona's expertise.

SW: There was also a lot of DLC talk about getting our expertise onto Google, e.g., promoting their [Uncle Sam search](#) to their front page.

JS: This proposal sounds to me as hopeful as BJ walking into Congress with proposed legislation that instantly gets passed.

KR: What will privatization of government information – googlizing – mean for the delivery of government information?

### **wiki**

SW: It would be a good idea to build a wiki.

JP: It is really neat that anyone can go in and edit wiki pages for everyone's benefit.

ASM: Who's going to do this work?

SW: We mentioned your name ☺

SW: The registries should be very familiar to the documents world – they would be much like the old government locators.

KR: Sewanee set up a wiki using tiki – it is very simple. Our installation provides headlines to the DuPont library front page.

SW: I am serious about developing a wiki. We could promote our institutions' collections.

LR: The wiki should start with TN, and then possibly broaden to other states with time.

\*SW will look into getting a wiki installed at U Memphis. For starters it will just be accessible by the depository library community.

Phase I (two weeks): put it somewhere. Check with U Memphis and send out a call for other hosts.

Phase II: Train folks on adding and editing the wiki content.

Phase III: (ongoing) Develop content for the wiki.

### **Non-Exclusive Environment**

[Some examples of concrete actions from the [DLC slides](#)]

Foster collaboration and communication between digital collections

Develop talking points that prove our worth

Create customizable interfaces to government information

SW: This reminds me of the “carrots” discussion from several years ago. The way I remember it, we concluded that there are no real carrots to entice new institutions to take on the FDLP or to entice the deserters to stay. \$300 for PoD is not a real incentive.

SW: Yale would want to quit the FDLP in order to keep the public out.

SP: Whereas most institutions would state that we're going to do it because we traditionally have done it.

SW: Many institutions would also claim that it fits their community missions.

KR: Interestingly, the DLC report-back from the Law Libraries breakout session apparently was not what they thought they said during the breakout sessions.

MW: Will future FDLP services really be free? This is an important public library question – e.g., when the costs of printing are passed on to the user, is the FDLP really free?

KH: If patrons have to print out a large document... the FDLP becomes a restrictive environment.

LR: Current carrots include DLC meetings and the Interagency Seminar. Attendees get to find out what's going on and discover models for adding value.

LR: Administrative Notes is another worthwhile carrot.

SW: These are the carrots we take for granted ☺

KR: It is a stretch for some people to be able to attend the training sessions and DLC meetings.

KH, LR: Still, others who do get to attend are able to communicate information and ideas back to the locals and not-so-locals through reports.

MB: Another carrot: Some databases are only available to FDLP libraries

LR: [JS missed this comment]

SP: The incentives we have mentioned so far are incentives for the professionals, not incentives for the institutions. Directors don't have the connection that the government information folks have.

LR: No FDLP, no DLC. No DLC, then the GPO loses staff.

[BREAK]

## **Managing Collections and Delivering Content**

[Some examples of concrete actions from the DLC slides]

Digital deposit

Registry of digitization projects

Light archive trials

Collaboration on digitization projects

KR: Digital deposit: very important, very necessary.

There are different models for digital deposit, e.g., push vs. pull models. In "pull," libraries could pull electronic documents from GPO to a local digital collection as desired. "Push" models act much like the tangible distribution system and could conceivably be subscribed to by item selection profile.

Regardless of the model, it is imperative to preservation concerns to create multiple copies of digital government documents.

At the present date, there are no clearly defined parameters or cost for developing or participating in any of these systems.

Still, there is broad support for digital deposit and multiple copies. Storing the only copy with GPO is dangerous.

LR: Digital deposit should open the possibility of selecting specific titles or agencies.

KR: Digital deposit presents an opportunity for other smaller institutions, like Sewanee, to participate in FDLP/GPO initiatives. There are several good agency-fits for Sewanee's library, e.g., USGS.

KE: Will GPO help fund these depositories? Will these digital depositories involve offsite-storage? Will these digital depositories manage different file formats – PDF, TIFFs?

SP: Cataloging records – what overlaps amongst franklin/marcive/oclc? Where do you put your money and resources when you can't tell where you'll get the information that you need?

JP: GPO is pushing 3 titles to LOCKSS-Docs participants. UT is a participant.

SW: We are already 3-4 years too late capturing born-digital docs. We know where the legacy collection is and don't need to focus resources on saving it.

KE: Is there a real fear of federal information disappearing, as there is from state web sites?

SW: Sustainability is the key word for projects dealing with permanent public access.

JS: Contra-sustainability: We have models of passing responsibilities between institutions –e.g., the National Needs and Offers list, whose electronic version was initially hosted here at Sewanee – models of “non-sustainable sustainability.” There is some work that needs to get done regardless of whether we can ensure our individual institutions will maintain it in perpetuity.

ASM: Keeping a registry of digital collections is important to ensure we know where to go to find information.

SW: Depository vs. repository: GPO conversations have been with ARLs in the evolving regional agreements.

KR: Generally, ARL libraries are more receptive to GPO initiatives.

## Deploying Expertise

[Some examples of concrete actions from the [DLC slides](#)]

Nationwide chat service

Knowledgebase – similar to our nascent wiki

Clearinghouse

OAI compliant repositories

Expand education – interagency seminar

More marketing – better-displayed “ask a govt librarian,” make google's uncle sam more visible

Portals to government agencies ?

Advocacy – GPO and FDLs advocate for one another in a beautiful circle. Kumbaya is heard in the distance.

LR: The FDLP inspections and suggested computer requirements got Vanderbilt terminals upgraded to meet the standards when otherwise they wouldn't have been – but most of this regulatory power has disappeared, and our depositories suffer.

SW: There will be no more depository library inspections. The veritable replacement, the consultant program, had an initial study that failed in MI. KY, NC, and TN have a plan turned in, but the funding to realize that plan doesn't exist yet. Regardless, the current sense is it looks like they would hire neophyte librarians – new to libraries and new to Government Documents – and this will not forge an effective consultant program.

MB: In the new electronic depository library manual, there are not sticks to force following the guidelines.

SW: Miriam wouldn't be sitting with us if we never had inspections 😊

SW: Are we happy about the loss of inspections?

LR: Some measures of inspections were arbitrary, e.g., map cabinet problem leading to double-failure.

### ***[13:45] Recent Initiatives and Projects in Our Libraries***

#### **Govtinfo.org**

U Memphis and TSLA are participants in the online reference pilot available to users at <http://govtinfo.org>

SW: There is a tremendous amount of state government questions.

KH: The Illinois State Library uses prominent link to the service on their site, which users may confuse with their local online reference service, branded as it is with an undefined acronym.

JS: The statistics I have seen indicate that about 1000 questions have been answered to date this calendar year.

#### **Chattanooga Hamilton County Bicentennial Library**

JR: We are enduring an ongoing budget crisis. The doors are still open and we are not firing folks, though. The library Director has seen the visioning paper and is curious about the outcome.

The library is applying to be a passport agency. Our regional, the New Orleans office, got hit by Katrina, though, and we are not sure where application process lies now. When providing this passport service, your institution gets to keep quite a bit of the money. UTC called about their Monthly Catalog holdings; they are looking to discard their collection from 1950 on. JR communicated the existence of doctech-I and govdoc-I and the importance of not just throwing the stuff away.

#### **East Tennessee State University**

SP: No news to report.

#### **Fisk University**

EM: EM began working with FDL collection in 1997 and was pulled off for other assignment. EM was re-assigned as librarian to the FDLP collection in the recent past. Fisk is a 38% selective. We are looking to supply access to online documents.

#### **Nashville Public Library**

MB: No new news in Nashville.

PB: We are seeing less paper, more electronic titles.

MB: Has everyone seen that there is not a commensurate increase of electronic catalog records to replace the declining records for tangible items?

KR: John Stevenson has documented this, and passed around a handout at ALA Annual.

JP: We should be seeing map tubes again in the near future.

KR: There's been a lot of shifting at GPO, esp. through cataloging, of staff contingent on budget matters. This is hearsay.

### **Tennessee State Library and Archives**

JS: Jeanne Sugg has been appointed as the new State Librarian and Archivist. Meredith Haddock has been appointed Assistant State Librarian and Archivist for Administration. We are discarding "Deep Six" – a collection of 150 linear feet of FDLP materials separated from the collection for discard before the emergence of a regional library in Tennessee. Prepare for the offers lists!

### **Tennessee Tech**

RL: TN Tech still asking: Where is all this going?

Staff might move the maps and micro cabinets to make way for as many as 250 work stations.

### **University of Memphis**

MF: In 2003 NLM offered grants to deal with electronic medical information with a focus on senior citizens' user groups. When using library computers, senior citizens will look for medical information a vast majority of the time. NLM wants to make sure they are getting good information. A grant was awarded to Tennessee, focusing on MedLine Plus. The grant provided hardware, software, instruction, web design, and publicity. Efforts were focused on senior citizen centers in Memphis, with the Lewis center as the grant flagship institution.

The execution of the grant provided a fun experience. Each session consisted of 8-10 seniors in asking about a variety of medical conditions. Their focus tended to center on common ailments like high cholesterol levels and hypertension, with the occasional excursion into viagra.

Now that the grant has completed, NLM is looking to expand this service.

Please use and evaluate the Web site at < <http://library.utmem.edu/webhealth/> >.

Public libraries should find this resource to be especially helpful.

[Swag was passed out. Pens and pillboxes.]

The question of TMI: tons of information was winnowed down to the most essential links for the target community.

Some of the community, namely males, had used computers before at work and had little problem adjusting. Others had to be trained on mouse use. NLM pushing the use of authoritative information, and the audiences were receptive.

### **University of Tennessee, Knoxville**

JP: The Documents/Microforms section is merging with other sections to form an information commons on the library 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. The library closed the Reserves section in the fall and is currently closing the Periodicals section, which is moving into the former Documents/Microforms space.

The entire Documents/Microforms collection is moving into storage.

A number of digital collections have effectively replaced the use copies of the research microform collection. The library has discontinued microform backups of journals. We are discarding most of our collections' microcards.

These are drastic changes that will come at the first of the year.

We have decreased the documents staff by two.

UTK was 80% selective, but now we are weeding that high selective rate down – we were told to move to as many digital materials as possible. We will not wait for new item selection system to complete this process; instead, we will cut all paper items.

UTK never received congressional materials in paper.

We have gotten many other titles through direct order, duplicating the FDLP items.

We are moving reference-like FDLP documents into the reference area.

We do not yet know how we will continue the technical services aspects of the Documents/Microforms section. These functions could move to Technical Services, or perhaps some Periodicals staff might be reassigned.

The libraries will not be shipping JP anywhere – the administration appears to still want to maintain a government documents specialist.

The Next Big Step: diminish the map collection so that it fits in Hodges. Travis Dolence left his position as head of the Maps library over the summer. Eric Arnold still runs the operation, reporting to JP. JP is not sure whether a replacement hiring will be made for the map library. There is the possibility of combining frequently used maps with data services, which would require hiring more data/GIS librarians. The digitization of TN topographical maps has moved forward – ask Eric where the files live.

Regarding UT obligations in the pre-1989 regional shared holdings agreement: the Ag-Vet library which houses the A's is not going anywhere, so A is safe. The TD collection will be shared in an arrangement with KY.

We are also discarding our tangible Serial Set – TSLA and others can fill in their missing volumes

LOCKSS – UT is a partner for LOCKSS (journals) and LOCKSS-Docs!!!

### **University of the South, Sewanee**

KR: not much happening with the documents collection at the University of the South.

There is an upcoming move of all tangible materials off the first floor and up to compact shelving – providing students with an information commons on the first floor. There are multiple possible organization merger models. Will we remain FDLP? Right now, this is being left to KR's discretion, which means "Yes."

### **Vanderbilt University**

ASM: Government Documents is merging with microforms. As a result, we are weeding and sending the appropriate discards to TSLA.

LR: We migrated web materials from static HTML pages to a database as long as 1 ½ years ago. Public policy pages were transferred 1 year ago. The efficiency of providing accurate access has been greatly increased – when a change needs to be made to a URL for a resource, one need only change a single item in the database to have that change effected on multiple pages throughout the Web site. But it was time-consuming to move the data over from HTML files to the database. Data entry was completed mostly by students.

ASM: Our library IT department built the database structure.

LR: library it doesn't trust us to make changes to our materials – headers and footers for web pages.

JP and ASM will deliver a presentation at the TASL conference in Knoxville!

### **[14:25] Item Selection**

Background: The GPO has proposed changes in the Depository Selection Mechanisms. GPO has released three documents concerning these changes and has asked for comments.

JS: likes Alaska's state government documents' group's motion to create a state item selection.

SW: has not seen how thick the item list is after GPO's completed its process of number weeding – we have not seen this delivered in the box yet.

KR: GODORT response to GPO was delivered yesterday and is available online.

KR: The GPO selection tiers seem complicated for both electronic and tangible items. What we want and have called for in the past are broken-out items that are more specific, more granular.

SW, JP: It is hard to comment without seeing the process right in front of you.

LR: Let GPO and GODORT know that we have met and that we have ideas...

SW: But we do not know how they broke the items out.

LR: We can assume, however, that their breakout is not what we want 😊

JR: We did all the work to break out item numbers – and now there is movement to conglomerate more titles under single item numbers

\*SW collecting ideas and composing a document of response [This letter was exchanged amongst TLA GODORT members over TNGOVDOL and delivered to the GPO 2005 10 31 –JS]

LR: There is a problem with OCLC holdings – most institutions are not attached to most of the records representing their actual holdings. Also, policies for ILL are varied.

SW: Each institution can decide the parameters it places on collection use.

LR: ILL restrictions on usage – e.g., only in the library...

SW: ILL restrictions should depend on the particular publication. Vanderbilt probably has valuable documents that would require restrictive ILL treatment. Perhaps it would be safe to do librarian-to-librarian loans in these cases.

### **[14:40] State Government Information – Status of Electronic State Government Information in Tennessee**

KR: TLA-GODORT / TSLA / State Documents Advisory Board had a meeting on 2005 08 26 to discuss the current state of preserving Web-based Tennessee State documents and collaborative efforts to carry this mission forward. We came away with big plans and little steps to build small successes.

SP: The ideas discussed spilled over from our TLA-GODORT conversations here for the past couple years. We spent a lot of time discussing fugitive Tennessee state documents. Our earlier state plan focused on electronic documents. It behooves us to look at the same issues we are dealing with on the federal level. E.g., Training: lots of folks do not know what is out there, especially in public libraries. If we are moving toward more models of combined “information commons”es, we need to make sure that state documents have their place. The depository system on the state level has never worked equitably in Tennessee. We really need to make sure that we are capturing the state web sites, which

is hard since the state cannot even decide on their main URL – tennessee.gov, state.tn.us, tennesseeanytme.whatever? The ALA GODORT program in Chicago focused on state government information – several models are out there, and they're all dealing with the same problems.

BUT Tennessee differs from most states in that it does not have a clearinghouse structure for the depository system. We have lost much of the Sundquist administration's Web-posted stuff with the change to Governor Bredesen's administration. It will have to be a cooperative/collaborative effort of all of us to get this job done. We cannot depend wholly on the state library.

At the meeting, we discussed the possibility of using the *List of Publications* to build a super state documents database.

No group has ever created a list of core state documents – things every library in the state should have access to.

KE: In 1999, TSLA received 2K+ paper titles, 2004 saw 10% of that. *Rules and Regulations* is now delivered on CD. Supreme Court / AG opinions are delivered through the Web. TSLA is actively capturing opinions and filming them.

[Describes history of human capture process.]

[In 2000, a discussion concerning the definition of "Publications" that would have explicitly included electronic Web publications in the definition was opened, but not considered by the legislature. –JS]

For state documents, there are specific tangible formats TSLA does not collect – posters, guidebooks, etc.

TSLA has been experimenting with software to aid with the identification and capture of Web-posted state documents. Several of the software options are no-fee, open source packages, e.g., Greenstone. Greenstone works great, however metadata entry is time-consuming.

TSLA staffperson Sue Maszaros is enrolled in an MLS program and, as a class assignment, will prepare an NHPRC grant application on collecting and preserving electronic documents.

KE: requests notifications for located fugitive Tennessee documents.

JP: Can we write a collaborative grant? UTK does not have the staff to accomplish this, either

\*JS: will work with JP on the nuts and bolts of a grant and setting up a system for tracking fugitive documents.

KR: no reason to limit electronic publication deposit to the Tennessee Depository Libraries. Electronic document preservation is a very serious problem that I would be willing to devote resources to.

KE: It is going to take everybody working together.

JS: As long as we do not call the emerging electronic deposit system the “state depository system” and somehow violate the Tennessee Code regulating publications deposit.

SW: With electronic publications and their local storage, we face the problem of authenticity.

KE: Will a disclaimer on locally stored electronic documents suffice?

KR: GPO’s authenticity solution – merely establishing the document hasn’t been changed in the period that the GPO has held it – is not sufficient to guarantee authenticity.

MF: How often are agency sites visited for new or altered publications?

KE: Most agency sites are visited 3 times per quarter; some sites, like those hosting court opinions, are visited once a week.

ASM: can JS create a form for identified fugitive documents?

\*JS work on that [We will be testing Greenstone for the identification and capture of documents in the near future –JS 2005 11 17]

\*SW will ask Dean Ford for commitment of resources to handle chosen state agencies.

KE: Our ultimate goal should be a functioning electronic depository.

KE: Getting there will involve considerations of hardware, software, staff and time.

KR: asks interested parties to volunteer to handle a couple agencies apiece.

\*KE: records commitments

SP: Use my list of agencies, created with the Blue Book, Appointments, Official Compilation and xxx. . In his compilation of agencies, SP emailed agencies without web pages – and got their responses!

\*KE: I will add others agencies to this list as necessary.

\*KE will email a list of TSLA’s “keeper” formats – e.g., including annual reports and not including letterhead examples

KE: discusses selection of certain types of materials

KR, SW: Discarding certain guidebooks currently not maintained by TSLA’s policy is probably not a good thing.

\*JS will provide examples of discarded materials. If this issue needs to be revisited wholly, or if individual format choices should be re-evaluated, so be it.

KE: Are universities archiving their own publications?

JP: UTK: yes

SP: ETSU: yes

SW: UM: when we get them – it’s much like the state ☺

\*KE will email key information needed for fugitive docs. Then interested parties divvy them up.

\*KE collected commitments to identify documents on the Web and will share them with the group

MF: Shall we prioritize the agencies?

SW: How do we know we've found a fugitive?

\*JS will begin rapid application development. Give us a week. We will start with a restructure Kelly's record of downloads.

### ***[15:45] TLA/GODORT Business***

#### **Prospective TLA Presentation**

SP: State docs – we have got to have deans and directors in the room during the TLA/GODORT presentation so they learn the value of taking action now to preserve this material..

SW: The presentation should sell that this information and its preservation pertains to all libraries – electronic access means that there are over 1600 effective state documents libraries

JS: “Vanishing Volunteers” would probably not be a good title...

LR: The disappearance of state documents is a problem for us, the documents library staffers. Selling others on its importance is difficult. SW's suggestion might be a good sell. How do you find the gems amongst all the other stuff? There is a lot of wonderful material there. We use the Department of Health stuff a lot. But it is not easy to find. The URLs are not consistent from year to year. Focus, though, on what you can get. A Tennessee Documents 101.

\*KR: will follow up with Katrina Stierholz from Federal Reserve Bank who offered to do a presentation.

#### **Minutes**

**Motion passed to approve minutes from TLA GODORT meetings on 2004 08 and 2005 04.**

#### **Fall TLA/GODORT Meetings**

LR: It is great that KR hosts and arranges this every year. It is a little much to also ask that he continue compose the agenda each year. I propose that chair-elect composes the program and KR agrees to host in future years.

KR: Attendance was down this year because 1. we did not have programs and 2. information was released slowly.

JS: seconded the proposal.

**Motion passed that KR will continue to host TLA GODORT's fall meeting at Sewanee and that the chair-elect will be responsible for composing the agenda.**

\*JS will email everyone a list of all urls discussed today.

\*JS will get TN registry of projects up and running on the wiki.