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Karrie Peterson, Chair Elect and Recorder

Committee Members Present:
Claire Hoffman, Thomas Karel, Chuck Malone, Denise Arial, Angela Bonnell, Ann Liebst, Lynne Stuart, Karrie Peterson

MiniProgram:
Fugitive Documents How did the Chadha court ruling affect the situation? What are other reasons for fugitive documents? How has the shift to electronic publishing affected fugitive documents?

Speaker:
Superintendent of Documents Fran Buckley

Mr. Buckley reviewed the process back to the Printing Act when agencies used GPO for printing almost exclusively, making the process of having publications included in the FDLP was practically invisible to the agency. Over the years, many statutory exemptions allowed agencies to contract out their printing. In recent decades, following the Printing Act is observed more in the breach than otherwise. Many agencies are quite good about promoting their publications to the public, but are unaware of the value of the FDLP for bibliographic control and permanent public access.

Chadha was a Supreme Court case involving naturalization. It revolved around the idea that a single house of the legislature may not exercise "veto power" over the operations of an executive agency, also known as the "separation of powers" issue. Mr. Buckley does not feel that Chadha, although it has been bandied about sometimes in a threatening way, has had any very great impact on the amount of fugitive documents. It was explained that the JCP had a lot of regulations for agency printing aimed at saving public funds. Agencies balked at these regulations because they couldn't get exactly what they wanted, and GPO became the "bad guy" for adhering to the regulations. JCP could prevent agencies from getting things printed the way they wanted. Throughout the 90s, there were some memos and presidential statements indicating that it was unconstitutional for the JCP to have this power over executive agencies. There were also significant memos from powerful government officials taking the opposite view, encouraging agencies to use the GPO for printing. The Chadha case has never been finally resolved in any confrontation, and in effect has more to do with print publications that the major issues in the electronic realm.

Since JCP has had much less attention and power to enforce unpopular regulations, the GPO has become much more customer-service oriented and will print or procure for agencies what they want and need. OMB has attempted to foster the idea that contracting out is cheaper for agencies, but this has never been forcefully demonstrated.

In addressing the issue of fugitive documents, GPO does a great deal of promotion to establish relationships with agencies, but connections are often made with the printing officers and not with the units responsible for putting documents on the web.
GPO needs a systematic way of identifying electronically-born documents. It does not seem that they will ever have resources they need. Committee such as the workgroup established at DLC help greatly. GPO is also looking at ways to harvest web documents.

Although there is a backlog of citations sent to GPO, it is helpful to them to get (through LPS) citations for electronic documents or even citations for print ones. They "triage" and follow through.

There is positive effect from legislative reform attempts even when they don't pass because they generate discussion and debate and publicize important issues.

Mr. Buckley expressed dismay that CRS reports are deemed not appropriate for the FDLP when there are commercial agencies getting and distributing them.

Mr. Buckley was thanked and applauded for his talk.

Old Business
Minutes from 2001 mid-winter ALA Education Committee mtg. were approved.
Liaison reports:
Karrie Peterson reported from FDTF that further response from FDTF to the NCLIS report and the GAO report were tabled. Discussion at FDTF on changing the Update segment to a more general update covering GODORT business, state, local and international documents. That the GPO conference has developed into a good tool for informing federal docs librarians and the same information doesn't need to be repeated at ALA. That the conflicts between GODORT committee meeting times, and the length of committee meetings kept members from seeing other programs and making allies - working with other groups on programs would help solve this.
Angela Bonnell reported on IDTF's final work on the Toolbox for Cataloging International Documents, and that they would like to collaborate with the Education Committee on the Welcome Wagon idea given their discussion on mentoring.

Steven Woods reported on the State and Local Documents Task Force, which also has a toolbox for cataloging local documents, and who sponsored a good presentation from University of California's Patricia Cruse on the California Counts online statistics project.

We need to assign representatives to the Education Assembly and the Literacy Assembly. Claire Hoffman will continue at the Education Assembly if there are no other volunteers.

Sherry DeDecker has given word that she would be happy if a volunteer could be found to take over the Education Committee web site, and Anne Liebst volunteered.

Welcome Wagon handout, drafted by Tom Karel, was given final approval with minor changes. Tom will send the file to Robin Haun-Mohamed and write a short blurb for Administrative Notes.

New Business
Claire read over a list of suggestions for issues the Education Committee should discuss at future meetings that was developed from a meeting at the Depository Library Conference in October. These will be posted to the committee members for future agenda development.
Proposal for Voluntary Certification was discussed in order to give our Councilor feedback. Members were in general opposed to the idea at this time. Some of the concerns raised by the committee and the chair include:

On page 2 the proposal says why now, but doesn't address this issue
On page 3 the proposal talks about standards being developed by the appropriate ALA Division, what does that mean for roundtables?
On page 3 Who will develop the examination?
On page 3 Why 3 years for certification? What are the fees for recertification?
On page 5 under limitation who do they intend to pay for services rendered? What services? Are there staff, how many?

On page 5 under Board of Directors: Which will it be members of the Executive Board or members of Council?

On page 8 the paragraph about both expenses and revenues associated with development of the standard for professional practice...will be budgeted by the involved ALA divisions, where there will be an expectation of net revenues. What does this mean for GODORT as a roundtable, not a division?

On page 8 it talks about outsourcing Who will get the outsourcing contracts and are there any guidelines?

On page 9 it talks about using the competencies developed by PLA and LAMA for the Certified Public Library Administrator. These were developed in 1994, will they be updated or looked at? Haven't things changed since 1994? On page 10 it mentions a Task Force Report on the Status of Librarians that we need to take a look at.

On page 11 there is a statement that is going to Council. If this is approved, is it a done deal?

On page 13 Budget, why does the application fee increase every year? Where does the $100,000 cash in come from? In the salary line there is $32,000 what does this represent, one full-time or several part-time? How many staff?

Karrie will post the list of committee clearinghouse page web masters and poll for new volunteers. Meeting adjourned.
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