

UC/Stanford Government Information Librarians Meeting

UC Berkeley

May 4, 2005, 10 am – 3:30 pm

Yvonne Wilson & Jim Church, Co-Chairs

Present: Jim Church, Cindi Wolff, Harrison Dekker, Susana Hinojosa (UCB), Alice Youmans, (Boalt Law Library), Mark Takaro (IGS), Kay Sundstrom (UCB Documents Technical Services), David Cismowski, Janet Coles (CSL), Yvonne Wilson, Kay Collins (UCI), Elizabeth Cowell, Joan Loftus (Stanford), Janet Martorana, Sherry DeDecker, Lucia Snowhill (UCSB), Megan Dreger, James Jacobs (UCSD), Jan Goldsmith, Kris Kasianovitz (UCLA), Patsy Inouye, Linda Kennedy, Marcia Meister, Kathy Stroud (UCD), Peg Durkin (UCD Law), Lynne Reasoner (UCR), Lucia Orlando (UCSC), Nancy Kushigian, Rosalie Lack (CDL)

Announcements

Yvonne and Jim reminded the group that there are two openings for the UC/S GILS Steering Committee: one Northern representative, one at-large member. Call for nominees ends May 31, terms begin September 1. (See <http://www.library.ucsb.edu/gils/gilscharge.html> for organization details.)

- ✓ **Action:** Let Yvonne or Jim know if you are interested in these positions.
- ✓ **Action:** Yvonne and Jim will update the GILS organizational information.

Round robin reports were circulated prior to the meeting. Cindi Wolff announced that she will be leaving UCB in May.

1. GPO's Strategic Plan

Linda Kennedy and Marcia Meister, UCD, summarized discussion at the Depository Library Conference in Albuquerque in April. Briefing documents provided to council are on the GPO web site: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/briefing_topics/index.html

Key topics:

- The Essential Titles Survey was flawed, as 40% of the titles on the selection list were dead. Susan Tulis, Ann Miller and Cindi Wolff will use Documents Data Miner to prepare a more accurate list; then the survey will be redone. They will focus on user needs and historical retention.
 - Cindi Wolff, UCB, said that GPO was told that congressional publications must be printed, which is the reason for them being added to the List.
 - There may be different essential lists for different types of libraries.
 - Linda emphasized that the Essential Titles list will not be large; the federal depository program will be primarily electronic, and we must prepare for this. 92% of the titles available for distribution are also electronic at this time.
- LC Subject Headings was the most requested title, but is expensive to print. GPO & LC are partnering on a digitized version to be supplied free to depository libraries.
- The Print on Demand (POD) proposal was shelved, as there was no consensus from libraries as to how to structure it, plus the titles would only have a shelf life of 30 years. David Cismowski, CSL, said the decision to shelve the proposal was due to feedback from Congress, whose members had been contacted by library organizations. Because of requests at this conference, GPO will reevaluate this.
- Look at the Implementation Plan, Chapter 6: Services
http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/IDPlan.pdf
Although incomplete, the future of the FDLP will be reflected in this chapter.

- Also discussed: revision of ID 71: Dissemination/distribution policy for the Federal Depository Library Program.
- The law librarians are especially concerned that print legal publications remain on the Essential Titles List, as electronic is not accepted by the courts. GPO is working on an authentication process, to begin with the bills for the 109th Congress.
- Notes from the Conference can be found at the freegovinfo site: <http://freegovinfo.info/>

Linda posed a question to the group: although the Essential Titles list has not been decided, what can UC do about collaborating on print?

2. SOPAG charge to UC/S GILS

Bernie Hurley, SOPAG Chair, sent a message to Cindy Shelton, CDC Chair, proposing that GILS be charged with analyzing the impact of the proposed changes to the FDLP on UC. As a result, Phyllis Mirsky, CDC, asked that we take advantage of so many of us meeting in Albuquerque to discuss this upcoming charge. The librarians at the Depository Library Conference did meet to discuss the issues and make recommendations.

Lucia Snowhill, UCSB, JSC member, said it is to our advantage to inform CDC and SOPAG on what we need to provide government information to our users. In our response, we should discuss state issues, what's changed, collection opportunities, if any, and what we need from them. We should form a small task force to work with CDC and Phyllis regarding a response to the charge. Cindi suggested that in our report we summarize concerns from other groups: ARL, ALA, and AALL.

The group decided we would like to expand the conversation to include other government publications besides federal and state. Options include providing regular updates to CDC or including recommendations in our Annual Report, due in August.

Action: A GILS subcommittee will outline the issues concerning the impact of the proposed changes to the FDLP on UC. The law librarians should be included in our discussions. A report will be written which will include recommendations on how to move forward, as well as plans to address the issues sequentially. A draft should be submitted by July 25 for incorporation into the GILS annual report. (Annual report is due Aug 1.)

3. Consortial purchase of Marcive records

Patsy Inouye, UCD, polled the group for interest on this. LSU initiated a program to send records to libraries based on item profile.

First step: what is everyone getting? What would you like to get?

The issue of separate vs. merged records was discussed. GPO is implementing their new ILS in June; libraries will be able to extract records from the new system, or GPO could push records based on item selection. If that happens, the Marcive records may not be necessary.

Action: Patsy will poll campuses, track the GPO ILS capabilities, and report back to the group.

4. Follow-up to Government Information Workshop

Linda and Kris Kasianovitz, UCLA, prepared a discussion outline for the group, to solicit recommendations based on concerns expressed at the workshop.

Preservation

The NDIIPP grant was discussed (National Digital Information Infrastructure Partnership Project, an LC project to harvest and preserve digital information. Several in the group are participants in this and met the previous day in Oakland. The curators will collaborate on selecting

government information to preserve, and use the govinfo list to communicate to the others. James Jacobs, as Chair of GODORT GITCO, is tracking non-federal digitization projects, and volunteered to help in tracking UC digital projects.

Action:

- ✓ Participate in the NDIIPP project to preserve government information
- ✓ Sherry DeDecker, UCSB, and James Jacobs, UCSD, will track existing digitization projects as well as UC projects, and link to them on the GILS web page.
- ✓ Address NDIIPP in the report to SOPAG.

Bibliographic Access

Action:

- ✓ Investigate purchase of Marcive records.
- ✓ Kris Kasianovitz and Sherry DeDecker will contact Ellen Meltzer re putting instructional guides on the CDL site.
- ✓ On local campuses, librarians, will look at enhancing guides, making them more visible, and sharing on the govinfo listserv. When enhancing, keep non government information librarians in mind.
- ✓ Pursue retrospective cataloging of government collections in libraries with CDC & SOPAG?

Collection Development

There is no formal liaison relationship between GILS and the business/econ and history bibliographers; should there be?

Action:

- ✓ Lucia will pursue assigning liaisons between relevant bibliographer groups, identifying overlapping subject areas.
- ✓ Fold this into the NDIIPP and SOPAG discussions

Training and Expertise

The GPO pilot project for digital reference was discussed. No UC is a member of this project.

UC is also conducting a pilot with evening live chat reference Sunday through Thursday. Digital reference is distributed among campuses. James Jacobs and Kris Kasianovitz are participating.

Action:

- ✓ James Jacobs and Kris Kasianovitz will send information on the UC pilot to the govinfo list.
- ✓ This pilot has revealed government information and documents that will assist in reference service. The information will be posted on the UC Gateway to Government Information website. See agenda item #8.

5. California State Library Report

Janet Coles reported on the *California Government Documents Conference*, which was held in March 2004, funded by an LSTA grant. It was conducted by OCLC and included California depository librarians and representatives from state agencies. Speakers presented the issues

surrounding digital government publications and their impact on the State Library's depository program. Based upon recommendations in the resulting report from OCLC, additional funding was requested for strategic planning. In July, the *California Digital Depository Planning Meeting* was held. At that meeting, volunteers were recruited to work on a pilot project to address digital issues. The planning process is now on hold due to lack of funding and loss of CSL personnel. The final OCLC report was issued August 20, 2004. It gave an overview of the issues and mandate to preserve all publications, but no concrete steps.

COSLA (Chief Officers of State Library Agencies) met with NDIIPP in October 2004, and developed a toolkit to be used as a planning model for states. There is the possibility of COSLA holding workshops for state libraries.

There are several preservation projects in progress: one is a persistent archives testbed at the San Diego Supercomputer Center to manage digital resources; this will be part of the NDIIPP (Web at Risk) project. The California Archives are interested in working with SDSC on preserving digital resources.

Janet Coles discussed proposed legislation: AB 219 and SB 503. 219 would convert the CA depository program to a digital program by creating a central archive at CSL. The committee left the LDA (Library Distribution Act) intact, but added the provision that agencies send electronic publications to the CSL.

CSL was asked by the Assembly Appropriations Committee for a cost assessment. The tools are relatively inexpensive – est. \$12,000/year for storage of digital files – but four new positions were requested, as the larger expense is the labor. Digital files would conform to DIP protocols and reside on the OCLC digital archive. The legislature denied the funding, so 219 is dead.

SB 503 would mandate that agencies notify CSL when digital documents are put up.

CSL will most likely subscribe to the OCLC Digital Archive in the coming fiscal year. New Mexico is working on a project doing shared curation and description of their state government with some of their depositories. Janet also said that she had been having discussions with Becky Culbertson about cataloging collaboration for California government publications. These records would appear in Melvyl and Google.

GILS discussed a draft Essential Titles list for California publications, coordinated by Susana Hinojosa. Janet C. stated that there is no one to submit to and make it law. The Office of Printing does not have legislative authority. The state librarian could only recommend the list be followed, but not require it. The group discussed involvement by the California librarians in promoting the importance of establishing such a list.

Action:

- ✓ Janet will distribute the essential titles list to Govinfo and Caldoc-I
- ✓ Investigate sending the essential titles list to the agencies.

Janet discussed the California Performance Review Report. The Little Hoover Commission reviewed the report in December, entitled "Historic Opportunities: Transforming State Government." The governor has submitted three proposals, but no action has been taken.

David Cismowski updated the group on the GPO consultant. CA was scheduled to get a consultant this year, but there is no money in the budget. Dr. Blevins, GPO, suggested that librarians send letters to Congress requesting money for this program. If you send a letter, please cc David.

Action: David will post the information to govinfo.

6. Shared Print Collection (added item, Sherry DeDecker and Nancy Kushigian)

(See April 28th email from Linda Kennedy)

Based upon discussion and agreement at the UC federal documents librarians meeting in Albuquerque last month, Sherry recommended that we move forward with a UC Shared Print collection for federal government information by designating all materials already at the RLF's as part of the shared collection. In order to fulfill depository obligations to the academic and public communities to preserve and provide access to documents, there should be one copy at NRLF and one at SRLF. These would be circulating, not archival copies. As the group that met with the California State Library last December (Sherry DeDecker and Linda Kennedy were part of this SOPAG group) determined, the CSL is about access, not archiving materials, so the UCs should take steps to ensure access to materials. The SOPAG Steering Committee on Implementing Shared Collections of Government Information that was formed to investigate shared collections found that the process for identifying titles, changing records, reviewing for preservation, etc. was very costly.

Can we declare these materials "shared" without changing the records (for all retrospective materials); any new items added after a specified date would then have some kind of shared collection designation? Can we cross-send materials to the RLF's (e.g. would UCSB be able to send to NRLF)

Nancy asked how will campuses know if an item is shared if the record isn't marked in some way? How would we ensure that materials can't be withdrawn at some later point if the records aren't changed? Could we set up a MOU with depositing campuses? Many were under the impression that once an item is sent to a RLF, it cannot be withdrawn. Nancy clarified this:

Shared Concept = a copy is put into a shared collection; it stays in the shared collection and will be conserved. Once it's in the collection it won't go back to the depositing campus.

Persistence = materials be called back to the campus, but the campus cannot dispose of the material. The UL policy on persistence states that if a campus wants to withdraw this material they would have to offer to the rest of the libraries.

Nancy also noted that there was very little support for the concept of two shared titles, in both RLFs.

Several people raised the issue of sending monographic series to RLFs: many campuses analyze the titles, but when they are sent to a RLF the individual monographic records are deleted and the issues are attached to a serial record. This decreases access to the titles. Can this practice be changed?

David Cismowski raised some concerns and issues from the viewpoint of a Regional Depository: Federal Documents are only in the custody of the depository library, they do not own the materials. RLFs aren't true selection sites. If materials are going to be put in the RLFs then GPO needs to know who has custody of the materials; technically the original depository library is still responsible for the material. We should be sure to work with GPO and CSL before anything is finalized. GPO would want to be assured that anyone from the general public could walk in to a UC Library and request this material.

We need a good inventory of what is already in the RLFs. Can we rely on the Melvyl records?

A subcommittee was formed to consult with Nancy on putting together a plan. Members: Lucia Snowhill (ex officio), Patsy Inouye, Megan Dreger, Jan Goldsmith, and Sherry DeDecker (chair).

Action: The team will draft a more complete shared collection plan that will address access, cataloging records, custodial and inventory issues. They will report back to the rest of the GILS group by September 1, 2005.

7. Review of “Guidelines for University of California Bibliographer Groups”

Due to lack of time, the following action item was agreed upon:

Action: GILS Steering Committee will review the current guidelines and make sure they reflect the work of the GILS group. A revised draft, if needed, will be sent out to everyone within a month.

8. Redesign of the GILS webpage

There was general consensus that the UC Gateway to Government Information website as it currently exists is not useful. Campuses are using guides that have been created locally rather than linking out to the Gateway. Perhaps the mission and goal of the website should be changed? There was discussion as to how to use the website as a training and communication tool for GILS and non-government information librarians. Is there a way to use the website to address in the action items from the UC Government Workshop with regards to training and retaining expertise? Could we make use of Blog software in order to make posting/contribution to the site by all librarians easier?

Action: Kris Kasianovitz, Kay Collins, Lucia Orlando, Janet Martorana, and Marcia Meister will evaluate the website and decide the next steps for this space. The team will investigate what kind of training campuses are conducting; can the information be added to the website? They will also determine if there is a way to combine the internal page and the new version. Deadline: August 1.

9. GILS listserv

(See Linda’s handouts for information about the two listservs)

The group agreed to maintain the two lists GOVINFO and UCGOVINFO (as one is for a specific purpose, i.e. the discussion of licensed materials within the UCs). In order to make a clearer distinction between the two, the names will be revised. Suggestions: UC-S-GILS for the joint list and UCGOVINFO for licensed databases.

Linda also wanted feedback regarding access to the archives. People on the Davis domain can access archives of the listservs or they can be open to the world. The group agreed that it was best to keep the archives “closed”. If we want anything from the archives, we can send Linda a request and she can pull the messages.

Action: Linda Kennedy will change the names of the GILS listservs.

10. Counting California

(See Rosalie’s Roundrobin report)

Content is continually being added to CoCA; most recently added: 1970 2nd Count, 1980 Census STF 3, 1980 EEO Special File for California. They are working on adding 1960 Census, 1964-73 County Business Patterns. The historical census data has been particularly challenging to load. Crime statistics is another area of interest for the site. Please continue to send Rosalie any suggestions for topics, content, etc. to add.

Harrison Deckker, UCB Data Services

(Handouts: Bibliography and Continuum of Data Repository Scenarios)

Harrison is working on a Virtual Data Centers project. CDL is not (and won’t be) a

central archive for data; the campuses have their own data archives to manage these collections. However, conforming to digital standards and creating a consistent user interface, they could make their data sets widely available (BEST scenario on handout). The project would enable universities to provide free access to current and historical (and often unusable) data. There are ways to incorporate methods from the digital library world for the preservation of data (e.g. standard sets and finding aids, see Rutgers example from handout.)

Harvard and MIT data centers have been working on this project for 6 years; data centers or even individual departments can archive their data, with appropriate metadata, and then make it harvestable by other universities. It's almost like creating a union catalog for data sets. One would be able to do a federated search for specific data. Data and metadata is all open source; data can live on a local server or one can be pointed to a repository or ftp site to access it. The metadata schemes will be able to accommodate variable fields and export to MARC to be included in local OPACs. (More information on this to come.)

Harrison is currently working on the Bi-National Data Archive with representatives from Mexico. This will be an archive for policy makers and researchers; it will contain bilingual data sets and technical documentation. It has been proposed that the UCB Library will be the repository for this.

11. LOCKSS-DOCS

Elizabeth Cowell reported that after 2 years in the making, GPO is moving forward with a LOCKSS-DOCS pilot project. There are currently 16 members for the pilot; no UC campuses are participating. In order to join this pilot project, campuses need to join the LOCKSS Alliance Partnership, which requires a fee. All titles will be serials.

Action: If anyone is interested in the project or becoming a LOCKSS site, please contact Elizabeth. The responsibilities for being a LOCKSS pilot project partner:

- Set up and maintain a LOCKSS box.
- Designate a contact to participate in meetings/conference calls/email exchange.
- Maintain a LOCKSS cache.
- Monitor cost, technical issues, and operational experiences.
- As titles are added over, install plug-ins for each title.
- Configure your LOCKSS machine to collect the GPO distributed content (this will entail checking a box on a web page).

12. Web-At-Risk (NDIIPP) Update

Due to lack of time – a very brief summary of the project was given. This will be posted on email.

13. Wrap up from Item # 2, morning session

Action:

- ✓ Lucia Snowhill will report the following information to CDC/SOPAG: GILS accepts that depository collections will be primarily digital; these issues are not just related to Federal, but all levels including International: GILS will form a subgroup to address particular issues that CDC/SOPAG need feedback on; issues or projects won't be taken on all at once, but we need to develop an overarching plan; we are not sure what the CDL NDIIPP Web-at-Risk project will and won't do or how it will affect the way we develop collections; CDC is waiting to charge the group with a project – Janet Martorana will work with Phyllis and Lucia to develop this charge.

Sherry DeDecker and Kris Kasianovitz, Recorders