

ALI Indiana Light Archive for Government Documents Planning Group  
Tele-meeting Notes, 1 December 2006 9:00-10:45 a.m.

Next tele-meeting: 1/12/2007, 9:00 a.m.

Present: Laura Bayard, Bert Chapman, Kirsten Leonard, Lou Malcomb, Cheryl Truesdell, Judy Violette, Anika Williams

#### AGENDA:

A. The attendees agreed upon a name for the group:  
ALI Indiana Light Archive for Government Documents Planning Group

B. The attendees agreed that our purpose is:

To create an implementation plan for establishing a cooperative "light archive" with as comprehensive a collection as possible of U.S. federal government documents distributed since 1789 in perpetuity through the combined collections of the Indiana State Library, Indiana University, Purdue University and the University of Notre Dame.

Some additional discussion ensued: 1. about including a reference to state documents becoming archived in the future (DECISION not to add such wording since it is not part of our charge); 2. about including the concept of a "single storage facility" (DECISION not to add such wording to the purpose statement, but such could become part of an implementation plan perhaps as a recommendation).

C. The attendees discussed our charge.

1. Discussion began with what would be entailed in an implementation plan. In broad terms, it would be some kind of working document that each library could sign on to and what would be accessible to others. It could be a statement of what we currently "own" and what our commitments are. We discussed the possibility that we are building a permanent distributed model by not specifying how future documents would end up in ALF 2 when it is available. The 1<sup>st</sup> archived copy within ALF should be regarded as the copy of last resort and a 2<sup>nd</sup> copy could be from anywhere around the state. The distributed model should be regarded as a stopgap between now and when ALF 2 is available and bureaucratic decisions are made (5-10 years).

2. Text from today's agenda (re: our charge 1) Each of the four archive collections (ISL, IU, Purdue, Notre Dame) assume responsibility for building the

comprehensive collection and maintaining specific federal documents such that all federal documents are collected and preserved.

Discussion about comprehensiveness and what that means ensued. Lou and Paratext are still working together and eventually will have a report about comprehensiveness. There are problems with piece-level items not being cataloged as such.

Claims to and stewardship of SuDocs ranges will be made by ISL, IU, PU, and the ND. Every effort should be made to achieve comprehensiveness, including collections and maintaining expertise and cataloging.

The role of a “steward” will be to develop and maintain a collection as comprehensively as possible; maintain expertise about it (reference & instruction); catalog it in OCLC/ INCat; deliver it (ILL); and preserve it. The question arose whether a way to prioritize digitization would be if an item were not in the ALF. Since the focus of this group is to provide for archived tangible copies, the question became, do we have to support all tangible formats? The committee agreed that a steward, then, will define what “comprehensive” is within his/her designated SuDocs areas and what is being used to measure “comprehensiveness.” The committee also agreed that the minimum benchmark should be to collect all depository items within an area and that the print format would be our priority (retain print over fiche), but the steward should state whether or not other tangible formats are collected.

The committee further agreed that the steward will define “preservation” as found in his/ her institution. In discussion, some guidelines came up. It is safe to assume that the copy in ALF is preserved; therefore, take best care of the ones not in ALF. The idea was suggested get a grant to preserve ones outside of ALF. Lastly, use needs list for 2<sup>nd</sup> or better copy for ILL reasons.

ASSIGNMENT DUE by 1/5/2007: Using the NOTES fields in the document of SuDocs classification numbers that Lou sent out in October, indicate willingness to be steward of particular ranges. Also note whether old SuDocs fields are missing. If edits are finished in advance of the due date, send to Lou sooner.

ASSIGNMENT DUE 1/15/2007: Lou will draft the implementation plan.

FINAL DOCUMENT DUE (hopefully) 2/1/2007: in time for ALI’s consideration at its February meeting.

3. Text from today’s agenda (re: our charge 2) Provide cataloging plan for all documents such that all citizens in Indiana can easily locate and obtain U.S. government material.

Discussion around cataloging identified one minimum standard as the 086 field must contain the SuDocs classification number and another as to catalog at the piece-level when possible. Bound-withs are problematic. If the item is pre-2000 and it is not in ALF, then the steward's institution catalogs it, but work on post-1976 before going to the retrospective ones. Lou also announced that ISL's holdings for Marcive are now in InCat.

ACTIVITY: Kirsten will write a short paragraph for what the steward needs to do for cataloging: guidelines or best practices and what the minimum standard would be. Then each of us in the group will take the paragraph to our own cataloging people for comment about its doability.

4. Text from today's agenda (re: our charge 3) Work with OCLC/Incolsa and our individual libraries to develop a mechanism for identifying the documents as part of the Indiana Light Archive within InCat. [Note: I talked with Michael about the procedure for obtaining an OCLC symbol for the Light Archive. She suggested we contact Collette Mac at InColsa about getting an OCLC Symbol. We discussed how it might be used: It would not be used to catalog, but listed with the holding institutions symbol as well (at least while we are a distributed archive) so Indiana Light Archive materials would get two symbols (for Instance, Purdue and the Indiana Light Archive); thus the cataloging institution would retain the holding for ILL purposes, for counting purposes, and for costs (cataloging costs/credits). She questioned whether all the institutions have authorization to enhance Serial records with the 086 field, which of course I do not know? We need to discuss this.

ACTIVITY: Lou will contact Collete at Incolsa and report back to this group about getting an IN light archive symbol. They will sort out what is the best course to achieve what we want/ need to support: ILL, cataloging institution retaining OCLC credits, etc.

5. Text from today's agenda (re: our charge 4) Cheryl did not include here the responsibility for developing a delivery or reference services plan. Her understanding was that our goal was to develop the inventory, designate responsibility for collection and maintenance among the light archive libraries and make sure the cataloging got done in such a way that all citizens would know where specific documents are located. Lou believes we need to at least talk about areas of expertise because the "Indiana Light Archive" collection won't necessarily define these, especially if ultimately the collection is housed in one secure preservation-quality location.

ACTIVITY: Cheryl and Bert will work together to write a short paragraph for what the steward needs to do as regards distribution: guidelines or best practices and what the minimum standard would be.

D. Does this task force/group want to at least outline a charge for the reference/outreach/delivery services plan team?

A couple of suggestions were to welcome smaller IN campuses to contribute stewardship to core collection or essential titles and to welcome reference and instruction in those areas. Discussion showed that because these areas are broad and cross many SuDocs areas, then it would be difficult to figure out unless perhaps it was regionally.

The committee agreed to consider reference and instruction secondarily and to decide later. By separating collection from expertise, everyone's energies across the state, not just the collectors', could be harnessed.

E. Other topics

ACTIVITY: Lou will try to get a student over the holidays to put on the web the documents and procedures/ processes for achieving the Indiana Light Archive for Government Documents and will work with Judy.

ACTIVITY: Anika will meet with IT to set up needs list. The committee agreed that the revised disposal guidelines for post-1976 should be distributed as soon as possible. We reaffirmed reliance on each other to be thoughtful, considerate about document disposal.

ACTIVITY: Bert will begin to investigate what is needed for a housing agreement for the pre-1976 materials said by Judy Russell to be needed at the time the ALF content would be designated as the copies of record.

ACTIVITY: Meanwhile, the group will regard the agreement signed on to by the involved ALI directors to be in effect. Lou will send the group a copy of that statement of agreement. When our proposal for the distributed archive is ready to be presented to ALI and a housing agreement is needed, we will do one then.