DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL MEETING AND CONFERENCE TRANSCRIPTS

ARLINGTON, VA | OCTOBER 15 - 18, 2012





UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

+ + + + +

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE
AND
DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL MEETING

MONDAY OCTOBER 15, 2012

+ + + + +

+ + + + +

The Conference met in the Crystal Ballroom in the Doubletree Crystal City, 300 Army Navy Drive, Arlington, Virginia, at 10:30 a.m., Sharalyn J. Laster, Council Chair, presiding.

PRESENTING:

SHARALYN J. LASTER, Depository Library
Council Chair
MARY ALICE BAISH, Superintendent of
Documents, GPO
DAVITA VANCE-COOKS, Acting Public Printer
of the United States, GPO
PAUL GIANNINI, GPO
CHERIE GIVENS, GPO

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

DAVID WALLS, GPO

SHARALYN J. LASTER, Chair STEPHANIE BRAUNSTEIN CHRISTOPHER BROWN HELEN BURKE MARIE CONCANNON BLANE DESSY STEPHEN M. HAYES PEGGY ROEBUCK JARRETT COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT (CONT'D):

ROSEMARY LASALA SUSAN LYONS MARK PHILLIPS DEBBIE RABINA ARLENE WEIBLE

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Welcome, Introductions, Announcements4
Davita Vance-Cooks, Acting Public Printer of the United States16
Mary Alice Baish, Assistant Public Printer, Superintendent of Documents43
Presentation of Federal Depository Library Of the Year Awards68
FDLP Forecast Study - Methodology, Study Phases and State Forecast Mary Alice Baish, GPO Superintendent of Documents
Questions & Answers143
Summary, Blane Dessy, Library of Congress186
Adjournment194

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 | 10:32 a.m.

MS. LASTER: Good morning. Welcome to beautiful Arlington, Virginia.

My name is Shari Laster, and I'm here from the University of Akron in Akron, Ohio.

As the Chair of the Depository Library Council, I am pleased to welcome you to the 2012 Federal Depository Library Conference and the Annual Depository Library Council meeting.

For those who like to keep a tally, this is the 80th Depository Library Council meeting, the 20th Federal Depository Library Conference and the 50th anniversary of the Depository Library Act of 1962.

This means that we have seen half a century of dedicated service from our regional depositories along with half a century of a Federal Depository Library program that is open to libraries of all different shapes and sizes.

This also means that given its 40-year birthday, the Depository Library

1	Council is getting ready for its mid-life
2	crisis, and that the Federal Depository Library
3	Conference is not quite old enough yet to hit the
4	bar after we adjourn today.
5	I would like to take a moment to ask
6	my friends on the Depository Library Council to
7	introduce themselves.
8	MS. WEIBLE: Hi. I'm Arlene Weible
9	and I'm from the Oregon State Library in Salem,
10	Oregon.
11	MS. LaSALA: Rosemary LaSala. I'm
12	from St. John's University, Rittenberg Law
13	Library in New York.
14	MS. RABINA: Debbie Rabina, Pratt
15	Institute School of Information and Library
16	Science, New York.
17	MR. PHILLIPS: Mark Phillips,
18	University of North Texas.
19	MR. BELEU: Steve Beleu, Oklahoma
20	Department of Libraries.
21	MR. ROMANS: Larry Romans,
22	Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.

MS. BURKE: I'm Helen Burke at

1	Hennepin County Library in Minneapolis,
2	Minnesota.
3	MR. BROWN: Chris Brown, University
4	of Denver.
5	MR. DESSY: Blane Dessy, Library of
6	Congress.
7	MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, University
8	of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana.
9	MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Stephanie
10	Braunstein, Louisiana State University, Baton
11	Rouge, Louisiana.
12	MS. JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
13	University of Washington Law Library, Seattle.
14	MS. LYONS: Sue Lyons, Newark Law
15	Library, Newark, New Jersey.
16	MS. CONCANNON: Marie Concannon,
17	University of Missouri.
18	MS. LASTER: Thank you.
19	I hope many of you will take the
20	opportunity to get to know members of Council
21	throughout the week. We will all be present
22	each morning at the Coffee with Council sessions

in various states of caffeination. And we want

to use this time to meet with you and to hear what's on your mind.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Also feel free to chat with any of us between conference sessions. We do ask that you give us a chance to take a nature break immediately after each session. We'll be happy to speak with you on our way back from the restrooms.

We are also very interested in your and questions during the Council comments sessions and the other plenary sessions throughout the next four days. When the moderator acknowledges you, please state your name and institution before you begin your comment or question. This is to help those of us who might not know everyone in the room yet, and also to facilitate the work of our friendly neighborhood court reporter. If you forget, you will be interrupted and reminded. So please don't forget.

While I'm on the topic of forgetting, please take a moment right now to check your mobile phone ringer. These devices

do need to be on silent during sessions and meetings this week.

The wireless is available in this ballroom and the Washington Ballroom. The password is g-p-o -- all lower case. The network is Bosch or PSAVDTECH. Please let Lance know if you have any trouble connecting.

The twitter hashtag for this event is DLCF12.

Can I see a show of hands from our tweeters? Excellent. Thanks for sharing the conference experience with the folks playing along from home. I saw three.

Tweets tagged DLCF12 will appear on a widget posted on the free government information blog at FreeGovInfo.info. Thanks to James Jacobs for setting this up.

I will read any announcements at the end of each Council and plenary session. You can give them to me or you can give them to Lance or Bridget at the registration table.

There's also a message board near the registration table for coordinating any

extracurricular activities. Please remember that this hotel has at least two and probably three areas that can be considered lobbies. So be sure to specify your gathering location.

Today's lunch is traditionally held by states and regions. I have the following meeting locations to announce.

Alaska, Montana, Oregon, Washington will meet at the message board. D.C., Delaware, Maryland will meet at Noon at the lobby near the check-in desk. California will meet at the Redex table. Florida will meet at Noon at the hotel restaurant. Illinois will meet at Noon at the lobby desk. North Carolina will meet at the lower lobby. New Jersey will meet at 12:15 at the lower lobby. New York will meet at 12:20 at the lower lobby. And Ohio will meet at 12:10 at the lower lobby.

If you're not sure who's here from your state or region, you can check with the registration table.

You're also welcome to join the outing of a really friendly state such as Ohio.

My recommendation of Ohio is of course in no way 1 based by my employment at a mid-size public 2 research university in the northeast corner of 3 that fabulous state -- no way whatsoever. 4 Now before I hand the microphone 5 6 over to GPO, I'd like to invite you all to 7 participate in a round of Council calisthenics. First, I would like to ask that all 8 the regionals in the room stand up. 9 10 (APPLAUSE.) MS. LASTER: We are all grateful for 11 your hard work and service each and every year. 12 13 And I'm glad that we get to celebrate 50 years of regionals in the FDLP with you this week. 14 Next, let's do a quick time zone 15 16 check. Those of you hailing from Eastern, 17 stand up, please. Oh. Thank you. Okay. 18 Sit 19 down. What about those from Central? 20 Great. Have a seat. 21 22 Mountain? I know we have a couple.

23

Yay!

How about Pacific? Rock on. 1 2 (APPLAUSE.) MS. LASTER: Any Hawaii/Aleutian? 3 4 Any other time zones represented? 5 Great. Thank you. 6 Now I'd like to ask those of you who 7 came to your first DLC meeting in 2010 or later to please stand up. And if this is your very 8 first meeting, wave your arms around. 9 10 (APPLAUSE.) Okay. Everyone who's 11 MS. LASTER: still sitting should memorize your faces and 12 come and greet you during the breaks. 13 Now let's have those who came 14 Okay. to your first DLC meeting in the 2000s -- in the 15 16 aughts -- stand up. I hope this meeting is just 17 Aughts? as exciting as your first meeting. Or if that's 18 19 a bad thing, then I hope this meeting does not remind you in any way of your first meeting. 20 (LAUGHTER.) 21 MS. LASTER: Now let's have those of 22 23 you who came to your first DLC meeting in the

1	1990s. So getting into some serious territory
2	here.
3	(LAUGHTER.)
4	MS. LASTER: Thank you.
5	How about those and I know there
6	are a few who first came in the 1980s? Yes.
7	(APPLAUSE.)
8	MS. LASTER: And do we have anyone
9	here who first turned up in the 1970s? If you
10	don't remember your first meeting, you should
11	stand up now, too.
12	(APPLAUSE.)
13	MS. LASTER: Thank you, all, for
14	being here today.
15	One more group to recognize. Would
16	former members of the Depository Library Council
17	please stand? And if you're a former Chair,
18	please wave your arms around.
19	(APPLAUSE.)
20	MS. LASTER: All right. Thank you.
21	Along with our veteran attendees,
22	these folks are some of the best resources out
23	there. And I hope that those of you are new will

seek them out and say hello.

Finally, I would like you to stand if you ever get at least a tiny occasional little thrill from the fact that government document librarians get to help ensure the future available of government information and help to build an informed citizenry.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. LASTER: It's pretty cool, isn't it. Okay. I think it's awesome. Thank you.

And now before I introduce Acting Public Printer Davita Vance-Cooks, I am very pleased to announce that this morning we have the privilege of being the first GPO stakeholders to view a new and exciting video. It captures the essence of GPO's transition to meet the changing expectations of its customers under the leadership of Acting Public Printer Davita Vance-Cooks. I invite you to sit back and enjoy.

(VIDEO PLAYS.)

MS. LASTER: Now it is my pleasure

to introduce the Acting Public Printer of the
United States, Davita Vance-Cooks.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. LASTER: Ms. Vance-Cooks became the Acting Public Printer in January 2012 and has already achieved recognition for her forward-thinking leadership of the Government Printing Office. As GPO continues to transform itself to meet its core mission in a changing environment, Ms. Vance-Cooks has guided the Agency in doing more with less.

She is incredibly supportive of the work we do as government documents and government information librarians, and she is strongly committed to the FDLP. In fact, this past March, she invited the Depository Library Council to meet with her in order to share her expectations for her advisory council and to listen to our vision of the program. It was a fantastic and productive meeting and I am proud to work with her.

Please join me in welcoming Acting
Public Printer Davita Vance-Cooks.

1 (APPLAUSE.) 2 MS. VANCE-COOKS: Shari, thank you for the kind introduction. 3 4 Good morning. 5 EVERYONE: Good morning. 6 MS. VANCE-COOKS: Let's try that 7 again. Good morning. 8 EVERYONE: Good morning. 9 10 MS. VANCE-COOKS: All right. Now, you're awake. You've had your calisthenics and 11 all that stuff. You good? All right. 12 13 Good morning to the FDLP Conference attendees, the Depository Library Council 14 Members, GPO employees and to our guests. 15 16 Welcome to the 2012 Depository Library Council meeting and the Federal Depository Library 17 Conference. 18 19 I am absolutely delighted to be here with you today for a very special meeting and 20 conference. Believe me when I say I am proud to 21 stand here before you as the Acting Public 22

Printer of the United States. It is a position

23

which I have held since January 2012.

I have been with the GPO for eight years. And I have served in a number of leadership roles. Last year when I attended this conference, I was serving as the GPO Chief of Staff. So basically this means that over the past 22 months, I have been faithfully serving as a senior leader and a strategist for the GPO.

I am passionate about the mission, the vision and the core values of the United States Government Printing Office. I recognize and I respect the history of the GPO over the past 151 years. And I am excited about collaborating with our stakeholders to build the future.

The theme for this conference is Celebrating the Past, Building the Future Together. And I think it is so fitting that as we begin a conference in which we will talk about and plan for the future that we pause and take note of a number of the milestones which have already been articulated. But I'm so excited, I'm going to go through them again.

(LAUGHTER.)

MS. VANCE-COOKS: First, we are celebrating the 40th anniversary of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer. And this is the Council's 80th meeting.

I, too, would like to take a moment to recognize and thank all current and former members of the council for their hard work and their dedication to the GPO and the FDLP. I know it's a lot of work. And I appreciate everything that you have done and that you will continue to do.

Second, this is the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the 1962 Depository Library Act that established regional depository libraries. We will recognize our regional depository libraries this evening at a reception which we will hold in the GPO Bookstore. And I really hope that I will see all of you there tonight.

Third, this is the 20th anniversary of the Federal Depository Library Conference.

GPO is delighted to offer you this annual

opportunity for learning and professional development.

I want to especially thank all of you who are either speaking at a program or presenting a poster session. Thank you so much for your generosity in sharing your special knowledge and your expertise with your colleagues.

Now before I begin my total remarks, I would like to acknowledge the hardworking men and women of the GPO Library Services and Content Management Business Unit who work with you and for you each and every day. They have worked very hard to develop a conference that is meaningful for you.

Would all of the LSCM employees in this room please stand so that we can acknowledge you.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. VANCE-COOKS: Well done. We're very, very proud of you.

I would also like to introduce several members of the GPO Management Team who

1	have come here this morning. And when I call
2	your name, I would appreciate it if you would
3	stand up, turn around and wave.
4	(LAUGHTER.)
5	MS. VANCE-COOKS: All right?
6	Well, the first one is Mary Alice
7	Baish, Superintendent of Documents. And she's
8	right here.
9	(APPLAUSE.)
10	MS. VANCE-COOKS: Mr. Jim Bradley,
11	Assistant Public Printer, Operations.
12	(APPLAUSE.)
13	MS. VANCE-COOKS: Mr. Andy Sherman,
14	Communications Director and Congressional
15	Liaison.
16	(APPLAUSE.)
17	MS. VANCE-COOKS: Mr. Cary Miller,
18	Deputy Legal Counsel.
19	(APPLAUSE.)
20	MS. VANCE-COOKS: Dr. Olivia Girod,
21	Managing Director of Plant Operations.
22	(APPLAUSE.)
23	MS. VANCE-COOKS: Mr. Herbert

1	Jackson, Managing Director of Business Products
2	and Services.
3	(APPLAUSE.)
4	MS. VANCE-COOKS: Mr. Gary
5	Somerset, Media and Public Relations Manager.
6	(APPLAUSE.)
7	MS. VANCE-COOKS: And by the way,
8	Mr. Somerset is the one who's responsible for
9	that wonderful video we just saw.
10	(APPLAUSE.)
11	MS. VANCE-COOKS: We also have
12	several guests whom I would like to acknowledge.
13	First and by the way, when I call
14	your name, you too must stand up. You too must
15	turn around and wave.
16	Mr. Dominick Storelli, Staff Member
17	of the Joint Committee on Printing.
18	(APPLAUSE.)
19	MS. VANCE-COOKS: Our experience
20	with the Joint Committee on Printing in the 112th
21	Congress has been absolutely positive. They
22	have been engaged and supportive of GPO. And we
23	have deeply appreciated the leadership of JCP

1	Chairman Greg Harper. We look forward to
2	continuing to work with Chairman Harper and his
3	staff in the remainder of the 112th Congress.
4	And as you know, the leadership of
5	the JCP will transfer from the House to the
6	Senate in the 113th Congress.
7	I understand that we also have some
8	members from Treasury Melissa Hartman and
9	Zachary Twining.
10	(APPLAUSE.)
11	MS. VANCE-COOKS: I understand that
12	Eric Petersen is also here from CRS. Oh, there
13	you are.
14	(APPLAUSE.)
15	MS. VANCE-COOKS: Our LC partners
16	Robert Newlen.
17	(APPLAUSE.)
18	MS. VANCE-COOKS: Dr. Beth
19	Dulabahn.
20	(APPLAUSE.)
21	MS. VANCE-COOKS: Cliff Cohen.
22	(APPLAUSE.)
23	MS. VANCE-COOKS: We also have

several members from the National Academy of Public Administration. They did register.

I'm not sure if any of them are here. Are you here? If so, please stand.

Okay. In any case, NAPA is the organization that is conducting an independent operational review of the GPO. You received a survey from NAPA several weeks ago. We expect to receive a draft report from NAPA later on this year. And we will provide review, comments, and we hope to get the final report later on in January. It will be submitted to Congress, and we're looking forward to continuing to work with them on this very important project.

As the Acting Public Printer, I feel strongly about communicating to you my vision for the direction of the Agency. I would also like to provide a brief status of the Agency. So I chose six topics that I thought may be of interest to you.

I'd like to talk to you about the GPO transformation, our strategic plan, our budget, which of course means I will talk about the

continuing resolution and the threat of sequestration. I will also highlight some of our FY '12 accomplishments, discuss the FDsys program and affirm our commitment to the FDLP.

The current state of the GPO can be summed up like this. GPO has a good news story to tell. And let me explain why.

First of all, GPO is open for business. We are 151 years old. I consider GPO to be the poster child for adaptation because an agency does not survive 151 years without adapting to change, without adapting to expectations and without adapting to customer preferences.

Number two, we have a diversification business model that reflects a one-stop shop for tangible print, digital technology, security precision printing, distribution and dissemination, graphic design, web services and consultant services.

Number three, our brand. The GPO name is strong. It is trustworthy with demonstrated proven expertise in print,

distribution and secure credentials.

And number four, we are committed to the transformation of the Agency to meet changing customer expectations.

But this good news story is also set against a backdrop of challenges which are common to all of us. We, too, are dealing with rapidly changing customer expectations. We are also dealing with budget constraints. We are also dealing with political realities and of course, intense public scrutiny. But I firmly believe that these challenges represent opportunities for the GPO to transform itself to become leaner, more customer-focused and much more of what our stakeholders need.

GPO is undergoing a transformation from a traditional ink-on-paper operation to a digital information platform. We are moving away from the print-centric business model to a content-centric focus with an emphasis on digital. Part of that transformation requires that we identify and achieve the balance between tangible print and digital. We respect our

roots. And we celebrate a past which is grounded in the print-centric model.

I know that most of you in this room remember that business model. And I know that because Shari asked you how long you've been here.

(LAUGHTER.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. VANCE-COOKS: Ιt was very manual. Remember that? Tt. was paper-intensive. And we moved those products by highway, by rail, by plane. Today though, we are building a future in which our shift to a content-centric focus is system-based. digital-driven. And the products are moving along an Internet highway at unimaginable speed.

For many, many years, the GPO has built digital products, utilized digital equipment, and embraced digital processes. This digital immersion is not new for the GPO. But the level of sophistication and the volume of digital is increasing. And the marketing niche that we have carved for ourselves is based upon the fact that the GPO provides information

that is official, digital, secure.

We are rolling out a new marketing campaign to help us market this bold and progressive niche. We have a new marketing look, a new motto and a new marketing collateral. Like everyone else, the GPO has to market itself. And in this day and age, we have to market ourselves crisply, succinctly and effectively. And you are the first public audience to see our new look, our new motto and our new marketing collateral.

You've just seen our new GPO video.

And I really, really hope that you liked it.

Really hope that you liked it.

(LAUGHTER.)

MS. VANCE-COOKS: I asked my staff to develop a video that explains who we are and what we do. I asked for a video that popped with good music, strong imagery. And if you really heard the beginning, you noticed Michael Jackson's Thriller was running through it. Did you get it?

I loved the video. So I hope that

1	you liked it, too. I hope that you understand
2	our marketing message. And I ask you, does the
3	model official digital secure spell out what we
4	do? Does it get right to the point?
5	If you liked it, let me see 100
6	percent of you show your hands. Thank you.

Now we intend to show this video to our appropriations and oversight committees in Congress. We will push this video to our customer agencies throughout the government and to the public via social media. You will see it on You-Tube. You will see it on Facebook. When you get back home, we're asking you to help us to push this image out to the communities that you serve.

And there is more.

How many of you noticed the new folder? Let's all raise our folder. There you go.

Did you notice the new look? All right.

And if you noticed when you opened it up, you had new inserts like this -- part of

our product portfolio. Everyone see this?

This is the new look. Last night when I showed it to the Depository Library Council, Stephanie said oh, that's contemporary. And I said oh, thank you. Because that was the compliment. That's where we're going. We want you to know that we're no longer in the past. We're moving to the future. We are contemporary. We are here.

Yes, there is a new look, a new motto, a new collateral for the GPO.

Now let's talk about the GPO strategic plan. If you look in your folder, you'll find it. Right here. It covers five years -- 2013 through 2017.

I told you about a transformation. When you lead an agency or any organization through a transformation, you need a plan. You need a roadmap. That is what this is.

I continually emphasize to my staff that our re-stated strategic vision is the touchstone for decision making. We heavily communicate our plan, and we update it every

year. And you can find it on our website.

Look over there to the mission statement. I know that you're familiar with our mission statement. You've heard it for years. Keep America informed by producing, protecting, preserving and distributing the official publications and information products of the federal government. That is what we do.

But our strategic vision communicates where we're going. We know what we do. Where are we going? Our vision has changed to reflect our commitment to being official, digital and secure. Our strategic vision is to continue to transform ourselves into a digital information platform and provider of secure credentials.

Now FY '12 was a great year for the GPO. We were on the move. And we had a number of successful initiatives. I will highlight just a few of those initiatives and accomplishments in terms of app development, eCommerce, passports and smartcards and quality certifications.

How many of you in this room know, or knew before you saw the video, that we make How many of you knew? Good. Then we're apps? doing something really well. The GPO in FY '12 developed and released three highly successful mobile apps. All of those apps are powered by FDsys data. We released a Congressional Member Guide app for the 112th Congress. This app enables users to view information about the 112th Congress on their mobile devices. In February of 2012, we released an app for the President's FY '13 budget.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

This app provides mobile users with access to the text and images of the main budget. This app is award-winning. We just recently received a 2012 digital government achievement award for this app. And yes, thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. VANCE-COOKS: We're excited. Thank you.

And just last Wednesday, how many of you've seen the new app? It's a creative app for the daily Presidential documents in partnership
with the Office of the Federal Register. How
many of you have seen it? It's great, isn't it?
Great.

By the way, we also supported the Library of Congress' development of an iPad app for the Congressional Record.

Now if you want more information about the mobile apps that we're involved in -- www.gpo.gov\mobile. Check it out.

eCommerce. As you know, the GPO has established an eCommerce platform to provide access to federal publication content in various electronic formats. And we have developed in-house eBook consulting expertise for federal agencies.

We now sell an expanded range of eBook and print-on-demand titles. Take a look at the slide and you'll see all of the partnerships that we are now involved with. We have signed partnerships with Google, Barnes and Noble and Apple iBooks to offer information products as eBooks to the public.

We have a partnership with Ingram,

a distributor to smaller eCommerce sites like

4 | eBookPie.

Did somebody just clap? Oh, okay.

Great. I'm glad you like Powell. Okay.

Diesel, eBooks -- Diesel eBooks -- Powell's and

We also have a partnership with OverDrive to offer books -- eBooks to public libraries. Well, okay. We also have a partnership with MyiLibrary -- anybody there -- want that one -- to offer eBooks to academic libraries. And we also have a partnership with Zinio to offer eMagazines.

How many of you have seen our online bookstore? Well, we've improved it. GPO recently beta launched an upgraded, online bookstore website. The new site can be found at NewBookstore.gpo.gov. And we are currently inviting public comment. The new site makes it easier for the public to navigate and find publications and subscriptions.

In terms of smartcards, passports. Last year, we manufactured over 10 million

passports, 800,000 smartcards, including the introduction of several new security credentials. In Fiscal Year 2013, we will produce 13 million passports. And we will open a second secure credential manufacturing site to support the increased demand for these secure products.

The reason why I'm talking to you about quality certifications is for one reason only. It's to prove to you that we're very serious about making sure that we offer quality products to our constituents. And we want industry-wide certifications to prove that we produce quality products.

In Fiscal Year 2012, we successfully renewed our ISO 9000 certification for our passport operations. Our plant operations achieved IDEAlliance Master Print certification. And just two weeks ago, we received notice that we have achieved sustainable green printing certification. That is major.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. VANCE-COOKS: I would like Olivia to stand up for that one again. There you go. There you go.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. VANCE-COOKS: In particular where the library community is concerned, our digital profile continues to grow. In March of 2012, the transition from GPO's legacy system -- GPO Access -- to FDsys was completed. Now FDsys is GPO's website for online official and authentic government information.

Today, we have approximately 680,000 titles sitting out there, 34.6 million retrievals per month. We're approaching 315 million retrievals. For the first time in 2012, we offered audio content. And we had a pilot project for public access for federal court opinions. And you can tell by all of those accomplishments, we're on the move.

And so when you look at FY 2013 planned FDsys features, you see we intend to really pursue mobile app development. We will add the remaining courts in the U.S. Courts

collection. We intend to refresh our search engine. And we intend to work on the digitized-bound Congressional Record collection.

Which takes me to the budget. Okay. We've done great things, but we've also had budget constraints. But I'm happy to tell you that our finances are sound. And that is a very good thing.

The buy-out that we ran last year generated enough savings to cover the reduction in printing volume that occurred because of the decline in printing related to the continuing resolution and just a decline in demand.

For appropriations, GPO, along with the rest of the government, are now covered by a continuing resolution that will take place all the way until the end of March 2013 or the passage of a legislative branch appropriations bill, whichever one comes first.

Our funding has been continued at the FY '12 rate. We're looking at \$35 million for the salary and expense appropriation of the

Superintendent of Documents, \$91 million for Congressional printing and binding, \$503,000 for the revolving fund. Most of that is for the investment in FDsys. The overall FY '12 rate is the same amount that we requested for FY 2013. It is a flat rate.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But. GPO and the rest the trying to plan for the government are possibility of a fiscal cliff in early January I'm referring to the combination of spending cuts and tax hikes that are scheduled to go into effect automatically unless Congress and the President act before then to avert. are working to minimize the potential impact on the GPO.

I hope through my comments you now have a sense of the kind of leader that I am. I do not wait for things to happen. I plan. We have a task force that is watching the situation very carefully. We're monitoring. We're developing recommendations if the sequestration should occur.

In recent years, as I think you know

all too well, the FDLP has faced a number of challenges. Increased demand for digital resources, reduced resources to support print collections are predominant among challenges. The forecast study that has been conducted by FDLP in recent months is an effort to address these challenges.

But in the meantime, I want you to know that I believe we have within the parameters of the current law the ability to make many of the kinds of adjustments that are needed to support the FDLP through this continued era of change.

There are a number of creative efforts that are being applied within the library community to address the challenges it faces. I believe we can and I believe we should support these efforts and that we have the ability to do so.

I also believe that the world in which we live is changing rapidly. And therefore, we must increase the pace of our response. I believe that we must be realistic,

responsive and relevant. So I encourage you in this conference to speak up, be heard on what your libraries are facing and what you need from the GPO.

And as I go to my seat, I am inviting you to a party. After your meetings end here, please come over to the GPO to see a wonderful new independent film about the linotype machine, the technology that was used throughout the 20th Century, not just by GPO but worldwide. And not only did this technology vastly increase productivity and reduce the cost of printing, but the resulting flood of printed books, pamphlets, newspapers, et cetera, et cetera, increased the literacy and affected libraries profoundly.

Now after the film, please join us for a reception in the GPO Bookstore. I've been told to tell you it's 50 percent off all books.

(LAUGHTER.)

MS. VANCE-COOKS: I've also been told to tell you it's free shipping.

(LAUGHTER.)

1 MS. VANCE-COOKS: I've also been 2 told to tell you free drinks. (LAUGHTER.) 3 4 MS. VANCE-COOKS: So 50 percent 5 discount, free drinks, popcorn for the linotype 6 machine. Does that all work for you? Okay. 7 So in closing, please know that the administration of the FDLP is one of GPO's most 8 9 important roles. I take that duty very 10 seriously, both as a commitment to the public and as a commitment to you and your colleagues to 11 assist you in the important work that you do each 12 13 day. Thank you for joining us at this 14 conference. Thank you for all of the hard work 15 you do in serving the public's need for access 16 to government information. The partnership 17 that the GPO shares with you is a longstanding 18 19 one, one that will continue and one that I am proud of. 20 Thank you. 21 22 (APPLAUSE.)

MS. LASTER:

Thank you very much.

23

I know I am really looking forward to tonight's film. And I hope you'll all be there to see it

3 as well.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Now it's my privilege to introduce the Assistant Public Printer, Superintendent of Documents, Mary Alice Baish.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. BAISH: Thank you very much.

Following Davita is always a tough job to do. But I'm here, and I will do my best.

I want to join her in welcoming all of you to the 2012 Depository Library Council meeting and Federal Depository Library Conference.

As you saw in this wonderful new video and you heard firsthand from Acting Public Printer Davita Vance-Cooks, this is a very challenging and exciting time for all of us at the U.S. Government Printing Office. Under her leadership, the Agency is embracing opportunities to transform our processes, our programs and our services to meet the changing needs of our customers and all

stakeholders and to build upon the historic mission of the GPO, keeping America informed, through a new strategic vision and plan that will ensure the important future of the Agency.

The Conference theme this year, Celebrating the Past, Building the Future Together, is very appropriate and meaningful. We are indeed very fortunate to recognize milestones that both Shari and Davita have already mentioned to you. But I think even more important than celebrating the past this week, we're here to continue a strategic dialogue about the future of the Federal Depository Library Program in the digital age taking into account the needs of our users and all of our partner libraries.

A year ago at this meeting and conference, we held a very fruitful day of discussion on creating our shared vision, roles and opportunities in the FDLP. We acknowledged that the future of the FDLP is at a tipping point but that we could come together identifying necessary changes to accommodate today's

digital world so that it will become more robust.

We asked the community to participate in the FDLP forecast study so that we could hear the views and the opinions of all libraries. And you certainly delivered for us.

This slide shows the three components of phase one of the study -- the FDLP library forecast, the FDLP state forecast and the FDLP national plan.

We have received so far 775 individual library forecasts from the just under 1200 libraries. This was a voluntary survey, and I want to thank all of you for completing it very much.

In addition to the individual library forecasts, we have received 40 state forecasts and 33 state-focused action plans. Your participation has been enthusiastic, and we are very, very grateful.

Over the course of the next four days, we're going to share with you the preliminary quantitative findings and the major themes which we have identified.

The FDLP forecast study has been one of our largest initiatives since last year's meeting and conference. And we will ultimately use it to inform the new FDLP National Plan for the future of the program that will ensure that it sustains and becomes more robust for the future.

Here's a slide for the three parts that I just mentioned. We're finishing up phase one right now. We're going to be sharing our information with you. Phase two is going to consist of a series of interviews and focus groups. We've identified themes that might be particular to one type of library, for example, those regional libraries or our public libraries. Phase three will be the development of the white paper and the final phase, of course, the FDLP National Plan.

In terms of the mission, I wanted to just briefly show this slide. The mission of the Federal Depository Library Program is to provide government information when and where it is needed in order to create an informed

citizenry and an improved quality of life.

That's our vision. And the mission of the FDLP

is to provide for no-fee, ready and permanent

public access to federal government information

now and for future generations.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

This vision and mission were approved by the Depository Library Council at the October 2008 meeting. And the mission is achieved through first, organizing processes that enable desired information to be identified and located; second, expert assistance rendered by trained professionals -- those of you in the room this morning -- through our network of depository libraries; collections of publications at our depository libraries; and last but certainly not least, current and archived online information dissemination products from the Federal Digital System --FDsys -- federal agency websites and our FDLP partners.

In addition, by law and tradition, the following principles for government information have come to represent the core

ideology of the Federal Depository Library Program. They were articulated in the -- and I know many of you could repeat the title with me -- Study to Identify Measures Necessary for a Successful Transition to a More Electronic FDLP as required by Legislative Branch Appropriations Act 1996, Public Law 104-53, in June of 1996. Some of us were around back then.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

These are the five principles that were developed in partnership led by GPO, but in partnership with all of the national library associations and the Federal Depository Library community. And they are going to always be our mantra as we move forward.

First principle, the public has the right of access to government information. Second, government the obligation has disseminate and provide broad public access to its information. Third, government has obligation to guarantee the authenticity and integrity of its information. Fourth, government has an obligation to preserve its information. And five, government information

1	created compiled by government employees or at
2	government expense should remain in the public
3	domain. So these are the principles guiding us
4	as we move forward to the new National Plan.
5	I would now briefly like to
6	congratulate Shari Laster, our new Chair of the
7	Depository Library Council. It has just been an
8	overwhelming pleasure working with Shari since
9	she became Chair on June 1st of last summer.
10	I would also like to welcome all the
11	members of the Depository Library Council and
12	introduce to you our newly appointed members.
13	Steve Beleu, if you would just raise your hand,
14	Steve.
15	(APPLAUSE.)
16	MS. BAISH: Chris Brown.
17	(APPLAUSE.)
18	MS. BAISH: Marie Concannon.
19	(APPLAUSE.)
20	MS. BAISH: Blane Dessy.
21	(APPLAUSE.)
22	MS. BAISH: Rosemary LaSala.
23	(APPLAUSE.)

MS. BAISH: And Larry Romans.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. BAISH: And I really this morning want to give a brief moment of introduction to Blane Dessy who is the Executive Director of FEDLINK at the Library of Congress. He's our newest Council Member, having been appointed by our Acting Public Printer, to complete the term of Donna Lauffer.

Following her retirement from the Johnson County Library in December of 2011, Donna made the difficult decision last June to resign from Council to spend more time with her family and her grandchildren and also to pursue her important volunteer work. We're very grateful to the many contributions Donna brought to our discussions, and she has graciously agreed to continue as an unofficial advisor to Council representing the needs of our public depository libraries.

It's been a real pleasure working with the Council throughout the year. And I really want to thank each of you for your

leadership and your support.

We're very pleased that Shari followed the footsteps of her predecessor, James Jacobs, and convened Council working groups this year to focus on some of the key challenges that we face. This year's working groups are on collaboration, education, sustainability and technology. And we all look forward to the Council working group sessions that are scheduled throughout the week. So thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. BAISH: As Davita mentioned, we're also recognizing the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the Depository Library Act of 1962. This Act dramatically changed the program by creating the current system of regional and selective depository libraries.

Our regional depository libraries demonstrate a high level of commitment and leadership by taking on collection and service statutory obligations. In addition, over the years, regional depository libraries have

expanded services beyond these legal responsibilities.

To show our deep appreciation for the dedication and services of our 47 regional depository libraries, their parent institutions and their depository library staff, we have mailed a special plaque to each regional library director as a small token of our deep appreciation.

At this time, I'd like to acknowledge the dedication of all the regional library coordinators who are here. I know you've already stood up. But if you would once again please stand up and be recognized for your hard work and dedication.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. BAISH: And as Davita mentioned, we'll be recognizing you again this evening at our wonderful reception.

We're really pleased with the high level of attendance this year knowing how difficult it is given budget constraints and the reality we all face of having to do more with

less. And I know it's hard for you to be away from your library. So thank you so much for coming to this meeting. And we look forward to your contributions to our discussions.

There's a terrific array of educational programs throughout the next four days. I'd like to note 17 sessions led by members of the depository library community this week and ten by our federal agency partners.

In addition, we brought back the very popular poster sessions. We would like to thank each of you who've been so generous in contributing to these educational sessions for sharing your knowledge and expertise with the community. So thank you very much.

For those of you who could not be here with us this morning but are following us on Twitter, I appreciate the time you're taking out of your busy schedules to follow us virtually. And we're also very pleased this year to be offering virtual attendance at the four forecast study sessions that are being held each afternoon at 2:00 p.m. Eastern Time for

_ -

those of you who can join us. I'd like to note as of yesterday, 160 librarians had already registered to follow us virtually for our forecast session. That's a terrific response.

I would now like to introduce to you the senior management of Library Service and Content Management. Ms. Jane Sanchez. Jane, if you would stand up, please. Joined GPO last March.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. BAISH: Jane is our new LSCM Director. She comes to us with 35 years of library and information program management experience, both in the federal government and private sector. Most recently, she served as Associate Director, Library Staff at the U.S. Department of Justice, Justice Management Division Library. So welcome to your first conference, Jane.

Jane is ably assisted by Ms. Laurie
Hall -- if you could stand up, Laurie -Director of Technical Services.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. BAISH: And Ms. Robin
Haun-Mohamed, Director of LSCM Outreach and

(APPLAUSE.)

Support.

MS. BAISH: I would also like to offer a word of gratitude to Lance Cummins who may have stepped out of the room. Wouldn't you know it? He's very humble. Lance Cummins, Bridget Govan and Deborah Smith for all the hard work they've done, not just in preparing for this meeting, but over the course of the last 24 hours in putting all of your packets together. So wherever they are, we're very grateful to them.

I'd also of course like to take a moment to express my heartfelt gratitude to all of the managers and staff of Library Services and Content Management. They are a hardworking team and a very talented group whose expertise, creativity and commitment to serving the Federal Depository Library community and our agency partners are unparalleled. So would you please just briefly stand again.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. BAISH: Thank you.

You'll see many more staff joining us throughout the week and just look for this wonderful eagle on the staff card. And please feel free to come up and talk to us and be able to put names to faces.

So now I'd like to briefly highlight several initiatives we've undertaken during the past year.

First, a remarkable team of LSCM staff members have provided in-person and virtual training to over 1600 members of the depository library community, Congressional staff and agency personnel on basic and advanced searching of the Federal Digital System.

The team has also conducted a total of 61 virtual training sessions. They've also worked with LSCM's web team to create FDsys educational videos. The first module is now available on FDsys and focuses on basic search techniques and working with FDsys search results. The second module on advanced searching will be posted shortly to the FDsys

homepage.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

We believe it is very important that we provide training to members of the public at their point of need directly on the FDsys homepage. And we will be adding in the coming year an additional 30 modules, most of them just two- to three- to four-minute tips on how to do a particular search.

of Second, member t.he as а International Internet Preservation Consortium, LSCM initiated a web archiving team to develop a pilot project to analyze the use of automated harvesting tools in addition to our manual harvesting methods. This allows us to capture entire websites as well as individual publications from agencies and commissions that are predominantly published in electronic forms.

Unfortunately I don't have time to go into it in any more depth, but I do want to tell you that the wonderful team of LSCM who's been involved in this harvest pilot project will present an overview of their work during the

Depository Library Council's technology working group session which is being held on Thursday morning.

Third, LSCM staff have been working in tandem with Chief Technology Officer Richard Davis and his team to prepare for an audit by the Center for Research Libraries according to the metrics and methodology known as a trustworthy digital repository checklist or TDR.

For the audit, which will begin in November and last approximately eight months, GPO has asked CRL to perform the following functions: one, to conduct an audit and assessment of FDsys' functional attributes, user community and financial support to perform as a trustworthy repository for the long-term preservation of federal digital information assets against the performance metrics defined in the TDR checklist; second, to identify and document opportunities for improvement in FDsys operations; and third, to rate FDsys according to all TDR metrics and write a final report of audit findings and recommendations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The Center for Research Libraries is in the process of inviting members to serve on the certification advisory panel. And I just want to make one more note about this important initiative. FDsys is the first digital repository of any federal agency to be formally audited by the TDR standard ISO 16363.

While these are exciting, ongoing initiatives, we've also been collaborating very closely with our CTO Richard Davis and his team to bring more content into the federal digital system. I'd like to update you briefly on our progress.

Davita has already mentioned the United States Courts Collection. This has been done under pilot with the а one-year Administrative Office of the United States Courts to make available lower federal court and bankruptcy court opinions through FDsys. pilot is completed. We had a goal originally of adding 12 court libraries. And in fact. currently today there are opinions from 32 federal appellate bankruptcy and district

courts available on FDsys.

The United States Courts Collection has consistently ranked among the 12 most heavily used FDsys collections since it was made available in the beginning to the public last October.

I'm very pleased to announce that during its September meeting, the Judicial Conference of the United States approved the pilot for national implementation. So we will be working with the Administrative Office to ingest the opinions of the remaining 172 federal courts into FDsys in FY 2013.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. BAISH: Second, U.S. statutes at large in the bound Congressional Record. The Joint Committee on Printing approved a collaborative initiative between GPO and the Library of Congress to digitize and enhance online public access to some of our nation's most important legal and legislative documents, historic volumes of the United States Statutes at Large and the bound Congressional Record.

The Statutes from 1951 through 2002 became accessible through FDsys last April and the final volumes last summer. And I wanted to announce that LSCM has just successfully completed eight-week Statutes-at-Large an metadata project. It consisted of adding metadata to the specified field of the private laws. the concurrent resolutions and proclamations, sections of each year of the Statutes-at-Large in order to improve searchability and enhance public access.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

We've begun the process again in partnership with the Library of Congress to ingest files of the bound Congressional Record going back to 1873. And we will be working throughout FY 2013 to make that collection publicly accessible on FDsys.

Partnering with federal agencies and the courts is one of the most important things that we can do to bring content into FDsys. And I'd like to recognize briefly this morning, we have three representatives from the Library of Congress. And if you would please

1 stand.

Robert Newlen, Assistant Law Librarian for Collections Outreach and Services.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. BAISH: Dr. Beth Dulabahn,
Director of Integration Management in the Office
of Strategic Initiatives.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. BAISH: And Cliff Cohen,
Associate Director, Office of Congressional
Information and Publishing, Congressional
Research Service.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. BAISH: We value our partnership. And thank you so much for coming today.

This morning, we're also excited to be unveiling a new partnership with the U.S. Department of the Treasury which is very exciting. We have signed a letter of agreement with the Department of the Treasury for a pilot project to make historic digitized content from

the Treasury Library available on GPO's Federal Digital System.

The Treasury Library has identified nine collections for the pilot. And this morning in the wee hours of the a.m. -- I think about 2:00 o'clock -- the first set of content -- the Treasury reporting rates of exchange from 1956 to 2005 -- were made publicly available. These rates of exchange lists the exchange rates of foreign currencies based on the dollar. And over the next year, we're going to bring in additional historical documents that have been identified by the U.S. Department of the Treasury.

The next collection that will be ingested into FDsys is the Official Register of the United States, 1829 through 1861 and 1879 through 1959. The Official Register is a publication with information about the federal workforce including the name of every employee, their job title, date or country of birth, location of their post and their annual salary.

It's a privilege right now to

introduce you to Melissa Hartman -- if you would stand, Melissa -- Deputy Assistant Secretary for Privacy, Transparency and Records at the U.S. Department of the Treasury.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. BAISH: And sitting next to Melissa is Zachary Twining, Chief Librarian at the U.S. Department of the Treasury.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. BAISH: Our growing number of partnerships with federal agency colleagues is critical to our collection development plans. And thank you also, Melissa and Zach, for joining us today.

Another new initiative that is just getting underway is the FEDLINK working group for the FDLP. FEDLINK, located at the Library of Congress, stands for Federal Library and Information Network.

Working with its Executive Director Blane Dessy, our newest member of Council, the Advisory Board recently approved my request to create a new FDLP agency working group. Our

mission is to develop and implement collaborative strategies to increase awareness of and permanent public access to federal government information from Executive Branch agencies. We look forward to developing these new collaborations through the working group.

The FDLP supports federal agency responsibilities to provide information to the public in accordance with OMB Circular A130 and Title 44 of the United States Code.

So now we're going to step back for a moment, and at this time Acting Public Printer Davita Vance-Cooks is going to present this year's recipients of the Federal Depository Library of the Year awards.

And while she's changing locations just very briefly, I want to invite all past members of Depository Library Council when we break after the awards ceremony to please come up and join the current Council members here at the front of the room so we can get a group photo to commemorate this special anniversary.

So Davita.

_ .

MS. VANCE-COOKS: The FDLP of the Year Award provides special recognition to libraries that have gone above and beyond to further GPO FDLP's mission of ensuring the American public has free access to government information. This year for the first time, GPO offered two categories of nominations, that of Regional Depository Libraries and Selectives, so that we could honor two extraordinary federal depository libraries of the year.

Well, guess what. We had a tie. So we actually have selected three libraries this year that have demonstrated extraordinary levels of service to expand access to federal government collections and services.

I'm very pleased to announce that our first Federal Depository Library of the Year is the Newark Public Library in Newark, New Jersey.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. VANCE-COOKS: The Newark Public Library serves as a regional for the other FDLs in the State of New Jersey. Under the guidance

of the regional staff, the State's Federal Depository Libraries have continued to provide excellent public service while weathering the State's financial crisis. Newark Public Library thrives under the leadership of Library Director Wilma Grey and Depository Coordinator Laura Saurs.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. VANCE-COOKS: And we will invite Director Ms. Grey for some remarks.

MS. GREY: Thank you. Yes. I just have to say that I'm carrying around this little ribbon that says "First-time Attendee." And I'm so happy to be here today to hear about all the wonderful plans for the GPO and the Federal Depository Library Program. Just awesome.

When I received a call a few weeks ago from Mary Alice Baish, I was a little taken aback. It's not every day that you receive a call from the Superintendent of Documents. And I had no idea what she was going to say. I was a little bit worried there.

(LAUGHTER.)

MS. GREY: But when she announced that the Newark Public Library was going to be honored, I was just elated.

And my first impulse was to get on the phone and tell everybody. But she cautioned me that I couldn't tell anybody until October 15th. So I'm so happy that October 15th has finally arrived. And I'm going back and telling everybody.

I have to say that I was very fortunate in being a librarian at the Newark Public Library. I started my career just a few years after we became a regional. And it gave me the opportunity to see what a vast and wonderful collection government documents is.

It also gave me the opportunity to develop a profound respect for the people who are given the responsibility of developing and managing that collection. And through the years, I have to say that I have known every single coordinator of government documents. But not one of them has surpassed Laura Saurs in her ability. She is a librarian's librarian --

consummate documents librarian. And she has taught herself everything I think there is to know about documents.

(LAUGHTER.)

MS. GREY: She has an incredible amount of expertise, and she can answer questions in such a professional manner that I think no other librarian at Newark Public Library can do.

She has put together a wonderful, wonderful exhibit a few years ago to highlight the 100 years that the Newark Public Library has been a depository. So if anybody really deserves this honor, it is Laura.

And I just thank you so much to the Public Printer, Superintendent of Documents and also to the Committee. Thank you so very much.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. BAISH: And I have to mention as they return to their seats that Laura Saurs is one of the distinguished past members of the Depository Library Council.

So our second honoree today is the

Buffalo University Library, a selective depository library in Buffalo, New York.

Representing the University of Buffalo Lockwood Library this morning are Dean Hendrix,

Assistant Director for University Libraries,
and Ed Herman, Government Information

Librarian.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. BAISH: The Buffalo University libraries have a very long history of teaching government information resources and a longstanding partnership with GPO to provide federal depository libraries with data useful for managing our depository operations.

So Dean Hendrix, welcome.

MR. HENDRIX: Well, I am just absolutely delighted and thrilled to accept this award on behalf of the University of Buffalo libraries.

I have to say that we can't do what we do without good staff. And let me just go over a few of the things that I did in preparation for these remarks.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

library Ι think а lot of administrators, we kind of have a pathological obsession with reading mission statements and strategic plans. So I hopped onto GPO.org, read the mission statement and a few words and phrases came to mind when I was reading it collaboration, transparency, users, expertise.

And when I read and I started reading all these things, it was crystal clear -- and I don't mean that in an egoistical way -- but it was crystal clear why we're getting the award. It's because of the staff like I have here to be honest.

Ed is our full librarian, full faculty librarian. Whether it's lecturing at the law school, helping an undergrad who's just become frustrated with scrolling through Google results or helping our Regional Transportation Authority with international trade proposals, Ed is a noted expert in western New York for government information.

Three other of my colleagues are not here, but they are just as essential to our

overall operations. The first is Mary Ellen Donathen who's a consummate library professional. She's our FDLP coordinator. And she provides back-end help and makes sure that there's seamless and transparent access to all the information.

The other two are Tim McCarthy and Ann Mongiovi who develop and maintain the enhanced shipping service that some of you may use and has become a part of the processing —the document processing toolkit for many of you. They represent the innovation that I saw today in the video. They are wonderful to work with.

You can't do anything without good staff like these people. So in their name and in their trust, I thank you and I thank Acting Public Printer Davita Vance-Cooks and Superintendent of Documents Mary Alice Baish and the Council for recognizing us. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. BAISH: I mentioned the tie.

Our third and final outstanding honoree is Olin

Library at Washington University, a selective

depository library.

Washington University's Depository is under the leadership of University Librarian Jeffrey Trzeciak who took over this position I believe on July 1 and at the last minute was unable to join us. But accepting the award is our Depository Coordinator Barbara Rehkop. And I've also asked Marie Concannon, the Regional Depository Librarian for the State of Missouri, to join in with us this morning.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. BAISH: In addition to providing extensive training opportunities, the Olin Library collaborates with their regional depository library to ensure that the needs of the very populace St. Louis metropolitan region are well served.

So, congratulations.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. REHKOP: It's surprisingly heavy.

(LAUGHTER.)

MS. REHKOP: I'm so proud to accept

this award on behalf of Washington University and St. Louis. And in actuality, it's an award for community building in St. Louis. And as you probably know, you can't build a community in a year or with just one library.

So it is with great and probably what you didn't know is what a terrific and wonderful and what a hotbed of leadership St. Louis is. So I'd like to recognize some names that you might actually know like Bill Olbrich and perhaps John Montrey, Frances Piesbergen, Katrina Stierholz, who was on Council for a while, Jess Windles who was Regional Librarian before Marie and who is an honorary member of the Missouri Contingency. And Marie, too, who -- Council, if you haven't discovered how wonderful Marie is yet, you're in for a treat. She's a hard worker, intelligent and wonderful.

I also wanted to say how very happy
I am that Mary Alice could join us for our very
first regional conference last May. She was a
wonderful keynote speaker. And we're all very
proud of this.

1	Thank you.
2	(APPLAUSE.)
3	MS. LASTER: Congratulations to all
4	of the recipients and their staff. And thank
5	you for all your hard work.
6	With that, it's time for lunch. So
7	we will see you back here at 2:00 o'clock for our
8	first session on the forecast survey.
9	Thank you.
LO	(APPLAUSE.)
11	(Whereupon, at 12:01 p.m., off the
12	record until 2:05 p.m.)
13	
L4	
15	
L6	
L7	
18	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
2	

2

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N 7

2:05 p.m.

MS. BAISH: Thank you very much.

My name is Mary Alice Baish. the Superintendent of Documents. Welcome to the first of four daily sessions on the FDLP forecast study.

I really want to thank so many of you for coming back from lunch. It was a lovely two-hour break.

(LAUGHTER.)

And I looked out my MS. BAISH: hotel room a few minutes ago and it appeared that we may be getting some rain. So I hope everybody's dry and comfortable again.

In addition to a full conference room of document librarians, I also want to

3

6

21 22 23 welcome our virtual attendees. This year for
the first time as we announced this morning, we
were able to provide virtual registration using
our iCohere software. And I understand that
within about the first two hours of the
announcement, we had more than 100 people who had
registered. And that registration number has

gone up to over 130.

I want to thank Cindy Etkin and recognize her for all the hard work she has done to make this virtual participation possible today. I spoke with her a few moments ago and she said well, 31 folks had signed on virtually. But she got excited. She said more and more are coming on. So I'm not sure what the number is. She's making this big expression that I guess means a lot of people have joined us. And I want to welcome our virtual attendees. And these iCohere sessions are obviously going to be archived for any of us to go into and look at afterwards.

So the goals of the FDLP forecast study. The goal was really to work

collaboratively with the community to explore rand document the most pressing issues, goals and viewpoints of FDLP members of all types of depository libraries and to understand their needs, their vision and the environment within which each individual library exists at the state level. We also wanted to look at the goals and initiatives of states and multi-state federal depository regions to determine how best GPO can complement all of the wonderful efforts that you've made each and every day.

The data collected from the individual library and state forecasts and the state-focused action plans and the continued collaboration with the community will inform the decision making and ensure that the national plan for the future of the FDLP will be one based on a shared vision with all of our member libraries.

As I mentioned this morning, we were delighted with the high level of participation by the community. There were 775 individual library forecasts that were submitted complete

and signed. There are now 40 state forecasts which we appreciate very much. And the state forecasts really form the basis for the preliminary findings and for the 33 state action plans that we have received to date which is just incredible.

Those 33 action plans really represent 39 states and territories. And if you want to take a note, they include 132 initiatives and 691 actions. So I think you all should congratulate yourselves for a job well done.

This study provides an opportunity for GPO and you, our community, to work together to identify the projects that are going to be most beneficial to users and to your libraries and to identify the most important initiatives that you have undertaken and identify where change is needed, not only that but what changes are most important to the community.

Together, we can shape the future of the FDLP to better meet the needs of users and your libraries. And we can be a program that is flexible as we seek to meet both current and future needs.

As Acting Public Printer, Davita Vance-Cooks noted this morning these are tough economic times for everyone. Diminished funding for libraries and staff -- all of you, documents coordinators wearing multiple hats, and we understand that and thank you for your commitment to the program.

We also understand the continued competition for space in your libraries. And that means that new initiatives and a more flexible program are needed.

Your viewpoints and ideas are helping us shape a new FDLP strategic plan, a new library services and content management strategic plan and ultimately our shared FDLP national plan that will shape the future.

During the forecast sessions this week, we are going to share preliminary quantitative results from the state forecasts as well as themes identified in the state and library forecasts and also goals and initiatives that have been identified in the state-focused

action plans.

Today's session will begin with an introduction to the methodology explaining how we created the study and why. And I really want to take a moment to pause and to thank members of the Depository Library Council for the great support they have given to this project, including those of you who might have migrated off Council since June but were so fully supportive of our efforts as we develop multiple versions of both the individual library and state forecast questionnaires. This was really a team effort.

On Tuesday, we're going to continue finishing up our discussion of the preliminary findings of the state forecasts and move into the goals and initiatives that were identified in the state-focused action plans. On Wednesday, we're going to look at the individual library forecasts -- 775 of them. And Thursday will be devoted to summary discussion and to future roles.

It takes a team -- a full team -- to

do such an important and lengthy and difficult initiative as a research project. And all of you who are here today -- and I suspect that many of you came to this meeting in particular to find out what our preliminary results are -- all of you who participated at any level -- individual library, at the state forecast, state-focused action plan -- all of us at GPO want to thank you really sincerely for your efforts.

Within Library Services and Content Management, there is a very large team who have been working really since we began looking at the questionnaire with Council last year. And I'm going to call off their names, omitting the ones who are here and are going to be speaking this afternoon.

I want to let all of you in the audience know how committed they have all been to this project, how time-consuming it has been, how many weekly meetings we have had throughout the process that culminated in what you're going to be learning this week. So I'm not sure they're all in the room, but if you are will you

1	please stand up and be recognized?
2	Mark Ames, hiding in the back.
3	Kathy Bayer. Kathy, please stand
4	up for a moment. Thank you.
5	Christina Bobe. Christina Bobe.
6	Amanda Colvin. She may actually be
7	out in the exhibit hall at the table.
8	Ashley Dahlen. Terrific.
9	I don't think John Dowigiallo is
LO	with us today. In addition to the team of LSCM
11	and PA assessments and policy analysts, we
12	brought in our web content team. And John has
13	been very, very helpful to us. Katy Davis, as
L4	well, and of course, Karen Sieger. I hope you
15	all are appreciating the wonderful charts that
L6	we've had outside of the room.
L7	I mentioned Cindy Etkin as well who
18	has done a magnificent job in putting together
L9	our iCohere virtual opportunity.
20	Melissa Fairfield. Okay, way in
21	the back.
22	Robin Haun-Mohammed. Robin,
23	please do stand up.

1	Linda Moayedi. Linda Moayedi I
2	really wanted to recognize Linda for the
3	valuable contribution she has brought to the
4	table. I made my best effort actually to have
5	her come up too as a presenter. And as she
6	explained, she prefers to be in the background.
7	But as you admire so many of the charts and the
8	graphs that you are going to see, you might want
9	to take the opportunity to thank Linda in
10	particular for her careful eye over everything
11	that we have done.
12	Heidi Ramos is hiding here. Right
13	up in the front. Thank you, Heidi.
14	Of course, our new LSCM Director,
15	Jane Sanchez.
16	Kelly Seifert. Kelly? Oh, there
17	she is. Thank you so much.
18	I think that actually covers the
19	list. So thank you.
20	(APPLAUSE.)

MS. BAISH: As each month got closer to the conference, our workload intensified as you might have imagined. I don't know if

anybody's kept count of the graphs or PowerPoint slides that we've created, but you're going to be enjoying and learning from them all week.

I wanted to let you know that when we met last week to have our run through, the stack of slides seemed so tall that we decided that we were going to go green. And so, I want to let everybody know that all of our PowerPoint slides that we're using throughout these four days are on the FDLP desktop. And certainly they will be available as well to our iCohere attendees.

Posters outside of the room. That was one of our staff's brilliant idea to kind of provide a forum. Everyday we will be changing the posters to recognize the issues that we will be covering that afternoon.

There is a question and an answer box for those of you who are shy somewhere in the registration desk.

Today we have two hours. As you know, we're breaking a little bit early so that we can all go over to GPO Main and be there in

p.m. to be followed by the reception in the Bookstore.

At the end of the session -- and I want to thank Shari Laster, the DLC Chair -- is going to facilitate a 15-minute discussion, Q&A from the audience. And again, if you're shy, find the box and write your question down, please.

In addition, we've asked Blane Dessy if he would provide following the Q&A just about a seven-, eight-, nine- to 10-minute summary of what we have discussed together today.

So now I would like to introduce you please to the three speakers of this afternoon's presentation.

The first one is Cherie Givens. Cherie Givens, who many of those of you who were at the conference last year may recall that Cherie was one of our speakers. Cherie reports directly to me. And she is a Program Planning Specialist. She will discuss the methodology.

Joining us also today -- and this is

a new face for the library community -- is Paul Giannini. Paul is Senior Business Intelligence Analyst at the Government Printing Office. He's a mathematics graduate of Christian Brothers College. And he spent three years in private industry in the area of quality assurance and quality control. Paul brought this experience to GPO when he joined us in 1975. And it resulted in the creation of GPO's Quality Control Through Attributes Program -- QCTAP, we pronounced it, which is used everyday on every print job that GPO procures.

During Mr. Giannini's career at GPO, he's championed business analytics and business intelligence initiatives resulting in GPO's better understanding of both itself and the customers whom we serve.

So we're going to hear today first from Cherie, followed by Paul, and then followed by David Walls. David Walls is a staff of Library Services and Content Management. And he is our Preservation Librarian.

So with that, welcome to you those

of you present in the ballroom today, our virtual attendees. And Cherie Givens, will you please come up to the podium now? Thank you.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. GIVENS: I am pleased to be here to talk about this national study that GPO has initiated through LSCM under the direction of the Superintendent of Documents.

This is a mixed-method study. And it's designed to investigate and document the most pressing needs of the FDLP community now and in the future looking at individual library needs, looking at needs at the state level, and looking at initiatives that we are already doing -- the community's already doing -- at the state and/or regional level.

It's our intent to build a foundation for the FDLP National Plan and also for the strategy that goes for LSCM and for the FDLP. So we're looking at actual initiatives that will go into strategic planning on both of those levels. And then those will feed into our National Plan.

Our goal has been and it continues to be to work collaboratively with the community for a vibrant future. And this approach that we're using -- the mixed-methods research approach -- began in the 1980s. And it became mainstream in the social sciences in 2003. And many of you may know about this as there's actually a journal devoted to this. And sometimes it's been referred to as the third methodological movement and also as the third research paradigm.

And what we're doing here is we're combining what we hope to be the best of both worlds. So what we've done is the complaint that you get about qualitative research is that you can't put numbers to it and that's it's somewhat subjective. And the complaint that you get about quantitative research is that you lose out on all this extra information that you might know if you had gone the other way. So what we've done is combine these two in order to make a more comprehensive study of what exactly are the current needs. And in doing this, we

have gone about it in three phases which we'll be discussing.

Now what we're here today to talk about is essentially phase one which almost all of you have participated in, and we've had an overwhelming turnout for that. And so, we'll be discussing what we've done in phase one and where we plan to go with that, what we're going to do in phase two and when that's going to happen and what we're going to do in phase three and when you can expect to get the information.

Now, I'll be covering the history of this, the qualitative aspects and the three phases. And then I'm going to turn it over to my associate, Mr. Giannini, who's going to talk to us about the quantitative aspects.

So to back up just a little bit, so many of you were here this time last year when we first started talking about this. The whole study came about as a result of a collaboration with the community where we opened it up to you and we said hey, here are the things that we're proposing.

And on October 20th of 2011, what we proposed was to do a state forecast, which was our original state forecast questionnaire and to do a state-focused action plan. And at the session -- that special Thursday session -- what attendees told us is that they would like to have the ability to submit an individual questionnaire. Well, what amazing luck. This gives us such a great and enriching environment.

We have now 775 -- and actually -so we have 775 valid completed surveys for the
library forecast. And I'm going to talk about
this a little bit more in just a few minutes.
But we have even still continuing -- people are
continuing to submit to us. So this is a wealth
of information that we would never have. And
it's the ability to see what's happening right
at the ground level -- what's happening in each
and every library. And it gives us so many
different ways to analyze the data and to look
at it and to understand what's going on by type
of library, by region, and even down to specifics
of a specific library one thing that might be

important that we need to investigate. So it's really wonderful.

So phase one, this is where we are.

So I know many of you have heard me talk about
this in virtual sessions about how these
different research instruments build on each
other. But I think it's worth talking about.

So the library forecast is our initial foray in. And this is what the 775 have done. We looked at the individual library level where you told us what was going on with you. And we got to hear what would an ideal FDLP look like for each and every type of library and for each and every coordinator who submitted.

Then this builds into the FDLP state forecast where groups got together at the state level and decided what the answers were at their state. And now what we have seen and as would be expected is that that's not always in agreement because the decisions that you might make at an individual level do not necessarily represent what you would make at the state level. So this in itself is an interesting area for a

future analysis.

Then all of that builds into the state-focused action plans. And what we got in the state-focused action plans were ideas where people came together to look at what was working for them at the state level and then talk about what actions and initiatives they wanted to put together to move forward. And this is an especially important piece for us because it tells us what's going on in the community, and it gives us the opportunity to see how we can best complement those efforts.

All of these build into the National Plan. But there are some intervening steps, and we'll talk about that. But first, let's look at the response that we got.

So for the library forecast, we had 775 valid responses. And by that we mean that -- what happens is in Survey Monkey -- we facilitated the study in Survey Monkey. The questionnaires were released in Survey Monkey. So Survey Monkey is designed to record every time someone enters. So if you just came in for a

peek, it's recorded. So one of the things that
we had to do as part of this process was to figure
out which ones were valid entries versus which
ones were just to peek into it and which ones were
maybe not complete.

So what we did was we looked at it and determined that if you had incorporated your library number and your library password and you had completed it -- because we only took completed entries -- we counted this.

Now for the purposes of our preliminary analysis, we had to stop at a certain point. So the survey was scheduled to close on June the 30th. We kept account until July the 2nd. That was our latest entry point that we went in and we said okay, for the purposes of this preliminary analysis, this is the point that we're going to take in.

Since then, we know that there are at least 16 others that appear to be complete.

And we understand that more are still coming in.

Now what this gives us is 775 of a possible 1201 libraries completed it which gives

us a plus or minus 2.1 margin of error that we can be 95 percent confident that if we were to do this again, we would get the same or similar responses.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Now one of the things that make the library forecast such a wonderful document to have to have all of this data is particularly the questions that we were interested in is question 31 that asks about the future roles and opportunities. And to get this much information from all of these libraries -to get a 65 percent response rate and to know exactly what an ideal FDLP would look like for 65 percent of you is just amazing. And it gives us the ability to really understand at a level that we could not have gotten if we had kept it only at the state forecast level.

So we have a really great response rate. And this slide -- which we'll talk about more on Wednesday -- this slide on our library forecast breaks it down by population by the percentage of possible FDLP libraries from each state who did participate. And you'll see that

we have at least a fourth of the people participating from almost everywhere. And the bright yellow represents I believe it's over 90 percent. So that's really amazing.

I cannot see that from here, alas.

I'm sorry. It's on the slide outside. And they

are broken into -- oh, wait. Mary Ellen's going

to hand it to me. Thank you.

Okay. So now we get to see how old my eyes are.

Okay. So yellow is over 90 percent. Then the pinkish color is 81 to 90 percent. Then blue is 71 to 80 percent. The tealish green color is 61 to 70 percent. Purple is 51 to 60 percent. Then the next kind of blue, which would be the aquaish blue, is 41 to 50 percent. Then -- I would call that like burnt red -- I don't know -- is 31 to 40 percent. And then the light kind of very bluish which is just the -- I won't name the states because you know who you are -- is the 21 to 30 percent.

Okay. So that's the breakdown for the library forecast. And the really great thing is that we're still getting more in now. And we haven't closed it off. But what we had to do is we had to pick a point at which we were going to stop trying to get them all in to get the analysis because as we're trying to begin our theming and looking at creating our preliminary code book, we have to have something to base it on. And the longer we kept it open and we said well, here was our deadline but we're not going to start our analysis, then we couldn't move forward and we would have come empty handed, and we knew you didn't want that.

So that's where we are with that. And we're still getting more. And it's just an incredible response right now, I think. I mean, when you think about what the average study gets back that we have this wealth of information is amazing.

And along that same line, when we look at the state forecasts that were submitted, so this particular chart is showing the 39. At the time that we cut it off, we cut it off for 38 because at that point, that's what we had in. Since then, we had one additional late

submission that was past the point where we were going in and theming it and all of this within the last couple of weeks. But then Sunday we got another one. So now we're up to 40. But it was too late at this point to do it.

So I would like to say that Georgia should not be red because they have submitted. And Texas already has its appropriate color. So Texas was another submitter that we have which what a great number that will make. And for even just looking at the land mass and number of libraries, it's quite impressive.

So for the library forecast, when we look at that -- oh, I'd like to also add that it's not too late to add your viewpoints for the National Plan. So those of you in red, it's never too late. It's not too late. We're keeping it open. Yes.

So if we looked at that and we said 40 out of a possible 55, that would be 72 percent. If we even looked at it and we said oh, well, 38, then that would be 70 percent. So when we look at this and we think about what would the margin

of error be and what could we say in terms of the confidence rate on this, it's a little bit different than when we're looking at the library

forecast because we had so many entries.

For this one, we have a plus or minus 8.9 percent rate of error to be 95 percent confident that we have now could be replicated or that we believe that it could be replicated.

Then our third of the three research instruments that we have there making up our first phase of this is the state-focused action plans. Now the state-focused action plans, we received 33 state-focused action plans that represent 39 states and territories out of the possible 55. And I say 55 because even though we have 56, we have one territory where we don't have any libraries so that could not have been a possibility for us.

So that gives us essentially the same in terms of margin of error as we would have had for the state forecast. But in terms of the knowledge and what we have with that, having 132 initiatives and 691 actions really gives us so

much more information. And if we had only ever asked just at the questionnaire level and not followed up with this, all of this information, we wouldn't have. And this is really where we're looking at in terms of the things that we can do now, we're focusing on some of the things that we can move forward with right away in terms of our strategic planning. And a lot of it is coming from here. But this will be discussed on a later day, so I won't talk more about that at the moment.

One other thing that I would like to talk about though in relation to this is the issue of bias. So one of the issues that comes up when we think about a study like this is how will we account for bias. We know that we are the administrators of this program. And so, when we think about how we're going to look at your data and how we're going to analyze it, one of the things that we had to do was to step back from our positions and say that what we were going to do is do a plain language reading of what you wrote, and that if we think that it's open

to more than one interpretation, then part of what we're doing in the follow-up in phase two is contact respondents and asking them for clarification. So this is part of the phase two that we'll talking about shortly that's about interviewing and about focus groups.

So what we're trying to do at all times is to remain cognizant of the idea that we need to not put our own bias onto it as much as we can. I mean, nothing is ever foolproof. But if we keep that in mind and we work towards that goal, we feel that we're in much better shape.

The other really great safety net that we have with this is that we're sharing it with you each step of the way. We've been sharing it thus far our progress has been and the FDLP connection, we're going to continue to share. And the sharing and collaboration is part of phase three. And that's the main part of phase three which we talked about. But it's also present in all the different phases as we move through and in all the different time periods. So we could think of phase three as

something that's overlapping in time.

So what are we doing? So our mixed-methods approach involves both quantitative and qualitative analysis. And there's a focus on numbers, but then there's also a focus on context.

The statistical analysis has been performed by Paul Giannini and he's going to tell you more about that. And he's going to bring his more than 30 years of analytical experience to it which has just been wonderful for us. But I'm going to talk a little bit about the qualitative process because although it may seem like oh, okay, yes, you just read it and then you put it together under themes or whatever, the process is slightly more involved. And when we started working at GPO doing this, people were really surprised at the level of involvement it takes and the level of process that's involved. And so, we're going to look at that.

So as I mentioned before, what we're doing is line-by-line coding of the data. And this means that what we're doing is that we're

reading the entire -- well, we're reading first
through the entire forecast. So if you submit
a library forecast, you submitted a state

5 each and everyone completely.

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Then we read through all of them. So we went first through like each person's library forecast that's submitted. Then we read through all of the library forecasts together to get a feel for what's going on -- what have you said, what are the themes that are emerging.

forecast, we read through them. We read through

Then focused specific on we questions -- on the questions what would an ideal FDLP look like, and on the question is there anything else you would like to tell us. Ι always find this a fascinating question because you think that you've asked everything that would be relevant and important. And then you find out when you ask a question like that that there was some piece of the puzzle that you may And you would never know the have missed. answer unless you asked this question.

So these questions are designed to give us the greatest amount of variance that we would see in terms of answers and to help us to get sort of we could think of it like as umbrellas as ideas -- where we're going to put them. And this is how we've done the theming as sort of in that fashion.

So then this leads to a code book. And this is what we're working on now is a preliminary code book which will tell us what are the themes that we see emerging, how can we categorize those themes, and then we're defining them. And we're defining them based on what you told us. And we're coming up with these based on your own language. We're not going to impart our own language onto it or what we think about it. We're going to go with what the plain language says. And when we don't know what the interpretation is because it's open to multiple interpretations, then we're going to check with you to find out.

So the code book itself and with the definitions could be either being broadened or

narrowed as we go through this process. And it's also changing.

And then we're using the code book for intercode or reliability. So what we're doing when we do the coding is that we always code a minimum in groups of two. Then we also meet weekly to go over this. So like I may code with David, and we're coding and we decide oh, we think this thing is something about training. Then we meet.

And you'll hear Kelly talk about training. So I'll bring Kelly as a great example. So we pulled together all the things that we think are about training. Then we meet with Kelly, and Kelly says well, gee, I don't really think that's about training. I think it might be about this. Well, at that point you look at it. We read all of those responses that we have together and we say does this fit within that same scope? And if it does, then it stays. And if it doesn't, then we may have to either broaden our definition or we may have to move it under a different theme or a different category.

And so this is what we're doing with it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Then we're also using Nvivo And the Nvivo 9 software is really software. great because not only once we code it can we find every instance where this has occurred so we can look at it including frequency counts. But it can also give us the ability to look and see what kind of intercoder reliability we have. can see if I'm coding in the same way that David is the same information. And I can look at it and visually see -- and it does it by color --I can look at it and visually see if there are strange patterns that need to some investigate.

And this is another mechanism that is designed to keep us with the best intercoder reliability that we can have so that when we say to you we believe all these things are based under this particular category or this theme. We have several different instruments that we've gone through or several different mechanisms to make sure that we come up with the best possible category for it.

So to give you just a quick look at what this looks like. So this is how we've started. This is before Nvivo. So one of the things that we did as I mentioned, we looked at the questions, what does an ideal FDLP look like and what else would you like to tell us. And from those questions, focusing on the state forecast and focusing on the 38 of the state forecasts, we looked at what were the categories we were seeing. And as you can see running along the bottom, this was just some of our preliminary themes that we were catching.

So FDsys, item selection and distribution, preservation and digitization pearls. And then that last category which will appear to be in white is actually in light grey. And that is new and improved services. And just so you know, that's a big category. And that's being further broken down. But this was our first go at it, just to sort of get things broken up. So you can see some of the different things that are eliminated there.

And so, the first thing that we do

is we go through what each and every person has said -- each questionnaire -- and we go through and we code it like this -- each guestion. Then take that information and pull like we information together. And I know people are thinking well, what's going on with the bottom one, right? It's got all these different colors in it. So what's going on is that -- so FDsys would be under agua. And these are all the statements that we found that were related to FDsys. This is what people thought. And these were the viewpoints on FDsys.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But within those statements are statements related to other topics, statements related to cataloging. So that's that dark grey which will appear light grey on the screen. Then there was also references to preservation. So that's what the purple is. The reason that it all appears here and in the same colors -- in multi-colors -- is because we're taking that statement, and we don't want to lose the context of what's been said. So it appears here under FDsys coding so that we know that that

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

statement was related to FDsys -- the light blue portion of it. But to understand what the light blue portion actually means, you have to read it in its full context. If I were to take it out of context, then I might have a different interpretation of what you said than what you actually meant. So that would appear there.

So then when we see the purple, that statement will also appear in preservation -the full thing. So you would see it there. would see it in preservation for the purple. You would see it in red for the authentication. You would see it in yellow for training. You would see it in green for the tangible collection. So that's what you're seeing.

So then once we've gone through like this, this is the point where we can look at it and we can say do all of the things that we see here all have the same relation, right? they all about the same theme? Because at this point once we pull them together, it's readily apparent if something is in the wrong place. Then we can sit down as a group and go well, gee,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

that doesn't seem to make any sense. That shouldn't go there. We should put it here. And we make a decision as a team about where to put it.

So then once we've gone through this process -- and I know you're thinking my goodness, this is a lot of work, and it is.

(LAUGHTER.)

MS. GIVENS: So once we've gone through this process, then we look at them. And these are secret numbers. It's not Alaska or Alabama. These are secret GPO numbers. keep track of where we actually got the statement We pull them altogether. And this would from. be an example from training. So these are all things that we had in the questionnaires. were all responses in the questionnaires that related to training, not all webinar-based, training from other agencies, training in professional development -- all of these things that clearly fit to our minds under training. And so that's where we have it in this umbrella.

Now as we move forward, we'll be

breaking them into finer grains. But this is our second level of analysis. And the way we're doing it in terms of categorization is that we've imposed the first level from the forecasts themselves. So things that we had under preservation, that's the top level. Then the second level would be the things that we're identifying specifically from the responses to those questions. So this is the second level, and then from there we'll be moving to at least the third level and possibly a fourth level for some things that are more intricate.

Okay. So enough about qualitative analysis. What happens now?

So we're essentially at the end of our phase one. So we asked you to do the library forecast, the state forecast and the state-focused action plan. And as part of that -- as part of the launch of that -- we had approximately 37 virtual and in-person sessions where we talked about this, what were our goals, what we were planning to do and some of the phases.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

_

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But now we're about to move into phase two. And in fact, if we look at the top one -- "identify issues for investigation" -we've already partially moved into this phase because as we're going through we're reading all of our responses, any of those responses that we think might be open to more than interpretation, we're making a note of that. Contact this person and find out what is the appropriate interpretation of this, what is meant by that if it's something that we didn't understand.

Then we're also moving into interviews and focus groups. And that's set to start in April. And by set to start in April, I mean not that we will begin thinking gee, we should get started with this in April. We mean like we will have set up here's the interviewing. The first interviews are starting in April, and the first focus groups are already set up so that we can begin this process.

Now those will go on April through

t. We're be transcribing that information

and coding that information in the same fashion that we've coded the questionnaires. And from there, we'll be incorporating that information along with primary and secondary analysis of things like the biannual surveys and different reports that have been issued about GPO and comparing those and moving those. And those will form the white papers which will be part three. But that information will be released to the community.

Let me talk about phase three.

So phase three -- so after we've done the focus groups, then we're going to go back. And after we've coded this information, we're going to look at this information and compare it to the information that we had from the questionnaires and the state-focused action plans.

So it's another level of analysis for us to decide perhaps there is something that's different or slightly different than the way we were perceiving it the first time. So if we think about it in terms of text on the way that

we're analyzing it, we've got the library forecasts, then we've got the state forecasts, which is reinforcing or giving us discrepancies from the library forecast. Did we understand what they said? Here's what they're saying at the state forecast level.

Then we have the state-focused action plan which is giving us the initiatives and giving us another layer of it.

Then when we meet and talk with people and do the targeting interviewing in the focus groups, then that adds another layer. And we'll be asking about the things that we saw in the questionnaires and in the action plans. So this gives us another wealth of information. Then we'll be folding that back in and doing that analysis.

From there, it'll give us the white papers. We'll be releasing the white papers in community forums for discussion, getting comments back on that and incorporating that back in as well.

All of these things will contribute

to the strategic initiatives.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But one thing that I should point out to you and if you saw one of the posters outside is that we can look at it and we can say oh, okay, well, this isn't really happening until phase two or three, except that there are two lines that come down from this preliminary analysis section from the phase one which is the things that we can do now. Things that are clear to us that we have read in your questionnaires, we're taking action on right now. So LSCM initiatives are being acted on now based on what we've read and what we've found out. The ones for the FDLP plan as well. And then those will feed into the national plan. But the things that we consider to be -- for lack of a better term -- the doable, we're moving forward to do those.

And on Thursday, they're going to talk about the doable and the possible and where we might want to go from here. But I think it's important for you to understand that at this level, we can act on certain things that we have seen. And that has always been our goal.

So if we look at it a different way, we can see that each of the different phases is supporting our FDLP National Plan and also our FDLP and LSCM strategic plans. So each one of these different phases is helping to form the foundation that we'll be building off of. And it's giving us the documentation that we need to know what the direction is and also to know who we need to ask in the community for further confirmation of any issues that we may have questions with.

So I'll leave you with this thought.

I believe that collaboration is the key, and that has been our goal from the start. And it continues to be. We want to work with you -- the community -- for the future of the program. We want to chart a course for progress together.

And as we move into phase two, we're asking you to stay with us and to contribute and to be willing to be interviewed and share your opinions online and help us to shape it. Because each step, the more collaboration that we get and the more feedback that we get from you,

1 the more carefully we can plot a course that best 2 represents what we all want. And with that, I'll turn it over to 3 Paul for the quantitative portion. 4 5 Thank you. 6 (APPLAUSE.) 7 GIANNINI: Good afternoon. We'll see how we can drive this thing a little 8 bit. 9 10 All right, the state forecasts. This is going to be the most exciting part of all 11 the presentations. 12 13 (LAUGHTER.) MR. GIANNINI: Okay. All right. 14 Well, we'll start off with the 15 16 LSCM's February 2012 FDLP directive because that's where all of the information that I'm 17 going to use helps set the expectations of how 18 19 many eligible questionnaires I should be 20 receiving. So for the state side -- for the 21 state forecasts -- 50 states and the District of 22

Columbia and five territories. So the maximum

23

I would expect is 56 questionnaires.

When I went to go download the information from Survey Monkey, I was greeted with 163 submissions. And as you can see, I knew that there was always stuff you have to do with data, but this was going to be interesting.

So I use SAS to do my clean-up work.

And I've been SAS since it came out in 1976.

And you might ask how do you get 163 submissions. Well, we made it quite easy for you all to send information to us. It was captured by Survey Monkey. One was off your FDLP desktop and also from the emails that we sent to you all through Survey Monkey. And it seems like you all liked to use the desktop because over 97 of your submissions came that way.

So Cherie mentioned some of the steps that we took already. First, it had to be timely. An the timeliness was supposedly the June 30th deadline, but I pulled the date of July 2nd just before the 4th of July holiday so that we have the information and I can start having

my group take a look at it.

Then, was the questionnaire complete? It meets all the required questions and the answer. Then from the state forecasts, we had to look at question 21 to make sure it was certified. Then on question 22, we had to make sure that all those who participated in the survey, the formulation from the state was it listed. Well, once it met those four criteria, we were pretty happy.

However, sometimes we still had multiple eligible questionnaire submissions. So the business rule that we used was the latest one that you submitted was the one we would take and make it a unique observation that was placed in our state library forecasts master database.

All right. On October the 1st, I took a little re-visit to Survey Monkey and found out that there were ten additional submissions.

One was valid, and nine of them were repetitions.

So the state library master survey database contains 38 eligible submissions from 34 states, the District of Columbia and three territories.

Those three territories are American Samoa, Guam and the Virgin Islands.

A little bit different, but we're going now to look at the library forecasts.

Again using the FDLP directory, at that time in February of 2012, it contained 1,201 FDLPs. Again, that's the level that I would have expected to have submissions. So when I went to Survey Monkey and downloaded the observations, I was pleased to see 947. At least we did not exceed the 1201 submissions.

(LAUGHTER.)

MR. GIANNINI: However, as always, if you look at the data closely and you find out you have incomplete information, duplicates and for some reason we had FDLP numbers that did not exist in my directory. So we go through the certification process again to make sure that we have eligible submissions. Again, they had to be timely, they had to be complete, all the questions that were required had to be answered and it had to be certified in the library forecast and questions 34 and 35 were checked.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Again, after I realized that I had some duplicate eligible submissions from the FDLPs, and at that point we took the latest one again.

He didn't realize I was afraid of that thing.

(LAUGHTER.)

MR. GIANNINI: Okay. So once we decided which was the latest one, we put all the eligible submissions into the library forecast master database and realizing that it had given us a total of 775 eligible submissions.

Going back to October 1st, checking Survey Monkey, we found out we had 21 additional submissions. Seventeen appear to be valid. haven't done any real indepth checking on those. Two were definitely repeaters and two were I would call garbage in the data world.

So just a little trivia about your participation. Eighty-one percent of regional-designated libraries participated in this questionnaire survey study. Ninety percent library of your state types participated. Seventy-three percent of your

large libraries -- those exceeding 1 million volumes -- participated in the study. And Alaska, American Samoa, Guam, North Dakota and

(APPLAUSE.)

Vermont had 100 percent participation.

MR. GIANNINI: And I will have to give the State of Kentucky their due. But they had 95 percent participation.

(APPLAUSE.)

MR. GIANNINI: All right. Our major focus when you're ever doing a data analysis is that you want to make sure of the data, the integrity of the data, the validity of your findings and the reliability of your results. That is the foundation we built and maintained throughout this process -- my staff and I -- when we're providing results back to LSCM.

All right. We've downloaded the data from Survey Monkey into Excel spreadsheets. We've imported Excel spreadsheets into SAS. We've performed clean-up. And now we add some demographic information, especially to the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

library forecast, such things as your state -we didn't ask you that because we knew who you
were -- the size of your library, the type of
library you are -- things like that we added.

And then from analytical an viewpoint, I think of how we can group things to make analysis a lot easier. For example, for your library types, there were ten categories in the Depository Library Directory. And ten can be very broad. So I said why we don't group So the first grouping I did looked things? pretty natural, was all the academic libraries versus the others. Then I said okay, let's take another look at it and say let's look at the academic, the public and the other ones. then the last cut I took was the academic general and community college in one group, the academic law, public and the other. So we had to look at four to see if there's any group that has a particular interest contrary to the others.

You will see this when you take a look at you all on Wednesday. We have some surprises for you there.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

All right. After we'd taken in the data, cleaned it up, got it all categorized, I took the quality of the information and sent that to LSCM for them to do their analysis. And my staff and I worked on the quantitative side producing high-level and survey-to-survey comparisons.

Now the for the reason survey-to-survey is that there are similar questions in the state and the library. example, question 14 in the library and question 13 in the state both dealt with do you plan in the next five years to digitize your FDLP So those, we normalized the data materials. from the library side to compare it with that information that was in the state so that LSCM could take a look at it and draw inferences from it.

And then to help visualize -because different people have different ways of
seeing things -- we put these things in maps -you've seen some of the maps already -- some
charts and some tables.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Yes. Transparency. All right. When it's all said and done, eventually we're going to publish all the survey data, probably most likely in stages. And we'll also give you access to our findings and the documentation that was used by LSCM in their efforts to quantify your responses.

All of this is under the umbrella of what you probably heard Davita say today of staying in focus with our GPO mission to keep America informed by producing, protecting, and distributing the official preserving publications and information products of the federal government which there are now four initiatives that they've broken up. And we come under the first initiative which is satisfy our stakeholders. You all are a major stakeholder that we want to make sure that we satisfy. And this all comes under one of the ten strategic goals, that of being open and transparent government agencies.

With that, my part of the discussions right now are done. Hopefully, you

haven't been too bored with the methodology.

If you have any other questions,

we'll probably answer those later. And I will now turn this over to David Walls.

Thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE.)

MR. WALLS: Next slide deck, please.

Okay. So good afternoon. My task this afternoon is to actually show you some data that we recovered and looked at in the state forecast.

You remember the state forecast was a collaborative effort on the part of state groups to meet together. The state library forecast represents the work of 38 of these groups. By now of course we have 40, but from the time we began looking at the data, we had 38.

And the coordinators met together to discuss the individual responses to the library forecast questionnaire and as best as possible to reach a consensus of opinion at the state level. So the state forecast responses are the

result of all the hard work of organizing these state meetings, bringing people together in a discussion. In some cases in some of the larger states, they had a combination of virtual as well as present meetings where people met together.

So this is a result of the hard work that came out of those. And we applaud those who organized these meetings and got everybody to develop consensus as much as possible and for everyone who participated in these collaborative discussions.

So we know there's a lot of digitization going on in the community, but we were very interested on where people stored the products of those digital efforts. And among states, a lot of people are storing digital files in local digital repositories. As you might imagine, Hathi Trust and the Internet Archive were a very large portion of the place where people stored digital data. And under other repository, some of the applicants listed other repositories such things that you might imagine like locks, the Trail Project, the Law Library

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Microphone Consortium and 19 percent of the libraries reported this time at least that they're not digitizing at all.

I should point out that because this question required or asked people to provide multiple responses, the actual total number of responses to this question was 82.

So when we met with groups during the webinars that we had and discussed a lot of these state forecast projects, we made sure that coordinators knew that this question -- do you have plans to digitize FDLP publications -- was certainly nonbinding. We're not going to come check on you within five years and see if you have actually done it. But we wanted to know what your plans and were you already were, digitizing, or did you have plans to within the next five years. And these were the responses we got.

You'll notice that 48 percent say that they have no plans to. They're not digitizing now. They're not planning on digitizing in the next five years. But if you

add the 34 percent yes and the 18 percent that are already digitizing, you can sort of see that there's a lot of potential digitization out there within the next five years.

So it's not too surprising with all the digitization going on that people would think that it might be useful to have some guidance from GPO in currently planning digitization projects. We carefully chose the word guidance because it seemed like a more collaborative term that suggested a partnership based on a consensus of best practices. And based on this overwhelming response, we will be definitely working on some sessions in the future on guidance for digitization.

But as we move into a digital presence and further into an expanded digital future, the question inevitably comes up are we getting ourselves into a situation where we can anticipate that while digital certainly expands access that it might in some cases put up barriers to access. So we asked the question do you anticipate this or what do you think those

3

4

5

6

8

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

barriers might be. And surprisingly for me that 84 percent said that they did anticipate that there would be barriers to access in the digital world.

The largest concern expressed about these barriers is that the funding is simply not going to be there to provide the bandwidth, the computers, the digital repositories and the level of preservation required to ensure free and permanent access to digital government information. Another concern expressed is that many members of the public simply don't have the computer skills necessary to be proficient users of digital government information. And the third anticipated barrier was that digital government information is frequently not as well indexed and access to more content isn't great if you can't find the content to begin with. There are some anticipated finding issues with that digital government information.

Moving away from the purely digital world, we asked a lot of questions about LSCM projects. In the actual questionnaire, we

grouped these into these four topic areas. And I won't take the time to go into what the questionnaire said. But we listed for purposes of helping people understand what we were talking about what we meant and what the current projects were under say, education and online communication.

You'll notice that only one area under collection management, development of management tools actually has a not beneficial. And almost everybody felt that the projects were beneficial moderately or extremely so in some way.

And I'll say that later on in the week, our new LSCM Director Jane Sanchez is going to be talking more about some of the current projects that are under way in LSCM.

The state groups were asked about additional services and service areas that they felt that LSCM should offer. And we've got here some of the most frequent responses that represent projects that in fact we're working on right now. So one of the concerns was that PURL

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

link checking with resolution updating was an important thing. We're currently working on this right now. People asked for more access to older Congressional materials. As you heard Mary Alice say this morning, we're working on that right now. It'll be a major project in 2013. No-fee catalog records similar to what Marchive provides is an ongoing project that's currently going on right now. I think you'll hear something more about that later on in the week as well.

Another simple overwhelming response, would you be interested in virtual training from GPO. Well, I think there's no doubt that we're going to be doing a lot more virtual training.

(LAUGHTER.)

MR. WALLS: And we've made a great significant investment in ICO care to conduct webinars like we're sharing with the online community today who are listening to us from afar.

And in addition to simply asking you

21

20

22

23

if you'd be interested, we also asked people to tell us what talks that they would be interested in. And here's the top four that appeared.

We've had an overwhelming positive response to the FDsys training that we've done.

And people are asking for more.

We've had a huge inquiry into some response to the number of new coordinators or coordinators who feel like they need some additional help in training in some of their responsibilities. There's a program actually this week about becoming an accidental depository coordinator. And that's right in that theme.

Training on how to use resources available from other federal agencies is a topic of high interest. And as was reported in the previous slide about digitization, people want to know how to digitize, how to conduct those projects.

So that's a quick fly-over of some of the major quantitative questions and some themes that have come out of the state library

forecast. We're going to be talking tomorrow about some of the future roles and responsibilities, issues that came out of some of the more qualitative questions on that forecast instrument. And we wanted to provide everybody a lot of opportunity that they've asked questions of us. We've dumped a lot of information on you.

So at this point, I'll turn it over to Shari.

(APPLAUSE.)

MS. LASTER: Hi, everyone. For those of you who I haven't met yet, my name is Shari Laster. I'm at the University of Akron. And I am the Chair of the Depository Library Council.

I would like to open today's question and answer session by reminding everyone to please before you start your question state your name and institution. We'll take questions from the audience here in Arlington. And if it's quiet and we don't have anyone at the mics, then we will start to take

questions from iCohere. For those of you who are following along with iCohere, if you ask a question and we don't get to it, there will be a response to your question later. So please go ahead and ask away and we'll take as many of the questions as we have time for.

So, let's have some questions.

MS. CANFIELD: I am Jane Canfield from Catholic University in Puerto Rico.

The first thing I'm going to do is make a confession. I made a very obvious and erroneous assumption on the state forecast data that because we belong to Florida as a regional that that would cover our state forecast plan. Obviously you intended to have separate information from the territories which I just realized as of today.

My question is if you would still like that data, I will -- okay -- I will cheerfully go home and do my best to get it to you on American time, not Puerto Rican time.

MS. LASTER: For the record, the answer was yes.

1 MS. CANFIELD: Thank you. 2 MR. IVERSON: David Iverson, Minot State University in Minot, North Dakota. 3 MS. LASTER: Sorry, one second. 4 5 MR. IVERSON: Try this again here. Minot 6 David Iverson, State 7 University, Minot, North Dakota. And how about that North Dakota 8 being 100 percent compliant? Wahoo! Just had 9 10 to get that in there. 11 (LAUGHTER.) MR. IVERSON: I wanted to express an 12 13 expression of thanks to GPO and to the people who do all of that wonderful cataloguing of new 14 electronic titles on the FDLP. 15 16 We had a budget cut just recently at our institution such that we won't be able to buy 17 anymore new published materials for the rest of 18 19 our fiscal year. And at our staff meeting last week at which this sobering news was mentioned, 20 our collection development librarian made the 21 22 comment we're not going to help students find new

materials in our library catalog. The only new

23

1 things that come up are government documents 2 unless it electronic government was our And being the modest person that I 3 documents. 4 am, I didn't say anything about that at the 5 meeting. But afterwards I spoke with my 6 director about that and he and I both gave each 7 a high five. 8 So many thanks to the people at GPO who do all the hard work of making all those new 9 10 electronic government documents available for us to use out in the hinterlands. So thank you. 11 Hear, hear. 12 MS. LASTER: 13 WOODS: So I have a couple MR. Steve Woods -- Steve Woods, Penn 14 questions. 15 State. 16 The first question has to do with how open you guys are going to be with the data. 17 When you say the data's going to be open, once 18 19 you have it coded, will we be able to do any type 20 of analysis on our end with the data so it's going to be open to us?

MS. GIVENS: May I answer this?

Okay.

I got head nod yes.

21

22

23

Okay. Yes. So what we're going to do is we're going to remove the confidential information from those who do not want it shared at the library level. And we've been in the process of doing that.

But we're going to be releasing the responses by the questions so that -- we anticipate that people would want to do their own analysis and we will be releasing all that information. So you will the answers to the library forecasts, the state forecasts, the state-focused action plans. And then you'll also have our white papers and a recording of the different comments that we get as well as the interviews.

Oh, I'm sorry. Name and institution. I'm Cherie Givens with GPO.

MR. WOODS: Okay.

The second question I have -- and I hope that in doing this analysis, the reality was that there was an amazing study that was done before this study. And I hope that you guys take that into account to see whether or not the

Ithaca report itself -- I mean, I would like to
know what was confirmed and what was not
confirmed in that report to make us have to do
this again.

MS. GIVENS: I'd like to address that because I think that's a great point. And that is part of what we're doing in the primary and secondary analysis and comparison in phase two. So we'll be looking at all of that information.

Thank you.

MS. BAISH: Mary Alice Baish, GPO.

Sorry to interrupt you for a minute before you ask a question. But in response to I believe Steve, in terms of if you read the Ithaca final report, you'll notice that they did very few interviews with members of the community. I believed they acknowledged speaking with about 30 individuals.

And so a big difference between that report and our FDLP forecast study is that we made a proactive effort to bring everybody to the table and encouraged everybody to respond. And

I think the fact that we received 775 individual
library questionnaires completed, signed and
another additional -- Paul, I'm not sure how many
you said -- 18 --

MR. GIANNINI: Sixteen.

MS. BAISH: -- of another additional 16 really speaks to the interest and desire of all depository libraries -- almost all depository libraries -- to have their voices heard. And I think that's a big distinction.

Thank you.

MS. MILLER: Barbara Miller,
Oklahoma State. I have a question about bleed
through.

When you did your qualitative analysis and you divided things into certain areas, I'm sure that there's some questions that are going to affect more than one of those areas. And are you going to hit that in the second phase? Or because I'm sure that if you make changes in one, it's going to bleed through to another area or if you make changes in two areas, they're going to impact each other.

1 I just wondered if you made any 2 arrangements for that? MS. GIVENS: Cherie Givens, GPO. 3 4 Can you clarify? Are you asking me about in the individual questions themselves or 5 6 in the phases? No, in the questions. 7 MS. MILLER: When you decided which section all of these 8 questions would go in and you talked about 9 10 allowing for discrepancies. But I am sure that there are some that are going to affect 11 you're going to have to put one question in more 12 13 than one area, at least I would think so. then if you answer them in two different areas, 14 15 there's going to be different kinds of answers 16 depending on how they affect a certain area. So I don't know. Would this show up in like the 17 white paper? I'm just wondering where that 18 19 would come through. 20 MS. GIVENS: That's correct. Ιt would show up in the white paper. And that is 21 22 what we're seeing.

I guess I should have said although

23

we're using so many of the categories, obviously
not all of them would lend themselves to that.

And then also what we saw is that in a lot of the
responses, we saw that sometimes people who are
passionate about a thing will mention it in more
than one area. So we're also taking that into

account.

So we're looking at them not just in terms of what people said but also the frequency of what they said. So if you think about it in terms of say the same person -- we'll take a particular library. Say this particular library felt very strongly that we needed to offer some type of training and they mentioned it in the question that was responsive to training. But then they also mentioned it in what would an ideal FTLP look like and then they mentioned it in is there anything else. Those would all appear under training. And that has happened.

And then we're also looking at it in terms of its importance based on how many times it was mentioned, but being careful not to

overweight it so that what you wouldn't have 1 2 happen is you wouldn't have one person's saying it four times make it worth more -- make it like 3 worth four times. But it would tell us is that 4 5 this issue of training is a higher level 6 importance that it was mentioned that many 7 times. 8 Is that making sense to everyone? 9 Okay. Thank you. 10 MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. 11 I'm a little confused about what 12 13 phase two actually entails. I did see it of course on the screen. But we were concentrating 14 on the survey and then of course the white 15 16 papers. Could you tell us a little bit more 17 about literally where we go now in the second 18 19 phase? MS. GIVENS: Cherie Givens, GPO. 20 So what we're doing is in the second 21 22 phase, what looking is we're at we're

identifying areas for investigation that we're

23

going to be doing either targeted interviewing which is -- what I mean by this is following up with on interviewing people that we had questions. So if we saw something in your response that indicated to us that this is something that is an issue that we need to investigate further or maybe it wasn't clear to us and that what you said is open to a couple of different interpretations and we're not sure, so we would be doing that type of interviewing then.

Then we're also doing focus groups because it became clear to us and what we anticipated would happen is what did in fact happen is that we saw that there were issues that were important to the community that we want to follow up with. So we'll be doing focus groups about different topics and likely with different groups, so maybe law librarians for different things to investigate further how you use certain information. We know for sure that issues about training are of major importance and we'll be looking into that. And that's what we're going to be doing in phase two which begins

in April.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Then we're going to take that information and in that same phase and phase two is also where we're looking at the primary and secondary analysis. So what we've got for phase one is the preliminary analysis which is what we're getting to here, and we're looking just at the library forecast, the state forecast and the state-focused action plan. Then going to be taking that information as the basis for phase two doing that second level of investigation and then combining those to make the white papers which would be part of phase But also in phase three is that we're three. going to open it for comment and make adjustments to those white papers to reflect that comment.

MS. MORIEARTY: Thank you. And thank you for keeping us informed and involved.

MS. HARPER: Beth Harper,
University of Wisconsin, Madison.

First I have to say someone who is reluctant to do this, it did turn out to be a good experience. We got to talk to quite a few

selectives that we haven't talked to in our state. But I have a few questions.

One is the individual versus the state questionnaires, are they going to be weighted differently? I guess as I listen it sounds so calm and so smooth and like everybody went through the same process. And I know the way our state, we didn't all sit down and come to a consensus. We had several conference calls with different people. I know states did it different ways. And I wonder if that's going to be taken in account. That's the big question.

Oh, and the granularity. Part of me was kind of sad to hear all the academics lumped together because we're not similar at all. And I know you could go drill down and then the results would take six years and that would be useless. But it's like you do have that granularity and I'd hate to see you give up the chance to do some of that analysis. You have your large research universities and a liberal arts college with selectives. So I hate to see that detail lost.

MR. GIANNINI: Paul Giannini,

Government Printing Office.

First, we did not throw away the granularity. We looked at the granularity and we have got -- the amount of output that we have created for LSCM to digest is in the 1,000s of pages. Okay? And I felt that might be a little bit too overwhelming for them.

Definitely, we respond back to them when they want to look at something more specifically. We give them the specifics they're looking for. So we've done it all as granular as you could think of, and we've consolidated as much as we could so that we can get the full breadth and depth of what's out there.

So you're not being ignored. It's just different ways to look at it. I didn't want somebody to say well, why didn't you think about grouping it? Well, we did think about grouping it. But we will always look at the granular as well as the grouping as well.

MS. GIVENS: Cherie Givens, GPO.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I'd just like to address the first part of the question or the first question that was about how we're looking at the library forecasts versus the state forecasts.

So when we look at those, we're not necessarily weighing them one versus the other. We're looking at them as essentially three pools of information to poll from to get a better sense of what the issues are. And we know that we would not get necessarily agreement. What you would say at the library level would be what you would say at the state level because different decisions come into play. But part of the analysis that we're doing -- and it's to help us but also we think that it would be helpful to libraries in states -- is that we'll be comparing that information for the states. So it's something that you can see on your own and make decisions about. It's not that we're weighing one over another as we're just using it as an additional source of information.

And in that respect, it's very insightful to see those differences. And in

1 fact, that is what we saw that when we looked at 2 the state forecast, we see that some move mean, the list of who all 3 smoothly. Ι 4 participated is like running on. It's like a page. And then some could not come to that level 5 6 of agreement about things. And some say this 7 many of us thought this and this many of us thought this. And some of the really insightful 8 ones say this many of us thought this and this 10 many of this thought that, but as a group we've decided X. And that to me in itself is a very 11 interesting thing that it shows that level of 12 13 trying to come to consensus. And that's part of what we hope to achieve when we looked at having 14 15 the state forecast completed.

Thank you.

MR. BELEU: Steve Beleu, Oklahoma
Department of Libraries.

You've already told us that we're going to be access to the microdata for this survey. Several people have mentioned they like to do their own analysis.

The format for the microdata, is it

23

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	going be Excel or SAS?
2	MR. GIANNINI: What do you want it
3	in?
4	(LAUGHTER.)
5	MR. BELEU: Most of us are not SAS
6	users. We want it Excel.
7	MR. GIANNINI: Okay. Excel then it
8	will be.
9	MR. BELEU: Thank you.
10	MS. LASTER: Any more questions?
11	MR. POWELL: I just had a quick
12	question.
13	Dwight Powell, Library of Congress.
14	How big is your staff that's doing
15	the analysis?
16	MR. GIANNINI: Right now, it's just
17	me.
18	(LAUGHTER.)
19	MR. POWELL: Okay.
20	MR. GIANNINI: My staff got
21	dispersed, but I can call on a couple of other
22	folks to help out as needed.
23	Oh, Paul Giannini, Government

1	Printing Office.
2	MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
3	University.
4	I have an anonymous question from
5	the Twitterverse.
6	Someone asks for suggestion for
7	kickstarting slacker states in responding.
8	(LAUGHTER.)
9	MS. GIVENS: Cherie Givens, GPO.
LO	I think we can post the list the
11	percentage of participants by state the
12	library forecast. I think that's a good one.
13	Shame. I like shame.
L4	(LAUGHTER.)
15	MS. SMITH: Lori Smith,
L6	Southeastern Louisiana University.
L7	I was kind of surprised with the
18	Louisiana results because when we did the state
19	forecast, I had responses from everybody, so I'm
20	surprised you didn't have responses from
21	everybody.
22	Did our regionals get a list of the
2	neonle who regnonded the libraries that

responded and the ones that didn't? Could they?

Because the answers are out there. Somehow they

just didn't get to you.

MS. GIVENS: Cherie Givens, GPO.

So I remember Louisiana in particular because David and I handled this one. And the issue was that yes, we did send two -- I'm not sure if it was to you -- but I know I definitely had interactions with Stephanie about this. And we were getting some in at the last minute.

Some of the ones that we got in were incomplete and so we couldn't count them. And some of them were manually entered. But the ones that were incomplete, our policy was that we weren't taking incomplete ones. So we couldn't take it.

But I am sure that we can go through this process pretty quickly to find out which ones we still have that need to be completed. And I would be happy to have you all pressure those who have not yet responded into full performance.

1	Thank you.
2	MR. GIANNINI: This is Paul
3	Giannini.
4	There's only five libraries from
5	Louisiana we did not supersede. So we could
6	easily tell you which ones those are if you'd
7	like to know.
8	(LAUGHTER.)
9	MR. WOODS: Steve Woods, Penn
10	State.
11	I'd like to comment about the state
12	plan and one of the barriers for me personally
13	from being able to participate in that.
14	It's the fact that what you guys
15	wanted was response that was blessed by my dean.
16	Barrier.
17	(LAUGHTER.)
18	MS. BAISH: Steve, however you may
19	or may not be able to comment anymore but when
20	you said barrier, was it the time frame that was
21	a barrier? Could you say anything a bit more
22	about that, please?

MR. WOODS: Well, I mean, it's not

just the time frame. I mean, if you're asking my dean to agree on what a consensus is within my state, they have to take into consideration the culture of my institution, particularly now at this time. And so it becomes a barrier in that what you're really asking for is not the consensus of the documents community. You're actually asking for the consensus of the deans or the administrators of these different libraries. And so to be perfectly honest with you, it was nearly impossible for me to go down that road.

guys gave me in Survey Monkey, I didn't respond through Survey Monkey. I downloaded the questions into a Word document so that I could walk it up to my dean and say bless this. And then I sent -- I'm hoping you guys got what I sent as a Word document. But I sent it to you that way because administratively I couldn't do that through Survey Monkey without getting myself into trouble by just responding to something without the blessings of the higher ups.

152

1 MS. SITTEL: Robbie Sittel, Tulsa 2 City County Library. We're wondering who the focus groups 3 4 are going to be comprised of. MS. GIVENS: Cherie Givens, GPO. 5 6 That's an excellent question. 7 that's something we're still working on now. We're looking at focusing mainly on 8 So the focus groups that we're the issues. 9 10 thinking of now are focused on what are the different types of things that we want like the 11 exploration of what types of training might be 12 13 needed. And so, it would be coming in response to what we saw in the questionnaires themselves. 14 But we also anticipate looking at specific types 15 16 of libraries that we may want to investigate issues related with them further. 17 So we're open to the different 18 19 things. And we're letting the data lead the way on that. 20 MS. BAISH: Just other 21 one addition. Mary Alice 22 Thank you, Cherie. 23 Baish, U.S. GPO.

1	Looking as we've been able to
2	segment responses to sort of the questions for
3	example from public libraries, there is in many
4	cases very diverse opinions from our public
5	libraries as to what format is most needed
6	whether they want everything in digital or
7	whether they need more in print tangible
8	materials. And that for example would lend
9	itself to a virtual conference with as many
10	public library directors as we could bring into
11	it to try to clarify what those differences are.
12	Is it a certain type of content that they would
13	like to see more of distributed to them in print,
14	for example? Those are the kind of
15	things I think if we are to provide more direct
16	service to respond to the needs of public
17	libraries, we need to get more information from
18	what we know so far through the questionnaire
19	responses.

MS. SELBY: Barbara Selby, University of Virginia.

This kind of falls after what Mary
Alice just said. But one question about the

1 barriers to digital access, and what you didn't 2 ask is about the barriers to print access of which there are barriers as well. 3 4 though it was 84 percent that said there were 5 barriers to digital access, I'd hate to see that 6 number just bandied around because you didn't 7 ask the other question.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. WALLS: I'm David Walls, GPO.

So even

I think we originally had a question in there like that, and we kind of felt sometimes we whittled it down to some of the essentials.

That question was sort of obvious because that's the trend. We're moving that And so, we were asking that to find out -it's not always a positive thing to an awful lot of people. And so we wanted to know more about that.

But that's certainly a valid point about what you brought up.

MR. BARKLEY: Hi. I'm Dan Barkley, University of New Mexico. And I'm one of those slacker states. And I don't appreciate being called a slacker state. I find it a very condescending approach from GPO, and I'm very disappointed in it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And I'm not being funny up here. The reason that some of us in New Mexico didn't respond was at the time there were three vacancies. I come from a state with a 11 selectives. Three vacancies. All the people responded apparently didn't finish the survey. A couple people finished the survey and didn't check box 34, so they weren't able to share it with me. So I'm basically trying to do an action plan based on three respondents. And I think GPO needs to look seriously at the barriers that some of these other people talked about. Му dean was very reluctant to sign off.

So I think before you condemn and publicly shame people, you need to look a little bit behind the curtain and understand why some of us were unable to fill this out. So I would hope from this point forward, we're not shamed anymore.

However, I will be wearing a scarlet three-letters that says NSP for no state plan if

1	that's what you'd like.
2	MR. SUDDUTH: Bill Sudduth,
3	University of South Carolina.
4	I want to kind of go back to the focus
5	group discussion because I heard two aspects to
6	the focus groups. I heard topic and I heard
7	library type.
8	I would think that if there's a
9	topic, I would hope all library types are part
LO	of the focus group discussions, whereas if it is
11	a particular issue of a particular library type,
12	that's not going to bother me.
13	But I don't want a particular
L4	library type to have over input into a particular
15	issue because again, it may be more important for
L6	this type of library, it may be more important
L7	for that type of library. If it comes to
L8	marketing and something like that, then that's
L9	a cross-type issue.
20	So just be careful. I heard two
21	different responses when we started to talk

MS. BAISH: Bill, I appreciate what

about focus groups.

22

1 you're saying. And I hope I was clear when I brought up the example of public libraries and 2 looking at the survey results and looking at the 3 4 first overview -- very preliminary -- of their 5 open text responses. Clearly, we do not 6 seem to be meeting the needs of the public libraries. 7 There are those in that type who are not getting the print they need. There are 8 those in that type that don't want anymore print. 9 10 And as we talked this morning, one of the purposes of the study is to be able to ensure that 11 LSCM is providing the libraries what they need. 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So we're not in an overall discussion of what is best, either tangible print or digital. We're looking at this particular type of library because that is a group that is very much at risk. We are losing public libraries from the program. And we want to make sure that from GPO's perspective we are giving them what they need to keep them active in the program. So that's what I was getting at.

I think Cherie is absolutely right.

Most of them are going to be topically oriented.

public

urban

But I think public libraries gives a good example 1 2 where we don't quite understand what they need and what those differences are. And it could be 3 4 differences between large 5 libraries versus small county systems, for

example.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So that's where we need to delve down more and get some more information.

Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Kristen Clark, University of Minnesota.

I'm a little concerned in terms of the time frames you've talked about for the additional phases. It sounds like we're not going to hear from focus groups with that information until next August.

And then you're talking about the second phase. Then you're talking about the third phase being the white papers and then basically a fourth phase for a national plan. It sounds like we're looking at a couple years here. And I guess I would like you to address that.

I know many of us, especially at the regionals, we are pushing our selectives to get this information in on specific times. There was a lot of concern in terms of this was brought up last November, but we really didn't get the information until after January yet we still had a deadline of June 30th.

And the questions that have been brought up about people not being able to get their plans in, yet now we're waiting at least another year -- a year and a half, two years -- to actually have a plan in place.

So I'd like you to address that issue.

MS. GIVENS: That's a great question. And I think maybe I should have emphasized this more.

So although it will take us time to get all the interviews done and get that data transcribed, we're moving forward already with both the LSCM strategic plan and the FDLP strategic plan. And those are 2013 to 2017. And if you take a look on one of the posters that

we have outside, that's the years that those will be covering. We're moving forward with those

right away.

The national plan itself is something larger and more expansive and will require more community input. But those two can be done right away. And if we think about those, we're looking at having those done in the coming year. And we're going to use the information from this for those.

The LSCM plan is looking more at the operational things -- what are the things that we can do now that we can act on. And one of the things that we've already done is that when we first put out the questionnaires, we were looking at that back in February and we were creating those in like December and January. So a lot -- well, I won't say a lot -- but a number of the things that we have seen that you have asked for are things that we already have in process.

So we're already moving forward with those things based on the information that you

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

have. We're already moving forward with things like in our realignment with taking into account

the things that have been said in the library

forecasts, the state forecasts and the

state-focused action plans to make changes now

in both of those strategic plans.

The national plan will take longer.

And I'm not sure its exact time frame for that.

But phase three, we plan to have the white papers

up by October, if not before.

MS. CLARK: I just wanted to end with -- I'm Kristen Clark, University of Minnesota. That's great. Thank you.

additional information, For the I just also want to put out we have deans that we're dealing with and have we administrations that we're dealing with and just know that we're getting pushback because this is a conversation that's been going on for many And so, that's a piece that we're having years. to face as part of this whole discussion and how we have to interpret that to our deans is a huge part and an issue.

MS. GIVENS: Cherie Givens, GPO.

Thank you. Please tell your dean, 2013 to 2017, the LSCM strategic plan, the FDLP strategic plan.

MS. MONGEAU: Deborah Mongeau from the University of Rhode Island.

We've been talking about creating a white paper. Then what? I was under the impression that this all was going to be used to introduce model legislation for revamping the depository library program to meet the needs of the 21st Century patrons or users.

And I was under the impression that it wasn't just going to be a strategic plan that we're all going to use internally within the depository community and GPO. I was under the impression that this was going to be taken out to the movers and shakers and to move us forward that way. And now it seems like all I'm hearing is white paper will be created. What's going to happen when the white paper is created? That's what I want to know.

MS. BAISH: Well, I think Cherie had

mentioned as we're looking at these responses,
we're looking at the doable. Some of the doable

have been done.

We're looking at the possible and within that possible category, some that is possible can be done administratively and some would require a change to the statute. And so that is actually as we're looking at the FDLP strategic plan, I'm sure integrated into that will be somethings that are not currently today permissible by our current law. Okay? And so when we're thinking about the national plan, that is that great plan with whatever changes may be required to the statute that we will be able to map from the responses that we have to the survey.

MS. TEGEGNE: Bekele Tegegne,
University of Kentucky.

So could GPO issue the things that came out of the study that are being done and maybe give us a list of those things that you think are possible? Do we have to wait for the strategic plan and the white papers to find that

1	out?
2	MS. BAISH: No, we will be beginning
3	that discussion on Thursday with you all.
4	MR. SUDDUTH: Bill Sudduth,
5	University of South Carolina.
6	I guess I'm overly focused on the
7	focus group idea.
8	(LAUGHTER.)
9	MR. SUDDUTH: But I think they're
10	fascinating things.
11	The other question I had about the
12	focus groups is when you do the focus groups, is
13	it going to be the community that you surveyed
14	or are you going to have focus groups of other
15	individuals like library administration?
16	And I have a second question. And
17	how do you see this affecting the 2013 biannual
18	survey and will that be used as a partial
19	follow-up to this?
20	MS. GIVENS: Okay. Cherie Givens,
21	GPO. I'll take the focus group question portion
22	of that.

So, yes, we're not limiting it

simply to those that have already responded because in the pool of people who might have a concern about that, it could be larger than that. We're just using that as our first stepping stone for identification and then to put it out there. I think certainly there are people at all different levels and certainly including administrators who need to weigh in on certain things as we move forward. And we're just looking at that as our first ready pool of information that we can use to identify issues that need further investigation. Our goal in it is to be inclusive.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But our goal mainly is just to find out about things that haven't been articulated to the degree that we would like to know about them. And so that's our first step with that. simply factfinding.

MS. BAISH: Yes. In terms of the 2013 biannual survey, actually Robin might want to address that. No, she's shaking her head.

(LAUGHTER.)

MS. BAISH: Shaking her head no.

1	But what we have discovered and
2	partially that's what we're hearing from many of
3	you. We've gotten comments to the effect that
4	wow, this was a great survey way much more fun
5	than doing the biannual survey. I think what
6	we're going to do are take lessons learned from
7	some of the questions which we did ask of the
8	individual libraries and Robin, correct me if
9	I'm wrong but possibly incorporate those into
10	the next biannual survey.
11	MS. LASTER: Sorry for the pause for
12	those of you following along online. We were
13	having a microphone issue.
14	MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin
15	Haun-Mohamed, GPO.
16	Mary Alice Baish is Superintendent
17	of Documents and what she says I do.
18	(LAUGHTER.)
19	MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: So if you have
20	feedback or comments on the survey that you think
21	would be helpful to help improve the next

biannual survey, we are beginning to put

together our group -- if we're not writing white

22

23

167 papers -- late this fall, early 2013 for the 1 2 issue of release of the biannual survey towards the end of 2013. I look forward to hearing from 3 4 you, Bill. 5 (LAUGHTER.) 6 MS. LASTER: I think we have time 7 for perhaps one more question. Surely there's one more question 8 from this room. 9 10 MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. 11 It still seems to me that the federal 12 agencies themselves are being left out of this 13 I feel that we're sort of like we're 14 process. 15 a bunch of bankers sitting around trying to 16 decide what we're going to do with our customers'

agencies themselves are being left out of this process. I feel that we're sort of like we're a bunch of bankers sitting around trying to decide what we're going to do with our customers' money. But it's their stuff that we're talking about and it seems like we really should be involving them in the plan of how to preserve and provide access to their stuff for posterity. Are you going to talk to them at all?

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. BAISH: Thank you, Lori.

I made some comments about our

partnerships with agencies this morning and about the thanks to Blane Dessy who's the Executive Director of FEDLINK that we are creating a new FDLP federal agency working group to try to bring more agencies as we were successful with the U.S. Department of Treasury in getting content -- historic content -- that they had already digitized and being able to ingest it through a standard method into FDsys.

We included federal agencies at our depository libraries in the survey. We actually did a face-to-face meeting that Blane helped arrange with agency libraries that we hosted at GPO thanks to the help of the Maryland Regional Library.

And we hope to do more of that because the agency librarians first of all have their fingers on the pulse of information coming out of their agencies. So that's incredibly important. And secondly, federal agency collections are really a treasure trove of content much of which was never produced through the U.S. Government Printing Office. So we're

doing our outreach to agency librarians.

And Blane, if there's anything else you would like to add to that, please feel free to.

MR. DESSY: Sure. Blane Dessy, Library of Congress.

I mean, this is an area of particular interest to me because as I've discussed with Mary Alice, I think the role of federal librarians is changing. Not only are federal librarians custodians of their agency's content, but in fact librarians are being asked to really manage this whole new knowledge creation task.

Agencies know they have these large caches of information that they want to make available whether voluntarily or through Presidential mandate. They don't know how quite how to do it. And so, they're turning to their librarians who are actually having to come sort of internal knowledge creator experts. And I think that's a very interesting and different role for federal librarians. And I

1	really want to capitalize on that.
2	So you'll be hearing more from us
3	about that.
4	MS. LASTER: A last question.
5	MS. HAGER: I'm Frances Hager. I'm
6	at Arkansas Tech University in Russellville,
7	Arkansas.
8	And I was wondering in your focus
9	groups if you're going to have any actual users
10	of the data and how they feel about it and how
11	they use it.
12	MS. GIVENS: Cherie Givens, GPO.
13	I think that's a fascinating idea.
14	We're still in the very early stages of this.
15	But we'll definitely take note of that. And
16	that may be something that we definitely want to
17	do.
18	Thank you.
19	MS. LASTER: Thank you, all, for
20	those excellent questions. And thank you to
21	everyone from the GPO for such a great
22	presentation and discussion.

Right now, I would like to invite

Ι

1 Blane Dessy to come up and summarize today's 2 discussions. And we'll move on from there. Good 3 MR. DESSY: afternoon, 4 everyone. 5 It dawned on me how trusting Mary 6 Alice Baish was to say to me you have ten minutes 7 at the end of the day to say anything. 8 (LAUGHTER.) So I was thinking of 9 MR. DESSY: 10 what are all the most devious things I could say to really make it an interesting end today. 11 I won't do that. 12 13 But I do want to thank Cherie. looked at the agenda for this week's program. 14 And I don't know about you, but every meeting or 15 16 every conference I go to talks about metadata. And to my horror, I didn't see a single session 17 on metadata until Cherie started to talk about 18 19 how they're coding the responses to the survey. Up there, I can check it off. 20 There was a metadata conversation at this meeting. 21

actually back to people about that.

22

23

No one said this was going to be

1 easy, right? I've heard lots of conversation 2 this afternoon -- all of it important, all of it And I've heard differing 3 very germane. 4 opinions. We're going too slowly. Maybe some 5 of you think we're going to quickly. Maybe some 6 of you think we're involving the wrong people or 7 the right people or the disenfranchised. knows? It's a very large group of people and 8 there are what -- 100 people online. 9

This is not an easy process for anyone. But personally I commend GPO and Mary Alice and her team for undertaking this because whenever you take this kind of a task on, especially when you are sort of a federal agency, you are going to take a lot of hits. So I just want to say thank you for having the guts to do this and maybe in spite of some things.

But let me tell you about some of the things that I heard over the last two hours. And these are just keywords that I was writing down -- things that I thought were sort of provided a thematic summary to what's been going on.

I've heard a lot about stakeholders

23

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

and collaboration. I think that's very important to remember even when we hear opinions we might not want to hear. Everyone's a stakeholder. Everyone has an opinion. And everyone gets to play. So I think it's important that we all realize that even though there are some tensions or difficulties, that's all part of a very democratic process that has to be undergone. So in that sense, this was a great afternoon.

I thought what I heard today were things that were thoughtful. Sometimes we're accused of oh, you're doing the survey too quickly. What are you going to do with it? It's just another survey. We hate it. You're evil.

(LAUGHTER.)

MR. DESSY: Don't you know I have a real job to do?

What impressed me is how thoughtfully this whole project has been laid out. And while it may not be perfect -- no project ever is -- I was really impressed by how

174

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

thoughtful the whole methodology has been done, how they've looked at quantitative and qualitative. For any of you who have managed a project that involved surveys and data, you know it's hard. It's very hard to get your arms around this. So I was very impressed by that.

I was really impressed by how equitable the process was. We've heard from public libraries, academic libraries, small libraries, state libraries. Everyone has a stake in this. So I know that having come many, many years ago from a small rural public library where I thought no one cared about what I had to say, it's really heartening to hear everyone really does have a stake in this conversation and that every voice -- all of those 775 libraries -- are being listened to. doesn't happen every day in the federal government when you get to have 775 opinions actually listed to. I was really impressed by that.

I was also impressed by the fact that GPO is already making commitments based upon

1 what they've learned. And I heard that from several speakers here today that yes, we're in 2 phase one and then there's a phase two and a phase 3 4 But if I'm not mistaken, what I heard was oh, no, they've already looked at some of these 5 6 results and they're already realigning their 7 thinking as to how they can begin to take action that's going to be to the betterment of everyone.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So that's what I heard. lots of thoughtful comments from the stage. I've heard lots of thoughtful comments from the audience.

Ι believe all learned we've something. We kind of know where people are staking out their claims in this whole issue. So I was very encouraged by it.

I'm also encouraged by the fact that we're going to have Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday to discuss this even further. I can't When I was at -- was it you -- you were talking about oh, you're going to give us great information on Tuesday. I was like well, I want it now.

1	(LAUGHTER.)
2	MR. DESSY: I don't want to wait
3	until Wednesday. I mean, now that you've piqued
4	my curiosity, it's like what is that data? So
5	I'm really thrilled about the fact that everyday
6	this group's going to be able to come back and
7	work through this together.
8	So as the newest member of the
9	Depository Library Council but as an old time
10	federal librarian, I want to thank you, Mary
11	Alice you and the staff and all of you for
12	sitting here and being patient enough and being
13	faithful enough to work through this process.
14	And I guess on that note, is it time
15	to say good night?
16	MS. LASTER: I have some comments.
17	MR. DESSY: Oh, Shari.
18	(LAUGHTER.)
19	MR. DESSY: Our illustrious leader
20	has a couple of comments.
21	MS. LASTER: Okay. But before we
22	adjourn, I have a couple of announcements.

First of all, for everyone who is

joining us tonight at GPO to see the Linotype
movie and to enjoy the refreshments, you must
have your conference badge to enter GPO. Must
have conference badge.

If you have a guest with you, please stop by the registration table and get that person a badge. You won't be able to get in without a badge. Got it?

Okay. Any other announcements?

(No audible response.)

MS. LASTER: All right. Well, we will see you -- yes? Oh, wait. We have another announcement. I knew this announcement was coming.

MR. MYERS: I don't think the official announcement has come out yet. But our very own San Bernardino County Law Library, if you have not done so and want to join the law librarians and friends' dinner tomorrow night at the fabulous Irish restaurants we've kind of adopted as home, the sign-up list is on the bulletin board. Please add your name. If you've run out of numbers, please add the number

1	as well. And tomorrow at Noon, I will call in
2	a final count.
3	PARTICIPANT: How do we get to GPO?
4	MS. LASTER: So to GPO? So there
5	are a couple of options. There is a paper in
6	your packet that has the directions taking the
7	Metro. It also has the street address for
8	those who would be taking a taxi. And I think
9	perhaps all the other options would require
10	creativity that we might not need to engage
11	tonight.
12	All right. Thank you. See you all
13	tomorrow morning.
14	(APPLAUSE.)
15	(Whereupon, at 4:00 p.m., the
16	meeting was adjourned to be reconvened on
17	Tuesday, October 16, 2012 at 8:30 a.m.)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

+ + + + +

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE
AND
DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL MEETING

TUESDAY OCTOBER 16, 2012

+ + + + +

+ + + + +

The Conference met in the Crystal Ballroom in the Doubletree Crystal City, 300 Army Navy Drive, Arlington, Virginia, at 8:30 a.m., Sharalyn J. Laster, Council Chair, presiding.

PRESENTING:

SHARALYN J. LASTER, Depository Library
Council Chair

MARY ALICE BAISH, Superintendent of Documents, GPO

JANE SANCHEZ, Director, Library Services & Content Management, GPO

CHRIS BROWN, University of Denver

MARIE CONCANNON, University of Missouri

BLANE DESSY, Executive Director, FEDLINK, Library of Congress

CYNTHIA ETKIN, GPO

JANET FISHER, Arizona State Library

JENNIE GERKE, University of Colorado

LAURIE HALL, GPO

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED, GPO

PEGGY JOBE, University of Colorado

BARBARA REHKOP, Washington University in St. Louis

KELLY SEIFERT, GPO

DAVID WALLS, GPO

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: SHARALYN J. LASTER, Chair STEPHANIE BRAUNSTEIN CHRISTOPHER BROWN HELEN BURKE MARIE CONCANNON BLANE DESSY STEPHEN M. HAYES PEGGY ROEBUCK JARRETT ROSEMARY Lasala

DEBBIE RABINA

SUSAN LYONS MARK PHILLIPS

ARLENE WEIBLE

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

PAGE
LSCM Update to DLC by Jane Sanchez, Director, Library Services & Content Management, GPO
Break
Council Session - Collaborations: A View from the States by Arlene Weible, Oregon State Library
Missouri94
by Barbara Rehkop, Washington University in St. Louis113 Questions and Answers130
Planning the Six-State Virtual Government Information Conference135 by Chris Brown, University of Denver by Janet Fisher, Arizona State Library by Peggy Jobe and Jennie Gerke, University of Colorado Questions and Answers

Lunch Break

FDLP Forecast Study State Forecast
and State Focused Action Plans
by Mary Alice Baish, Superintendent
of Documents, GPO172
by David Walls, GPO174
by Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO181
by Cynthia Etkin, GPO204
by Shari Laster, Depository Library
Council Chair, University of Akron226
Questions and Answers231
Summary
by Blane Dessy, Executive Director,
FEDLINK, Library of Congress262
Adiourn

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2 (8:39 a.m.)MS. LASTER: 3 We're going to get 4 started in just a second. My name is Shari Laster from the University of Akron and welcome 5 6 to our first morning session. 7 This is an update from the Library 8 Services and Content Management Unit to the Depository Library Council, and as soon as Jane 9 10 is up here I will turn it over to her. MS. 11 SANCHEZ: Good morning, 12 everyone. 13 (Multiple good morning) I'm from New Mexico, 14 MS. SANCHEZ: 15 which is a land of manana so I apologize. 16 a little late. I was getting coffee and talking, so apologies. 17 Good morning. This morning we want 18 19 to talk to you about what we're doing in the LSCM, which Services 20 is Library and Content

And we want to tell you about what we're working on and also lay the foundation for

Management.

21

22

23

a session that we'll be doing later in the week,
talking about some of the initiatives that we're
working on that will contribute to us moving

So I'm going to talk about what we're doing this year and as laying a foundation I'm going to remind you again, I said this very briefly yesterday, LSCM has four programs that we're responsible for.

forward based on what we heard in the forecasts.

First of all is cataloging and indexing and this has the largest dedication of our staff.

We're creating the Catalog of U.S. Government Publications and we're doing a lot of work in metadata, cataloging, indexing and I'll talk a little more about that later.

The second program is the International Exchange Service. This is with the Library of Congress. We distribute tangible government publications to foreign governments.

In exchange for that, those foreign governments send like publications to our

government and in many ways I believe this supports the Law Library of Congress which is collecting legal materials from many of the countries around the world.

We are the entity that sends our government publications to them. Very important program.

We also are responsible for the By-Law Program. We distribute certain government publications to members of Congress and other government agencies.

Last, but certainly not least, is we manage and we work toward -- we don't manage, we work in partnership with our Federal Depository Library Programs.

And our goal is to provide free public access to official Federal Government information in all formats, in tangible/electronic.

I like to say that we're format neutral. In this day and age, formats are less important than they've been for many, many years.

б

So our goal is to treat all information that we get and to even go out and gather information when we need to and make that information available to the American public.

We'll talk more about it during the meeting.

We spend a lot of time also harvesting information from government websites. In this day and age, many of our Federal agencies, partners, are publishing less and less in tangible form.

So what we're doing is going out and finding material on their websites that they're not keeping there permanently and harvesting that content when we feel it rises to the level that we need to gather for the American public, so that is something that we're working on as well.

Okay. I came to LSCM in late March and one of my first jobs was to look at the organization, and I'll digress for just a moment.

What I was told by my staff was that they were very reorganization weary. They had

gone through a number of reorgs in the last couple years, so in deference to that I decided not to be too aggressive if you will.

I decided that I needed to focus on the future, acknowledge that we were shifting more and more to electronic and digital but also do it in a way that I felt like I was taking time and getting to know the various operations.

I met with a lot of the staff individually. I really wanted to take some time because, again, there was a little voice that kept telling me that everyone was very reorganization weary and I had to acknowledge that.

But I knew that we still had to focus on the future and one of the things that I noticed was that the organization was very much set for the status quo and primarily still set for the tangible process, not as set for the electronic, so I made that one of my focuses.

A couple things also happened around the same time. Some preceded my coming to LSCM in March but they also played into where I was

going.

The Laurel warehouse transfer happened in January of 2012, January of this year. That had occurred before I came.

As many of you may know, the distribution process was downtown at headquarters and we had a large state-of-the-art warehouse up in Laurel.

And it made sense to take that warehouse operation and move it to Laurel where we already had everything in place to maximize what we were doing as well up there.

As you can imagine, that was a huge shift and I'm sure some of you probably experienced a couple little glitches along the way.

But I think in general now the move has occurred and we are still working toward making sure that everything that feeds into that distribution process is working smoothly.

For those of you who were here yesterday, we have many systems that are still on old mainframes.

б

We're working very diligently, not necessarily to take them off of mainframes just to take them off mainframes but to make those systems more interactive and work for us in better ways.

So part of what is happening is we have someone on our staff, James Mauldin who many of you may know.

And he has been tasked and accepted the challenge of looking at a lot of those feeder systems and making them complement and interoperate better so that we can facilitate the distribution process better, so we're working on that.

Also many of you may know Joe McClane. I understand that he is a good friend to many of you in the depository community.

Joe retired in August of 2012. He hasn't stopped smiling yet. We just got a note from him the other day.

We invited him to come back because we knew that he would like to see many of you and that you would like to see him as well.

But I'm happy to report that he's very much engaged, I gather in some remodeling of his home, and he felt that he couldn't leave right now. I think he's doing bathrooms and kitchens and that kind of thing so.

But he said to say hello to everyone and I want you to know really and truly the man has not stopped smiling. Every time we see him and every time he sends us notes he tells us his jaws hurt he's smiling so much.

So, you know, talk about a good news story. This is what we would wish for everyone. So at any rate, I hope that hearing this is a joy to many of you because it certainly is for us as well.

The reason I say that Joe McClane's retirement was in some ways an impetus for change, Joe managed a group of staff that were our content acquisition staff.

When he was retiring, we looked at his staff and we saw the perfect opportunity to kind of begin our impetus for change and to begin what we were going to do.

1 | 2 | f

a

And we took the staff who were formerly in content acquisitions and we moved them to classification so now that staff, under the able leadership of Valerie Furino, are doing content acquisitions and classification.

One of the things that we know all of you are interested in is making that bibliographic information and doing that work more quickly.

And classification was one of the areas that we needed to put some more people in so that they could work on that and get that work done more quickly.

So we feel like this is definitely making a difference. It's only been about a month or two but we're seeing changes already and we hope you are as well.

Okay, my goal was to streamline the organization, to focus more on the future. So when I looked at the organization, we had three major areas as far as I could tell.

We had Technical Services and this gets funding every year from the Hill for major

projects to develop what we're calling the 1 2 National Bibliography Records Inventory. It's gone by a variety of names. 3 We 4 call it the National Bibliography or whatever, 5 but we're calling it the National now 6 Bibliography Records Inventory. This is to be an inventory of all 7 Federal Government documents that we can fill in 8 from the past and of course keep up with in the 9 10 future. One of the other areas that I'm very 11 focused on and I know we need to get more folks 12 13 working with us is in the technical area, in the 14 systems area. Sometime later in this meeting we 15 16 are having a session on Ben's Guide and the new FDLP website. We hope that all of you or as many 17 of you as can go will go. 18 19 We're very excited. It's definitely something that I think all of you will 20 be very interested in. 21

Karen Sieger will be doing a presentation. I believe it's Wednesday

22

23

afternoon. Wednesday afternoon, so please come if you can.

Ben's Guide, as many of you know, all Federal agencies or most Federal agencies were enjoined by whatever, executive order or whatever, to create websites that were accessible by younger people, younger citizens. Ben's Guide is what we are doing in that regard.

The FDLP website is, we're modernizing the website and we're trying to bring all of the systems, everything that you need onto one desktop.

So we're working toward that and, again, both of them, we are looking to a November launch so please stay tuned. For those of you who can come to the meeting on Wednesday afternoon, please do.

One of the things that I'm very focused on and I believe it goes to the four functions that we're responsible for is web discovery of all government documents. This goes beyond cataloging and indexing.

So one of the projects we're working

on right now is we are identifying the large web
discovery tools. Some of you may know of some
of them. Summon is one of them. There's a
couple from Ex Libris.

What we want to do is identify those large web discovery tools and partner with them to make sure that our government documents and our government information is available through those web discovery tools.

I don't have to stand up here and tell you that people do white box searches. We want to make sure that all the appropriate government documents are identified and show up in those searches when it's appropriate, so that is one of the big projects that we will be working on this year as well.

Okay, I talked about the National Bibliographic Records Inventory. I don't want to steal Laurie's thunder.

But I do want to show you some of the activities that we're doing that are contributing to this new National Bibliographic Records Inventory.

б

A couple years ago or a year or so ago we digitized the Historic Shelflist. We now have staff who are taking those digitized records and transcribing them and putting them into this new inventory.

We are looking at historic MoCat cataloging. Right now we're just beginning with 1895 through 1898 and 1898 and making sure that all of those records are in this records inventory.

We're identifying bibliographic information for known sets of fugitive documents. We heard from Blane yesterday about Federal agencies.

This is one big, enormous effort that we will try to reach out, we will reach out to Federal agencies, to those librarians, and get them to help us identify many of these fugitive documents.

In the best of all possible worlds, every agency would publish everything at GPO.

Unfortunately that doesn't happen, so there are these fugitive documents that we

don't know about and our goal is to know about them and make sure that we bring them into this inventory.

I'm not going to stand here and read this slide to you, but I just wanted to give you a sampling of all of the work we're doing to create this new National Bibliographic Records Inventory.

And now I'm going to turn the podium over to Laurie.

MS. HALL: Actually I think I'm going to go back to that slide. Good morning, everyone. I'm going to do really a brief update of the various things that we take care of in Technical Services.

Jane suggested that we put this slide together because all these little projects were going on. I, in the back of my mind, had an idea of what we were really doing but we hadn't really put a name to it.

So in reality this is really what we do in the cataloging and indexing program. We go out and we catalog materials from all branches

of government, whether they have been distributed to libraries or not.

And all these little projects had been going on for a couple of years but we never kind of put them all together in a grouping and named them and people who have been in this audience before have heard about a lot of these little projects that have been going on.

But we've added a few more in this fiscal year because we had additional funding to do specific cataloging and indexing projects.

As long as I've been at GPO, every year we get specified funds through our appropriations to do cataloging and indexing projects and usually in addition to our routine work that goes on every day, through our routine acquisitions processes, getting and identifying things into GPO and doing our web harvesting and working with agencies.

So for the last two years, three years now, we've been doing the Historic Shelflist transcription and I've got some statistics on the slides later for FY '12.

б

But we've been transcribing the Shelflist cards from about 1880 to 1992, so that's the major one at the top of the screen.

We also digitized those Shelflist cards because they're in a wide variety of conditions. They're in very, very old card catalog drawers and we wanted to make sure that we have a preserved copy of them as well.

Then we also worked with a couple libraries to get historic item cards. Some of you still had complete collections of item cards that we used to send out from the 1940s onward and we wanted to have a complete inventory of every single item number and class stem that we've ever assigned.

We transcribed those off the cards and all the information on the cards and now we're getting ready to load those into the DSIM System. We're working with our Oracle contractors to load that historic data.

So eventually DSIMS will not only have the current item numbers that we're using, ones that have recently been inactivated, but

also the historic range of items and class stems and titles of those categories.

So we're building up that big inventory of bibliographic information that we've used in our collections and you use in yours.

We also have some cooperative cataloging partnerships going on now, one with the University of Florida for the Panama Canal Commission and Montana to get Forest Service publications into the CGP that they have in their collections that we may not have distributed.

So we're looking for other opportunities for libraries that may want cataloging assistance or help with collections that we know that we have big gaps in our Shelflist.

So if you find myself or Suzanne Ebanues during conference, if you have some collections we're willing to kind of work together to add value to your bibliographic information, help you do name authorities and things like that to get all those records in the

CGP.

At the bottom we also have a lot of internal files. Besides the Shelflist, we have Kardex, Kardexes like most of you have, of serial holdings from the '70s and '80s.

We now have some support staff through contracts to help us transcribe individual serial issues into the CGP.

I think there's about five years in those Kardexes, so we're trying to get rid of all those manual records and get them into the CGP.

And we're also continuing to transcribe serial set information to House Reports and House documents so that when you pull up a bibliographic record for a House Report or a House document, a Senate document or Senate Report, you will get the serial set information as well, so that's another thing that we've been working on.

So that's the whole scheme of things that we've been doing for the last couple of years and we're doing this year, some of our projects.

So let's go on to some of this other stuff. So here's our general LTIS projects that we work on from year to year.

Talked a little bit about DSIMS. We were on a legacy mainframe system that handles your item selection profiles and what you select.

Our first phase is over. We've moved it off of that 1982 platform into an Oracle-based application, so that's our first phase.

And you saw the first list of classes come out. A little different from what we routinely did from our old system but some of the new enhancements are going on.

We have contractors here and if you have any additional information or want some help with some of that, Lisa Russell is here and is sitting out in the lobby during the lunch hour and is available to help you.

So we're doing some enhancements for that DSIMS application, different look and feel to Item Lister so we're looking at some of those

projects right now. We have contractors in-house working on those.

We've also done a lot of serials work in the last couple of years and that continues.

Transcribing serial information, all your current stuff that's going out, serials that are going out in your box process, the Federal Register, Congressional Record, CFRs, those are now all checked in.

We're using the serials module so you can go in and look at individual issues. You can see the individual class and get the individual shipping list.

A lot of that information was in internal systems that you all couldn't see so now it's all flowing into the ILS so you can actually go in and look at individual issues that we are checking in when it is in the box process.

So we're creating lots of serial patterns and also doing that for the historic serials from the Shelflist as well. So we're checking all those in.

In the Historic Shelflist, the

serials were just checked in on a three by five card so we're now transferring that into serial holdings.

ILS enhancements, we have now deployed the acquisitions module of the ILS so you can now go into the system and see pre-process or in process order records. They're order records for tangible material.

We sometimes order one copy of a document or we order 500 copies of a document.

Routinely if we order one copy of a document the on-order record is in there.

There's a brief bibliographic record and it says in process and if you look at the holdings it says on order, so that's the first time now that you can see some of that information. That was in our old legacy system so that information is in there.

When we order one copy, we usually know there's an electronic version available so it won't be distributed. The library's in a tangible form. We will identify the electronic version.

1 | 2 |

And then also, like I said, bulk orders are in there now so that's for the first time and we've migrated all of that ordering and acquisitions process into the ILS. It used to be in an old legacy system.

Then Jane mentioned the web harvesting project. There's more information about the web harvesting project on Friday. No, Thursday in the morning, Friday, Thursday.

(Laughter)

MS. HALL: We started using Heritrix. We're looking at some agencies that we routinely don't get publications through, the GPO channels, because these agencies routinely publish mostly electronically.

So we're dabbling in some of those areas as well, so there'll be some more information about that coming up too.

Okay, so we talked about the Shelflist project. That continues. We have contractors on site. The first was to transcribe the cards. Now we have librarians going back and adding LCSH subject heading to

those records and an authorized name authority.

So we're setting up name authorities for some older materials or upgrading name authority records or creating old ones that don't exist, so we're doing some enhancements to those Shelflist records that are in the CGP.

The Cataloging Record Distribution Project, our contract with Marcive is now in its third year, and in FY '13 we now have 80 libraries that are participating.

So if any of you are interested,
Melissa Fairfield is here or I'm here. We have
openings now for libraries.

A couple libraries didn't stay on last year so we do have openings if anybody's interested in this free service that we provide, so if you want to talk about that.

There also is a project page on the FDLP Desktop that talks specifically about the CRDP project and what the services are and you can actually go and profile.

And Joan and Jim are here as well to tell you about what that service is through GPO.

We're really happy with the participants and we always get really good feedback for the participants in that project.

Of course, as some of you are Tech Services, we're heavy into RDA. We've been doing lots of webinars with our cataloging staff. They've been doing a lot of sample training, getting ready.

Next week our cataloging staff and some of our Tech Services librarians go to NACO RDA training or participate in NACO RDA training, so we'll be doing some name authority testing.

Our ILS has been upgraded for the bibliographic records. We're now working on the authority fields to upgrading the displays and the information in the ILS for the NACO RDA.

And given that our training is in October, then it's Thanksgiving, then it's the holidays, we figure that we will probably start in early January, you know, to start implementing and start using RDA.

So there also is an RDA project page

on the desktop with updates as to all these little different things that we have done. There's sample records, hub IDs to the CGP so you can take a look at specific records.

We have some Congressionals that we've cataloged, some maps that we've cataloged. I think there's a serial or two in some just monographs there if you want to take a look at what some of the records look like that we've done in RDA.

And like I said, we're continuing with those cataloging cooperative projects with Montana and Florida.

I think on a monthly basis we process about 50 to 60 records from Montana so those are Forest Service pubs that we have not seen in the program before so.

Okay, quickly, Mary Alice mentioned some of the staff in cataloging worked alongside FDsys to do a metadata project for the Statutes at Large to get more granules for better searching so we're really excited about that project.

We've got some others in the queue
and it's really good for the catalogers.
They're really interested in doing some more

besides more cataloging.

So that was a really good, helpful project and it gives them some additional skills, so that stuff is getting ready to be loaded into FDsys shortly.

And I already talked about the item cards and loading data into DSIMS. That's going on now. And those order records in the ILS, I already covered all that, wow.

Okay, so a couple other projects going on in FY '13. We're going to be transcribing brief bib records from monographs from the 1895 and the 1898 MoCat volumes just to kind of get a sense of how much we're missing, just to see how the workflow would go in in our area.

So that's something that's just starting right now. We have some contractors working on that.

We are going to be doing some

enhancements to the Item Lister and the List of Classes coming up soon. Contractors are here on site working now at GPO.

And we had some backlogs of PURLs that don't work, some of the old PURLs. When we first started PURLing, we weren't archiving the documents so we're going back.

We have some contract help to do some archiving of some of those older PURLs that are broken and trying to find copies of material so we've got some of those projects. Sixty thousand of those I think are being worked on so.

As Jane mentioned, James Mauldin and some of my staff, Linda Resler, Valerie Furino and Janet McCaskill, are working on some shipping list box processing workflow enhancements, because now that we have part of our operation where the shipping list is produced in main GPO, the stock and stuff comes out to Laurel.

So there are some time lags between the workflow and the boxes coming back and the shipping list preparation so we're trying to

stream that a little bit.

It's only 30 miles out but bringing those trucks back and forth with materials, we're trying to streamline that and make it a lot more automated than it was.

So James is streamlining that and working really hard with the folks on that, so that's an ongoing process.

Plus looking at new quality control checks, quality control measures out at Laurel and eventually we want to have the folks out at Laurel when we get the bulk stock in Laurel to enter that bulk stock directly in the ILS, so we're working on that.

Okay, so here's some brief little information about DSIMS. We switched in February and I don't know how many of you know about that. I'm sure you do now.

And we started using it in March and then we launched it to you in April and of course there is a big project page on the desktop about the whole migration of your item profile information.

We created over 900 new items during that process because we tried to continue to move to that one-to-one correlation between items and stems so there's a big spreadsheet on the web page that has those 900 items that were created.

Also trying to break out by formats to give you greater selectivity between the formats, and the main focus was that mainframe replacement in Phase Two. We're going to improve more of those products and services that you use with DSIMS.

Okay, so here's one of the Item
Lister and the List of Classes. We're
constantly doing a lot of data cleanup. That
always happens when you're moving legacy data.

We had to break out in our old system. It was not a relational database so we had to now move all our data into a relational database so we had to do a lot of breakout of fields and post-cleanup.

So we hope to be issuing another copy of the List of Classes in August. We did that in August, right? This is October. So we're

getting ready to do --

(Laughter)

MS. HALL: Right, I'm looking at this. That was the first one we did and there were some changes in there that we noted. We don't have the dot for the new items, things like that, but those things will start changing as we start working with the new data in the new system so.

Okay, my time of statistics. I always like to give everybody a sense of statistics.

In LSCM we have 98 employees, correct? As of today, we have 98 employees. In Tech Services we're running 50 and 60, so just give you a context of how many people.

Plus we do have some supplemental contractors helping us out but our space is fairly limited, so I think on staff right now for supplemental staffing contracts we have like about six folks helping us in classification, in serials transcription, Shelflist transcription, those kind of things.

б

So that gives you an idea of how many staff are working on not only all the projects that we're doing, the forecasting and Robin's section and other projects Jane's talking about, but just in Tech Services.

So just to give you a sense of some of the stats. In FY '12, 142,000 Shelflist cards were added. We've created 405 serial patterns, those serial patterns.

I guess if you're in Ex Libris those are available to you if you're interested in some of those patterns. I know people like to share their serial patterns back and forth.

We sent out 47,000 records approximately to our CRDP participants who get those records monthly.

We checked in 40,427 serial issues, that's both current and from the Shelflist. I think that's a lot. It seems like a big number to me so.

And there's 2,065 orders. I kind of wanted to point out that last one, only 2,065 orders. That's the amount, a very, very small

amount of orders that we're getting through main GPO.

Shows you how minimal amount of things that we are ordering in tangible format for you. A significant portion of that 2,000 is when we're ordering one copy just to review.

And in 99 percent of the cases we order that one copy, we find the electronic version and we just process that one tangible copy and create a bib record that's not distributed for that format.

So in terms of the statistics for the number of titles that are being distributed in your boxes, there's been a 46 percent decline just from last year to this year in the number of titles that are going out in your boxes.

So I thought that was kind of an interesting phenomenon, not that nobody thought that that wasn't going to happen but it's a major decline, the number of titles that are going out.

We keep on track of our cataloged items. That's running pretty stable with our staff. We have about 17 cataloging staff and on

an average basis we're doing 20, 21, 22,000 bib record, you know, cataloging.

These are the statistics that we sent to CONSER. For those of you who don't know, we're in every single PCC, Program for Cooperative Cataloging group, at the Library of Congress.

We are in BIBCO and CONSER plus we also provide or we submit nominations for LCSHs so for name authorities and subject headings.

So gives you kind of an idea of the amount of work that the staff in cataloging and Tech Services is putting out on a regular basis.

So with that, I think, is that my last slide? Yes, that was my last slide so hopefully that gave you a brief overview of all the things that we're doing in Tech Services so thank you.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: We're doing a dance up here. Good morning, I'm Robin Haun-Mohamed, and I will get behind in the slides. Somebody wave at me and say, Robin, move forward.

1 Welcome. Glad to see so many folks 2 here early in the morning. Laurie talks librarianship. When she starts talking these 3 terms, my eyes start to glaze over and --4 5 (Laughter) 6 MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: -- Kelly elbows 7 me once and says, all right. So I'm going to talk about the really important stuff. (Laughter) MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Actually I'm going to share some information about the one 11 unit that's probably been realigned at this 12 13 point, Library Service and Content Management Outreach and Support. 14 15 You might know us as Education and 16 Outreach. We will use that term, I'm sure, for quite some time. 17 18 As Mary Alice and Jane have both 19 expressed, we heard you talk about training. Actually we've heard this for quite some time and 20 in the forecasts you kind of gave us some real 21

examples this time.

10

22

23

So I'm very excited that we're able

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

to synthesize that and we've actually already started implementing some of it. For example, we've acquired the iCohere software. We call it an e-learning platform. That's probably not what iCohere quite calls it.

But it allows us a lot of different opportunities and one of them, of course, was shown yesterday. In the forecasting session, we had, Cindy, I'm going to say over 140 followers via virtual?

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: One hundred forty-four registered over the four days that are listening along to the forecasting discussion you, and thank Cindy, for facilitating that.

We also have today we're testing it out for some distance participants to join in a panel presentation in the session immediately following this one.

So I look forward to hearing from those participants about how that went and I look forward to hearing from all of you in your review

and your analysis how it felt to have the virtual participation, although it's limited.

We want to make sure that we could support it. We want to make sure that we did it well, and these sessions that we're doing for forecasting are being recorded, correct? Cindy's nodding her head yes. So that's pretty exciting because we have heard people say we really want the virtual component.

I'm going to take a little step onto a higher soapbox. The virtual component's kind of a double-edged sword.

It allows a lot more people to participate and at the same time it allows your administration to say to you, you know what, I think that we could skip it this year and actually we felt that in the Interagency Depository Seminar this summer.

When we announced that we were going to have that option, there were several folks that emailed, said gee, I'm sorry, I'm going to cancel. It's not necessarily a bad thing. It's a change, and so bear with us as we learn

1 about this.

I think those of you that participate in ALA and other associations have felt this also, that once the virtual component comes in, there's a real difference in how your conference operates.

It's a big difference in your networking opportunities. Some ways it's improved. In other ways you lose the ability to have the face-to-face interface.

So anyway, it is here kind of like the slide in print. We knew it was coming and we are going to do the best darn job we can with it.

So the other thing that we have been doing is a lot of training, FDsys training, and I think Mary Alice mentioned this yesterday. I'm going to say it again though.

As of September 2012, we had 1,800 individuals that participated in a total of 69 in-person and virtual FDsys training sessions. That's a heck of a lot of people.

And I'm going to give a shout out to

Kelly Seifert, wave your hand, please, Mark Ames, Kathy Bayer, Kristina Bobe, not sure if she's in here, Ashley Dahlen, Donna Kraemer, Fang Gao, Heidi Ramos and Steve Shearer and I hope I didn't leave anybody out.

These are the folks that put on these presentations and do the coordination and the webinars and, of course, Ms. Etkin sitting over in the corner. No curtain but she's over there, so a bit about that.

We'll continue to work on our development of additional FDsys tips and tools and we will be working in part with a web team to make this all happen and also with Gary Somerset in our public affairs office as you heard yesterday.

Gary is the voice of GPO and he works very well with the team and with the web team to make sure that these presentations are moving forward.

So library support and coordination, that's a real broad way of saying if it's a question we pretty well see it, unless

it's a cataloging question. We shuffle those right over right away.

(Laughter)

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Public Access Assessments, this may be probably what a good part of that team that I just mentioned are most involved with, until this summer. I'll come back to that.

But most of our Public Access
Assessments, or PAAs as we call them -- you'll
know them as inspections from previous years.
Those of you have been around quite a bit, you'll
know that that's what we used to call them.

They're being done in a virtual mode at this point, that is we are looking at your web pages. We are talking with you on the phone. We're talking with your regional.

We schedule conference calls. Sometimes your director's on that conference call, sometimes not. Either way it's usually a really good thing. It's an opportunity for you and your administration to have some one-on-one time with someone at GPO.

1 | 2 |

We would love to travel. I keep looking at Mary Alice saying travel, travel. And she looks at me and says travel ban, Robin. So we are doing the best we can, given our limitations.

For those of you that have had a PAA in the last 18 months, please do share your experiences. If they were great, share them with others. If they were problematic, share them with me and the person that did them.

We have done over 120 of these for FY 2012 and that's taking out a good part of the summer, which we were doing a small project called forecasting. Great project, it's just a lot of information.

But we've had to kind of put some of these things on hold. We do need your feedback on that, though, and we appreciate your continued sharing of information with us.

Sharing best practices, innovative efforts, how does that happen? That's when you talk to us and we do listen and we share back with a friend, your friend, maybe somebody in GPO.

This happens at the conferences.

This happens via email. This happens in webinars. So please, continue to share

information.

We love to be able to point to Bill Olbrich and say, Bill, you know what? We're going to send somebody your way because we know that you're doing this, historical collection, large city library, lots of experience, trying even to put a person and an expert together.

And that's one of the things that we are finding in the forecast too. That seems to be a strong need. So we've done it unofficially, but I wanted to share that that's something we do.

We also plan on updating the new coordinators' tutorials. We know they're on the existing FDLP desktop.

And for those of you that were thinking maybe I'll skip out early on Wednesday afternoon and not go see the desktop update, no, please, go to FDLP.gov with Karen Sieger and her team. You will see some wondrous opportunities

with the new desktop. I'm calling it desktop, right?

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Website, website.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: She's supposed to elbow me. Website, FDLP website, and at that point then we will be working on updating the new coordinators' tutorials.

And I look forward to having some volunteers from the audience who'd like to help us work on this also. If you don't know my email, it's too long to say. Just grab me while I'm here. I'm the one with the white scarf today.

I also wanted to share that we've been highlighting libraries, Library Spotlights, and I'm going to read these because there's 12 of them for the last year.

So Indiana University Kokomo's our October Spotlight library and we have also had Newark Public, the Marriott Library at the University of Utah, Hawaii State Public Library System, Bierce Library at the University of

Akron, Robert L. Carothers Library at the University of Rhode Island, Elmer Ellis Library at the University of Missouri-Columbia, the University Library at University of Colorado and the University of Arkansas at Little Rock Ottenheimer Library.

We'd love to be able to showcase what you folks are doing out there, how well you're doing it and this not only goes into the FDLP Connection newsletter, it goes up on the FDLP website and off GPO.gov.

So let us know if you think that one of your colleagues has a spectacular operation. We'd love to hear about it. We'd love to be in conversation about that.

So requests for participation, I see the requests come in and I share them with my administrator. Did I introduce my new director, Jane Sanchez, and Mary Alice Baish of course?

While the travel dollars are limited, Mary Alice has been doing lots of connecting the dots together to make the best use

of those travel dollars.

And so if we can put together your event along with a couple others, we'd love to come visit and participate in either your anniversary celebration or your regional meeting, et cetera.

The other thing we can do though is iCohere allows us now another opportunity by which to participate. And of course there's the standby, conference call. We do that on a pretty regular basis.

We haven't been so successful in video conferencing. I don't know if it's GPOs video or the hookup between the two but we think that iCohere will fill that gap nicely, so please do continue to send in requests for participation.

LSCM Outreach and Support's the spot where we see your emails come in and also some phone calls about questions with your depository operation, about a directive from your administration or really just about anything else.

б

We try to handle those, we being that team of five. Mark Ames, Kathy Bayer, Kristina Bobe, Ashley Dahlen, Melissa Fairfield do try to meet all your needs.

If we're not meeting them, if you think you've sent something in or called and you haven't gotten a response, please let us know.

I'm sure all of you have that little lost sock syndrome that happens with the Internet sometimes and emails.

Telephone calls, we still get a few of those and I personally, I love to chat on the phone so please do that. That's 202-512-1119. That's the line that our team picks up on.

I also wanted to share that, and this was said yesterday and I'm not sure Joe Paskoski's here today. Joe, are you here?

(Off microphone discussion)

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Yes, he is. I'm so pleased to have Joe rejoin our team. Many of you old timers, those of you that stood up when they were doing the council exercises down towards the end, will remember Joe.

And I'll tell you my story again.

Joe inspected me 20 years ago, and he failed me on a category too. He is a wonderful Public Access Assessment specialist and I look forward to his joining our team again so I did want to share that with you all.

Our group is also the team that investigates complaints, and for those of you that have actually been through this process, the complaint could be from a patron.

The complaint could be from a depository coordinator or a library administrator or a selective talking about a regional or a regional talking about a selective. We investigate all of these.

Ninety-nine percent of the time the patron complaints are somebody that's been barred from the campus for other activities, and when there's legal action against such an individual, GPO is not going to intervene. It's not our place.

We will support free public access.

We will help the patron or the complainant,

either way, try to gain access to that material or provide other options. But if a patron is barred from the institution, we are not going to intervene.

Now, when it regards those other complaints, there's a couple things that I always suggest people do.

First of all, whatever your administration tells you to do you do. You document whatever you need to do. And if you just need an ear to listen, we can generally do that.

If we need to have a conference call for some reason, we can do that. If I need to contact the Superintendent of Documents, I know where she lives and I know where she resides on the eighth floor. I can do that also.

Please rest assured that all of these are viewed in the best possible light in that we think it's important that we investigate.

We think it's important that we provide feedback, and we support the depository

operation and the coordinator to the extent that
we can.

So if anybody has anything they need

So if anybody has anything they need to say to any of us, grab us on the way back from the bathroom and we'd be glad to have a chat.

Sorry, my print's in eight-point font and I wear trifocals. Okay, so updating the customer service. GPO has enterprise-wide picked up the RightNow Technologies customer relationship management tool.

I believe that has actually been purchased by another rather large vendor, but it is being shared throughout GPO and we have a team that are working on this.

We also have a number of other communication options, and this is my time to get feedback from you and feel free not to walk up to the mic but shout out later or write it down.

We have our FDLP.gov website. We have our FDLPL announcements. We have our RSS feeds. We have the monthly news Connection newsletter. We have our askGPO.

And of course we have our email and

phone numbers, although many of those you won't

find. You'll have to click through use a forum

in order to reach us. If you Google us, you'll

get our email addresses pretty easy there.

You also have the option to share through the DLC members and also at the conversations at these events and at ALA when you see us.

We've tried to minimize the number of items that we push to the libraries but there's times when we think that needs to happen and shared broadly.

We tried to minimize the postings on GOVDOC-L. So when someone writes in there will GPO please respond, it's probably a good thing to send that to askGPO unless there's some gross misstatement or error.

GOVDOC-L is a forum for many other individuals besides the FDLP participants and program participants so only those most important things, things that reach the broadest levels are we going to push to GOVDOC-L.

And if we see that there's kind of

a, there's no nice way to say it, a firestorm brewing and we're not seeing it and Dan hasn't emailed me or Steve hasn't called me and said, Robin, have you seen this, feel free to send an askGPO or I'm at 202-512-0052. 512-1119 is the other number. Feel free to let us know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

big news.

following me.

I did want to get your feedback lot of different though. That's а communication options and we would like to know is there something we're missing? something that perhaps could be combined down? For example, the Connections newsletter. We have a lot of effort put into I'm hoping you're finding that helpful that. and interesting, and I am not going to tell the

But I do think that electronic communication has made instantaneous expectations and sometimes it takes a bit of time to respond.

I'll leave that for Kelly who's

For example, if you're asking about a pub, is it coming in or not or have we cataloged

it or not, that sometimes takes a little bit longer than responding to an email because we may have to contact the agency.

One may have to ask one of you to send us pieces of that pub because Laurie didn't say it this time but we don't have a library.

We have the materials that come in.

They're processed and then they go back out under our records agreement to the National Archives and Records Administration.

And James Mauldin is doing his job so well that he's making that not every four years that we do that, that we're pushing those out because we're out of space, every year.

So sometimes we do call you. John, you've gotten this call I'm sure and I know Laura Saurs has too and Sandy McAninch. I don't think we ask you on a regular basis.

You know, can you send us a facsimile of the title page and/or other pieces of a publication so we can get it cataloged because it didn't come through us or some other thing has happened, so when you are waiting for those

responses, please use the CRM or askGPO.

Software, track it. If you find that we're not being responsive or you think there's an issue, let us know because, again, sometimes those things fall through the cracks.

And then partnership activities.

So in our realignment there's been a bit of a shuffle. Technical Services is being refocused. The systems group will be coming in.

And I get to play with the agencies again. I'm very excited. For those of you that participate in QAC, I get to come back again. That was one of my favorite sessions to attend.

We do want to work with agencies, not just for pubs and permanent Public Access Agreements but also for training because we don't have a library. Our library is dispersed.

All of you together work with us and we are the Federal Depository Library Program.

I can't train on things I don't have in GPO.

Electronic, it's a little bit easier but it's harder because, of course, again, I don't know the tool so I'm going to be reaching

out to agencies to try and get their experts to train with us and to work with us to provide training for all of you.

Examples of this, of course the Federal Register on Thursday and the Census Bureau tomorrow. These are both folks that we have every year at the Interagency Depository Seminar.

They're great at what they do. Most of their registrants and participants seem to really enjoy their sessions and we will be doing increased outreach to do those.

Sorry. So as I said, requests for participation. Please send them in. We want to meet with your state and local documents group if there's a role for us to participate. If we can do it electronically, that's probably the way that we're going to do it.

For those of you that may have had us in the near past, I think Ohio's a good example. We've participated in some of their regional meetings, so continue to provide those notifications and we'll participate as we can.

Working with the FDLP Forecast

Study. I alluded to the fact that the team was

busy this summer and that's because you all gave

4 us a heck of a lot of data.

You responded in such a tremendous way that there are six groups that I'm on dealing with these issues, and I only have to present on one today so I'm doing a little whoo-hoo. Then I'll be done for this conference.

That is just the tip of the iceberg as we've heard and, believe me, we've heard you say we want it, we want it now.

So as I look at the PAA group, the folks that have been doing Public Access Assessments, I'm looking at them going, guys, you know, we have to keep it at a lower rate than we would like probably through the next phase of Forecast Study.

It is that important. Those of you that know me know I really believe in working with the libraries and doing these assessments because I think it's important that we hear you and your administration and that you hear from

us if there's an issue.

That said, this Forecast Study is even more important at this point. So if you are reaching out to us and we owe you a report on an assessment that was done, feel free to let us know. We are working on them, however.

If you're wondering when we're coming your way and I use quote marks because we used to really get in the car and go visit Virginia, all of Virginia, tripping through it. That was great fun, but we don't have that ability right now.

So if you're wondering if we're coming your way virtually, we are hoping to ramp that up again but it's just not going to be in the immediate future.

If you have a need for us to talk with you or to do an assessment and believe it or not people will say to me, Robin, I really think you need to do an assessment because we've got some issues here and this will help, we will make the time to do it if that's needed. You just need to let us know, okay?

Marketing is also an area that's

coming my way, but Ms. Kelly's going to update

you on that because she does it so well. Thank

you very much.

MS. SEIFERT: Shari's keeping tabs

MS. SEIFERT: Shari's keeping tabs on me so she's going to kick me if I talk too long. I'm Kelly Seifert. Before I jump into the marketing, I'm just going to touch briefly on what Robin said about the FDLP Connection newsletter.

If you got the last issue, you noticed it was the September/October issue. We are moving to a bimonthly format so the next one you'll see is the November/December issue. It'll be the conference wrap-up.

If you aren't receiving that, please log on to FDLP.gov. You can sign up to receive a copy whenever it comes out in your inbox.

If you don't want to sign up to receive it, you can always go onto FDLP.gov and every past issue is up there so you can take a look at that.

Cindy Etkin over here and myself

were the co-editors and we're always looking for guest contributors from the community so please catch up with us this week if you would like to be a guest contributor.

Many of you have received calls and emails from us asking for your contributions and they're always really valuable to share your expertise so please consider doing that.

To jump into the marketing, in the next couple of weeks we are going to release the FDLP promotion plan.

The first piece of that plan is really what I call setting the stage. It talks about, first of all, why it's important to promote the FDLP and to promote your library.

So it gives a lot of good justification for why your library is so important and the services that you provide are so important.

The next part of it talks about what our goal is, what we want to do. Obviously on the surface we want to increase awareness of the FDLP and we want to increase usage of your

1 libraries.

Next talks about who should participate. This is a joint effort between GPO and all of you.

We talk about when we should get started, and the answer to that is yesterday. We talk about where we should all be promoting, and that's both online and in your community.

And then we talk about how we're going to accomplish that, so that takes us to the next piece of that plan.

The next piece is GPO's role and that will introduce a brand new promotional campaign that we are launching in the coming weeks as well.

And it also introduces all the different ways that GPO is going to use that campaign to help spread the word about the FDLP.

The next piece of that is your role in this, tips and tricks for how you can use the campaign that we've created and the promotional resources that we've created in order to promote yourselves right in your community.

The next piece of that is focusing your message. So this talks about different ways and different angles you can look at the depository, different aspects of it that you can promote.

And finally, the last piece is just a various collection of promotional resources.

In the past, we've introduced several plans.

A couple of years ago, we had our Easy as FDL campaign. Before that we had the Make the Connection campaign.

And then in between them we have lots of different great promotional resources, a lot from you guys here at the conferences, a lot through the Connection newsletter that you are submitting as guest contributions, so we just point you to a lot of different resources that already exist.

This is the Government Information at Your Fingertips logo. This is the new campaign that we are releasing.

We will have this green logo as well as an orange version and a black and white

version available for you in the coming weeks on FDLP.gov that you can grab and use on your websites and in your material as well.

And this is just a preview of some of the new promotional items that we are releasing.

You'll notice the two posters on the left side, one is for FDsys and one is for the FDLP. Those will be available to order on the desktop pretty soon.

To the right of that we have four images, one about the FDsys, one about the CGP and two about the FDLP that you can use either as screensavers on your public access workstations or as digital images if you have LCD screens in the library.

We are also going to offer bookmarks, a two-sided bookmark. One side is FDsys and one side is the FDLP.

We're also introducing new stickers for your library doors and windows. You'll see that in the red and blue next to the bookmark.

And then to the right of that you'll

see a table tent that mirrors the sticker that you can use anywhere within the library.

This poster is going to be available out in the lobby area so if you want to look at it in greater detail throughout the week it'll be out there for you and we're working on procuring these items right now.

These are three new informational handouts that we're introducing. You got a preview copy in your packet when you came in. They are three handouts, one about FDsys, one about the FDLP and one about the CGP.

The FDsys handout in particular kind of serves a dual purpose. It's a promotional brochure and it's also an educational handout.

It goes through a search results page on FDsys and kind of talks through the different components and the different things that you can do with the search results page.

A lot of the same information is covered in our webinars if you've attended any of those. Those will be available for order soon on FDLP.gov.

And also coming soon, we've created two public service announcements. One is for our FDsys and one's for the FDLP. We did a public service announcement release a couple of years ago. It was pretty successful.

We worked with campus radio stations and local radio stations to push those PSAs and we did that in partnership with you guys and we're hoping to do that again. Those have been created so those will be released soon.

We're also doing some national media outreach with a company called NAPS. We've done this before. What NAPS does is we provide them information about the FDLP. They craft advertisements that look like news articles.

And those articles get put on various websites and in print publications and they're also released as public service announcements on FM radio stations, so that will be coming soon.

We're also working to create some press release and announcement templates. A lot of what we've heard from you guys is that you

would like us to provide you with a way to
announce your anniversary or announce a new
collection that you have or new services, so
those will be coming soon.

We'll also be offering digital images like the Government Information at Your Fingertips that you just saw to go along with the campaign that you'll be able to use on your websites.

We're also working on a webinar about promotion so we're going to wrap up all of this information in the new promotion plan and create a webinar for you.

And we're also investigating how to do better outreach to libraries, schools and other Federal agencies and entities that might not have the full awareness of the FDLP as well.

Now, tomorrow during the Forecast session in the afternoon, we're going to go a little bit more in depth with some of the marketing stuff that we're doing.

And you will also have the opportunity to have a preview copy of the new

1 FDLP promotion plan, so tomorrow we'll 2 talking more about that. How did I do? (Off microphone discussion) 3 4 MS. SEIFERT: Okay, thank you. 5 MS. LASTER: Thank you, Kelly. 6 first I'd like to see if there are questions from 7 members of Council for LSCM staff about today's 8 presentation. Stephanie 9 MS. BRAUNSTEIN: 10 Braunstein, Louisiana State University. address that final report, what kind of vehicle 11 do you guys use to do metrics that would 12 13 determine the success of the PR programs that you're instituting? 14 MS. SEIFERT: With our contract 15 16 with NAPS, they provide us with really detailed report of the reach of the print publications and 17 the PSAs as well, especially when they are posted 18 19 on the websites, how many views they get. So we'll get that at the end of the 20 fiscal year to determine the successfulness of 21 our investment in that. 22

With the public service

announcements, what I did last time was, and this
is not exactly scientific, but I reached out to
all of the radio stations that we were able to
get to air them and just talked to them about any
feedback they received or how many times they air
it and what their listenership is for that.

As far as the handouts and brochures, they're harder to gauge because the libraries are just putting them out on the reference desks.

We do do some checks. The Public Access Assessment folks talk about the usefulness of the products and how well they're being received.

MS. JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library. First,
thank you. This was all really interesting and
informative.

And of course I have a question about something you didn't talk about, but it's in the LSCM update.

So the question I have, and I'll frame it in how can I find more information so

you don't have to answer right now, but I was very
interested yesterday when Mary Alice Baish
mentioned that the judicial conference had
approved the court opinion pilot project.

And it's in the LSCM update but I'm wondering are we really talking about all lower Federal and Bankruptcy Courts, are the opinions going back to 2004 and what's the timeline for putting these on FDsys?

And if you don't want to answer it now, just if you could tell me -- I looked. I was searching on things.

MS. BAISH: Thanks for your question, Peggy. Unfortunately --

MS. LASTER: Mary Alice Baish, GPO.

MS. BAISH: Thank you, Shari. Unfortunately we had invited Michelle Ishakian from the Administrative Office of the Courts and Wendell Skidgel, both of whom attended last year's conference and provided I believe one or two training sessions just as we were launching the pilot, to attend yesterday's plenary but they were both unable to come due to a conflict

of a conference.

Wendell Skidgel and I had a good conversation. I know Cindy has been in close touch. She is our lead on this project. We work closely, as I mentioned, with the CTO and the staff of FDsys.

Wendell believes that they, on their side, can get all of the courts prepared to submit their opinions into FDsys in FY 2013.

That is the latest update that I received and that's the information I gave yesterday. Cindy might have a little bit more.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. Just to add to that, it's going to be a phase-in approach but it will be for all of the opinions of those lower courts.

It's a phased-in approach because the systems in which the courts have their opinions housed have to be updated with the extraction software that will feed directly into FDsys.

And so as the courts get that upgrade to their system so that they can feed, then they

will begin so it's a bit of a phased-in approach but the expectation is that the rest of the courts will be added in this coming fiscal year. MS. JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett, University of Washington Law Library. Thank you very much.

And I have one more request which is that even though this is kind of incomplete information, if you could put something on the FDLP website because this is such a fabulous addition that you really need to push that out and advertise.

And I think particularly the law library directors are going to be delighted with this.

And it's something that we, the coordinators, can then take to our directors and deans and say look at this great thing that GPO is doing. So I really would like some more official information on that. Thank you.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Thanks so much, Peggy, for that suggestion and we will look at ways to get the information out

1 to folks, but this is a very recent happening 2 with the just occurring judicial conference meeting within the last couple weeks, so thank 3 4 you. 5 MS. LASTER: Let's go ahead and take 6 the audience question. This is a bit of a 7 MS. GUTH: Hi. technical question. 8 Name and institution? MS. LASTER: 10 MS. GUTH: Oh, sorry. LuMarie Guth, Columbus State University. This is a bit 11 of a technical question and I did submit this 12 just now to askGPO and I look forward to your 13 14 response. I really do like the new DSIMS tool 15 16 thank you very much for that. The so searchability is wonderful. 17 There was one aspect of the old tool 18 19 though that I do miss a bit. I was wondering if there was any thought over returning the record 20 of amendments to your profile. 21

I can't seem to find that anywhere and it was very useful for me because once in a

22

23

while I would make a mistake and accidentally drop the wrong item number or something like that.

And also I tried to look on DDM2 to find that information but it doesn't seem like the new DSIMS and DDM2 are well linked together, so I was wondering if that was an issue that was being addressed.

MS. RUSSELL: Lisa Russell, GPO. Excuse me, I have a frog in my throat. That is not something that's currently in DSIMS. It is something that we're looking at and doing as an enhancement.

One thing that you might want to think about and that I would like to get some feedback on is whether you want -- it's one of those things if you turn it on you might start getting notifications every time a new item number is added.

And I don't know if everybody wants that many emails. So that's something I'd like feedback on. Do you want like one report that tells you this session I went in and added these

items or I went in and deleted these items, what 1 kind of format you'd like? Well, that's something 3 MS. GUTH: 4 that is an interesting idea that I'm sure we can 5 address to everyone. 6 I think that receiving a report on 7 item numbers added is really useful as well because it does help that sometimes once in a 8 while some new item numbers will sneak in that 10 I want to go over and maybe drop in the next revision. 11 But I think that maybe some other 12 13 people on GOVDOC-L, maybe that might be a good forum to look at it. 14 Thank you. 15 MS. RUSSELL: 16 MS. NEWMAN: Lorna Newman, the University of Cincinnati. I have a question 17 about askGPO and if you analyze the questions 18 19 that are submitted by categories and maybe do some kind of proactive thinking. 20 Like if you got a lot of fugitive 21

documents, do you try to put some effort into

being proactive about some of those things or

22

1	just kind of what's the popular category of
2	questions?
3	MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin
4	Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Oh, Cindy's going for the
5	mic, yay. Definitely this is something that we
6	know needs some additional work and it's very
7	time intensive, but Cindy can probably update
8	you on what they have been actually doing.
9	Thank you, Lorna.
10	MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. We
11	do have the capability to run those kinds of
12	reports and we have done it in the past.
13	It's been a while since we've done
14	it but if you all are interested in that kind of
15	report about the most popular categories that
16	are used and that kind of thing, we'll be glad
17	to make that maybe part of the monthly metrics
18	that we do and make available. Lorna, is that
19	okay?
20	MS. NEWMAN: Yes, that's fine. I
21	was just curious if there was
22	FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Microphone.
23	(Off microphone discussion)

1 MS. ETKIN: Understand, 2 I'll check into that next week. Thanks. MS. LASTER: We're just about out of 3 4 time. I know Larry was next. 5 MR. MEYER: Thank you. Since Robin 6 had the mic, this question is directed to Robin. 7 I'm Larry Meyer from San Bernardino County Law 8 Library. 9 Robin, you mentioned when a campus 10 has banned somebody or is preventing somebody. Do you want to know if somebody has been banned? 11 Do you want the documentation? 12 13 If a library were to adopt a code of conduct for patrons, do you want to have input 14 Do you want a copy of it? 15 on that? 16 happen to have a sample code of conduct? kinds of questions. 17 MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin 18 19 Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Larry, thank you for that opportunity. One of the things that our PAA 20 folks do on a regular basis is check about a code 21 22 of conduct. It can help you in so many ways when

dealing with a problem patron.

Do I want to know when someone's been banned? Not really. Do I want to know when you think I'm going to get called? Absolutely, give us a heads up.

At that point, we will be asking or talking with you and/or your attorneys. I think, Marie, you went through this one.

We want to make sure that we have a fair exchange for the person making the complaint and also for the depository that has a right to protect its faculty, students, staff and, of course, the Federal materials that are under your purview at that time.

Any kind of follow-up that needs to be done, if we can't handle it, we go to our general council's office and we ask them for their assistance because of course we're not attorneys.

Jane Sanchez, however, but I don't imagine you're practicing right now on this, no. So okay, well, you know the old mantra, don't ask us legal advice then, no. We definitely want to know if there's something that's happening.

Can we provide you examples of good I can't, but I bet those five 2 codes of conduct? people sitting over on that side of the room know 3 4 of some really good ones. Would we like input? We always love 5 6 to have the ability to provide input, especially 7 as it may affect your public access responsibilities.

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Or for example, in Ohio they were doing some changes dealing with storage materials and I think, Shari, you worked with us on making sure that we were comfortable as they were comfortable with their responsibilities. So, yes please, do let us know.

> Thank you. MR. MEYER:

MS. LASTER: Last question quickly.

WOODS: Stephen Woods, Penn MR. I wanted to ask about this NAPA survey. I was sort of silent about it last night because I thought I was the only one that thought that it was spam, that thought it was some sort of Nigerian survey sort of thing.

Well, first of all, why did I think

it was spam? Because I didn't know that it was coming in the first place.

The second question I have is more related to what is that collecting that's not being collected on the Forecasts? What's the point of that survey? Because I didn't open it because, again, I'm not going to click on something that I think is spam.

MS. BAISH: I hope the microphone's still on. Mary Alice Baish, U.S. Government Printing Office. Thank you, Steve, for your question and comment about that.

As Acting Public Printer Davita Vance-Cooks mentioned yesterday, in our FY '12 appropriations the Congressional Research Service was mandated to contract with NAPA, the National Academy of Public Administration, to do a review of GPO and included in the review was looking at the Federal Depository Library Program.

NAPA has undertaken that study and, as Davita mentioned, we're working very closely with them. We're giving a lot of information on

data requests that they have made with us.

at U.S. GPO have met with them one or more times and their study and the survey that they put out was done independently as part of their review and therefore not part of the Forecast Study.

They did not consult us on the questions that they asked. There are, I believe, one or two NAPA members who have registered for the conference and who will be attending some of the sessions.

We did hear your concerns, however, when the survey was posted and I want to thank many of you here in the audience for contacting either Robin or myself directly, which is why within I think one or two days of their having sent information and the request to you and your deans I did put out an email to all of you to say that this was a legitimate survey and to encourage you to please respond.

Again, it is separate from the FDLP Forecast Study that we are doing internally. It is part of this outside review of GPO and the FDLP

as required by our FY '12 appropriations language, so they're independent studies.

I want to thank all of you who took the time. I did let the NAPA folks know that from our perspective you were all surveyed out. You had just completed the Biennial Survey. We had additionally put the questionnaires out on the FDLP Forecast Study.

But I understand that several hundred of you did respond to the NAPA survey and I really want to thank you for taking the time. I do know that that was an additional burden on you.

They will be sharing their draft report with us in November. The final NAPA report is due to Congress on January 31st of 2013. I hope that responds to your question, Steve. Thank you.

MS. LASTER: Okay, thank you all. Sorry for running a little bit over. We will be back at 10:30.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 10:06 a.m. and went back

on the record at 10:32 a.m.)

MS. WEIBLE: Just another reminder if you came in late, the handouts actually for this session are at the front of the room so please feel free to walk up and grab handouts for our two sessions today.

So first I wanted to welcome everyone. My name's Arlene Weible. I'm from the Oregon State Library.

And I'm up here speaking on behalf of the Council Working Group on Collaboration. And what our goal is for this particular work group is to really try to highlight and promote all of the collaborative projects that are out there in the FDLP community.

This is an area where you see the real exciting parts of this program where you collaborate for lots of different reasons. You collaborate because you don't have enough resources in your institution to do everything that you want to do.

But it's also collaborating is a really good way to think about different ways of

doing business and really testing models.

The projects that we do together among depository libraries at the state and local level is where you can really see what our Acting Public Printer Davita -- Davita mentioned yesterday this notion of creative flexibility.

And when she said that, I was so excited because I think this is exactly where a lot of our collaborations are. We're really trying to work together to find the best ways to work creatively together.

And I believe that these new models that are being worked with at these local levels are really the future of this program.

And that's where we're going to be able to do this experimentation about different ways of thinking about things so we'll learn what will work and what may not work into the future.

But we're really fortunate today to have two projects that I think are really working and we're going to highlight them today.

They are two highly successful collaborations that we hope will inspire you to

1	explore the options that you might want to think
2	about in your own neck of the woods at home.
3	So the first discussion we're going
4	to have is Keeping Documents Close to Home, the
5	Sub-Regional Concept.
6	And we have Marie Concannon, who is
7	the Government Documents Regional Coordinator
8	from the University of Missouri, and Barbara
9	Rehkop, the West Campus Librarian and Government
10	Documents Coordinator from Washington
11	University in St. Louis.
12	And then our second presentation
13	will be Planning for the Six-State Virtual
14	Government Information Conference.
15	And we have our colleagues Chris
16	Brown and Janet Fisher, Chris from the
17	University of Denver and Janet from the Arizona
18	State Library.
19	And we're also trying some new
20	technology where we're going to have Peggy Jobe
21	and Jennie Gerke from the University of Colorado

So they'll be in the second part of

who are going to speak to us from Colorado.

22

the program so we'll talk about the logistics of 1 2 that when they come up. But first up, let's go ahead and get 3 started with Marie and Barbara. 4 5 MS. CONCANNON: Okay, thank you so 6 much for attending this session. As the 7 Regional Coordinator from Missouri, I have been delighted to be a witness to something wonderful 8 that's happened in the city of St. Louis. 9 10 And it is something that has been 11 relatively easy to implement. It has been something 12 that has not been very 13 intensive. really 14 And it has caused blossoming in that city that I could never have 15 16 predicted at the outset of this experiment really. 17 We call it the sub-regional concept. 18 19 Sub-regional is not a word you're going to find in Title 44. It is something we invented, okay? 20 We invented it and we ran it by GPO. 21

We said here's our plan. Here's our concept.

Does this fly? You know, does this work for you?

22

And they asked lots of questions about different things, about will it cross state lines and other things, you know, to make sure it complies with the statute. It all came out just fine. They said, yes, you can do it.

And so we've been practicing with it for maybe about a year? About a year. By the way, this is my co-presenter, Barbara Rehkop. She's over there.

I've told her that she is welcome to interrupt me at any point if she wants to pipe up and say something because she's actually the person who's a lot closer to it. She's going to have her own presentation right after mine. We're both going to have a short thing here.

But anyway, just tell you what this about. I know some of you are sitting kind of in the back row there and I myself can never see that far so I'm going to read these slides to you so you can make sure that you all catch this.

It's very simple. The concept is simple. What is a sub-regional? It's an arrangement whereby a selective depository

agrees to assist neighboring libraries with discards. Okay, normally that's a regional thing. This is now a sub-regional thing.

The sub-regional coordinator considers collection development priorities at area libraries in order to help direct documents to libraries that may want them.

And I just mentioned that the term sub-regional is not a legal designation for FDLP libraries. It is a role. It's a legitimate role. They are legally still a selective.

What defines a sub-regional area? Well, a sub-regional area can be drawn around any geography which has a relatively high density of FDLP selective libraries, people who feel that they are close enough to one another that they could meet on a more regular, more than annual basis, and benefit from those meetings. Any group of libraries could work as a sub-regional if they so chose.

So how do they function? The sub-regional accepts offer lists from FDLs, Federal depository libraries, in the

sub-regional zone, chooses what it wants for its 1 collection, then advertises remainders to the 2 other libraries in the zone.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Then the offer list goes to the state regional coordinator and that would be me, and once it reaches me, it goes through all the regular pathways.

I take what I want for my collection. I offer it to the other Missouri libraries in total, not just St. Louis but all the rest.

We have system where we simultaneously make it visible through national Needs and Offers list because our Missouri Exchange List website is permanently listed on the national Needs and Offers site.

So anybody at any time can go in and actually find it there. We still, of course, fill orders by giving favoritism to the Missouri libraries and then we fill the out of state.

Okay, the sub-regional coordinator may host meetings for networking, training and collaboration. Such meetings can include library staff from other states.

And St. Louis is on the river and right over the river there are some Illinois selectives which are very interested to be a part

4 of the trainings and the meetings.

They know that they can't be a part of the discard process because it's Illinois. That's a whole different jurisdiction, but they do enjoy coming over for those meetings.

The sub-regional coordinator cannot provide permission to discard documents because it's an authority that's given by the statute to the legal regionals. The sub-regional coordinator merely helps ensure that offers are distributed first to FDLs in the local area.

Okay, advantages. What are the advantages for selectives? They might not have to type up offer lists.

And I know that, as a regional, occasionally a selective may call me and say I have a lot of stuff and I'm not quite sure what it all is. Some of it's in poor condition and some not and I am not sure of the dates and some are in boxes, and I'm thinking, oh my.

If it's not a place I could travel
to, the only choice I would have is to say, well,

you have to kind of describe this for me. You
have to type something up.

But if it's in St. Louis, Barbara may have -- it may be a lot easier for her to simply drive across town and go look, and so that works out really well.

And as we've been practicing this for the last year, we've been in close communication with each other. It's been great.

It's been great for me, but actually my slide is what's the advantages for selectives, so I'll get to how it's great for me later.

There's a lower cost to transport the unneeded materials to their new homes. If a library in St. Louis wants to discard a big group of material, let's say topographic maps, heavy, bulky, hard to pack, hard to ship. You know if you've encountered that.

If there's another library in St.

Louis which wants them, it's simply a matter of them taking their library van and going and getting it. It's so much easier.

Writing the arrangement into the state plan creates a collective authority that would have to be considered before making any changes at the state level.

And what this is about is simply by making yourself into a group, the local level, you can have this presence that has weight and that group would have to be considered.

Before anything else that's happening in the FDLP in that state is going to change, you got to consult those guys.

And so it's really beautiful because we've been able to set up kind of a presence for St. Louis depositories as a whole where they can say we, as the St. Louis depositories, like this or want this and so that's really great for them.

Now, I've also seen -- this is something that I didn't expect at the outset but it makes a lot of sense. Identification with the sub-regional zone can be stronger than one's

identification with the state.

More opportunities to meet means more training and networking and I've seen a cohesion, an increasing level of cohesion amongst the St. Louis selectives, which is great.

They're just becoming real tight and they talk to each other and they ask each other questions and they have really developed this increasing enthusiasm and passion and desire for training and to want to do it better.

And they see how easy it is because now they have local colleagues, they have more regular meetings, more regular than just annual meetings, and it's actually happening. It's really growing into something very nice.

What are the advantages for the sub-regional itself? Well, a sub-regional library can use this arrangement to augment its rare books collection without taking anything it doesn't want because the sub-regional is not required to build any kind of comprehensive collection inside its own walls, nor is it

expected to try to build a comprehensive collection in the zone. There's no need for that. That's what the regional does.

Yet by we, the regional, giving Washington University, the sub-regional, the opportunity to take first pick, something that we usually get that opportunity, we give that to them.

So we are giving that up. That's okay with us. It's okay with my administration. We started in 1862 so we have lots of historic books. We're good.

We'd like to have Washington University get some more of that good stuff too and it makes it easy if they can just pick themselves.

Second, a sub-regional can use this arrangement to recoup space in their own building by helping to reduce collection redundancy across the zone, so you see how that works.

By working more closely with their neighbors, they can say okay, you, you're

interested in NASA, all right? How about if we make room for you having more NASA and less of health and human services, okay?

These guys like health and human services so let's not duplicate our collections unnecessarily. We don't all need copies.

Let's see where we can reduce them.

And so libraries, when they're working more closely with their neighbors, they can actually remove the duplication, the needless duplication, especially if they're only like a 10- or 20-minute drive apart.

And they also get that benefit for themselves. They actually can reclaim more space in their own building by engaging in these collaborations.

What are the advantages for the regional? Well this arrangement assures that selectives are getting proper attention.

I am in a state where there are 29 selectives and although I'm positioned right in the middle of the state with St. Louis being a two-hour drive east, Kansas City being a

two-hour drive west and my farthest along selective, Joplin, is a five-hour drive southwest, I can't visit all those people.

And I know from experience that visiting them makes all the difference. It really does. Those face-to-face contacts are irreplaceable.

I know that sometimes if I can't visit people often enough they sort of grow isolated and that's not good for them. It's not good for me. It's not good for the state, so this is really very helpful for the state's cohesion.

Second, this arrangement has the potential to keep documents in the sub-regional zone, thereby reducing the regional's space concerns.

And this is huge for us because we just had a fire and when they renovated, we got less stack space than we had before and we had to squish our, that's not a legal term, squish. We had to make our collection smaller.

And so what we have is full shelf,

two-thirds shelf, full shelf, two-thirds shelf, full shelf, two-thirds shelf, throughout our entire collection.

I really only have one foot of shelf space, empty shelf space, on every other shelf so I can take bits and pieces but there's no way I could take a big set if it should become available.

Yes, we have outside storage. It's filled. So I entered into this arrangement partly as a matter of necessity for ourselves. This helps the regional very much.

What are the advantages for users?
Well, they might not have to travel so far to find documents.

If Library A in St. Louis is removing things and Library B in St. Louis takes them, that just means that they can drive to the next college over. You know, it's not far for them to go.

It would be a lot more difficult for them to drive two hours to Columbia, especially if those documents would happen to be already in

our off-site storage because we're not affiliates.

So although it is possible, it's theoretically possible, that we can get those things out of off-site storage on the day that they plan to be visiting, it is a process that we have to hand-hold all the way through because the process is designed to be automated and it's designed to be for affiliates and we can override it manually, but at any step of the way it could mess up.

And I have to watch that very carefully and make sure that the documents come out of off-site storage on the day they're going to be there.

If it messes up, that's a long trip for that person to have made and I don't want somebody to be that unhappy.

So it's just so much better for the materials to stay in St. Louis close to where the people live, in a library where they can walk down the aisles and see the things rather than two hours away in a high-density facility.

How can I set up a sub-regional in my area? Well, I think it's pretty simple. We did it with remarkable ease.

First you assess the interest among selective depositories which are closely clustered together. Do they want to become a group?

Identify a leader for the group.

Ask the group, do you like this leader?

Everybody unanimously liked Barbara. There was

no guarrel with that at all.

And then draft an agreement that is in compliance with Title 44. Send it to GPO for approval and then get it included in your state plan.

We have handouts. I think a lot of you managed to pick this up. It's right here on the edge of the stage. This is our draft for the St. Louis area sub-regional plan and you can use this as a guide if you'd like to. We welcome you to do that.

This is an image of where the selectives are located in Missouri. The big

1 | yellow dot in the middle is the regional.

can see all of these many selectives over there in the St. Louis area.

I wish we could make bigger pins for the size of the institution or the size of the population there because this really doesn't show.

St. Louis, is it about half of the population of the state? It's sort of over there. A third of the population of the whole state is clustered right around there, so you see how it makes sense to keep the documents to where the people are? Okay, I just wanted to show you that.

Also 30 is a really good number I think for a state to establish a sub-regional. Some states have 15, 14, 13 selectives. Wait, I'm sorry. I said something wrong. Thirty is a good number of selectives to establish a sub-regional idea because you can take care of them better.

In some states where they have only about 13 or 14 selectives to begin with, I

1 ||

б

personally think that's a reasonable number to handle if you're a regional but everybody's got a different situation.

Now, this is a little thing that you got to be aware of if you look at our handout because we have another unique situation in Missouri which affects the sub-regional idea and that is the fact that we have regional partners.

You know, MU no longer has the entire regional collection. We've sent portions of it out to other selectives around the state indicated by the blue dots.

But it's not simply a shared housing agreement. We're not the selective for stuff that lives in Springfield or Joplin or Warrensburg. We actually gave those libraries the regional authority over those materials that we sent them.

So they have the collection, they have the responsibility to provide backup reference service for the whole state, they have the responsibility to fulfill those inter-library loans, everything a regional has

to do. We gave them all the authority for it.

So I don't actually have authority over the complete 100 percent SuDoc collection anymore. Does this make sense so far? Because I know that this is a little bit complicated.

So knowing that, I'm going to just use an example. We have Whiteman Air Force Base, which is located very near one of our selectives.

That selective expressed an interest in Air Force collection so we gave them our entire Air Force collection. Said you got it now. Now you're the regional for it.

If some selective in St. Louis should want to weed Air Force materials, we have to make sure that that regional -- well, they're not actually a regional. We've got to make sure that Warrensburg, who has the regional collection of Air Force, is okay with it.

So what we've done is we've talked to all of our regional partners. We call these blue dots regional partners as opposed to sub-regional, okay?

1 We've talked to all of them and 2 they're all so far very amenable to letting St. Louis do their exchange amongst themselves 3 4 because they see the economy. It's just so much 5 nicer. 6 However, those regional partners 7 still have the opportunity to say we would really like to see anything being weeded in our 8 particular SuDoc area first, and I have let them 9 10 all know you get to decide, okay? So we actually have one of our 11 regional partners in the audience, and to make 12 13 matters a little bit more interesting, Barbara is a regional partner as well. She has chosen 14 to hold 100 percent collection of HUD, HH call 15 16 numbers, CR -- oh, go ahead, Barbara. Hi, Barbara Rehkop 17 MS. REHKOP: from Washington University in St. Louis. 18 19 what I call the civil rights suite at the moment.

(Off microphone discussion)

That's the bulk of it.

20

21

22

23

It is the CRs, HH, J, the presidents for

Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson and the Y4.J89s.

Thanks.

MS. REHKOP: Okay, I like maps.

They're pretty wonderful things. And so this is

the census region, the census metro area

designation for Missouri, for St. Louis. These

are the counties involved. You'll notice that

a river runs through it.

I'm only responsible as a sub-regional, as Marie said, for the parts on the west side of the river, those of us in Missouri, although obviously there's a big area on the east side as well.

To put this out another way, this is a population distribution map for the same area. There are seven counties in Missouri that are in the metro area, five in Illinois.

2.1 million people live in the Missouri part of the metro area. Another 703,000 live in Illinois. So it's a lot of people and, as I mentioned, it's about a third of the Missouri population.

So it's my pleasure this morning to talk about the folks that are in Missouri. So we have three public libraries and when I'm in

1 my happy mood this is a story westward expansion. And when I'm in a less happy mood, this is a story 2 of urban sprawl. 3 4 St. Louis Public Library was where 5 I got my start in government documents so it's 6 very dear to my heart. It's been in the FDLP 7 since 1866, so over 140 years. They are undergoing a renovation. 8 9 They will reopen this grand Carnegie Library, 10 which originally opened in 1912, later this year in December. It's quite, quite wonderful. 11 Their estimated collection list I 12 13 know was between 800,000 and 1.2 million items. They represent a population of -- I have 319,000 14 down here but that's not quite right I think. 15 16 Anyway, they are 78 percent depository. St. Louis County Library is a more 17 suburban area. Those of us who live in St. Louis 18 19 County get to vote on a bond issue in a couple of weeks to renovate their main library. 20 Their population for the county is 21 998,000, almost 1 million, which is down. 22 Those

two areas are down in the last census.

38 percent depository.

Charles City-County Library, a few years ago you may remember that Anna Sylvan was the winner of the Depository Library of the Year award for her work developing a children's website.

In 2011 Denise Ulett won an award.

I wish I could tell you who it was from. It was from a consortium of medical libraries for their work in providing medical information to consumers.

They did a reorganization. She refocused their library, their depository collection to focus on health information and health literature.

She got two partners, one with a major hospital system, one with another major health care provider, to partner.

They come in. They do blood pressure screenings. They give all sorts of health talks about diabetes and whatever to the people in the area. It's really quite wonderful and exciting for them.

б

Their next projects include working with the Veterans Administration to provide similar sorts of collaborations and cooperations there, so it's very exciting for them. They are an 18 percent depository.

Next up, we have one community college. It is in Jefferson County which is south of St. Louis proper.

Jefferson is a very interesting county. They have no single public library system, so in some ways the community college serves that function for the whole jurisdiction.

Their county increased over ten percent between the two censuses. This college was established in 1963 and they have several locations actually throughout the county.

The depository collection is at their headquarters location in Hillsboro. They have an enrollment in 2011 of 6,000 students and they are a 21 percent depository.

Next up, we have one state-supported university, University of Missouri-St. Louis.

It's part of the same system that Marie belongs

to.

This campus was established in 1963 and it's the most recent of all of the four university systems. They have 16,800 students and doctoral programs in 15 areas.

They are also the home of the St. Louis Mercantile Library which was established in 1846, very historic, very wonderful collection that they have as part of their special collections group.

They are a 93 percent depository and have been since 1963. For a long, long time it was their goal to keep this 93 percent for, say, 30 years and then begin pulling off the back end.

But with the move to electronics and the remote storage facility, they have not had to do the heavy weeding that they anticipated when they began.

Then we have four private universities that are part of the depository system.

Lindenwood University was founded in 1827. It started out as a girls' school

affiliated with a Presbyterian church. It's a liberal arts program, offers various graduate programs, over 17,000 students, a 14 percent depository.

Washington University in St. Louis was founded in 1853 by a Unitarian minister. Its enrollment is 14,000 students. We have highly acclaimed programs in medicine, social work and business, also law.

And we are a national historic landmark because part of our buildings were part of the Louisiana Exposition, otherwise known as the 1904 World's Fair. Those buildings still exist on our campus. We're a 51 percent depository.

St. Louis University was founded in 1818. That's a long time ago, and it is the oldest of the universities that I'm talking about today.

Its foundations are in the Jesuit tradition but now they seem to have a majority of lay people on their board.

Their enrollment is almost 14,000

students and they are noted also for their
medical school, public health program,
engineering and other areas. They, too, are a
for their

Maryville University was founded in 1872 as a Catholic school for young women. It now is coeducational and has a lay board of trustees. They have almost 4,000 students, a liberal arts program and graduate programs in education, health and business.

Their present library opened in 1988 and was renovated in 2007, and in a story which is familiar to everyone -- I know many of you have lived through this experience as well.

You were renovated. You were downsized. They went through that. So they are now a 4 percent depository although they are highly, highly electronic in their collection.

We have two law schools. Now, this is not my area of expertise, so I called the various librarians up and said tell me more.

So SLU Law opened in 1843. It has an enrollment of 930 people, 14 percent

depository. It will be moving to their new location downtown St. Louis. They specialize in international law in the European area and

also health law and labor law.

Wash U, by contrast, was founded in 1867. We have enrollment of just over 700, a 10 percent depository. We specialize in international law but it's in Chinese and Japanese areas.

They also have a big, big program in international criminal law, specializing in the treatment of people during war as opposed to, say, war criminals. It's a little different there.

We have one Federal agency, the U.S. Court of Appeals, that's part of the depository system. I don't get to many law libraries, you understand? Their library is spectacular.

It is cherry with marble or green granite countertops and it is on the 22nd or 23rd floor of this massive building, which is on the skyline of St. Louis and it overlooks the Busch Stadium. It's just so cool up there. I've been

1 there once. It was just fantastic.

Next, these are the two depositories over which I have no control whatsoever but they are in our metro area. They are in our region. They are important for the 703,000 people in the east side of the metro area.

SIUE was established in 1957. They offer doctoral programs in dental medicine, pharmacy and education, also in nursing practice.

They have an enrollment of over 14,000 students and they are a 72 percent depository, which I think is appropriate for their region.

Principia College is a four-year private college. It has a long history dating back to 1898. They, too, are a national historic landmark and a seven percent depository.

Then we have two honorable mentions in our area. One is the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.

Many of you will know Katrina

Stierholz. She was on Council for a while. She was also at Wash U Law before she was at the Fed. She's really fantastic.

And then some people that I'm becoming aware of, the librarians at the National Archives and Records Service. It's quite wonderful what they do and I'm hoping to get better acquainted with them.

So in summary, this is what we look like. We have a total all together of 838 years' service as depository libraries. That's a lot. Some of us haven't been around that long, but those are the libraries we serve.

We are diverse by type of library.

I think this has implications for the FDLP study
as they try to granularize areas or regions or,
you know, public libraries and academic
libraries. It's very diverse.

We're also diverse in our view of what we think our role is as a selective. We come from diverse experiences but I think all together we have a deep desire for excellence in service as depository libraries.

Okay, this is my page. As Marie said, there's an opportunity here for the documents to stay in the St. Louis region where the population center is, rather than out in Columbia which is at least two hours, maybe I drive a little slower, two and a half hours away. And I can serve as a local contact point for the area. I've also promised, as a sub-regional, to circulate my materials.

Catalogers in the room? Nobody raising your hand. You know those people are special. I think so. I'm not a cataloger.

But it seems to me that the thrill of this is -- there is the thrill and chills of doing corporate author entry and then there's excitement of doing serials, all combined into one thing when you do government documents.

Really, special worship for those people.

I have, say, 800,000 or a million documents in my collection and most of them are not cataloged prior to, say, the mid 1990s when we got an archive contract.

So when I show those to my

catalogers, they sort of freak out as by being
the regional partner, by committing to this, I
can show these people a small set of documents
that have to do with civil rights which is
important to my campus and my community and they
can appreciate that and are busily cataloging

all of those.

The other thing I should mention that Marie didn't that works for our area is we have an inter-state cooperation among libraries called MOBIUS.

And we have a union catalog by which we can make all of these materials available or visible to each other.

And we also have inter-library loan situations where it takes maybe three to five days to get a document from one end of the state to the other end which makes it very, very convenient and easy for this group, whereas you think about what you can do in your own areas. Maybe that is a consideration you will want to make.

Things that I want to do. I host

meetings for the local documents librarians or other meetings of general interest such as the

regional meeting last May.

Marie was at a point where she was planning her 150th anniversary celebration this year, some personal things and she mentioned the fire.

Kind of a perfect storm situation for her. She did not want to have her annual meeting for Missouri depository librarians. Perfectly understandable.

Katrina heard this. I heard this. Separately we thought, gee, we should have one in St. Louis instead.

So we put our heads together and we pulled together this program which was really wonderful, well attended. Eighty people came. It was great. It was just really good.

Katrina will be doing one again and I hope to partner with her in 2013 or 2014 because the Federal Reserve Bank will be celebrating their 100th anniversary, so we'll work on this again.

Mary Alice came and was one of our keynote speakers and a couple of people from NARA came and they were our other keynote speakers at this meeting. It just worked out really well.

I want to work with the other regional partners as well as the other local documents librarians. We had a meeting two weeks ago and the thing that they wanted to do was go around and see each other's libraries.

So I have messages in my inbox from a young lady at Principia. She wants us to come over soon and see her library. SLU wants us to come and see their library.

When St. Louis Public reopens, we'll be going to visit their library, and Jefferson County wants us to come out and see their library. So I think these meetings are going to plan themselves and it will be just wonderful.

Besides it just builds stronger relationships amongst the group, not only to see each other as librarians but to see their facilities, their collections, and all that sort of thing will, I think, build group spirit.

MS. CONCANNON: Could I add something there?

MS. REHKOP: Sure.

MS. CONCANNON: Some of the other meetings that Barbara has held, she's held a meeting so that everybody could get together in one room and do some collaborative item selection so they didn't have to duplicate each other's things.

And also she's had meetings where the purpose was to just get together and watch an OPAL session together because people don't often make the time at their own desk but they'll do it if it's a group, so I thought I should add that.

MS. REHKOP: Marie has come out very often and after this meeting on her way home she will stop and we will have a meeting so that she can tell us everything she's learned and heard about Depository Library Council because we can't always make it all the time and so we get the first-person account of what happened, which is really helpful too.

So far, and here's the meat of the presentation folks, we've distributed five exchange lists amongst ourselves and passed them on to Marie.

We've had three local meetings since we started this sub-regional plan. I think we'll have more, and we did the regional meeting last May. And now for the questions and answers for Marie and me.

MS. WEIBLE: Yes, we just have a minute or two for questions before we move on, so do we have any questions from the audience or from council? Yes, go ahead, Stephanie.

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Stephanie Braunstein, Louisiana State University. It sounds like you've got two different levels then and some overlap.

One group is the shared housing agreement group, right, and that's where you actually have some of the regional collection housed in those partner libraries. And then the other group is the sub-regional group, right?

So I guess my question, because I

have exactly the same number of selectives in my state. How do you keep track of who's who and what's what and do you have a big flow chart someplace?

MS. CONCANNON: Yes, that's a good question. Sometimes when you establish new plans like this, people become concerned about the complexity.

I always tell people that you don't have to worry about what SuDoc number has been adopted by what regional partner. You can always just send your whole list to me or Barbara.

You don't even have to remember if it's me or Barbara. If you're supposed to send it to her and you accidentally send to me, don't worry. We'll get it to the right spot.

The thing about our regional partner system is that it's very easy because most of our regional partners have only adopted one SuDoc stem, well, I should say one group.

Warrensburg has adopted just the D300s which is Air Force. Rolla has adopted

just the House Committee on Science. Joplin has adopted just the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Congressional Committees on Indian Affairs.

And so, to me, I've got it memorized. Actually Barbara has adopted the most SuDoc numbers. She's the only one I have to go check the list because she's got CR, she's got HH, she's got Y4.J89/2. I mean, I can't believe I'm saying all these numbers, yes, yes, yes.

At least in my mind, it's not a problem. I can't speak for the selectives. They might be thinking it's confusing. I don't know. They haven't ever complained.

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Stephanie
Braunstein again. It sounds almost on one level
as if what you're doing is a centers of
excellence within a single state. Does that
sound familiar?

MS. CONCANNON: Yes, actually I've gotten that comment before it sounded like. It's similar in some ways of course and not in others. We've actually given them regional authority and I'm not sure that centers of

1	excellence have done that, yes.
2	MS. LYONS: Sue Lyons, Rutgers Law
3	Library. I just want to thank you for that
4	program. It sounds like you've developed a
5	really wonderful model to address local needs.
6	And I guess what really impresses me
7	is that you've done it and found that flexibility
8	within existing Title 44.
9	MS. CONCANNON: This is Marie
10	Concannon. I would like to say that one of the
11	things that really makes this work is the
12	fantastic selectives that we have in Missouri.
13	I have an extraordinary, wonderful
14	group of people who are agreeable. They want to
15	work together. I mean, I'm blessed. I'm
16	blessed. I'm so grateful for them all the time.
17	It's a great group to work with and
18	I really hope that this system serves as an
19	inspiration because it really hasn't been that
20	difficult and it's provided so many benefits.
21	MS. WEIBLE: We have time for maybe
22	one more question from the audience.

MS. SPROLES: Claudene Sproles,

University of Louisville, long-time attendee, 1 2 first-time question asker. Do you have any provisions in this 3 4 program for the state documents, the ones that come through the Missouri depository? 5 6 MS. CONCANNON: About the state 7 documents, Missouri no longer has a tangible distribution of state documents. That program died in 2004. 10 MS. SPROLES: That's sad. The state 11 MS. CONCANNON: Yes. library attempts to collect digital copies of 12 annual reports of state agencies, but it's 13 really not in the mix, no. Does that answer your 14 question? 15 16 MS. SPROLES: Yes. MS. WEIBLE: Okay well, thank you. 17 We'll go ahead and move on to our next program. 18 19 So we'll have Chris and Janet come up. 20 MR. BROWN: Hi, I'm Chris Brown, University of Denver. 21 FISHER: 22 MS. And Janet Fisher,

Arizona State Library, Archives and Public

23

Records.

MR. BROWN: And joining us by phone, with a three-second delay when they do join, in will be Peggy Jobe, Regional Librarian University of Colorado at Boulder, and Jennie Gerke, Business Librarian at University of Colorado at Boulder.

So we are going to be talking about the 2012 Six-State Government Information Conference, and it was a virtual conference and you can see the six states which now are Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming and Nevada. And if we can have the --

MS. FISHER: If we forget anything with this, we do have a poster session so you can come over and see more information there or ask us questions.

MR. BROWN: Yes and not only do we have a poster session, we also have a website. We use this website for the planning and also the distribution of the final product.

If you go to this website, which you can see in the poster session, also in the

handouts, you will see not only the handouts that
were used during the presentation, you can also
track the live Adobe Connect conversations and
feeds.

You can hear the speakers as they were recorded, and it's quite interesting. Even though we had upwards of 80 people during the conference, we can multiply that even more with the virtual saved programs.

MS. FISHER: Next slide, thank you. This is not the first time that there has been cooperation in the West. Arizona and New Mexico started biennial training sessions back in the '90s and biennial, we have them every two years.

But it got near the year 2000 and we decided to expand that meeting and create a conference and we decided the four corner areas seemed pretty good.

Tim Byrne's in the audience. He was the regional for Colorado at that time and so he was part of that four state.

But then we decided to expand it one more and brought Nevada into it in that 2000

1 conference.

2002 we kind of backed off and went back to our two-state thing, but we missed the other states, so we expanded back in 2004 to a five-state conference and 2006, same thing.

And at one point, and I'm not sure when it was in the process, we brought in Wyoming and so we switched out Nevada and added Wyoming.

And we had the five-state grant which Colorado led and it was an IMLS grant which included a lot of training and we had a couple conferences related to that, kind of train the trainer get-togethers.

And so you'll notice 2008 is not listed in here because we met a couple times related to that grant and didn't feel like we needed to have a conference.

And then we were all feeling the economic downturn and decided that we needed a different format.

My state, Arizona, for the previous two conferences I think allowed LSTA funding to support any of the Arizona depository librarians

to go to the conference so that worked out, but in 2010 we didn't look like we had that kind of money to do it.

So we decided as a group, the regionals from the states decided let's try it virtually, and so we did that in 2010 and it worked out really well. We did it in 2012.

Now some of the issues that we felt drew these states together and made a nice match were the geographic distance.

I have depositories that if I asked them to come to a meeting they would be on the road seven hours, three and a half hours in, three and a half hours out. It's a lot to expect from people, so that made a big difference.

We had issues like environment, water, things like that, energy, that we all had in common so that drew us together.

In Arizona I know we do virtual meetings couple times a year. Colorado meets all the time.

So anyway, it just all reinforced this getting together, and then moving online

1 just kind of was a natural extension. 2 MR. **BROWN:** Okay, next slide, please, and this will be Peggy. 3 4 MS. JOBE: Hello, everyone. 5 is Peggy Jobe. Jennie Gerke and I are sitting 6 in my office. I'm going to apologize in We haven't been able to hear the 7 advance. earlier discussion so if I repeat anything just 8 let me know. 9 10 This slide is really pretty simple. It shows the six states region and then it shows 11 that the work was really spread throughout the 12 13 states. What doesn't show on the slides is 14 that we had presenters from many of these states 15 16 as well, but you can see the various roles and you can see it really was a truly cooperative 17 18 venture. 19 So I think what I'd like to do is go on to the next slide, which is a little more 20 complicated. Let Cindy do it, and go ahead and 21

23 (Off microphone discussion)

change the slide, Cindy.

22

MS. JOBE: Sorry, back to the timeline. I'm sorry that Jennie and I are sitting here trying to figure out when to advance the slide and so we overdid it a little bit.

Okay, so we really got started in earnest back in August of 2011 and what we did was we started planning to plan. And planning to plan, that sounds kind of silly but we really did need to kind of gear ourselves up for it.

So in October we sent a survey to depository librarians in the six-state area for input and that was something that Janet pulled together for us.

And then at the DLC 2011 we met to talk. We got a group of people who were interested, and I don't know if you remember that particular conference, but there was construction going on and it was incredibly noisy in the restaurant.

So we tried to do the initial planning in the restaurant with all the banging, but we survived and everybody stayed on board.

So then in January we formed the

1 | 2 |

planning, communication and technology committees and basically we got some colleagues that we knew very well. We tapped them to lead the effort.

So Chris was the chair of our program planning committee, Jennie was really our technology committee and then we had a publicity committee with a variety of people on that. We exchanged our initial ideas via email and we tried to get other volunteers.

At the same time in January we started looking for a platform. Last time we used OPAL but GPO had dropped its OPAL subscription so we were looking around for things to use.

And we were aware that the Colorado State Library had a subscription to Adobe Connect, so we started talking to them about using their platform back in January of 2012.

So they agreed to let us use it and we started having in-person meetings, email and phone calls to flesh out the details of how that was going to work.

б

We wanted a keynote that would be exciting and when you want an exciting keynote you really have to get on their schedule pretty early.

Last time we were hoping to have somebody from the National Security Archive but we didn't contact them soon enough, so in January I contacted them.

And Malcolm Byrne, who was the Deputy Director, agreed to do it even though he was planning a trip to Istanbul about that time. He said, sure, he would do it. So we had to work on that part pretty early.

So we continued planning via conference call using Adobe Connect, a variety of mechanisms. We got program suggestions from Mark Ames at GPO and others.

Mark had seen a couple presentations that he thought would be interesting for us and he actually put us in contact with Dave Soller from the USGS who did a program for us.

So once we got all these suggestions together, we distributed a draft program and

1 | 2 |

then we started fleshing it out and discussing it in meetings, including GoPIG, our Colorado meeting.

Then about May you start getting really down to the nitty-gritty in terms of conference planning. We had to document the technical details of the platform.

We had to do that really early so that we could get Malcolm Byrne the documentation and allow him to test so that he would feel confident enough to do it before he left for Istanbul.

We had to test the platform. We had to contact presenters and get them to sign agreements allowing us to archive their material online.

We also had to finalize the schedules and really do a master plan of who did what on what presentation on what date.

We set up the registration site.

That was something that Janet took care of at the Arizona State Library. And then we started really pushing the publicity between March and

August.

Then finally, right before our conference was ready to start, we decided that we could really open it up beyond the six-state region so we started advertising it on GOVDOC-L.

And when you get to who participated in the conference, you'll see that we really did expand well beyond the six state borders.

So July and August it was getting the PowerPoints from the presenters by deadline and nagging those who don't submit. You know how that goes. And from January through August we kept updating the conference website.

Then in August it really got down to the nitty-gritty. We were arranging practice sessions, solving technical issues, worrying. We had problems getting some people, for their microphones to work properly so that was an issue.

Then we kept posting PowerPoints, testing the slides, posting revised PowerPoints, running through the slides, posting revised PowerPoints.

It's nothing like seeing how your slides look in an online system to make you think, oh, I need to redo that one.

So then down to the days of the conference we were worrying, resolving technical issues, contacting presenters who hadn't logged in on time.

And then finally on August 10th, we breathed a huge sigh of relief and we consumed virtual alcohol to celebrate the conclusion of our virtual conference.

Jennie Gerke is going to do the next slide on top ten things to remember.

MS. GERKE: All right, guys. So after we've done these conferences, the first and the second one, we've learned a variety of things.

And some of those are that you do need somebody who is, shall we say, obsessed with lists and if somebody doesn't do it they'll yell at them and they don't feel bad about doing that, which is good, you know, to have people like that in your group.

It's also good to try and have everything done with a couple people. That helps for a variety of reasons. Not everybody's schedules always work all the time so it's good to have backups.

And, as Peggy said, if you start planning a year in advance, it means that you really start thinking about it. You don't actually start really doing a lot of the hard work until about six months in advance.

But by starting to think about it a year in advance, you start thinking about that's going to have to be on my schedule, need to do all of that as I go along.

Using software to sort of help you keep track of those tasks can be particularly useful because as Peggy went through her stuff you heard her say there's lots of little nitty-gritty details that need to be taken care of as you go along and so you want to use something that helps you keep track of those.

It seems sort of silly to get signed agreements from your presenters, but it sort of

1 makes them feel like this is real.

And if you want to put all of their information up online, then you want to have that signed agreement so that they know that what they are doing there is going to be recorded and put out there for everybody to see later.

When we used OPAL the first time, one of the things that caused a lot of technical headaches for us was that there were some little pieces of plugins, little download that you had to do to make it really work the way that you would want it to work.

And so the advantage to the platform we chose was that there wasn't any of that. So it worked relatively easily and so we didn't have to worry about people not having permissions to change something on their computer or having trouble.

Creating documentation is good.

There are things that I was like, oh, that seems really intuitive to me but as soon as I started working with somebody else I realized that what's intuitive to me is not necessarily

intuitive to somebody else.

And that's true of just about everything so creating that documentation when you're doing something online is very important.

And then practice. As Peggy mentioned, we had a variety of microphone issues with a couple different people.

And if you do practice beforehand, then people will also feel a lot more comfortable. It's weird talking to a computer screen and so it's sort of good to do a little practice talking to the computer screen.

And then when you're all done, most important thing to remember is that you have fun. This is not supposed to be torture. If it's torture, then we probably wouldn't have done it a second time.

All right, I'm going to pass it back to you guys there.

MR. BROWN: Okay, this is the -- am I on? Yes, this is the programming, actually the order of the events, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday. Let me just say a bit about the

1 programming process.

We had quite a few online meetings, both by telephone and other means and sometimes the meetings had everybody from the committee.

I remember one memorable meeting when people just didn't show up and there was just two of us, Jill Moriearty from Utah and myself.

But strangely that was the most effective meeting because we made some executive decisions and we got things done, didn't we, Jill?

MS. MORIEARTY: Yes, we gave each other raises.

(Laughter)

MR. BROWN: So you'll notice from the content here that it's very meaty. There's nothing really light here. We learned this from the first conference that we did.

You don't really need to have a lot of fillers in there. In fact, the session that I did right after the keynote address, which is not listed here, but it was just meant to be a

touchy-feely thing, that was rather a failure.

2

3

4

5

first conference.

what people want.

focus.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

We really went for the meaty types of presentations, and we learned this as a result

of our user feedback, our survey results from the

So you'll see that there's a lot of local and national and state and international We're all over the board, but that's

And notice also that because Malcolm Byrne couldn't be the keynote speaker on the first day because of his international travels, he was actually on the second day right in the middle of the program so that's okay. It works out okay to have the keynote in the middle.

So my point is there's several things in a virtual conference that will be different from a physical conference, and next slide, please.

One of the things we learned from this whole process is what we say, go for the meat of the presentation. An in-person conference has a lot of fillers, coffee, introductions,

1 housekeeping, all these wonderful things.

But with a virtual conference, you don't have to do that. So that's why you notice that previous slide, the programming was rather substantive and no filler was required.

So we had a lot of content and we just didn't have the social elements that were necessary in a physical conference. For good or bad, that's just the way it is. Okay, Janet.

MS. FISHER: Okay, you can see here how our spread was in the people who attended, or those that registered. We had 170 registrations.

Now, to us that's a big number because what we were looking at was serving those six states, serving the depositories but also getting our colleagues, the non-depositories, the staff that works for us.

And so we were pleased with 170. It was 125 the previous virtual conference. It was 80 at the most when we did face-to-face.

So we're seeing growth. We saw more special libraries in there. We saw more public

libraries that didn't have depositories. We saw more rural.

You can also see from this the top two states of attendees, Arizona and Colorado.

Our third state ranking in number was California, not one of the six states but very welcome to join.

And the final push, I think with a week or so notice, we did actually get a message out to GOVDOC-L so that any other state could attend, anyone in the world could attend.

We had a similar kind of thing in the 2010 conference and we had people from other states come to that also but not in the same number as this time, so we were really pleased with this.

MR. BROWN: Okay, here is a breakdown of attendance versus registration. We did something a little bit unique, I think, for this conference. We had people register not just for the conference but actually for each presentation within the conference.

It meant that you had to visit the

registration site and enter things many times
but it really paid off because people could
register for individual programs.

And so sometimes we had not everybody show up. More people registered than attended. Other times, however, such as American FactFinder, more people attended than were registered.

Now the attended numbers reflect actual people because we would ask people that were in a group setting -- there were some in Utah, some in Colorado. I don't know about Arizona, I think some as well.

So sometimes we had a room with four or five, six people in the room and they would report via chat that that was the situation. That's how we know the exact numbers of attendants.

So we were able to track with great degree of granularity what the registration versus attendance numbers were.

MS. FISHER: And actually you didn't have to register to attend. It was a

courtesy, but that's why the importance of the attendance numbers is there. Okay, next slide, please.

Okay, I kind of feel like this slide was meant for me because Arizona doesn't do daylight savings time. We are Mountain Standard Time. The other six state in the grouping, Nevada does Pacific Time.

So Arizona is generally Mountain Standard time so when we did the planning we all had meetings at the time when we knew, you know, if we said 11 o'clock and it was somebody from Colorado saying it, I knew it was 11 o'clock. But when they all changed the time, it became different.

And as we advertised the conference, we had to in some way negotiate that time or make it very clear on all of our information so that attendees would come at the right time too, so it was a challenge.

MR. BROWN: This is Peggy.

MS. FISHER: They have a little delay here.

MS. JOBE: Hi, this is Peggy again.

So what you're seeing here is a picture of

Malcolm Byrne from the National Security

Archive.

But I would really kind of just briefly like to mention that both of our speakers who are not part of the depository library community were great and really wonderful to work with them.

Dave Soller went out several times to buy different mics and headsets. He's from the USGS. He poked through various computers at the USGS till he finally found one that worked. Both of them were just a joy to work with.

And Malcolm Byrne was our man in Istanbul. I was the one who was in contact with them and I was so nervous talking to him. For me it was like talking to a rock star.

Probably you'd have to be a total documents dweeb to feel that way, but it was really -- and they were wonderful to work with.

So I think it really elevated the conference I think to have people who were

outside the documents community participating.

And so now Jennie's going to move on.

MS. GERKE: All right, so as we
mentioned before, we chose Adobe Connect as our

mentioned before, we chose Adobe Connect as our platform. Part of the reason was that we could conveniently use the Adobe Connect platform from the Colorado State Library.

And also that we've actually used Adobe Connect a little bit before in Colorado. Chris Brown had let us sort of play around in the DU subscription to Adobe Connect.

So we were able to go in there and sort of kick the tires, shall we say, a little bit before we said, oh yes, this is going to work.

As I mentioned, it doesn't require any plugins or downloads. The other nice thing about it is it is relatively easy to figure out, and you can set up various different styles of looks.

So as you see here, this particular version of it, you'll see there's a little chat over on the side with the name of the participants with a big image of the slide in the

center. You could also make the slide smaller or move around the chat.

We had one individual who actually polled the audience and so we were able to put a poll in there and let her sort of use that to gauge information from the particular attendees, which was quite nice.

Actually I would recommend this platform to anybody who's out there thinking about it because it was a relatively quick learning curve.

MS. JOBE: Can I jump in just real quickly? This is Peggy again. We're really excited because CU-Boulder just signed an Adobe Connect site-wide license and so we're going to start using this. I'm going to start using this more for state-wide events.

MS. GERKE: All right and so, Cindy, if you can advance to the next slide. So here we just talk a little bit about how did we support it?

So while it was a relatively easy platform to learn and to use, we didn't want

anybody to feel like they needed to overcome a technological barrier to use it.

So for each session, we had a host and at least one person and in many cases two people that were operating this tech support.

What that meant was that if somebody put a chat in saying I can't hear anything and we could hear stuff, then we could individually chat with that person, maybe get them on the phone, try and figure out why their experience wasn't working.

That tech support person in addition to watching for tech problems would also watch to see if there was anything that we needed to relay to the presenter.

Either during the conference presentation itself or at the end, we could share particular questions that they may not have addressed.

Initially we had thought that most presenters wouldn't be able to monitor the chat and talk at the same time, but actually most of them did. So if they saw a question over there,

a lot of presenters would actually address them as we went along.

So in most cases what we found, the only problems that we were encountering were generally with the local computers. We had a few with the presenters which we ironed out in the tech sessions beforehand.

We had a couple people that had a lot of mic problems which was not something we had anticipated going in, that there would be quite as many but there were a few.

But those were easier to solve once we actually called the person and sort of talked it through. I think most cases the problems were local, you know, the individual using the software, not with the software platform itself.

MS. FISHER: Okay, we had surveys both before, as you heard Peggy say earlier, and after and so we got people's comments. We knew what they wanted to hear, or at least we thought what they wanted to hear.

And then we got responses on whether or not they liked it, and by and large they liked

it. And do they want to do it virtually again?

Over 90 percent, almost 91 percent of the people

said yes.

Some did say don't just do virtual.

Offer face-to-face at some times during this.

So we're taking this all into consideration as we plan our things locally and nationally, or locally and regionally, sorry.

But some of the comments we got are here. I'm not sure if you can read them. We've gotten things saying that they truly appreciate that this conference is open, that they can't get away from their office but they could easily attend this.

A new depository coordinator said that they were able to learn about a lot of sites and sources that they haven't had an opportunity to learn about yet.

Had a person here who used to work in a depository but is no longer. Their library dropped their depository status.

But they can still participate in this way. They can find out about things. They

can get back with the group and find out what they
aren't getting because they aren't going to
these meetings.

A lot of great conference things.

I'm reading the comments right now off of our survey tool.

We also offered the ability for people to get certificates for having gone to the conference and it's, in our state, part of a certification for library practitioner.

But even people from other states wanted the certificate, even outside of the six-state area.

And all it says is that you've spent this amount of time, so many contact hours, in this conference and so they were required to do surveys in order to get that and we asked them specific questions so we knew that they attended.

So anyway, we got great responses from our surveys. They liked what we did. They want it again.

MR. BROWN: Let me just add that I

know you can't read those comments, but if you
go to the poster session in the poster session
room, you will be able to read the comments
there.

And so as I mentioned at the outset, most of you in this room could not attend but you still can attend by going to the conference website and listening to every one of those presentations.

MS. FISHER: And I want to say that you can attend some of our sessions because three of our sessions are here at this conference.

Dave Morrison from University of Utah is presenting on patents. Malcolm Byrne is also presenting. He was our keynote. He is here. And Dave Soller also is presenting here on the geologic map database. So thank you, GPO. We appreciate your recognition of the talents.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Thank you. Any questions? Yes.

MR. ROMANS: I have two questions.

Larry Romans. One, how many depositories are in

1	your six-state area, do you know, more or less?
2	(Off microphone discussion)
3	MS. FISHER: Should be about 80
4	between all of the states.
5	MR. ROMANS: Oh, that's great. I
6	assume that you didn't do ten straight hours.
7	MR. BROWN: No.
8	MR. ROMANS: So how did you break it
9	up?
10	MR. BROWN: This is a three-day
11	span. Now, the first virtual conference in 2010
12	was five days and with a weekend in between, so
13	Thursday, Friday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday.
14	This one was Wednesday, Thursday,
15	Friday. So it was generally starting with two
16	morning sessions, a lunch and learn session, a
17	brief time over the lunch hour, and then one or
18	two afternoon sessions.
19	MR. ROMANS: And you allowed for
20	bathroom breaks between the two sessions?
21	MS. FISHER: It's all virtual and
22	you can go
23	(Laughter)

1	MS. FISHER: In our pre-survey we
2	verified the length of time people were willing
3	to sit and an hour was maximum, so we had our
4	sessions for an hour.
5	So it would be probably a 45-minute
6	presentation, 15-minute question and answer, so
7	we tried to pay attention to what people wanted.
8	MR. BROWN: Jill.
9	MS. MORIEARTY: Hello. I've got to
10	tell you, it's been wonderful working with these
11	two people.
12	MR. BROWN: Jill Moriearty,
13	University of Utah.
14	MS. MORIEARTY: Oh, see why they're
15	so wonderful? They look out for us. And my
16	colleague Dave Morrison, our team leader,
17	documents/maps team leader, can confirm this.
18	Virtual meeting, we had doughnuts.
19	We had coffee. We had convenient bathroom
20	breaks when we needed.
21	And I know that sounds silly, but it
22	also was good because the way we set it up at Utah

is we booked a room and so it got us out of our

1 offices, gave us a face-to-face.

We are team members but it doesn't mean we can even attend all of our meetings, so we had a face-to-face. We opened it up to everyone. There are some people who are not documents people, believe it or not, and they were able to attend this conference.

Our supervisors, by that I mean administration, were able to attend and walked away with a greater understanding. Now, they're not going to drop everything and come to this fiscal conference, though I believe they should.

The reality, though, is that they got to see what we were doing, what other states were doing and I believe it's impacted very favorably in our case. We've got a very supportive administration anyway, but this just got her really charged up.

MS. FISHER: And I wanted to add that that happened also in a public library in Arizona. They had a room. Their depository people were the ones that went in there first and

they're like a 21 percent depository.

And then their coworkers came in, staff came in, and they found their library administration came in and it makes a big difference.

MR. BROWN: Any other Council, comments, questions? Audience?

MS. FISHER: Come to our archive. We'd love to share it with you.

MS. WEIBLE: And thank you very much. I think this presentation was wonderful because they actually got to demonstrate at least an aspect of what it means to virtually collaborate by having Jennie and Peggy participate and I really want to thank them. I don't think they can actually hear me, but make sure that, thank them.

But also thank the folks at GPO for making that happen. I think the more that we can do this kind of thing at these conferences as well is really great.

So thank you, particularly Cindy who I think was manning the chat and making sure

1 everything was going smoothly, and the folks over to the side. Thank you very much. 2 And I guess, Shari, did you have any 3 4 other announcements? I think we're ready for 5 lunch so thank you, everybody. 6 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 11:55 a.m. and went back 7 8 on the record at 2:03 p.m.) 9 MS. LASTER: My name is Shari 10 Laster. I'm from the University of Akron and I'm the Chair of the Depository Library Council. 11 Of course, welcome back to everyone 12 in our session here and hello and welcome to 13 those of you who are following along from 14 iCohere. 15 16 This afternoon's session will go until 3:45. GPO will present 17 The information about the FDLP Forecast Study. 18 19 There will be plenty of time for questions and answers following the presentations and I will 20 moderate that session when we get there. 21

So for right now I'd like to turn it

over to Mary Alice to introduce the speakers.

22

23

all of you for coming back this afternoon. I think we had a great two-hour session yesterday. I wanted to warn you that today we only have an hour and 45 minutes so our time is a little bit less.

MS. BAISH: Well, and just welcome

I'm not going to go over the sort of process that we followed yesterday. Just to remind you that we will be keeping at least 15 minutes at the end of this session for question and answers. That will be facilitated by DLC Shari Laster.

And at the end, thank you so much, Blane. I think your short summary yesterday afternoon was very positive and left us all with something to think about as we regurgitated some of the issues of discussion during the reception after this wonderful movie. Thanks to all of you who came over to GPO.

So we need to move quickly into what we're doing today and, again, I wanted to remind everybody what we're presenting this week are our preliminary findings from the data we've

received, both the quantitative and the qualitative, and the themes which we have identified.

On the panel this afternoon is David Walls who spoke yesterday, our preservation librarian.

We're delighted to have Robin Haun-Mohamed, LSCM Director of Education and Outreach. Again, Robin has been leading the group dealing with the State Focused Action Plans.

And joining her will be Cindy Etkin who gets some relief from doing iCohere, and Cindy is senior program planning specialist who reports directly to me.

And I just want to reiterate one of my messages yesterday. We were overwhelmed with the wonderful response and participation, both for the individual library surveys, both for the state surveys and the State Focused Action Plans.

And we realize that there were a lot of circumstances that prevented people from

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

meeting those deadlines and, that said, I want to thank you all for what you were able to do, what you're striving to do.

And as I believe Cherie mentioned yesterday, while the deadline may have passed, we're still getting responses, both from the individual library and from the State Forecast and we're delighted to get any more State Action Plans.

So with that said, I want to turn this over to David. Thank you.

Good MR. WALLS: afternoon, I'm David Walls, the preservation everyone. librarian in the GPO and remember yesterday we talked about some of the first section of data from the State Forecast.

And today we're going to continue by looking at the section that we called Future Roles and Opportunities.

For the next three slides you're going to see, we asked people to think five years into the future and consider the questions thinking about what they might be engaged in five years in the future.

So the first question was about plans to host digital collections, and what we mean by host is could you have the digital content on your server in your library and provide access to it for people?

And I should also say that, again, all the population we're looking at, there were 38 responses at the time that we began looking at the data to the State Forecast.

So you can see that the majority of people don't feel that they can host digital collections but a surprising number do feel that they could.

And following right on that, plans to preserve digital collections of government information. Again, the majority don't feel that they can and a significant majority feel, significant number, I should say, feel that they could.

Normally in preservation you don't typically separate preservation and hosting, but I understand that there was some historic

discussion about having content pushed to
libraries to host as well as some libraries that
wanted to have collections locally that they
could manage and preserve.

I think it's interesting to me, if you go back and look at the graphs, the two charts almost look identical. If you do plans to host/plans to preserve, they're very similar.

We want to do a further analysis to see if indeed those are the same libraries that are reporting the positive in that because if that's true then those are potential digital partners for a lot of our future efforts.

So for the next slide libraries were asked if they would be willing to develop subject-specific collections. We recognize that a lot of this goes on anyway. There's a lot of local collection development.

But this was looking beyond that to actually being willing to be on record for being willing to develop these collections and being able to share them to others in the community, and you can see a huge number of people said that

they would be willing to do this.

This is my favorite question in both the State as well as the Library Forecast, and if there was a way we could have made the entire questionnaire for both be one question this would have been it.

What would an ideal FDLP look like that met all of your current and future needs for Federal Government information?

Well, we haven't actually had the time to code by the method that Cherie described on Monday, yesterday I guess it was, all of these questions because there's a lot of comments, a lot of very interesting things that you said.

But to give you an idea, I grabbed sort of a, just a number of these that I randomly grabbed and look how similar they are in the themes.

Cataloging and digitizing the legacy collection. An ideal FDLP would have every item, past/present, cataloged. Comprehensive bibliographic control. Better digital access. Current and retrospective

documents digitized and cataloged.

These are all individual responses and look how similar everyone's thinking is around this topic.

But as we heard earlier today from Laurie Hall, we're already doing a lot of work on cataloging the legacy collection so in many ways, as far as the ideal FDLP, we're working on that even right now.

And as terms of looking at the digitizing of the legacy collection, that's something that we're going to be working on earlier this next year.

And I think Mary Alice is going to talk a little bit about some digital partnerships that we want to develop on Thursday.

And I also want to point out that in the idea of having digital content available and preserved, if you come Thursday we're going to be talking about our web harvesting effort that we've got underway because not all Federal digital information just comes directly from a

1 digital publisher.

A lot of it, as you know, is presented on the web, and we're trying to capture that and to preserve it.

So in many, many ways the ideal FDLP is something that we're already underway working on, but we need to do a lot of work going into the other responses to this question.

People were asked about what a current and future vision would be and in some ways this was an opportunity to talk about positive things as well as concerns.

Privatization of Federal Government information is a huge concern that people have. It's very evident throughout.

We've had the experience of having a major title privatized this year that people relied upon that's gone, and that shows up throughout a lot of the comments.

Training is a huge issue, and we've got a number of initiatives underway to meet that and I guarantee we're going to be doing more training.

Electronic access and preservation, this response shows up almost throughout all the questions that people had an opportunity to comment on, is that more digitization, more electronic access is something that people truly want.

There was a request that came up frequently to produce a plan for moving the FDLP forward. Where are we going? If there is a future vision, where are we going?

And as we've heard already, we have an LSCM plan and we have a GPO plan for moving into the future, so we're already working on that.

Retention of the collection is a huge item, as we know, of concern and it's clear we're going to have conversations and need to have collaborative conversations about the retention of the tangible collection, that this is something we have to work out moving forward.

So that quickly, in a nutshell, is some of the things that people mentioned in the future vision, and do you have any questions?

1 We do questions at the end? Okay. Well, then I'll turn it back to Shari. 2 MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Good morning. 3 I'm Robin 4 Good morning? Good afternoon again. Haun-Mohamed and I'm Director of Collection 5 6 Management and Preservation because I can't 7 remember the new realigned title. 8 Okay, so I'm going to speak a bit about State Focused Action Plans and, all right, 9 10 remind me when I don't advance, please. was a joy, and that sounds a little facetious. 11 It's not. 12 13 The State Focused Actions Plans show a wide range of participation, of levels of 14 expertise and enthusiasm, and if you didn't see 15 16 the chart on the outside, you see we had pretty good participation in these. 17 I'm going to skip ahead in my paper 18 19 slides, not in the other one. Thirty-three of them were received. Thirty-nine states and 20 territories represented.

> We came up with 9 themes, I'll speak a bit about that, 132 initiatives, 691 action

21

22

23

items. We were reading for a bit, so you must have been writing for a bit.

But really, truly this was a great joy to go through and it's going to take us a bit longer to finish our analysis so a bit about this.

The purpose of the action plans of course were to document the goals and initiatives of the states and the multi-state Federal depository library regions and then to determine how GPO can work with your efforts on developing the national plan for the future and also on working for the LSCM's strategic priorities.

We asked that you consider doing the following, that you list up to five initiatives, that you list those things or identify those things you wanted to accomplish in the next one to five years and that if you wished to identify specific types of libraries for different actions you could do so.

The action items themselves were activities to accomplish that lead to

successfully meeting the initiative of developing the national plan for the future of the program and where you see yourselves going

in the future.

Oh, and one final thing about that. We asked that you certify the action plan. That tended to be a bit of a stumbling block, both at the State Focused Action Plan, also at the library level and some of the state levels.

Certification simply meant you identify who participated in your group and then submitted it completed so that we could say, yes, done, check it off and move forward.

Little bit about the working groups.

Okay, so Cherie talked quite a bit about methodology the other day and I want you to put that all out of your mind for State Focused Action Plans right now because this was a very different critter.

The survey, it wasn't a survey. It was very similar. To those of you who know about selective housing agreements, GPO put out a template and almost every template that we got

looks -- selective housing agreement looks like that template.

But there's always some variations, so going through these was not going to be easy. We couldn't code them so I'm going to tell you this is manual review at this point.

Let me tell you about the team that looked at this. There were six of us and each person reviewed each submission. Then we reviewed the initiatives and then the actions. Then we met and said, okay, now what do we do? We got lots of these things.

One person, bless her heart, put all of them into one piece of paper so that we could say, yes, there's this many. I don't know how long it took you to type that all up, but it was a bit of time cut and pasting.

So then we identified the preliminary themes and then we put initiatives and actions together and then we revised our themes.

So not all actions, of course, fit into the preliminary format but that's why I'm

saying this is a preliminary review. The most highly cited ones were put into this initial

format.

This is a completely manual, qualitative review. The coding, detailed coding information that Cherie shared, I'm not sure will ever quite fit this particular part of the forecasting process. I'm sure that she will share with me afterwards if I've made a mistake there.

But there were wide variations, too, on what was submitted. Some of these had as little as two initiatives. Some had as many as eight. We like the ones somewhere between three and five, I will say that.

The one with 8 had 28 actions and then there were sub-actions, so this was a very focused submission and we have a lot to glean from that particular one.

I think it was also very clear that the people that submitted these, the participants, felt very passionate about this process.

б

Now, remember the original date for the State Focused Action Plans was the end of June. Then we extended it to the end of August.

And we actually let it go a couple more weeks because we wanted to have as much information as possible to share with you at the conference, knowing that it's going to take a bit of time to synthesize these and come together.

When you look at these numbers and you think of six people, with each person having a very strong opinion but trying to come together, leave the subjectivity behind and take the words at their face value, this was a real challenge.

We met once a week, then we met twice a week and I think the last couple weeks we pretty much met every day.

Cindy and I had lunch together today and we will, I'm sure, meet again not Friday but probably Monday to take in what we hear back from you after this conference and during this conference.

So take one more look at that map,

691 action items. You guys are going to be busy, very busy.

The good thing, though, is we asked you what would you like to do, not what can you do absolutely or what do you have to do? What would you like to do in the next one to five years?

So maybe if we divide that up by five, we come up with a little more reasonable number for per library action or per state action, excuse me.

This is a word cloud and this is simply to share with you information, how we felt your words reflected in these plans. There's no deep theory behind this.

Simply what we did was pull together your most common words. We dropped out stop words. We put uppercase, lowercase together and we put single and plural together.

And I think it's pretty interesting the pieces that are jumping out at you there. The reason I say don't stress over this, because like I said, it's really just a visual to show

that even when you're looking at these at the broadest, highest level possible, we come to the same focus.

We've got access. We've got Federal depository libraries. We have government information. You'll see promote. You'll see provide. There's a lot of other key words in there.

So we did put that into -- not we. Cindy put that into a word cloud generator and we thought it was pretty colorful and we wanted to share it with you.

So the blur of theme development or how to nail Jell-O to a tree, honestly we started out with a theme list of this big and then we started talking and whittling it down.

The challenge of course are that the words you use, without tying in our bias or subjective analysis, is especially difficult because sometimes the terms are used differently, indicated by the context, or the initiatives have different actions or the actions have different initiatives. One state

it's an action. The other state it's an initiative.

Trying to get that all collated together in a cohesive format before October 15th, that was a challenge.

And I would really like to thank my team. So I will say their names out loud, Ms. Etkin, Ms. Bayer, Kristina Bobe, Ashley Dahlen who's driving over here, Melissa Fairfield, Mark Ames. I think that's everybody.

These are the folks that read through all of these State Focused Action Plans and we had them in a secure location but in a spot where we can all get to.

And sometimes you'd have that look that says, and I'd say, oh, you've been reading them again? Yes, Robin, we're reading them.

We're working through them.

So some examples of what I'm talking about, the blur here. For example, the initiative, all Federal depository libraries in XX state, will work collaboratively to promote awareness and access to government information,

dissemination, products and services.

Here's the action plans. To accomplish this, depositories will develop a marketing plan strategy that targets non-depository users using theme XY, educate staff and non-depository libraries about public documents.

So it's talking about marketing and promoting but the way they're going to do it is through education, training. So how do you put that in there?

Another example, depository libraries in XX work collaboratively to create and maintain a comprehensive collection of Federal documents in a variety of formats.

The action plan was establish an annual online-only depository medium for these depositories. Skype or some other video conferencing tool will be used.

The state would investigate using virtual conference tools and coordinate with some of the larger depositories throughout the state to make travel to the sites easier.

Okay, we have a whole lot in that Can we put it under one theme? Do we break 2

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

it up and put it under several themes? You can 3

4 kind of see where I'm going here. This is truly

an interesting and somewhat difficult process. 5

> One final example. Depository library staff will be knowledgeable about locating and accessing Federal Government information.

> The actions and plan, depository libraries will sponsor or provide continuing education programs within this state. again, does this refer to the knowledge of locations or training or both?

> We're glad to be at conference. We're glad to give our brains a little bit of a rest. We know we have to go back. Here's our themes.

> And as we worked on this on Saturday, getting up 6:00 a.m., take another look, I went, oh man, but I'm not going to tell you what the oh man is because it's a little preliminary review and I'm sure that we'll be having

discussions about that further.

But, anyway, as you look at these, you'll see access and discovery, bib control, communication and outreach, comprehensive collections, digital collection development, digitization of historical collections, promotion/marketing, reference and services, training/education.

The and, or the ampersand, generally means that it's between two themes. They complement one another. Training and education means they used -- they. You all used it interchangeably. Sometimes you said training. Sometimes you said education.

This seems pretty straightforward and intuitive but it took us weeks to agree on this. Remember, 6 people, 33 submissions, et cetera, same words/different concepts, different words/same concepts and everything else.

But we were able to put almost all of the initiatives and actions under these themes and, once again, I'm saying this is

1 preliminary review.

The way this is going to work right now is I'm going to do the first couple themes and then Cindy's going to join in partway through.

And then she will do a bit more dealing with relating some of what we've identified as needs and actions to maybe what we're already doing. So you've heard a bit about that from Laurie today. You'll hear a bit more.

So access and discovery. Access was to increase access and improve discoverability to government information and to the depository libraries.

You could see the slide. We're talking about cataloging, we're talking about increasing metadata, that we're going to share resources.

To improve discovery, well, web-scale discovery. We know that we've been requested to increase our efforts there via databases, the pathfinders, the social media,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the finding guides and the search and retrieval instructions.

These actions and initiatives, of course, relate directly to your libraries' effort to support the public's ability to identify and locate government information.

They're also directly related to the users' ability to gain access and discover information.

The idea of using the social media, improve discovery, going to where the users are, the databases and index of course, that includes government information that's not depository and so the fugitives, the declassified, the resources that help you get into the resources in your library that are Federal but may be tools that are commercially available.

Wednesday wants to determine the degree to which discovery service are including government information resources. going to be very interested in finding some more information about.

There were several folks that wanted

to scan for ILL and then to make those digital files accessible.

And pretty common among the

And pretty common among the initiatives was to digitize documents of interest to your local service area.

So bibliographic control, this is a huge piece and it comes out in many different ways. It doesn't fit under just this category.

It fits in so many different ways and I know that it's a large part of what you're going to find probably as you do the reviews through the Library and State Forecast surveys.

Retrospective cataloging, that's probably the one that jumps out the most to people. If retrospective cataloging is done and incorporated into your catalog, your users are able to find that information.

This particular comment was actually submitted by Connecticut so they thought Yale, Connecticut institution, did a great job of incorporating their documents into their catalog.

But that wasn't an overnight

process. That was something that's been carried on for years and years.

And I'm sure that keeping up with that is a bit of a challenge, but it definitely is one way that people shared how to get people to that information.

So share holdings on the public utility, you can see Arkansas and OCLC, Arkansas Union Catalog Project's listed there. Georgia has a Union Cataloging Project. Many states have a Union Cataloging Project.

As people become aware of them and use those resources, then they're shared more broadly such as OCLC again, the public benefits.

Your primary users if you are not a public institution or that's not your primary group but you've signed on to serve them as part of the Federal Depository Library Program, they are the ones that are going to benefit from that.

Also selecting catalogs, as many digital Federal depository titles as possible, select being an interesting term. What does select mean if it's an online-only resource?

Does that mean you select the item
number and you put it in your profile? Does it
mean that you're putting your catalog but not
worrying about item numbers and yet gathering
everything in?

Are you paying a third party to provide those records to you? All of those variables showed up in the State Focused Action Plans.

Communication and outreach.

Behind cataloging, and to some degree digitization of historical materials, this is a pretty common piece.

Very rarely was it simply communicate with GPO in a timely manner, but one state did put that in and privately we'll do a little whoo-hoo.

Right now I'm not going to mention the states. These will be posted. It is our intention that the State Focused Action Plans will be posted in the very near future.

I don't have the site at this point.

Karen is still working on the FDLP website and

so more to come on that.

But definitely communication was a key initiative and your ability to communicate with each other in your plans as submitted and then also convey that to GPO, those of us reviewing those plans, it showed that we've got a ways to go but we're trying real hard and it is important.

So communicate among the depository libraries to non-depository libraries. That was a big one.

School libraries, yes. Community groups, yes. General public, of course. And then with GPO, well, we really like it when you communicate with us so keep that coming.

It can take a lot of different formats that you can obviously deal with associations or groups, presentations, social media, training, create new discussion lists, monitor other discussion lists, review each other's state plans. There was a lot of different pieces of communication and outreach that you shared.

Comprehensive collections, there was a strong desire to have a comprehensive collection within the areas served by the regional, either the complete collection of depository resources or including non-depository or a complete collection of Federal depository material that is distributed by GPO and/or obtained through that mechanism.

The formats, though, for comprehensive collections, tangible only? Some. There were a few that wanted to focus. But most were format, wanted to include all formats.

And some just simply used the term comprehensive collection. Didn't specify a format. So the content is what was most important in this area.

The way to do this, activities included building upon your collection, collaboration that already exists. You identify your collections gaps, strengths, needs.

You determine priorities for the

collection based on the level of commitment at each depository. We heard a bit about that this morning I think.

Identify materials via databases and other reference resources. You create and update your library collection development policies.

You review, update and/or make a state plan, development of regional selective housing agreements and then of course digitize of historical resources.

There's two themes that were a bit more blurry than most and we ultimately went with digital collection development and digitization of historical collections.

These were used both ways, that is digital collection development. We want the electronic resources whether they're born digital, harvested or digitized converted material.

The other one is digitization of historical collections. You would think they're the same and many times they were but not

always.

Enough significance was put on the digitization of the historical collection that we decided that that needed to be an area to break out for further analysis.

So of course, as you can see, use existing digitization infrastructure and projects and David just spoke about that a bit.

Encourage the plans and develop projects for digitization, determine the standards for digitization, provide access to those resource and use digitization to help preserve content.

At the same time, at the bottom of digitization and digital collection development is access. Why are we digitizing? For many libraries it's because we want access, immediacy factor is a value.

For some of the State Focused Action

Plans it's the preservation initiative

involved. And some were between the two, so

some additional review needs to be done in those

areas.

And I think that takes me to you,
Cindy.

MS. ETKIN: Okay, on to promotion

MS. ETKIN: Okay, on to promotion and marketing. One of the things that was very clear from the State Action Plans was that you all aim to reach out to new audiences for you all, not the traditional primary clientele and the public which is always necessary, but you're reaching out to new audiences.

You want to go into school libraries. You want to go to your local Congressional staffers. You want to go into Spanish-speaking and immigrant populations and into law firms, more and more audiences for your promotion and marketing activities.

There was a wide variety of the materials that you're going to use, some of those GPO provided, some of those that you already have.

Some of you have marketing and development offices. You use those materials that you've created locally.

Some of the action plans actually

identified the action item of creating a state-wide marketing plan or strategies and to

develop your own campaigns.

And the end of all of this, the goal for all of this, of course, is that you want to promote the resources and collections that you have, your services that you provide and access awareness to the free public information that you all are getting through the Federal Depository Library Program.

Reference and services is the next theme and, again, I want to say that the ampersand indicates that these are two different concepts but related.

And some of the most commonly observed or expressed actions are listed there for you. ILL/resource sharing/document delivery, nothing is new with that one.

But what is new with all of these is that you want to expand, you want to enhance, you want to improve and all of those things are very, very good goals.

Some of the newer things you want to

do, develop knowledge bases. You want to
promote your regional services. I wonder if
that came from a selective library? I can't
remember. But everybody is promoting what
they're doing and what they have to offer.

There was a focus on the quality.

One of the states wants to go out and determine whether the quality of service they're giving is at the level that they expect it. They want to validate their service methods.

There are some states that want to do needs assessments to determine whether or not they are providing the needs of their community. What is it that they aren't doing that they can do to serve their public? And they want to do a gap analysis.

Of course all of these activities complement the mandate of the program which is public access, and reference of course is part of that.

Training and education, another big area and again another area where new target audiences have been identified, library school

students, new depository coordinators,
non-depository library staff.

That's been around for a little while, particularly with the IMLS grant and the training of the non-depositories with the G-21, did I get the number right, G-21 group that was working on that.

You want to train depository library staff. Of course you want to train the public and K through 20. It's not K through 12 anymore. It's K through 20, so new audiences for you all.

You want to accomplish this through webinars, through interest groups. You want to enhance what your local government information interest groups are doing and can provide to the public.

You want to start using, if you're not already, you want to examine the possibilities of how you can use social media for training and education, mobile apps, wikis, lots of good ideas of ways to provide continuing education and training.

The what you wanted to train was not

always real clear in the action plans. Some were really specific, like saying I want to provide training on Ben's Guide to the school libraries. That was very clear.

Some said that they just wanted to do continuing education or general training and then you were going to undergo some kind of survey or some kind of data gathering activity to determine what your community needs are for training and education.

So the State Focused Action Plans initiatives and actions. These are in your words and these are not in any kind of order. These are things that popped out of you all into us and out our minds from your action plans.

These are quotes, and we would have very much liked to have been able to provide at least one statement from every one of the plans that we got but we would have had many, many more slides and many, many more statements for me to share with you.

And anyway, they're going to be made available, as Robin said, and you can look but

there were some really, really good initiatives and action items across the board. But some of those that we didn't see too frequently, advance professional values of intellectual freedom, intellectual property rights, user-centered services. You wanted to develop and support information photocopying and scanning getting to reproducing agreements.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Maintain redundancy for essential titles Hawaii Pacific-related and and Well, guess who wrote that one? materials. (Laughter)

There were a couple MS. ETKIN: State Focused Action Plans that wanted to really get into some rigorous programs of government document staff and certification programs and try to increase the expertise of those people who are providing service in depository libraries.

A few more. One state that wants to recruit a new Federal depository library. Another, K through 12 information literacy standards, a basis for creating and providing curriculum materials. This state wants to pursue grants for some activities that they had listed.

Regional depositories, the regional depository library is going to encourage selectives to participate in state-wide preservation and disaster response planning efforts.

And there's one library that said they wanted to acquire regional library oversight. Who laughed?

When we went through the State Focused Action Plans we thought we might find a bunch of models that we could share with you, and we did find a few.

One is the Government Information Online, Ask a Librarian, GO program. There were several states that said they wanted to use that as a model to provide virtual reference services and as a means also to connect users to government documents experts.

Washington and Alaska wanted to use the Oregon model of dispersed regional

collection as a basis for something they might want to do in those states.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And at the same time, the Oregon folks decided that it was about time to review and evaluate their model and their state-wide depository library practices.

And there was another state that said they wanted to develop a plan to provide training for digitization and they were going to use as a model for that the Digital Library of the Caribbean.

And there were several State Focused Action Plans that mentioned centers of excellence, centers of excellence for service, of excellence for centers service collections and centers of excellence for just collections. So it came in a lot of different flavors there.

We want to take a look at Question 6 that was on the State Forecast and this is the one that asked you all to rate the current projects that LSCM has undertaken and identify whether they were extremely beneficial,

moderately beneficial or not beneficial at all.

And you've seen this, I think, already in some of the earlier slides but with 38 State Forecasts submitted, 31 had extremely beneficial to the projects that were to provide greater access to government information.

Twenty-four found extremely beneficial the projects to increase cataloging services.

And, as you see, to clean up the slide a little bit, I took out the examples that were in the actual question.

Twenty-seven of the states indicated that moderately beneficial were the projects focusing on collection development and management tools.

And projects focused on education and online communication with depository library members, 20 libraries indicated that was moderately beneficial and the rest were extremely beneficial.

So now I'm going to take a look at each of those different areas separately and to

identify some of the LSCM projects.

Some of them were used as examples in the forecasts and, as mentioned earlier, there were some things that Library Services and Content Management undertook after the survey was released so that we now have projects underway.

And, well, let me show you what I wanted to match up here, were some of our projects with some of the action items that you all mentioned in your State Focused Action Plans.

So this is actually a matching thing, so if there's a space somewhere and there's a bullet on one side and not the other, that's not a typo on my part. It's where something didn't match.

Okay, so in the projects to provide greater access to government information we had allow simultaneous searching of FDsys and use the Catalog of Government Publications at the same time.

We announced that about a year ago

this time, that that was now possible. But the ILS team is looking at other ways that there can be additional integration between FDsys and the CGP.

On the other side of the State Focused Action Plans there were many of you all out there that indicated that you wanted to maintain collaborative discovery and delivery tools.

We're doing this at the national level to help you but you all are doing the same thing at the local level to help yourselves.

And, again, one of the goals of this that Robin mentioned earlier was how can what we're doing support you and complement what you're doing and maybe you can use what we're doing to help you do what you want to do?

Increase FDsys content through partnerships and then we had some libraries that said they wanted to volunteer to submit content for ingest into FDsys, so that looks like a natural pairing right there.

We have a project that's been

ongoing for several years now where we have set regional holdings in OCLC for the materials that we catalog for the Depository Library Program.

And we have about 29 or 30 regionals that are participating in that project and we have a couple regionals that mentioned that they might want to participate or they're going to explore the possibility of participating in that program.

We are maintaining the Digitization Projects Registry and, as Robin mentioned earlier, a lot of you all had mentioned that you wanted to digitize content of local interest.

And the registry is one place that can help you identify what is being digitized or maybe where there is a gap for you all to digitize and so maybe we can help you out in that way.

There was one state that wanted to develop an inventory of Federal publications digitized by depositories in that state, so again they're creating their own little registry there.

Projects to increase cataloging

services. We had down there the Cataloging Record Distribution Project and I think it was recently announced that this was going to expand into yet another fiscal year so you all are glad to hear that.

At the same time, we have a regional that's going to make their records available from their OPAC for tangible and electronic record holdings to libraries in their service area through Z39.50.

A biggie, the Shelflist Transcription and Bibliographic Record Clean Up project that we've had underway for a while and still continues.

And then we have you all in the states who want to include all pre-'76 materials in your catalog and I don't know how many times we read this as a goal or an action.

And just a reminder that we are continuing to add records to the Catalog of Government Publication as a way to transfer those records to you all so in some ways we can help.

And then there's the Cooperative Cataloging Partnerships, so if you are going back and doing your pre-'76, maybe there's a way to identify a group of records or a group of publications for which you're going to create records that you can then help us populate the Catalog of Government Publications.

And there was one state that wanted to encourage GPO to allow libraries to contribute records to the CGP.

And I think this was in a different context than actual the Cooperative Cataloging Partnerships but this could be another kind of partnership.

MetaLib enhancements, this is one of those where there was nothing to map to in the State Focused Action Plans unless it's what you all are doing with discovery tools in your libraries.

But there was also another state that wanted to encourage GPO to create richer metadata to better able discovery tools to identify government information resources that

1 are out there. 2 Focusing on collection, development and management tools, we've got the National 3 4 Bibliographic Records Inventory. And there are some states that want 5 6 to create their state-wide digital collection 7 inventory, and maybe you can use some of the records from our project. 8 On the forecast that went out it had 9 10 LIST, Library Information Shipping Transformation, is that what LIST stood for? 11 (Off microphone discussion) 12 13 MS. ETKIN: Systems Transformation. Well, just as the forecast was 14 going out, we did that transformation into 15 16 DSIMS, which you've heard a lot about while you're here, and so we now have that. 17 And there are some states that want 18 19 to create a shared selection database across 20 their region, so very similar kinds

Library Services and Content

Management is looking at selective

activities.

21

22

dissemination of information using the ILS in a way that will allow you to better identify resources that have been cataloged that fit into your collection development policy scopes.

At the same time, there are some states that want to develop tools to help assess government information needs.

And SDI could help in that way as well as the PURL referral reports. You all would be able to see what your users are connecting to online through our PURLs.

There were a number of libraries that wanted to explore the adoption of a database-style solution for your Needs and Offers in the disposition process.

And there were a lot of states that wanted to share local practices for making records available in discovery tools. We're learning from each other here.

Education and online communication with depository library members. We have been conducting FDsys training sessions for you all. You've heard the numbers and Kelly will talk more

about this tomorrow.

But you all also want to develop training modules and videos at the local level and perhaps we can share on each other's experiences.

I can understand very easily why you would want to localize some of those training tools and meld them to what you provide in the way of services and collections.

We had down as one of the projects that LSCM was working on was to acquire an online tool for virtual meetings.

And as you all know, we now have that and we did a lot of the FDsys webinars through the iCohere product, the e-learning and collaboration platform, and we've done the webinars for the State and Library Forecasts.

And we are looking to expand the use of iCohere. We did a proof of concept with inter-agency this year, and as you all know, we are broadcasting and recording the sessions that relate to the forecast study of this particular conference.

And when I last checked, we had 145 registrants and that grew a little bit today so that's good to know, and thank you all out there in remote areas listening to us.

There was encouragement to participate in online forums and for GPO to provide online forums to discuss various issues and challenges of depository libraries. Now we can look more into that.

We had, as an example, for this particular question to communicate using social media. You all are using the social media and exploring other ways to use social media, new social media, to get your messages across.

Since the forecast questionnaires went out, we did start publishing FDLP Connection, a newsletter.

And there was an action from one of the libraries to contribute to existing newsletters and other publication. Let me put a plug in here first. If you're looking for a newsletter to contribute to, here we are. Contact me or Kelly.

1	We're getting ready to launch a new
2	marketing campaign. Again, Kelly will tell you
3	more about that tomorrow. It was mentioned a
4	little bit today, but she'll talk more about that
5	tomorrow. And you all at the state level are
6	looking at doing the same thing.
7	And another thing that came up from

And another thing that came up from the State Focused Action Plans was developing a mentoring program. That came up quite a bit.

So to wrap up, I just want to echo what Robin said earlier about reading these plans. I got a lot of energy from reading these plans.

They were wonderful to see all of the things that you were thinking about doing and wanting to do to make your services better, to enhance your collections and be able to serve the people that you do in your particular libraries. It was very invigorating.

Some of the words that popped out, if you take a look at the word cloud, really, really good words. Federal Depository Libraries is right there in the middle and

1 government information. We would expect to see 2 that. 3 promote, market, access, But 4 create, collaborate, provide, explore, 5 communicate, all of these very, very good 6 actions to whatever end. It's good to hear those kinds of words. 7 The State Focused Action Plans will 8 be posted on the community site following the 9 meeting and conference and we don't have a 10 particular date yet but they will be there. 11 We are recording this session and 12 13 the recording will be available soon. We'll let you know when that is. 14 If you have any questions about 15 16 State Focused Action Plans, you can contact She's listed first on that list. Robin. 17 (Laughter) 18 19 MS. ETKIN: You can contact me too. 20 Okay, no. This is an opportunity for questions for both of the presentations, correct? 21 22 MS. LASTER: Right.

MS. ETKIN: Yes, okay.

1 MS. LASTER: Thank you, Cindy. 2 This is Shari Laster from the University of Akron. 3 4 Before we move to the Q&A section, Mary Alice asked me to talk a little bit about 5 6 what this process looked like in Ohio and what 7 our outcome was. 8 Ohio has a government documents group called, surprisingly enough, GODORT of 9 10 Ohio or also known as Ohio GODORT. 11 Our group met in late spring 2012 to discuss responses to the State Forecast survey. 12 13 In fact, a lot of what we talked about were the individual responses that each 14 library had composed, along with some of the 15 16 surveys from folks who weren't able to attend and we used that time to fill out our forecast 17 18 survey. 19 For the State Focused Action Plan, 20 a committee was formed and charged with drafting an action plan and that committee was led by 21

22

23

I was on the committee, along with

Audrey Hall from the State Library of Ohio.

б

Cheryl Paine from the University of Mount Union, and Peter Thayer from Marietta College.

The way that we approached the action plan process was to review our state plan.

Our latest state plan had just been updated by a committee in 2010 and approved by all the Federal depository libraries in Ohio.

And so when we looked at the state plan, each section had components that were very -- it turned out to be very easy and very clear to turn into action items.

So we focused on different areas, again, based on the structure of the state plan and so these included access, marketing, resource sharing, collection development and preservation.

And for the most part, we really took the ideas in our state plan and looked at what action items would be necessary in order to complete them as initiatives.

The process of developing a plan took a couple weeks and we shared it with our colleagues in Ohio for review. Nobody said

anything.

So we -- well, since everyone had agreed to the state plan, one hopes that the action plan is really a logical extension of that.

And I think the benefits of this are that now we actually have actionable items and steps that we can take that move us closer to the goals of our state plan. So the process, I think, was really helpful for us as a state.

And now when we have our next GODORT of Ohio meeting in November, we'll be able to start talking about, okay, who's actually doing the individual items in our plan?

So I'll just share with you a couple of our initiatives which I'm sure you'll all get to look at when the plans are posted in the near future.

We have an initiative to ask Ohio Federal depository libraries to review and improve their web presence in order to better serve Ohio library users.

We are planning to discuss the

creation of a marketing toolkit, which I'm very happy to hear about the marketing and promotion efforts that are coming out of GPO because, boy, we're going to use those. In fact, that might make this one really easy. Yes. Thank you, Kelly.

We discussed resource sharing and for part of our action one of our action items is an initiative that's already taking place, which is to have libraries in Ohio that are using our shared storage facilities to actually contribute the records for the items in the shared storage facility to the centralized catalog in order to make it retrievable faster and to make it more clear where each item is actually located.

We discussed reviewing our disposition of materials process and we endorsed the efforts of the GODORT of Ohio's digital collection project.

So that was Ohio. Actually I think we had a lot of fun working on it. Audrey is smiling and I hope nodding, so I think that means

we had fun.

At this time we are opening the floor for questions. I would also invite those of you who have particularly innovative and exciting initiatives as part of your State Focused Action Plans, if you're willing to come up to the microphone and share them with us, I think we'd all really love to hear about them. So with that, the floor is open. Cindy thought they were exciting.

MR. ROMANS: Larry Romans, Vanderbilt. In addition to posting the state plans, are you also going to post your groupings and the individual initiatives and actions that people have proposed under each of those?

I can see other states looking at those and thinking, hey, that's something I might collaborate with them about.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.

Larry, we are going to make the State Focused

Action Plans available and we've got the themes

that we've come up with as a preliminary group

of themes.

As Robin mentioned, we are going to go back and look more closely at this and we certainly hope others of those that have not submitted plans will do so, so hopefully we can add to this.

But, yes, you heard us talk about the blur and some of those initiatives are action items that can fit multiple places, just as Cherie described yesterday in the coding that she was doing for some of the questions.

We can make all of this available with the action plans. I mean, you've got our slides. As things change, we'll be sharing information out.

MR. ROMANS: To follow up, I know you're making the State Action Plans available but I'm lazy and I don't want to have to look through each and every one.

So you put some good examples up there but I'd like a whole lot more examples under each type so that I could see if there's something where I could collaborate with perhaps the person who suggested that particular

1	initiativo
1	initiative.
2	MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.
3	Thank you, Larry, for elaborating that. So you
4	want a big master list?
5	MR. ROMANS: Yes.
6	MS. ETKIN: Okay.
7	MR. ROMANS: I mean, it doesn't have
8	to have all, what, 695 but I assume
9	MS. ETKIN: Six hundred will do you?
10	(Laughter)
11	MR. ROMANS: Yes, but a bunch. Way
12	more than
13	(Laughter)
14	MS. ETKIN: Okay.
15	MS. LASTER: That's a technical
16	term I guess.
17	MR. ROMANS: Yes.
18	MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.
19	Thanks, Larry, for that suggestion and actually
20	a lot of that has been preliminarily done as we
21	came up with this process and some of the
22	findings that we had with our mappings. Thank
23	you.

1	MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby,
2	University of Virginia. And actually, Larry, I
3	think one of the agenda items for the regional
4	meeting that's coming up after this one is to
5	talk about actions that in some of our various
6	action plans would look at collaboration.
7	So I think the regionals are going
8	to be looking at what did we put in some of our
9	plans that might lend themselves to just that,
10	so I think that sort of speaks to that as well.
11	One that I thought of, I think a lot
12	of us had promotion and all that marketing in our
13	plans.
14	And one of ours in Virginia is to do
15	some sort of a template that would be available
16	electronically that libraries could then plug in
17	their own.
18	So it wouldn't be you put a sticker
19	on a poster, but it would look more like it's from
20	the individual library.
21	And that's something that I think
22	GPO could help us with for sure, to have that kind

of thing that would be available and then we

could fill in your library here or your state or
let us customize it for our own use, so I'd like
that.

There was something else I was -- oh,
I know what it was. I'm just curious because I
know some of the things that my state included
are aspirational and perhaps don't fit within
the current law.

And I'm just curious how this process and the LSCM plans and those things, are we pushing the boundaries here at all? Because I sure want to.

And I just hope that others looked at this as an opportunity to say here's some things we want and let's go out and figure out how to do this or how to get those into the current legal environment.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. You inspire us all, Barbie. One of the things we had categorized in our chart was whether or not there needed to be a revision in Title 44 for this thing to happen.

And as you saw, the methodology and

the process of this whole study, that things are going down into the national plan and we're looking at what can be done now, what can be done that we aren't doing now and what are those things that are going to need Title 44 reform?

And those are kind of things that we're going to be aware of and we can't do anything about right now, but at some point we're going to be putting all of these things that require Title 44 change into an area to look at.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Barbie, you did have the eight initiatives.

(Laughter)

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: And really I expected to see more boundary pushing than I saw. So if anybody wants to know how to do that, Barbie, raise your hand one more time, please.

She and her colleagues had a tremendous range of initiatives and actions, from contacting the folks for the emergency situations to we want to help GPO look further into this.

1	And yours was one of the later ones
2	but it was so comprehensive in its scope, so I'm
3	embarrassing you I know. I'm sorry, but I think
4	it was a well thought out process.
5	The other thing I'd like to add is

The other thing I'd like to add is that when there was a state plan that was relatively recent, that was drawn upon pretty heavily it seemed like.

But there are a lot of state plans that date back into the '80s and there are some states and regions sort of that don't have a state plan at all. So this hopefully is a good impetus if it wasn't revised recently to do so.

One of the states, that was one of their initiatives they were going to undertake, was to update their state plan. Several of them actually had that. So thank you, Barbie, for providing that opportunity to share that.

MS. EREKSON: Sarah Erekson,
Chicago Public Library. I wanted to go back to
the Question 6 about the LSCM initiatives.

The way that the question was asked and as the Illinois Government Depository

Library Council was discussing how to answer this question, it seemed like you didn't want us to answer everything is the most beneficial.

And it was a little bit difficult for us to figure out what LCM initiatives were falling under which category.

And so I was a little bit surprised at the way that it turned out and I realize that it's probably because other states and groups as they were discussing this came up with different interpretations of what fit into different categories.

Is part of the release of this initial preliminary information going to, I guess, promote or define or redefine or whatever, to explain more of what those LSCM initiatives are?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO, sorry. The reason it was so vague is because we wanted you to be able to identify those things that were most important and have that flexibility.

I'm assuming, and since I'm not on

that particular part of this forecasting
process, so Cherie and David can throw something
at me and say, no, you got it wrong Robin, but
I'm assuming that's some follow-up questioning
that will probably be done related to that. So
thank you very much.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Just to throw out an observation. We talked about the blur in coming up with the themes from the State Focused Action Plans.

There's blur all over the place, which is what you were alluding to, Sarah, and what is a service and what's a product and what's a collection and what's a service and what's a communication tool?

In the online environment, everything kind of blurs and so it really is. You may have thought this in Illinois and Barbie may have thought this in Virginia and yet others other places.

And I think that perhaps this may very -- I might get tomatoes thrown at me too.

This might very well be one of those areas that

requires a focus group or some kind of follow-up discussion as part of Phase Two.

MS. GIVENS: Cherie Givens, GPO. Sorry I'm late to join this. I was having a little bit of difficulty with the mic. That is what our plan was.

When we first put together the questionnaires, we looked at asking the individual question to rate each and every one of our services.

But when you looked at the numbers that we had, the consensus internally was that no one would fill out a questionnaire that was this long and asked this many questions about each and every service including some that we're in the process of changing so it was designed to give you general, broad categories.

And then the follow-up question that was right behind it which asked you specifically about what new services you would like also gave us a lot of information because when we analyzed the data the preliminary analysis has shown us that a lot of the things that were mentioned in

the follow-up either are things that we're already doing, things that you would like to be improved and then the additional new services which ties into those additional areas.

So when we look at what are the new things that you're asking for, we can map them back to those general areas.

And part of what we're doing with the creation of the new jobs and our realignment is that we're looking at those exact things and about trying to streamline that.

But that is part of what's intended to be the future focus groups, is to get to the heart of that.

Now, in that same area, I'd like to also say that one of the other things that we're going to be doing is, and I know that many of you feel that you're surveyed out, is that we might occasionally send out maybe three to five tops, just a quick click-off Survey Monkey questionnaire about a particular issue to specific libraries who have indicated something in their forecast responses and that's how we're

1 planning to handle that. Thank you. FELTREN: 2 MS. Emily Feltren, American Association of Law Libraries. 3 Just a 4 follow-up on the discussion you were having 5 about Title 44 and that as you do go through the 6 categories and ideas you're marking off what 7 might require changes. 8 Is that something that you're going to make public sort of along the way or are we 9 10 going to have to wait until the national action plan or some other step before we see those 11 marked? 12 13 MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: We're pointing 14 this way. MS. BAISH: I think that discussion 15 16 will begin on Thursday, Emily. I thank you for the question. 17 And, Barbie, I also thank you for 18 19 reminding us that we did ask as part of the State Focused Action Plans for aspirational. 20 And I think we may also have asked 21 you to, like, put a parens around it. I don't 22

Did we do that, Robin, or not?

23

1	trying to recall some of your meetings. Didn't
2	we mark aspirational items?
3	FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Yes.
4	MS. BAISH: We did or the
5	respondents did?
6	FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Oh, did we
7	mark them or did they mark them?
8	MS. BAISH: Didn't we ask the
9	community?
10	FEMALE PARTICIPANT: The
11	respondents marked them.
12	MS. BAISH: Thank you, thank you.
13	So, Barbie, where you have aspirational items
14	you marked it clearly and we have a list of those,
15	so thank you.
16	MS. LASTER: That was Mary Alice
17	Baish, GPO.
18	MS. BAISH: I'm sorry.
19	MS. MONGEAU: Deborah Mongeau from
20	the University of Rhode Island. I'm just going
21	to make a comment rather than ask a question.
22	I was a little surprised. It seemed
23	like there's only one action plan that mentioned

recruiting a new depository. If I'm not mistaken, I think that was Rhode Island. Yes, it was us.

(Laughter)

MS. MONGEAU: The reasoning behind that was, yes, like most other states some people have dropped status. And we felt when life gives you lemons, make lemonade, that this would be a good opportunity to try to recruit new libraries, maybe someone who had a different philosophy, different outlook.

We also felt that many hands make light work, so this would be an opportunity to try to increase.

And I think that this is something that over these past recent years many of us have been just going into survival mode, saying how are we going to maintain the depository system?

When we really -- I think now is the time we should be saying, okay, let's really expand it. It's a great program. How do we go out and recruit new depositories to join us?

And I think this would be also an

ideal opportunity to bring in some of the issues
that were mentioned by the other states, the
partnerships, collaboration, resource sharing.

These are things that we could bring in as we go out and recruit for new depositories.

And I'd just like to say I think this is something that maybe all of us should be considering, not just small, little Rhody. Thanks.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Thank you for bringing that up, Deborah.

I think in some ways these action plans had that but it was in the blur, that is reaching out to non-depository libraries. What does that mean? Promotion to non-depository libraries.

So I think that while Rhode Island is the one that said this is one of our goals for this next year essentially, we did a little hoorah on that one too, we would love to talk to anyone who'd like to discuss strategies for doing that.

1	Some of our folks have brought some
2	new libraries in. There are some regionals that
3	aren't here that have brought in some new
4	depository libraries. So I agree that it is an
5	excellent opportunity. Thank you for bringing
6	that up.
7	MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Just
8	a follow-up on that. Again, just a reminder
9	that what we were looking at were your own words
10	and not trying to interpret and trying to keep
11	our biases in the back of our minds and looking
12	at your words.
13	You're right. You're the only
14	state that came up with we want to designate
15	another library in our state, but I think all of
16	these other activities could lend themselves to
17	just that goal.
18	MS. BAISH: Thank you, Rhode
19	Island. And
20	MS. LASTER: Mary Alice Baish, GPO.
21	MS. BAISH: Thank you, Shari. Mary
22	Alice Baish, GPO. I really want to thank you for

including that in your action plan and when we

talk about, and Barbie mentioned those aspirational things, that in current law we may not have the flexibility.

I think it's very unfortunate that bringing more depository libraries into the current program is really hampered today by the designation process that is required as part of Title 44.

In other words, in the past year I know I've worked with two regional librarians to bring -- and aren't we all happy public libraries, we met together for lunch earlier -- to bring two public library systems into the FDLP. They were in different states.

And what our wonderful staff came across quite quickly was that there were no open designation spots to bring these libraries into the program.

And I think that's a shame and as you look forward in Rhode Island with your wonderful plan, you're clearly going to have to find a library that exists in a district where there is not another Federal depository library.

So in that way I think in terms of going back to discussions many of us had for the last 20 years, in the electronic environment why can't every library be a depository library?

It's partially because of the restrictions on designation that are in our law currently today.

And is that something that we all need to have a conversation about and take a look at? I would hope so. So thank you, Rhode Island.

MS. MORSE: Hi, Catherine Morse, University of Michigan.

Going back to the question about pushing boundaries or what's aspirational, I would hope that you would look to the independent Library Forecast or the state questionnaire for the question on what is your ideal FDLP and not look at the State Focused Action Plan or assume that if the State Focused Action Plan did not push the boundaries it meant that nobody in that state wants to push the boundaries because the State Focused Action Plan did specifically say

put things that are realistic and attainable, so that was probably very often interpreted to mean legal.

(Laughter)

MR. WALLS: David Walls, GPO. Within the 775 responses to the Library Forecast for that question, people wrote small books about it.

I mean, the comments under that question are huge and we are coding it with looking at things that we can do within current law and also coding it for things that are outside of current law.

MS. LYONS: Sue Lyons, Rutgers Law Library. Going back to Rhode Island's challenge of recruiting more libraries into the program, perhaps within the current scope of Title 44 the Government Printing Office could create a category called Federal Library Partnership Libraries, or something like that, that did not involve deposit, either virtual or tangible.

But those libraries might certify

that they have at least one person on staff who has some expertise in government information and they were open to the public and they would get some sort of official recognition in return.

It would be a zero cost program and if we had something like that I think New Jersey could recruit not just one new library but dozens, including all the public libraries that may have dropped over the last ten years.

MS. LASTER: Okay, I have a question that came in from the virtual conference from private message.

"How seriously will GPO take State Focused Action Plan attempts? I'm not sure if the state will be able to do all that was listed."

MS. GIVENS: Cherie Givens, GPO. So this is a question that came up when we were talking in the virtual sessions about the State Focused Action Plans.

And we were never planning to hold every state to this. We know that things intervene and we're asking you to forecast into the future and you can't always know what will

5 6

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 or will not happen.

We understand that this is the plan and that you're working towards it and certainly, although we would like to complement efforts and try to assist you with that, we would definitely not be holding states to having met all of these action items within the five-year time period.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Just a follow-up to what Cherie said. One of the goals of this State Focused Action Plan was to take a look at what you were interested in and to see if the activities that GPO has or are planning to undertake are going in the same direction and is there some kind of potential cooperative effort there, if indeed you all are following your plans.

MS. JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library. So my
question is about the State Focused Action Plans
and the State Forecast.

So all the information is going to be released at some point, but you're talking

right now about releasing the Action Plans fairly soon or in the near future.

I think that I would actually like to see the State Focused Action Plans next to the Forecast for the state because if we're looking at another state and see an action plan that is something that we think is really great, I think it might be helpful to see what's going on in that state to see if maybe they have resources that we don't or are they a state that's similarly situated, if that makes sense, because every state has its own story.

MR. WALLS: I was asked to comment. I think that sounds like a great idea. And they certainly do have some complementary function that way, so that's something we can talk about.

MS. LASTER: That's David Walls, GPO.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: Tom Fischlschweiger, Broward County Main Library. Just to add on to what she was saying, I'm kind of wondering when Cindy Etkin was putting up her presentation about what LSCM is doing, what the

State Action Plans, many of which are saying we would like to do this, it seems that especially across states there could be a tremendous duplication of effort.

And we already report fugitive documents so is there going to be some kind of a mechanism wherein, oh, Ohio's doing this, Oklahoma's doing that, Florida's doing something, where we could all say these are some of the best practices we've come up with, these might be ways you want to implement it?

For example, one of the things that was discussed or mentioned up here was ingesting more executive agency documents into FDsys.

I just went to something from NCJRS this morning and they mentioned that they have 30,000 formerly print-only documents that they have digitized.

Someone in the audience asked are those going to be ingested into FDsys? And their response was, well, nobody at GPO's called us. They probably don't know we have them.

So how can we out here, I mean, you

1 guys can't do everything, much as we would like 2 you to. How can we all look out for what's 3 4 going on out there and, say, dovetail things that are going on that we see dovetailing into these 5 6 plans as this fog begins to jell, nailing it to 7 a tree. However this works, I don't know. 8 mean, if you saw The Fog by John Carpenter you 9 10 know what comes out of the fog. Be careful what 11 you wish for. (Laughter) 12 13 MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: So I just see that this could lead to massive duplication of 14 effort that really doesn't need to happen. 15 16 an observation. MS. BAISH: Mary Alice Baish, GPO. 17 (Laughter) 18 19 MS. BAISH: I really want to thank 20 you for that comment. On Monday, during my remarks in the morning, I talked about efforts 21

that we are making to better engage our Federal

agency FDL partners.

22

23

Many of them, such as the U.S.

Department of Treasury, are doing a lot of digitization of their historic content and it's very difficult for us to make the connections with each of these.

So what you just mentioned actually is a way in which you could collaborate with us when you make these connections yourselves.

And I'm not sure I want you to communicate directly with me but you're welcome to, or one of our staff. I mean, I think we need to know about that.

That presents an excellent opportunity for us to approach that publishing entity within a very large agency and see if we could develop a formal letter of agreement.

In the case of the treasury content, we're doing it as a pilot to test how we can use the standard ingest for FDsys, which is a fairly low-cost method of ingest.

Unlike the ingest of each of the Federal Court opinions, there's no development cost whatsoever.

So that's why we're doing that as a pilot to see how much of our wonderful LSCM staff time it's going to take, for example, and what the costs are going to be.

But in the case of an entity that is already making their information available, the enormous asset it would be for that agency is on discoverability of their content.

So if they partner with us, even though they continue to host the content on their website, we develop the cataloging records and the metadata that is going to lead the community to their content.

That is a huge plus I believe for a Federal agency who is looking at this time of limited resources and best return on investment. It's something they can take to the officials in the agency and say, wow, look at the use of our collection.

So I think if we could count on your help in guiding us to these collections on agency websites, we'd be very happy to do it. Does that answer your question? Thank you.

1	MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I
2	want to respond to the other comment that you
3	made about reinventing the wheel and a lot of
4	duplicative effort.
5	As Robin mentioned, there are a lot
6	of states that have state plans. There are some
7	that don't. There are some that date back to the
8	'80s.
9	This is one of the freshest looks
10	we've seen through these State Focused Action
11	Plans about what you all in your states want to
12	work on.
13	And I think what Larry suggested of
14	having a combined list of all of these, not 691
15	but almost of them, together could help us
16	identify some of that redundancy and
17	possibilities for further collaboration and
18	partnership. So, Larry, we may very well have
19	all 691 on that list. Thanks.
20	MS. LASTER: We've got time for one
21	more question. Go ahead.
22	MS. CLARK: Kirsten Clark,

University of Minnesota. When I was working

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

with our groups, and for us we have both Minnesota and South Dakota, on the state action plan, I felt a bit of like a chicken or egg situation because action plans is now.

And I go with Catherine in terms of I was very much looking at it at the attainable, which is in there, not necessarily thinking into the future.

I now look at as the national plan is being developed, are we going to have a chance to go back and have this conversation on State Action Plans with that national plan in mind? Because I can see the State Action Plans changing based on what comes out of a national plan, what things I might want to focus on instead or that collaboration piece.

I just kind of feel like this is an opportunity, yes, to provide this information.

But what are we looking at in the future to then take new plans that are coming forward and take these Action Plans that we're working on and better be able to bring it together? Is that part of the conversation for

1 as we get to that national plan and beyond that? MS. BAISH: Absolutely, I think 2 when we think about the future national plan, we 3 4 don't need to worry so much about the doable. 5 We may need to worry about the 6 possible and we definitely need to be able to 7 articulate what we want aspirationally and that will be part of that discussion, Kirsten, so I 8 thank you for raising that. 9 10 MS. LASTER: Okay, thank you, Mary Alice. And a very quick question. 11 this 12 MALE PARTICIPANT: No, actually that announcement. Thank you, Madam 13 Chair. 14 For those that are joining us for 15 16 dinner, if you want to meet at 6:10 over in front of the hotel registration desk, we can go over 17 in a group. Otherwise, we'll see you over at 18 19 Sine. Thank you. 20 MS. LASTER: Thanks. Now, before we close, I'd like to turn things over to Blane 21 Dessy to give a quick overview of what we talked 22

about today and get ready for tomorrow.

23

1	MR. DESSY: Twenty-five words or
2	less, right?
3	MS. LASTER: You can have 30 words
4	if you'd like.
5	MR. DESSY: I can have 30 words,
6	because you all have to be out of here at a
7	quarter of 4:00, right, so I promise I'll be very
8	brief.
9	There was a lot of discussion this
10	afternoon. Well, let me start by saying there
11	was a lot of discussion this afternoon about the
12	blur.
13	And I don't know about you, but I've
14	spent most of my career in the blur and I've come
15	to enjoy it, only because the blur means you've
16	got options and the blur means you can still
17	figure it out and the blur means that you can work
18	it to your advantage, right?
19	So I know as librarians we like
20	things to be orderly and organized, but right now
21	I think sort of being in the blur is a perfectly
22	fine place to be.

23 And this is part of you figuring it

out and nothing has been decided yet. Nothing
has been frozen, to use an organizational term,
so just go with be in the blur and it'll be fine.

Okay, so that's my blur comment.

But actually I thought the theme of the day can be summarized in two words and I think it was maybe, well, one of the folks up here, and they talked about expertise and enthusiasm.

And when I heard those two words I thought, you know, that really sums up the day because if you were with us in the morning you heard from Jane and her staff about all the tremendous work that's going on in LSCM.

There's a lot of expertise and enthusiasm that was talked about in this morning's program.

Today, or this afternoon when I was listening to all of you thinking about what am I really hearing, what's the subtext that I'm hearing in all of these comments, and it's all about the expertise that you possess and the enthusiasm that you have.

So I thought it was a nice

correspondence. This morning I got to hear all about GPO's expertise and enthusiasm and this afternoon I got to hear about all of your expertise and enthusiasm.

And I think that's important to remember, that when we get together we can talk about, oh my god, we're in the blur, we're not sure what's going on, we have dire circumstances.

Sort of tune in to that incredible level of enthusiasm that people were talking about this afternoon in terms of what they could be doing in the future, right?

No one talked about closing their libraries. Nobody talked about shutting down the system. What you all were talking about is we're going to make things better.

And I think that's what you want to key in on, apart from the specific recommendations that were made today.

But let me just give you some of my other observations and I promise I'll be brief.

Number one, I was really encouraged

to see that in terms of some of the things that you suggested that LSCM's already doing that.

I thought that crosswalk was a very interesting way to show how GPO is trying to be responsive to the issues that you are raising.

Now, again, we can get lost in semantics and talk about what's an initiative versus an action versus a -- who cares? Well, who cares? I mean, we could dance around that for days.

The important thing is that there's an effort underway for GPO to get in sync with where you want to go and they're listening to you and they're working in that direction. Again, I think that's a very important message to take away from this afternoon.

The other thing that I heard was the sense of empowerment coming out of the states.

And, again, I'm not picking on any one state but as we were talking about some of these state plans and what's going on and, again, aspirational or attainable, we can worry about that later.

What I was hearing is, gee, these states can actually take control of their own destiny to a certain extent, that there's enough flexibility for you to do what you want to do.

Yes, we may get to Title 44 but that doesn't seem to be prohibiting a lot of you from doing some very creative thinking about what you could be doing now.

And that's what I was hearing. I was hearing all about here's what Rhode Island wants to do. Here's what Virginia wants to do. Here's what, whatever. Here's what another state.

What I'm hearing is people taking control of their lives or people taking control of their own states and the fact that through collaboration, by coming together, you can really come up with ways to make your state plans better and they'll change because that's what plans do. They change.

But I heard a tremendous amount of self-confidence and self-empowerment in the room as you all were talking about your plans and

1	hearing about those ideas.
2	And I think that's tremendously
3	exciting because too often we think, well, the
4	system won't let us do this. We can't do this.
5	We can't do that.
6	Read those state plans. There's a
7	hell of a lot of interesting work to be done, and
8	you can do it.
9	So think of yourself. You're
10	pretty powerful people. You're pretty creative
11	people in that sense and I was very inspired by
12	that. Did you want to jump in?
13	(Off microphone discussion)
14	MR. DESSY: Okay, I know, I know, I
15	know. Geez, Shari is like the meeting Nazi.
16	(Laughter)
17	MR. DESSY: Everyone else ran over.
18	(Laughter)
19	MR. DESSY: But I'll be good. I'll
20	be good. I'll be good. But here are a couple
21	other things. I was trying to figure out what
22	I was hearing about today.

So Dave had started talking about

some of the issues that he wanted to bring up and I want to quote this because I thought this was really interesting and I was thinking about it the entire afternoon.

And this is according to the state plans, right, David? Two-thirds of the states indicated they can't host digital collections.

And two-thirds of the states said they can't plan to preserve permanent digital collections.

What does that really mean? I'm going to say it sounds like the majority of you are saying you don't have the capacity to really become sort of IT infrastructure people, right?

What I heard you saying is that's not where we want to go. Where we want to go is with services. We don't want to get bogged down in having to worry about the IT and the infrastructure. We want to focus on services.

So I was thinking, well, is that a differentiation? Does GPO become that IT infrastructure powerhouse? You create the GPO cloud and then everyone comes to it?

Or I don't know. You've got me

1 thinking now about how some of these 2 conversations play out in the future. But I thought it was interesting that two-thirds of 3 4 you sort of stepped back from that IT infrastructure issue. 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Where else am I going now? Oh, again, just to reiterate. I heard a lot about services and collaboration.

You're all good librarians so you get points for that because that's what we've all trained to do, right, service and collaboration with each other and with our partners.

So I think that's an interesting way to start thinking about this. Who is in charge of the IT infrastructure and who builds out from that?

The last thing I heard a lot of was about flexibilities and how all the state plans really thought about how to take their current system and create new flexibilities with it and that if you ever do have that discussion about Title 44 to even go beyond that and create additional flexibilities.

But I heard there's a lot of flexibility right now available to people if they want to exercise it.

So let's re-cap before Shari turns off the mic. Expertise, it's on both sides of the aisle. GPO has it. You all have it. Enthusiasm. You both have that in spades.

Right, so that's a good message to take away today. You've got the brains and you've got the energy, so that's good.

Two, you really want to focus on the service and collaboration and you're feeling your own power. As the state reports indicate, you're beginning to feel your own power for what you can do with your program in the future.

Think about that. You need to realize that it's in your hands, right, it's not in Mary Alice's hands. It's kind of in your hands at this point.

And third, you know you already have some flexibilities and there can be even more flexibilities in the future. So I think those were all pretty positive messages to take away

1	on a Tuesday afternoon, right? Okay, so did I
2	do okay? Am I over?
3	MS. LASTER: Yes.
4	MR. DESSY: Oh god. I'll never be
5	asked to do this again. Thank you.
6	MS. LASTER: Thank you, Blane.
7	Thank you, everyone, and we've got about ten
8	minutes for our break. Thank you.
9	(Whereupon, the meeting/hearing was
10	concluded at 3:49 p.m.)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

+ + + + +

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE
AND
DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY
OCTOBER 17, 2012

+ + + + +

+ + + + +

The Conference met in the Crystal Ballroom in the Doubletree Crystal City, 300 Army Navy Drive, Arlington, Virginia, at 8:30 a.m., Sharalyn J. Laster, Council Chair, presiding.

PRESENTING:

SHARALYN J. LASTER, Depository Library
Council Chair

MARY ALICE BAISH, Superintendent of Documents, GPO

MARK AMES, GPO

STEVE BELEU, Regional Librarian, Oklahoma Department of Libraries

KRISTINA BOBE, GPO

BLANE DESSY, Executive Director, FEDLINK, Library of Congress

JANET FISHER, Arizona State Library

PAUL GIANNINI, GPO

CHERIE GIVENS, GPO

CASS HARTNETT, University of Washington
DEBBIE RABINA, Pratt Institute, School of
Information and Library Studies
KELLY SEIFERT, GPO

JESSE SILVA, Head, Government Documents

Department, University of North Texas,
and Co-Chair ALA/GODORT Education

Committee

ROBBIE SITTEL, Tulsa City County Library DAVID WALLS, GPO

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:
SHARALYN J. LASTER, Chair
STEPHANIE BRAUNSTEIN
CHRISTOPHER BROWN
HELEN BURKE
MARIE CONCANNON
BLANE DESSY
STEPHEN M. HAYES
PEGGY ROEBUCK JARRETT
ROSEMARY LASALA
SUSAN LYONS
MARK PHILLIPS
DEBBIE RABINA

ARLENE WEIBLE

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S
Facing Training Needs: Building a Training Registry
Welcome by Ms. Debbie Rabina4
Presentation by Steve Beleu22
Presentation by Jesse Silva33
Presentation by Mark Ames38
Q & A led by Mr. Blane Dessy40
Sustainability Working Group Session, How to Succeed with Little or Nothing, Ideas for Federal Depository Libraries84
FDLP Forecast Study - Methodology, Study Phrases and State Forecast
Mary Alice Baish, Superintendent of Documents, GPO164
Cherie Givens, GPO166
Paul Giannini, GPO186
David Walls, GPO195
Individual Library Forecasts in Relation to Education, Marketing and Affiliations
Kelley Seifert, GPO202
Kristina Bobe, GPO233
Shari Laster, Depository Library Council Chair, University of Akron252
Blane Dessy, Executive Director, FEDLINK,

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 ||

8:35 a.m.

MS. RABINA: Okay. Good morning
everyone. I'm Debbie Rabina, Pratt Institute,

New York, School of Information and Library
Science. I want to thank you all for being here.

I know that there's a lot of competition so we

are a small group at this early hour.

But I'm sure we're all dedicated and committed. So this a presentation of the education and training working group from Council. And the members of that group are Sue Lyons, Helen over there, Blane Dessy, and myself. And what we're going to do this morning is just introduce to you some of the things that we have been thinking about and then open it to a discussion.

So I will begin with introductory remarks that kind of like describe some of the questions that we would like you to think about. There are handouts up front. So there are handouts of the slides. And then there's a one-page handout which are really the questions

that we would like to hear from the community, their responses and thoughts about.

And then one of our presenters has a handout. Steve Beleu has the blue handout. So that is for everyone. So should I just, maybe I'll wait a minute while people are getting their things.

Okay. So as I said, I will be giving an overview of some of the different dimensions of education and training. And then we will have three panelists or three groups, I guess. Steve Beleu from Oklahoma Department of Libraries, Jesse Silva from University of North Texas, and then from GPO will also be giving us their thoughts on the subject of education and training, Mark Ames, Ashley Dahlen, and Robin Haun-Mohamed.

And then we will end with a discussion. As you can see, we've left quite a lot of time for the discussion because we do kind of want this to be, we really want to hear from people what their thoughts are. So this overview or even like more accurately I would

say, kind of like this is where we are now in terms of education and training.

So we know that OPAL is no longer being supported. And it's, it has come up. And the discontinuation of that kind of leaves a gap. Some of those needs are now being filled with iCohere. So that answers a lot of the immediate and the more interactive training needs that we have particularly with very focused tools such us FDsys.

But we have been hearing quite a lot over the last few days that the community feels that there is a need for education and training. And as we have heard in the last two days with the forecast overview and with the bi-annual survey this is something that comes up a lot. And if you go back to Council minutes and all of our recommendations, this has been on the agenda every year for many years.

But it doesn't seem to be, you know, the lack of what we would like an ideal education and training setting, it's not, we're not hurting in that area. So we don't get a lot of

very, I guess, passionate calls for more education and training.

But since this is a constant reoccurring theme and it does come up whether under the label of education and training or I think as Robin said yesterday it comes up sometimes under marketing, it is maybe a time to address it a little more specifically and to kind of think what we would like to have an education and training tool look like.

So we would like to seek community input and we would like to do it more specifically on three areas that we have listed on the handout. So we would like to know from you who should be the audience of an education and training tool? What kind of model we would consider for a good education and training tool?

And then what kind of model in terms of delivery? And then a model in terms of who would be delivering this? Is it more of a GPO initiative responsibility or is there any opportunities for partnering with other institutions in the community?

And we're going to try to organize the conversation around these questions. So when we talk about audience we tend to, the immediate audience that comes to mind are librarians who are in depository library Programs. And this is an important, but a narrow group.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But increasingly we feel that there are other people that really could benefit probably at least as much from having an education and training tool. So these would include people that are librarians that don't have any experience working with documents, but somehow they end up with documents responsibilities or people who are just doing general reference or any kind of public service and they don't, are not aware enough of documents.

They could be subject specialists in other areas whether it's data specialists, whether it's people in urban studies or, you know, many of the social science collectors and specialists. Other, another audience again

would be just students or any library users that come and might benefit from something like that.

and then an audience that did come up again yesterday when we heard some of the results of the forecast study, would be people in LIS schools. So it would be either the students in LIS schools or people, or the instructors, the professors teaching in LIS and not again necessarily those that are teaching government documents, but people that are teaching either JIS, or business resources or anything that could be related.

The second question that we would like input about is what kind of model. And I have suggested a few models for what a resource would look like. And I know that, well I think Blane said yesterday it's like semantics.

But I'm trying to keep the words as kind of like neutral as possible so like not to say a registry or a clearing house or you know, or a resource or a tool. I know that these things mean different things to different people. So we try to do our best to kind of

describe different models and this does not necessarily mean that we have to follow one specific model.

But whatever model may work for us or any kind of combination of these models that are available. So we would really like input about which one of these models is probably best suited for an education and training tool resource.

So the first model that I would like to introduce, and I think this is a model that we're all familiar with, is what we call the registry. And this would be something that is kind of similar to the digitization project registry which I'm assuming everyone's familiar with, right? So there's no need to introduce it. I see one person nodding. Okay.

So just to think about what some of the features are because that really, I mean it speaks a lot to how we will maintain this. One of the things that you need to think about when we are talking about what we would like it to look at is not just ideally how we would like it to look, but how well can we manage to sustain that look over a long period of time.

So not just what is ideal, but what is the most doable one. So some of the features of having a registry is that you have content that is on the registry is locally managed and stored by the institution. So an institution has a digitization project, they go to the registry and they register it, so to speak, from the registry so it links to a specific institution.

The content is open to everyone, anybody can nominate something. But it is vetted in some sorts. The contribution that we get from having it in one place is that we have some kind of standard and uniform metadata and interface and we have a kind of, a clear hierarchy and statistics that we get with the registry about what is in there.

So some of the things to consider, registration is required for that. Some people are not comfortable with having to go through a process where they have to register in order to

have their content included. So that is something that if somebody just does a web page and links that step is not required.

There is more of a cost. I don't know how, I don't know if it's high. But there is a cost involved with the initial creation of this and that cost is at least for the case of the registry is, falls on GPO.

Other questions to consider is does this content get vetted in any way or it's just anybody who wants to nominate would nominate? And then if it gets vetted who does that? Is it something that GPO does or is it something that will be done by a team, kind of like library associations or a council, education and working group or something that's more like an editorial board?

And then the main question about something like a registry is again, how do we make it available to a broad public? How do we make it more discoverable? Because the feeling is that was something that is very in house, like that is that it just works for the public that

already goes there and knows about it.

The second model which I won't talk all that much about because I know that Jesse is going to address that, is what we call the clearing house model. And I think that we're all familiar with the GODORT exchange which is a clearing house model. I gave another example from civil rights litigation which is out of U Mich.

And here we have a team that, some kind of editorial team or somebody whose in charge who organizes and collects and they add the content. But in this model you don't really need, you're just linking out. You don't have, there's no registration that's required. So you don't really need any input or permission from the creator in order to include content in this clearing house model.

Another model that I would like to introduce again is the repository model. So a repository model, and we're familiar with FDsys or with Hathi Trust which are repository models. The main feature of a repository model is that

all of the content is actually stored locally on the repository. So it will, if it's something that comes out of a university, whatever their content is it will be duplicated in the repository. So you would need some kind of content management systems. Most repositories in universities today use DSpace or what is it called?

MALE PARTICIPANT: Fedora.

MS. RABINA: Fedora, which I think DSpace bought Fedora or something.

(Off microphone comment)

MS. RABINA: CONTENTAM, which is an LCLC one. But I mean DSpace is like an open source one. So this requires server. It requires a lot of installation and management of the system itself. It requires permission from whoever created the content to host the content.

The advantage of that is that you have more control over the content, that you will have access to the files, that you can maintain a variety of formats of the files. Are these all clear, all of the? Okay.

The last one I wanted to show and I just really called it the all in one for a lack of a better name. And I'm not sure, a lot of people may not be familiar with this one because it's a little outside our community. This is called CIAO, it's Columbia International Affairs Online. It's out of Columbia University. And it is, at Columbia it's a collaboration between the University Library and the University Press.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And they use content that is, a lot of the content that is in here is from open access sources. So it could be from universities, it could be from think tanks. But in addition, but this is, it's run like a journal. So they have an editor and they have an editorial team.

And they don't just simply link to the content, but they organize it for the specific needs of students of international affairs. So it includes and I mean, it includes things like reports and agency briefs. But it will also include course packs or syllabi or what else, books, journals.

So it is really it's, I don't know more data-based kind, but really focused on a specific group of learners. Now this one requires on going management. And as I said they do it as an editorial team. So in order to have this model we will require, it will require to have an editorial team.

There is also a much higher cost associated with this. So even though a good portion of the content here is open access content, this is a subscription model which I'm not at all suggesting. I mean I would be suggesting that is not something that we follow. I'm just saying that it just gives you a little bit of an indication of the cost.

And what they have tried to do is that even though it's a subscription based, they have tried to make it a reasonable cost subscription based. So the highest cost for subscribing to this annually is \$2,100. So high quality, so and again, it kind of like addresses all of the audience, both the students and the librarians, the professors and the well I

wouldn't say the world at large because it is subscription based. But they do also have a lot of subscribers that are on the K to 12 crowd as well.

The next question that we would like to get your input on is the question of partners. So who should be in charge of this and what would be the best way to run this? Is this something that should be the responsibility of GPO alone and, or is there a way to do this with partnerships?

And if we are going through the partnership models how many people will actually be interested or thinks their institutions could be involved or contribute to some way to a partnership? And what kind of contribution could you make?

And again, there are different partnership options. So one partnership, which I am guessing I was not familiar with when I, that's sort of like my bad, is the partnership with, between GPO and Oklahoma State University on Browse Topics.

It's

1 So this, to the best 2 understanding, is volunteer based. organized very similarly to the registry 3 4 although for each individual item there's 5 probably less metadata that's provided than for

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the registry.

library.

It requires a commitment of time and funds from the partnering organization. And it requires a commitment for revisions and updates that can be an ongoing challenge when people just kind of like, this is not often your main responsibility when you're working in

Another option for partnership is library information using the science community. And I was kind of glad to see that it came up yesterday in the state, in the forecast that, you know, people indicated them as an audience for education and training.

Because I am from the LIS community I know that there's kind of like a lot of power there and a lot of people. The way that LIS education works just because of the changing climate of education, is that everything tends to be project based. And like every student needs to walk out with a portfolio. So we're constantly needing to create stuff.

So I just gave you and it's a few examples here from my own institution. And so this is for example, one of our professors who teaches a course that's called Projects and Digital Archives. What they do in this course is every semester they partner with a non-profit in the New York area who has some kind of content that they want digitized.

And this can be audio or this can be paper or now they're actually doing film. So this is the gay and lesbian archive or the lesbian Herstory Archive, I'm sorry, in Brooklyn. And they have a lot of oral histories that are on tapes. So they have been digitizing their tapes and then they have been providing all of the metadata and they create the web site. And they maintain the web site for them. And they do this on Omeka.

So this is and you know, we have many

of these. We did something with like ambulance rescuers in World War II that had oral histories. So these are just some of the examples of what is happening. I teach another, I teach a class in international information sources.

And I had my students work last spring with the U.N. Law Library. And we created video tutorials for some of the U.N. collections. And I didn't, I'm not plugged in on the audio and you can see them. They're on YouTube.

So, you know, it's like a little five minutes of how to use particular, we have one for the treaty series or and so on. So these are the kind of things that if we try to get together with a group of LIS educators might be an option for partnership as well.

So finally, these are the names, we're kind of like seeking also input about a name for our yet to be born education resource because I think that once we have a name it's easier to have the conversation going. So if anybody's sitting there and suddenly has an

inspiration for some kind of like name or acronym which would be kind of like clever, catchy, pronounceable and so on we would appreciate that.

I think we put our e-mail contact on the hand out sheet as well. So the questions again to repeat are audience, model, partnership. If you have any suggestions through the FDLP community site you can link to our individual e-mails, e-mail any of us on the team or anybody that you would like to on Council.

MR. BELEU: Steve Beleu, Oklahoma Department of Libraries. I was asked to basically talk about what I would call how we've done it. So talk about the sorts of training we've done in Oklahoma. And basically it started in 2001 when my former reference library and Karen Fite and I were sitting around talking about internet.

And we concluded the internet had already started changing everything in 2001. So what we actually said to each other that day

is that as more time goes by, we're going to be seeing less and less people come in to do anything in this library or other libraries anywhere. So we concluded that instead of having the customer come to you, you go to the customer.

And what we would do is train people how to use web sites. In this case of course, government web sites. So thought that up in 2001, started developing the workshop contents and more important writing the teaching guide for those workshops.

They were ready to go in the fall of 2003. So it took a couple years because, you know, you can't just use a web site and teach it. You have to live there. You have to be on it more than once a week. You really have to live there like you live at home in your house. But this is a virtual web house.

So we started doing workshops in the fall of 2003, September. This data is from the time period between September 2003 and October 9, 2012. And to qualify for a workshop they had

to be at least an hour and half long. If it was less than an hour and half long they didn't even count it.

We did plenty of those little hour things and hour and fifteen minutes, didn't count, too short. So the number of workshops we gave in that period of time was 267. Since the Oklahoma Department of Libraries is half of the Oklahoma State Data Center, they were heavy on the Census workshops.

So far we've given 103 Census workshops. So I could be over teaching the American Fact Finder 2. In fact, some of the things I've done is teach American Fact Finder throughout our state is being part, being the State Library of Oklahoma, everyone in my building knows that our job is not in our building. Our job is throughout our state.

That's why any time I want to get a state car and drive from Oklahoma City out to the panhandle, where I've been four times now and it's a six hour drive out and six hour drive back, I can do it, not a problem. So I can get a state

car easily and get this done.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So the goal of the state library, our state library is to serve everyone in the state, all academic libraries as well as public libraries that you would expect, tribal libraries, tribal college libraries and we include special libraries. So they've all been served by ODL and we've offered training to all of them. And at various times they've taken us all up.

So 103 Census workshops, number of workshops about web sites posted by federal agencies by and about American Indians is 22. And the reason why we emphasize that is we have 39 tribal government headquarters in Oklahoma. And those just officially federally are recognized tribes. There are several additional tribes that are seeking federal recognition. We train them too if they want it.

My last data, our director asked for this, that's why I know this. Between the fiscal year from July 2011 through June 2012, the number of attendees we had was 391. Now the

state served, obviously that's Oklahoma, but we go outside of Oklahoma. I've been to Arkansas,

Kansas, Missouri and Texas, no less than four times per state and some states seven or eight

5 times.

Who has been coming to these? First, information professionals. That's what we are. Most of us are not data professionals, we're information professionals. And why you can tell if you're, there's always going to be some librarians who are data professionals but and the way you can tell if you're a data professional apart from the information professional is simple.

If you've ever done, answered a question and you were asked to write, for example disability characteristics, three or four of them for every census tracked in accounting, when you're a data professional. If you're not asked to do that level of data work, then you're an information professional.

So being at the State, at the State

Data Center I've had to be a data professional

as well as an information professional. And all it means is really you learn, you provide the service your customers need. And if that means you have to, of course we all know Excel. But if you have to learn something like SAS or SPSS you learn it.

So information professionals and general users make up the first category of customer groups. The second category of customer groups I call data professionals who are made up of industry sector employees, economic development staff, non-profit staff and again some librarians.

Typically customers from category two need and want to know more about web sites than customers in category one. So we've started to teach attendees from category one, the information professionals and general users, less than we teach attendees from category two because they may not need to know everything beyond some basics to do the job they need to do.

But what this is really all about is

just knowing your customers. You do that, figure out and answer that question by just simply asking them how much they want to learn, how much detail they need and they'll be glad to tell you.

And if there is some point at the workshop where it seems like you're going into more detail than they need, you simply ask them or you look out and see their eyes glazing over like donuts or maybe they're dozing off, or if I'm teaching this with Robbie Sittel back there, Robbie, raise your hand. Raise your hand anyway, I know you don't want to. She is one of my training affiliates.

Sometimes Robbie would say shut up, they don't need to know that much. Go on to the next thing. She'll write, the way I put it is she writes the reality checks for me because one of the things I have said to the person, the other half of the Oklahoma State Data Center is, before there was data there was nothing.

So that gives you an idea, data.

Okay. Now side note here. Since June, we've

given workshops to four times the number of data
professionals than we have the librarians and
general users. Over the past few years we've
started to train more data professionals than
information professionals and general users and

work with affiliates.

I've already mentioned that Robbie helps as assistant instructor. She's from Tulsa City County Library. Susan Woitte and Samantha Clifford from Northeastern Oklahoma State University are also training affiliates. I've had a few more in the past that have come and gone. Usually they've gone not because they couldn't take any more of me, but because they got another job.

Work with partner organizations simply means you recruit hosts in your service area. And not only from libraries, but from other organizations such as non-profit centers, tribal government facilities, technology centers, city government facilities and such.

Okay. Workshops come and go. In some cases we've exhausted the market for a

workshop in the specific geographic area and to a specific customer group. So we don't teach it

again for a year or two.

We have an example right now. We have one on the CDC, resources on the CDC. Well there's about two years when we didn't get any requests for it and Robbie and I have been requested to teach three of them just this fall. So interest may go, but it can come back very quickly.

It's also true that some workshops are hot for a year or two and then they're not. So obviously for something like the 2010 census we gave a basic census workshop 31 times in Oklahoma during 2011, not just as the Oklahoma Department of Libraries but at the Oklahoma State Data Center we were sure that every part of the state had at least one or two workshops delivered during 2011.

The demand dropped off in 2012. We've only give 14 so far, which is, we're going to be much less than 31 by the end of the year. But we also know that when we start getting data

from the 2012 economic census, which really isn't going to come out until 2014, we know that there will be a demand for workshops about data particularly from economic development people and 501 (c)(3) people.

Okay. Being a half of the Oklahoma State Data Center has opened doors for us, especially when we want to deliver economic development workshops such as our one about using federal data for economic development which is census data, yes, but it's one of the tools on the census that's not the census of population and housing. Like it's data base called business dynamics, the statistics of small businesses.

But it's also BEA and BLS data. If we were just coming to them as the Oklahoma Department of Libraries, they might well say what are your qualifications for teaching us who work in economic development, anything about economic development? Being the Oklahoma State Data Center, that opens that door for us.

And those are my remarks. I was

asked just to say a few things about how we've done it. Any questions about that? Do we it now or do we do it later or?

(Off microphone comment)

MR. BELEU: At the end. Okay.

Then Jesse Silva is next, University of North

Texas.

MR. SILVA: Good morning everyone.

I'm here as the co-chair of GODORT's education committee and I'm going to talk a little bit about GODORT's history in doing education and where we're planning on going from this point.

So here's GODORT's Education Committee, this is the charge that we have. We're basically charged to provide education to the following four groups, users and potential users of government information, government information librarians and staff, librarians who do not work directly or primarily with government information and library school students and faculty.

And so we've done several projects on this and I'm going to talk about two of them.

First is the Handout Exchange. I think everyone here is fairly familiar with the Handout Exchange. I'm going to give like a little bit of the history of the Handout Exchange.

It's basically a collection of guides, handouts, paper guides, et cetera created by documents librarians around the country. It was assembled in the early 1990's by Larry Romans. It was put on floppy disk and actually sold to people at conferences. I did not know this, I found this out recently.

So it was sold on floppy disk by Larry Romans. It migrated to the internet in the mid 1990's. Grace York put it up on the University of Michigan's web site and it resided there for several years. It hasn't really been updated in a few years.

It migrated from University of Michigan's web site to a GODORT web site and now it's living on the GODORT wiki and the Education Committee really hasn't touched it in a couple years, three or four years I want to say. And we're actually thinking about right now what

we're going to do with this thing.

It has a lot of broken links. People aren't really creating paper guides anymore. They're more, librarians have migrated their content into web lib guides, electronic handouts, electronic guides which doesn't necessarily fit with this handout exchange. So we're trying to figure out we're going to do with it next.

Next is new educational horizons. In June of 2011, GODORT issued a report on e-learning opportunities recommending that a group be charged to test offering webinars using ALA software, the software that ALA provides. The e-learning interest group was formed and charged to carry out this task. I was the chair of the group with three other people.

We basically probably saw last year around this time we sent out a bunch of calls for people to do webinars for this project. And we selected a person to do the webinar. In late spring, Kathryn Yelinek of the University of Bloomsburg, Bloomsburg University of

Pennsylvania, I'm sorry, presented her webinar Lions, Tigers and Videos Oh My.

And we had, it was a fairly successful project. We had 90 something registrations and about 70 something people actually attended the webinar. So it was fairly successful. In June of 2012, GODORT Steering decided to assign hosting future webinars to the Education Committee. And so this is where we're heading now.

What are the next steps? The GODORT Education Committee is going to be offering a minimum of one to two webinars per year, we're actually going to be hosting these things using ALA software. As things progressed in January 2012, ALA announced that we can, the organization itself is accredited to offer CE units for webinars.

This is something that's fairly familiar to FDLP attendees and conference attendees. It allows actual continuing education units to be granted to those who attend the webinars. ALA, Association for Library

Services to Children, Library Services for Children is actually meeting this initiative.

They've begun to offer these things.

You can look on their web site. They're offering some of these webinars through their organization beginning in January of 2013. It's a very paper work heavy intensive, paper work intensive certification process so it's something that we're going to be exploring as we move forward with this.

We're going to increase our course offerings in the next few years. Again this is just starting off. We want to start off slow and then build up as we move forward. And our goal is to offer online instruction with CE units beginning in the next two to three years. Okay. And that's it.

(Off microphone comment)

MR. AMES: Me, all right. Well, I'm Mark Ames, GPO. And let me just, as you know, when we were talking about what we need to discuss as we would point out as you already have the two things that we have going which are

Browse Topics and the registry.

And I do know that we had spoken with Karen Seiger and her, she mentioned that a registry is another, is something that she very heartily shook her head yes to. And we'll carry back the idea of the, yes, we'll carry back the continuing education point. Also we will mention doing the registration burnout as maybe saying, maybe we want to figure out a way to help simplify that.

I do know that how we do things, I think everyone in the room is pretty familiar recently has been webinars and FDsys. And plans are to try to expand those sorts of topics. And then we do keep those in a static archive. So it would be good to sort of also participate in some way to pull all those together.

And I will put in a little promotion.

I know Kelly will be speaking more at length this afternoon on that so I don't want to sort of steal her thunder on her presentation of that education programs coming on. And there's other things we're planning to do expanding the

education piece that we do at GPO at the FDLP looking more at curriculum development.

So again, we're very interested in getting involved with this and partnering. A couple years ago I know we had a chat with GPO which is a one-hour program we did. A lot of that ended up on the OPAL archive. Just to explain that is still there. You can still go and listen to those if you want.

But it seems like Help, I'm an Accidental Librarian has stepped into that one-hour monthly presentation gap that was left by OPAL. So it would be a good thing also to sort of think about pulling them, getting that sort of thing. So it seems like there's a lot out there. We're definitely interested in helping getting all this different stuff in one place to help folks out.

MR. DESSY: Good morning everyone. Good morning everyone. We need more energy than this. It's a small group, but we need some enthusiasm because this is an important topic, right? We had said that we were going to hold

questions for the speakers until the end of the program.

So we've heard from Steve. We've heard from Jesse. We heard from Mark whose running out the door. So are there questions for any of the three speakers? If you don't, I do. Yes, ma'am. Can you come to a microphone and announce your name and institution? I'm sorry.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: You're supposed to ask Council first.

MR. DESSY: I'm sorry. Can you hold that. Protocol, I'm supposed to ask Council first. So, Peggy.

MS. JARRET: Peggy Jarret,
University of Washington Law Library. I
thought this was really interesting and I really
appreciate all of the time that you have all put
into this.

And the question I have I actually wrote a note to Sue since she's on the committee and it's really for Debbie which is that and Helen and Blane, that I would love to see your

ideas going out to a broader audience maybe on govdoc-l to just really kind of get the communities input. Because obviously the forecast results have shown that this is really important.

And so I think spreading it to a really wide audience of people to find out what they want, not just the depository coordinators. But I think depository tax people who are interested in government information who follow the other Listservs. I know that my co-workers would be interested and they're also really creative with that acronym naming thing. So anyway, thank you.

MR. DESSY: Thank you. And Stephanie.

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Stephanie Braunstein, LSU. Recently there was a question posed on govdoc-1 which asked how do I go about finding opportunities and information about training? And many different answers were given.

And I guess what to me would be the

goal, the ultimate goal of all this and I would think that it would be appropriate for GPO to or the FDLP to be the one stop spot to list every single known opportunity for or, you know, resources for training. To be let's just go one place and it should be on, I guess we're not supposed to call it the Desk Top anymore, the FDLP web site. Thanks.

MR. DESSY: Thank you, Stephanie.

Are there any other questions or comments from Council, Shari.

MS. LASTER: Shari Laster, University of Akron. I have an iCohere question. The iCohere question I have is that the current way that the archives are set up looks, seems to be native to the iCohere software.

In other words it's set up this particular way because that's how iCohere works.

Is it possible to take the individual sessions from the iCohere archives and put them in something else?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy at GPO. Thanks

for that question, Shari. There are a couple possibilities. And yes, the information that's in iCohere can be extracted and put somewhere else. But the iCohere software as you've seen because you've mentioned it, does allow for a resource library.

And in fact we started to sort of try to test that with the PACER Access and Education curriculum material. So it hasn't gone very far with that yet. But we have been testing that. Excuse me, and so that is another possibility. But, yes, it can be extracted out.

Another possibility is to have whatever clearing house or registry that you all are imagining and putting together, thinking about putting together, things can be linked to the stuff that's in iCohere because the stuff that's there now, the videos for FDsys and the videos for this particular conference and those that we have for interagency are on a public accessible page. You don't have to log in.

MS. SEIFERT: Kelly Seifert, GPO.

Just to add to what Cindy said with the new

iteration of fldp.gov, we've been working with Karen's group to work on a training page that would essentially point everyone from one place to the recorded webinar's that we've done, the archives from iCohere, the videos that we're creating and then information about the FDsys curriculum and how it works.

And so just a one stop area because we've gotten that request a lot because we know the archives webinars for FDsys at least are a little bit hidden if you don't know where to go. So that's coming soon.

MR. BROWN: Sorry, Chris Brown, University of Denver. In an ideal world, it would great to have a system perhaps hosted by GPO, perhaps iCohere, perhaps not where a depository could go and say I need a room next week for a hundred people to sign up. And I want these archived afterwards. And not to get an act of Congress to get it to happen.

You know, many universities have these resources available to them. But smaller depositories do not. So I would like to see this

happen sooner rather than later. And how can that happen?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. One of the things that we have planned for in our procurement of iCohere is to allow activities just as you were talking about for depository librarians to come in and train their staff through our tool or have public webinars, whatever. But it is a tool for not only GPO to use with you all, but for you all to use with your constituencies as well.

We have enough licenses for every depository library to be a member of the site and to allow that kind of training and those kinds of resources. We're really just jumping in now with doing what we're doing with the proof of concept within our agency.

And what we're doing with this conference that I think from what I hear from Lance from iCohere, we're really walking out on that boardwalk now and we're ready to just about leap into those kinds of activities you're talking about. So that can happen and it will

happen.

As a matter of fact, we are going to be doing, Linda from the public health reports, we're going to do a follow-up webinar from the session from here on the public health report. So that's another way that we can extend what's happening here, but also use as a tool for us to train and you all to train and educate.

MR. DESSY: Thank you. Are there any other questions or comments from Council, Debbie.

MS. RABINA: Debbie Rabina, Pratt Institute. Just to follow-up on some of what Kelly and Mark were saying with the new Desk, the new fdlp.gov and the training tool and Karen's nodding to the registry option.

So what would it take to, I mean how feasible I guess it is to build on what you're creating there and to also add things that are created by the community because as we see we have so many places that are doing a lot of different types of training. And if we just want to have the one place that we can all go to

as Stephanie pointed out, how easy would it be or how doable would it be to create that?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. All of what you've been talking about is doable as Cindy indicated. What we have to do though is plot it out. What doesn't work well is to take this and this and this and mix them all together and make it happen.

What works well is we identify a process and I can tell you whose really good at doing that and prioritize and put forward recommendations. What's the next step? Realizing that everything that you're asking us to do is wonderful, but there's a cost. And Debbie, you kind of pointed out that the cost would be born by GPO.

No, the costs are born by the FDLP, which support all of you. So I'm being Robin, Ms. Realistic instead of Robin, this is my new unit and I'm really excited. There's a lot of enthusiasm at Cindy and Kelly and Mark and the rest of the team are very excited.

And one thing we forgot to mention when we were up yesterday was we have some jobs we're going to be posting. And one of them is a training/curriculum specialist to deal with some technicians or training specialists. I want a manager and then a couple of training specialists below that.

That will allow us to do a whole lot more than taking our folks off their really assigned duties and doing this as you all do other duties as assigned. So I would love to hear from Council your priorities. What is the highest priority of this? What can be linked together?

When you're saying linked together, we know that we can do links from our Desktop. Is that what you're asking or are you asking that a registry be built? Whose going to vet the submissions to the registry? You said that some of them would be looked at. Right now if the registry had digitization projects before we send authorization for somebody to do additions there, we actually validate that they're not a

for profit group.

They don't have to be at the govdocs librarian, but they do have to be related to a library and/or a digitization project, not for profit digitization project. And remember that at that level that's a collectionate. Are we doing collections? So it sounds like we're doing actual pieces here. So that may take a different validation structure.

So I'm really interested in hearing what are the most important pieces. And, Chris, I think we can do what you're talking about and I think we can do it in a pretty timely manner. But I want to make sure that what we're hearing is what you're wanting. As you started out you said, you know, education, education, training, training's been on the discussion agenda for years.

What hasn't been are the specifics. Steve gave us some specifics today of what he's training on and how detailed those are. And so again, taking training things from others, great idea. GPO does training, great idea. Get me

Robin.

me,

1 some details though so that we can work together 2 to have something at the next event. Thank you. 3 MR. DESSY: Thank you, 4 Stephanie. 5 MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Excuse 6 Stephanie Braunstein, LSU. And just to sort of 7 follow-up on what Robin just said and point to something else that was said earlier, there was 8 some suggestion that maybe partnerships could be created for this kind of thing. I guess what I'd like to know is if there is, let's just say that Chris wanted to 12 13 partner with GPO on this and you worked to build this registry. Would then where would the 14 registry actually be held, on whose servers? 15 16 And does it matter? 17 18

9

10

11

19

20

21

22

23

And, you know, that kind of thing because I think that might be the best way with staffing concerns at GPO and all of the other issues that make these things more difficult than we'd like them to be. Maybe that's the way to go.

> Thank you, Stephanie. MR. DESSY:

Arlene.

MS. WEIBLE: Hi, yes, I guess I kind of have a real opinion about the concept.

(Off microphone comment)

MS. WEIBLE: I'm sorry. Arlene Weible from the Oregon State Library. I think Jesse talking about the GODORT Handout Exchange is something we should really be listening to in terms of training materials have a shelf life. I really, really believe that.

And what worked for census training five years ago is not going to work today. So the concept of a repository or a registry that is something that's going to keep these training materials, you know, preserved. I don't think that's what we need. I think what we need is a really straightforward, easy link to what's out there.

And the more we talk about building registries and authentication and of submissions and such, that's infrastructure that takes time to build. It's really easy to put links on a web page. And I guess I would be

in favor of let's make this as easy as possible because the kinds of materials we're talking about do have a shelf life. They're not the things that we want to preserve forever and ever. So that's my opinion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. DESSY: Chris.

MR. BROWN: Chris Brown, University I really agree with that. of Denver. did the GT-21Government years ago we Information in the 21st Century. And we recorded, we didn't record, we had all the handouts placed on WebJunction. Those, that shelf life has expired. I suspect all those links are bad. I don't even want those handouts anymore.

So I really agree with that. I think what the priority really needs to be is a platform. A platform that can be used today by depository libraries. Yes, it's nice if we can have a place where they can be recorded like we did with six state virtual conference, but that shelf life might be a year. So we really need a platform for depositories that can't afford

Adobe Connect or some of these nice features to use tomorrow in a webinar.

MR. DESSY: Thank you, Chris. Are there any other comments? Sue.

MS. LYONS: I think that, Sue Lyons, Rutgers Law Library. First, I want to thank GPO for the really good work that they've done in creating some videos on searching FDsys for example. I'd love to see more of that.

In terms of a registry, I do think it's possible to construct this so that most of the work is done by the submitters and not by GPO. If you have a form where you list what type of media. Is this a video? Is this some sort of webinar? Is it a text document? That could help in sorting it.

You put a date on it so that you know if it's stale. You put some key words in so that it's easily searchable. You put a description in. So basically if many of the submitters are coming from the library community we're pretty good at metadata. We can handle this. And the form can do 90 percent of the work.

census data to me.

But there's wonderful content out there that we're not harvesting. I totally want that video that your LIS students are doing at Pratt. I want a video of Steve explaining

We're doing a conference on the census in New Jersey and we're planning on video taping those sessions so that we can contribute them to our training repository if it exists or at least use it in New Jersey for people who couldn't make it to the conference. So I think that there's a real opportunity here.

We see from the forecast there's a hunger for training materials. We have the capacity to provide it and GPO can be that central one stop shopping place for good, reliable training materials.

MR. DESSY: Thank you. Rosemary.

MS. LASALA: Rosemary LaSala, St. John's University Law Library. I think it's all a great idea. My issue is that I've looked at training materials that other people have done and I would never use them, ever.

б

And there just really has to be a way that you can work through this to either ask people that you know are knowledgeable on their subjects or somebody's really going to be having to check what comes in to be put on this registry because like I said I've, you know, taught undergrad students and law students and looked at what's been out there. And it's very scary.

So something that I think we're going to put forward that we want people to look at really has to be something that we think is, you know, that we would personally use ourselves. That's my only nerve.

MR. DESSY: Mark.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mark Phillips,
University of North Texas. Just to kind of echo
one thing that Arlene said, you know, we keep
talking about easy ways to get content into the
registry. Whose vetting it to say that, you
know, FDsys changed their entire search system
all of those aren't valid anymore? This other
agency changed their entire search system, all
of this is invalid or is no longer valid.

think there is also 1 So Ι 2 management piece to say who's going to be looking at all of this stuff that we're, you know, 3 4 collecting through a registry to say this is no longer relevant and this is no longer there? 5 6 it going to be those same people that put in on 7 there? I don't see that happening. Thank you. Debbie. 8 MR. DESSY: Debbie Rabina, Pratt 9 MS. RABINA: 10 Institute. Again, if we're looking at this as some kind of like a partnership that has part of 11 editorial team, which doesn't 12 it an 13 necessarily all have to be GPO. It could be either some Council people or you know, LIS or 14 This could be something that an 15 whoever. 16 editorial team could probably, a role that they could take on as well. 17 Thank you. Stephanie. 18 MR. DESSY: 19 MS. BRAUNSTEIN: One more. 20 MR. DESSY: One more then I'm going to have to turn it over to the audience. 21

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Right, okay, I know. Just, Stephanie Braunstein, LSU. And in

22

23

terms of whether or not the, every bit of the material that's accessed through this clearing house is up to the minute perfect. I think that there, that you can just cover that. Pardon my saying so. It may sound a bit sloppy.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But I think you do need to have some kind of disclaimer information on any resource you would be using indicating that before you use any of this training material you need to check it. You have some responsibility to look at it yourself.

MR. DESSY: Okay. And last but not least, Helen.

Helen Burke, Hennepin MS. BURKE: County Library. I guess I'd love to address the issue of involving Jesse GODORT as representative here, representative of professional association, that, their role may well suit the need for vetting, if you will, or what we've called editorial control or somehow saying, verifying that the topic, the training material that's submitted may be timely or of professional value.

1 I know that GODORT is one of the 2 professional associations that might be able to help in this process. I see that as something 3 4 that is ideally suited to the professional association such AALL or I don't know SLA or 5 6 whatever, more so than I would have an 7 expectation that GPO would do that. Okay. Really one last 8 MR. DESSY: comment from DLC because we're running out of 9 time and we have audience members. 10 MS. BURKE: Could Jesse just say 11 something in reply --12 13 MR. DESSY: -- Jesse. We can look into 14 MR. SILVA: Sure. 15 this. 16 MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Whenever I hear this it's like I harken Dame. 17 back to whenever I ask my faculty what would you 18 19 want. They go well I want more databases. And then you go fine, which ones did you have in mind? 20 But I want more databases. 21 Ιf 22 GODORT is voluntary а

organization, the reason that the update, it has

23

gone stale is because you don't have volunteers
who are willing to go in and do this. The only
person who can validate whether this is useful,
authoritative and everything else is the person
that's going to use it.

So I think the information the GPO is seeking is what would you like us to do to allow us to accomplish what you want to accomplish. And this is nailing jello to the wall also. And I think that it is, get the content in there. We have to make it visible. Whether it's good, schlock or whatever is certainly up to the individual who is going to use it.

But at least we begin to put it one place that it's easily done. I think the idea of self-description, et cetera is all perfect. The only person who can say am I going to use this is going to be me. And you know, so I think mechanism is what I'm hearing from Robin in terms of tell us what you'd like in terms of a mechanism to get what do you want in here.

And I think that's going to be the

б

key. After that it's going to have to be self-sustaining where like all of us, you know, I read some content and you never use it, it's aged out. Well, you know, okay. So it will scroll off the screen, we'll never do that again.

MR. DESSY: Thank you. Okay. Now I'm taking control of the mike because we've had at least one person waiting patiently to ask a question or make a comment. Ma'am, you're number one. Please come back to the mike.

MS. AMEN: Thank you. And it's okay. I think everything's been very interesting. Kathy Amen, St. Mary's University. I have a couple of comments.

One is I think if you decide you need to have things vetted don't take too long to make, to get into that process. I kind of think you could find volunteers to form a committee who could do this. Like, you know, as moderators of the LISTSERV, you know, you take turns doing it. I think it could be done.

Also I would like to urge you to not be too restrictive about how, what kinds of

things are up there. Hour long sessions are really great, but lots of times you don't have time to sit for an hour. At our institution we have access to something Atomic Learning. Is anybody familiar with that? It's for tech questions.

You can sit through an hour and a half thing on it about Excel. But if all you really need to know is how to format cells in Excel you can go to a two-minute thing. And I think we need both the big, long overviews. But we also need little snippets if people can develop those.

So don't be, don't make whatever we're going to end up with so restrictive that it will not allow for a variety of content. That would just be my suggestion.

MR. DESSY: Thank you. Next please.

MS. HALE: Kathy Hale, State Library of Pennsylvania. A couple of things. Many of the FDLP libraries are academic. I am asking you to remember the public libraries.

You had a large audience there that talked about students, that talked about non-depositories to try and put in your metatags whether it is basic information, how do I just get to the census information because there are students out there that may be computer literate but not information literate. So that they're

I am part of Browse Topics so that you can, there's very easy ways for the people who are putting in that information to do those different tags. So that to, because you're trying to get to a very wide variety of information users to try and tag it according to all of those users that you are going to do.

used to clicking on one place to go to have some

of those levels.

I also want to say as a state library we have mechanisms in place through, and Arlene has talked about this a little bit, with library development already part of many state libraries, departments of education who are crying for content. And so there are many organizations already in place that will get

that information out there for us if we allow them to do that.

MR. DESSY: Thank you. Next.

MS. FISHER: Hi, I am Janet Fisher,
Arizona State Library Archives and Public
Records. And I would like to see the State
Focused Action Plans fit in this in some way. I
know our plan as well as our state plan, include
educating our depository people and educating
our non-depository people.

Instead of having this State Focused Action Plan out there just as a document, it's almost doing an accountability thing. Tell us what your state has done during the year to act on this action plan.

So that may be a part of it. And that will populate a registry or whatever. And you know, why don't we review this material, review it not necessarily as an editorial board, but like Angie's List. You know, if it's useful it gets higher.

And please don't get, don't shelve, well that's, there's a shelving tool that I

dearly love and for years I've had my staff use it. And it's interactive. And it's on the GODORT site. I love it. So I'll review it highly. Okay. Thanks.

MR. DESSY: Yes, name and institution, please.

MS. SINCLAIR: Hi, I'm Gwen Sinclair, with the University of Hawaii at Manoa. I've just been thinking about a lot of different things as I've heard everybody speak. And one point I want to make is I've always appreciated the GODORT Handout Exchange.

However, most of the depository coordinators in our state are not members of ALA, they're not members of GODORT. So I would like to see some kind of platform or registry that is not tied to membership in a professional organization.

As far as what sort of characteristics a model would need to have, it has to be sustainable. So I'm concerned that if it relies upon a volunteer it's going to be difficult to maintain it as we have seen happen

with so many different projects over the years.

And I do think it needs to be vetted somehow.

So I think maybe having a rating system would work because if you have a training module or a video that everybody rates highly than you could kind of be assured that it was a pretty good one instead of just being something that somebody did for a class project or for their tenure dossier. Thanks.

MS. ORLANDO: Hi, I'm Lucia Orlando, University of California Santa Cruz. And I had just had a couple of points to add on with what I've heard so far. First of all I am a strong proponent of short and sweet.

A good example is the Kahn Academy.

I don't know if anyone has children in elementary school. But it's a great place to just go and get a very short video on how something works or how a math concept goes along.

It's a very organized site and it makes finding what you need really simple. And I know government information doesn't fit in those neat boxes. But it is something that's

important. I think it might work as generating some ideas.

Secondly, I'd like to say we're a big community. We have a lot of needs that we need to meet and I don't think that any one approach is going to solve everything. So I am pleased to see this conversation occurring and I think it needs to occur more widely. Too a disclaimer, I am part of the GODORT Education Committee and it's something I am very excited about.

So I hear your point about the ALA membership being a barrier. But I think that doesn't necessarily have to be so. I think it's pretty easy to expose that information in a way that is more public.

And secondly with education we're talking about educating ourselves. We're also talking about educating other libraries, I'm sorry, other librarians. And I'm in a situation where a lot of librarians are retiring and I'm finding myself taking on other subjects in addition to government information.

1 Ι want to insert government 2 information into classes that I'm doing for subjects that I'm not necessarily fluent in. 3 So 4 it is helpful to have maybe something along the lines of tips and tricks of if you have suddenly 5 6 taken on politics and you weren't doing politics 7 before. Or you're taking on urban planning, you weren't doing urban planning before, how would 8 you put government information in there? 9

think that might be helpful.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

As government information librarians as we take on other roles because I can tell you I think government information librarians at our institutions because we have such a wide variety of knowledge because we work with government information, it makes us ripe for the picking for other subject areas.

Lastly, Debbie Rabina, you were wanting some names. So I came up with a goofy one. And you have to forgive me, I'm still jet lagged from California. So maybe it's that California air. But I like to think of government information really being and

government information librarians being the glue around how basically, how the government works for you.

So I thought GLUE might be actually an appropriate acronym. So six o'clock tonight I might feel differently. But I thought maybe Government Librarian User Education might have some snappiness to it. So like I said, six o'clock tonight I might feel differently and you might too. But thank you for hearing me out.

MR. DESSY: Thank you. What I'm hearing is that there's a sense of urgency about doing something and I'll leave it just at something. And that anything that's done I think is going to have to be done incrementally. You know, nothing is born fully developed. So maybe the question is what are the priorities. Which takes me back, because I was going to try and bring the conversation back to Debbie's major points this morning. And you know, whatever you'd like to comment on.

But I also maybe have a question for you. And the first point that Debbie was trying

to make today is who is the audience. We talk about training, training, training. Well that covers a lot of territory.

So in the sake of prioritization, if you wanted to get something up and running whose your primary audience? Who should it be? Sir. Name, institution, your comments and then maybe you can respond to that query.

MR. IVERSON: Well now you're putting me on the spot. David Iverson, Minot State University, Minot, North Dakota. I was just going to say that this might be a wonderful topic for a session at next year's FDLP meeting in terms of people who have had success putting together such new on line instruction tools to demonstrate to those of us who attend next year's meeting.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Do you have any thoughts on either the audience or the type of structure? Debbie had gone on to talk about a repository, a clearing house an all in one.

MR. IVERSON: Well we serve a wide variety of audiences since we are a wide variety

of types of libraries. I think it's difficult to come up with a one size fits all model. But if we could come up with a model that's flexible and adaptable to different types of audiences.

If one of us hits upon that like our colleague who just came up with this wonderful acronym of GLUE. Well then that's something we should share with ourselves and each other in as many different venues as possible via e-mail or GODORT or govdoc-l or the FDLP web site, however different ways that we can via e-mail with, you know, blank carbon copy or carbon copy or whatever it happens to be.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Sorry for putting you on the spot.

MR. IVERSON: That's quite all right. I'm used to it.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Thank you.

MS. HALE: Kathy Hale, State Library of Pennsylvania. I think we have one of the models already from the western states, the six states that got together that they trained depository librarians.

But then those depository
librarians trained non-depository librarians.

And that seems to have worked really well in, to
take a Reaganistic type of view of a trickle down
theory of you train a trainer to train another
trainer to train another trainer.

MR. DESSY: Okay. So are you saying that the first priority should be to train current depository librarians?

MS. HALE: I think the triage should be training especially those new librarians that are just coming out of library school with people who have been in the profession for a number of years. We have quite a wide variety of expertise already.

And that if we're training these new people then they also can go out with all their fresh energy to train as well as us training non-depository librarians also teachers, parents and students that expanding it to the whole population since that is who we are really serving.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Any particular

model that Debbie mentioned that appealed to you more than others? We already had a lot of comment about registry and vetting and things like that. Any thoughts on that?

MS. HALE: As a person at a state level, I really like the idea of a one stop registry that I can from my page have a link to if you want training or if you want training materials go here.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Chris Brown, University of Denver. Thanks for those comments. Yes, during the GI-21 program which really trickled down into the virtual conferences, we made an overt effort to go out to rural areas of the six states in the west.

I remember going to Ignacio,
Colorado near the Indian reservation and
training librarians who are not depository
librarians but who wanted to receive this
information. Nothing was so exciting as
getting out there and seeing non-depository

librarians getting excited by this. So that's really, you really encapsulated the model that we've been trying to do in the west.

MR. DESSY: Ma'am, your name and institution.

MS. TROTTA: Ma'am. I love it.

Tory Trotta, Arizona State University College of

Law. This has been a great stimulating

conversation and I have a lot to say which I'll

put in an e-mail. But in addition to all of the

ideas, I really like the registry idea.

I don't think we need to focus a priority on a particular audience because I think that the community and the resources naturally focus on different clientele. I could probably do some, I do training for students. I would not be as good training for the public or for non-depository librarians.

I do have another idea to throw into the mix. And I would also counsel everyone that the perfect should not be the enemy of the good. That you can start if you, I agree it could be incremental, that maybe the registry would

start.

There's a lot of talent, there's a lot of stuff out there already. The GPO stuff is really great and then build on that. But my idea is to while we're doing that, is to actually come up with a curriculum of what training tidbits are needed, not a workshop but smaller items. Whether it's a tool or it's a process or whatever.

And the model for this is CALI, the Computer Aided Legal Instruction. When they are working on, they bring experts together, in this case it would be documents librarians. And they work with a topic. And they come up with an outline of topics. And then they farm out the preparation of small tutorials.

And that comes to be, and then you put out the word. And maybe you give a certificate. They give a prize every year for the best tutorial. And I think, and there are people on the panel that know about this model that I think it would be worth looking at as a way, as a second phase to start to systematically

build content knowing that there are some currency issues. They do go out of date.

But generally working with the FDsys, it's working with the FDsys, working with digest, working with the Federal Register, et cetera. So anyway, it's a great discussion. Good luck because it's a big project.

MR. DESSY: Thank you very much. Robin from GPO.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: To tie into a couple of things that have been said, in the State Focused Action Plan there was actually one comment that said mentor and train the new coordinators before the old ones retire. I mean that was an action that was mentioned.

And that's what I'm hearing in various ways here. So I do look forward to Council coming back to GPO with some recommendations on this or a recommendation that together we can move something farther forward. I like Tory's idea of okay, let's start and then phase in.

I'm going to go look at CALI. I

haven't been there in quite some time. And so any ideas that you in the audience have that you haven't been able to share it's jsanchez@GPO, no. I'm on the list of GPO folks, I think it's a separate sheet in your handout packet.

Please do share that information with us. We truly want to expand this. And this is the first time I think that we've actually gotten some very specific, doable pieces put forward and I appreciate that. So thank you for putting this together.

MR. DESSY: Well thanks to Debbie and the rest of the crew. Are there any other comments or questions? Can I say a couple of things as a member of Council? Can I step out of my moderator role for a moment? Shari is now taking delight in torturing me about time.

Actually I've heard a lot of really interesting things this morning. Let me see if I can give you my perspective. One is talking about iCohere which is sort of a technology platform which has the potential to be of use to depository librarians for training, right?

I mean regardless of what, anything else that may go on or not go on, there is 2 actually sort of a neutral technology platform 3 4 that could be rolled out for people to use that a depository library could make use of to do 5 6 whatever, well not whatever, but what's

7 permissible. So I thought that was really

interesting that there's now a platform to use

that didn't exist before.

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I was really encouraged to hear about staffing at GPO and the fact that you might be putting some staffing onto this. And I think it would be really interesting to have some discussions about well what's going to be in those PDs in terms of trying to move this agenda forward or trying to talk about that knowing that's your role.

But also just the sense of starting maybe smaller and growing bigger and the It sounds like there are a partnerships thing. lot of people who know a lot about what needs to be done and partnering with GODORT or LIS schools.

1 So maybe we can ask that at the next 2 conference there be sort of a more fully developed plan for this as to what's going to 3 4 occur and really put some meat on the bones that 5 people can take home with them. We have about 6 one minute left. So any last comments from Council? 7 8 MS. LASTER: Shari Laster, University of Akron. We may also be able to use 9 10 iCohere to hold a discussion on this topic at some point that would let, that would happen some 11 time before October 13 and would let folks, give 12 13 opportunity feedback more for and 14 participation. You could do a webinar 15 MR. DESSY: 16 on this. MS. ETKIN: Well I can sit down now. 17 No, no come back. 18 MR. DESSY: 19 You've got 30 seconds so you have to be succinct. Cindy Etkin, GPO. 20 MS. ETKIN: was just going to offer what you all have just 21

I'd be glad to set up a webinar for

discussion on just this topic so that we do not

22

23

said.

1	have to wait until next October because people
2	are crying out for this stuff. They need it now
3	and the faster that we can get going and
4	delivering something whether phased in
5	incrementally, we can do it.
6	MR. DESSY: Okay. So we know
7	there's an urgency. And now there's a
8	commitment among this group to respond to that
9	urgent need. I think it's ten o'clock. Thank

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 10:00 a.m. and went back on the record at 10:35 a.m.)

Thank you, Council. Have a nice day.

MS. JARRET: Welcome to the sustainability working group session, how to succeed with little or nothing, ideas for federal depository libraries.

I'm Peggy Jarret from the University of Washington Law Library, and I'll be your moderator. The other members of the working group are Steve Beleu, and Marie Concannon, who is our timekeeper.

So it's no secret that times are hard

you all.

and resources are scarce. We are living in a time of doing more with less. We have fewer staff, we have flat or smaller budgets, we have less space. We are expected to make it work with what we have.

So today's program is intended to be a conversation with our panel, with counsel and with all of you. And we really hope to share ideas and stories. And our goal is that by the sharing of our ideas and stories, we'll be able to keep calm and carry on.

Our three panelists are all librarians who've managed to survive, and maybe even thrive. First, we have Cass Hartnett.

Cass is the U.S. Documents and Women's Studies librarian at the University of Washington's Suzzallo Library, which is about a 95 percent selective depository.

Along with her U.S. Docs and selector duties, Cass is an adjunct lecturer at the information school, teaching government publications.

She's an author of the wonderful

book, Fundamentals of Government Information.

She has served as GODORT chair and she co-founded the Northwest Government Information Network.

Next we have Janet Fisher. Janet is the director of the Law and Research Library at the Arizona State Library Archives and Public Records. She serves as regional depository librarian and state law librarian.

Until this week, Janet also held the position of acting state librarian for Arizona, an 18 month assignment. She served on the Depository Library Council early in her career.

She has been active in the depository community, most particularly at the state and regional level.

She plans, coordinates and sometimes presents at the five state and the six state virtual government information conference. Janet is also a member of the ALA committee on legislations FDLP task force.

Finally, we have Robbie Sittel, government documents and research librarian at the Tulsa City County Library. Robbie is an

active participant in GODORT, and the Oklahoma Library Association.

She also serves as a member of the ALA Committee on Legislations FDLP task force, and works closely with the Oklahoma Department of Libraries to offer workshops and programs that inform librarians of the value of government information.

So I'm pretty sure, those are kind of long introductions, but I wanted to make it clear that they really do keep calm and carry on and make it work and do a million things at a time.

So in preparation for this session,
Marie and Steve and I asked our panelists to talk
about five different areas. We asked them to talk
about staff, space and collections, reference
and public service, advocating to
administrators and sort of what they think the
future holds.

We sent them some questions ahead of time to get them to start thinking. We wanted to send them some food for thought. We did not

send them that little tiny cake on the fork, however.

We're really interested to hear.

And what we're going to do is we're going to go
through each of those five categories. And they
each have three minutes to speak, and Marie is
going to keep time.

Then after the three of them talk, we're going to open this up to questions and discussion from council and the floor. And we really do want this to be interactive. Everybody has a story. Sometimes they're good stories, sometimes they're bad stories.

But hopefully they're educational stories that might be instructive and that people can take back to their institutions and think, you know, this is something that maybe I could do.

Some people don't like to come to the microphone. That can be a barrier. And so we have another option, which is David Iversen, would you mind standing up, from North Dakota is going to collect index cards.

He has some index cards. There's also some in the back if you wanted to pretend that you were going to get water and pick up an index card.

You can write down your question or whatever on the index card. And then David will come to the microphone and read them anonymously. So that's just another option in case that you don't want to come up to the microphone.

Okay, all right. Topic number one is staff. So we asked our three panelists, has your staffing situation changed? How have you adjusted?

How does the change effect depository services? Do you still have dedicated government information staff? And what aren't you doing anymore?

Now they don't have to answer every single one of these questions because, as we said, everybody has a story that's different. But this was what they were presented with. So now I'm going to give it to our panel, starting

with Cass.

MS. HARTNETT: Well Peggy, our staffing has completely changed over the past seven years. We've gone from having five government documents librarians down to 1.5 to two FTE depending on how you count.

So we were a classic large ARL. And the five were myself with federal documents, and then an international docs librarian, state and local docs librarian, foreign docs librarian, and then we had a projects librarian.

So those were the five. And the 1.5 to two are me, but now I've got two other selection areas I do. So I'm really only 0.75. I know, it's like you add us all up.

My boss, who was the international docs librarian, is only working four days a week. He's in phased retirement. So he's 0.8. And our state and local docs librarian who retired, we have our political science, public affairs librarian doing state and local docs. So that's the other little bit that could take it up to two.

The other change is we used to have

a lot of graduate students working with us, library science graduate students. Sometimes as many as four who would work for us 15 hours a week.

Now we only have one library science graduate student. Our technical staffing has stayed about the same with three FTE technical staff.

We've even lost some of our sort of student shelver, student assistant, undergraduate level. So yes, a lot of changes there.

An adjustment that we've made, change in the culture. We're using a lot more sort of what our library science program calls directed field work students who are doing a 100 hour internship for credit.

We have people approaching us wanting to do unpaid internship and volunteer opportunities. So that's pretty different from a labor perspective.

And how has this affected our depository services? Well, we also are at a

merge service point. So it used to be when you kind of walked into our area, it wasn't completely clear where the gov docs stacks were.

Now it's not clear at all. We're much further down. We're sort of, like, I always say like an airport hallway away from where our stack area is. So there's a little bit of a disconnect there.

What are we not doing anymore is probably the hardest question. My former boss, Eleanor Chase, who retired would do very, very detailed census reference. And I feel like we probably aren't doing that level anymore.

MS. FISHER: Okay, another perspective. In the State Library in Arizona, we had merged all of our reference areas pretty much several years ago. So all of our reference librarians do documents questions.

There are experts who know a little bit more that can handle the in depth. But all the reference librarians do basic documents questions. And that's six and a half people.

Back in 2008 when the economic

downturn started, our agency, which is the State
Library Archives and Public Records lost ten
people. Our library lost six, three to
retirement, three were let go.

One of those six people was our clerk in federal documents. We were able to get clerk time back because we started sharing a clerk with our acquisitions area.

You know, in a downturn, acquisitions doesn't get much. So that was actually a good relationship. And so we also have, for a few years, been able to hire a contractor on grant funds who only puts in maybe 16 hours a week.

She's a former gov docs librarian and used to come to these meetings. She was at a public library. And so that has continued until this year.

Well, let me also say, we had two of our reference librarians who retired within the last year who were very good at in depth reference questions, in depth government documents reference questions.

So they retired within the last year. And we've been building up the others to kind of fill that role. Our current staffing has me, the director of the library continuing as the regional librarian, but being the fall back with most knowledge on in depth fed docs reference questions.

A library associate who does the tech services and collection maintenance, and the half clerk.

We do serve the regional responsibility. We house the listserve for our depositories, and we have a webpage for information. So we do information, we do information sharing.

Our state plan created a depository library council. And the regional always serves as chair or vice chair. And the good thing is there's another person there.

There's another depository person who is either the chair or vice chair. And so as I get bogged down, or things need to be done, there is a person out there to help. So I used

my time. On to Robbie.

MS. SITTEL: Thanks. I'm the public library perspective. And we actually have not gone through any major staff changing. I think we are unique in public libraries that our funding is relatively secure.

We haven't seen any loss of services or collections as a result of loss of funding.

Our budget is flat, as well, but we haven't experienced any great losses yet.

Our documents department is part of our research center, which is at our main library downtown and serves, I like to call it the brain hub of the system.

So any general reference questions will come through our department. Our docs staff is me, and I have a part time clerk who does all of our cataloguing and processing.

But I think because we are part of our main reference department, most of our staff is well versed in government documents and government information, as well, which I think is a great thing.

As such, I do try to educate new staff about our collection and government information, our services. Now I've missed my

place in my notes, sorry.

We have had some staff turnovers, so that's always a challenge to get people to recognize that they are using government information when they're answering their general reference questions.

Well, when I took over documents five years ago, my predecessor did not really work the reference desk, with the exception of Fridays when we were short staffed, other times like that.

I am, and I do have 20 hours on the desk each week, which is a lot, but I love it.

I would not trade it for the world. It's the best part of my job in all honesty, because then I get to tell people about docs.

So as such, my predecessor also was completely over docs. I do have collection responsibilities for our legal and our public administration collections in the general

1 reference. So that has changed a bit.

I think that as far as changes, she offered a lot of trainings to the general public. And I have not done as much of that. I do partner closely with Steve to go out into the state and educate other librarians about government information.

So that's a little bit just how the position has morphed since I took over. And what else? Trying to -- am I done? Okay, sorry. Thanks. That's a quick three minutes.

MS. JARRET: Three minutes can seem like an eternity, or the blink of an eye. All right, so topic two is collections and space.

We asked our panelists have your documents outgrown your space? Have you been asked to shrink your collection? Are you planning to convert to more virtual collecting?

How are you handling competing formats and competing needs for physical space? So take it away, Cass.

MS. HARTNETT: We're not running out of space in the sense that our tangible

documents still fit in our stack area. And we have some remote storage areas, so no we're not running out of space.

But yes, in a way, because documents work as we move forward, I think is going to involve continued sort of sifting and manipulation of these tangible collections, and that requires surge space and staging space.

And that's what we really don't have. So when we get gifts of opportunity, when a federal agency that's local downsizes or when Seattle Public Library downsizes radically and we get many, many boxes of materials that we decide to take, we really don't have a place to put that stuff.

And I'm seeing nods, so I know that that resonates with other libraries, whether you're a large ARL, academic library, or any library.

Have we been asked to shrink our collection? No, but like when we had to reconfigure our space two years ago, we had to move our microfiche into sort of off site remote

areas.

So that's been interesting. We did join the Hathi Trust last year. So that is sort of how I will answer the digital part of the question.

Our membership in that organization does help inform collection decisions when we're looking at maybe taking in more stuff, physical stuff.

If we look and see that it's already been digitized on Hathi, we consider that a use copy. We're not inclined to take on more physical items that are already represented there.

Keep in mind, we're not a regional, yet.

MS. JARRET: Just say yes.

MS. HARTNETT: Just say yes. Oh goodness. Are we doing more digital collecting? Yes, yes. That's our future. So we are helping contribute to the Hathi Trust through digitization that's been okayed by our regional.

We're contributing our technical reports, some of them pretty interesting and rare, to that trail project, which is a certified partner within Hathi.

And as we look forward to sort of commercial things that we buy, our partners there in the lobby are wonderful, vendors there in the lobby.

Those commercial collections that we buy, of course, we're looking strictly virtual now. I don't think we're acquiring tangible sets anymore through those folks.

Yes, I'm done. I've got so much more I can say.

MS. FISHER: Okay, do we have space issues? We have some, although we had an archives building built a couple of years ago.

And I said archives because it is mostly archives.

Those materials moved out, and then we got to move some materials we had in off site storage into the space they vacated. We had put it in off site storage in boxes.

Q

And part of the good thing with that is we catalogued all the things we sent. So we actually set big sets, indexed medicas, official gazette, Government Reports and Announcements in Index, GRANI.

And so when we brought them back, we kept them in boxes. The archives left their shelving behind. It's box shelving, so we used it.

So what we have done is we've kind of looked at things in a two pronged effort. One thing is we try and get duplicates of Arizona related federal documents and store one copy in our archives so that, you know, we'll have it in future years for us to use.

If our one in our building, our main use copy deteriorates, we've got something to bring out. We also put some effort, not lots and lots of effort, but some effort into digitizing or harvesting Arizona related federal publications and putting them on our website in our Arizona memory project, which poster session. Come and visit.

We still get all formats. We weed paper as much as we can. If we can keep the microfiche. And we are a regional, so we have to keep a tangible copy. So it makes for using more space, but we're okay right now.

Our tangible copies do serve as the backup for any of our selectives who are mostly electronic. Not a high use thing, but we are the safety net.

Our challenge is that we're in a legislative building. So we have to justify why we are in that building. And we have had to justify it almost every year.

When they funded the archives building, they think we all moved out. That's wrong. So we remind them. So they would like our space back.

Lucky thing, our shelving, most of our shelving but not all is part of the ceiling and part of the floor. So who cares about our offices, but our shelving will stay there.

We also really appreciate the legal requirements document that GPO has put together

recently. The instructions to depository libraries used to do that.

The handbook did not give us the support we needed to go to the legislature and say here's why we have to do this. The legal requirements document does that.

We have also, in the past few years, I'll do fast, had to put together a justification of how much it would cost to return our documents collection to GPO.

And we did the how much it would cost to list everything out, to hire people to list it, to have a workstation for them. To mail them back to GPO.

So we were kind of beyond reality, but sort of. And it was in the millions of dollars, and that really helped us. Okay, thank you.

MS. SITTEL: That's okay, sorry.

Our library is actually planning for a big renovation. So we have been asked to weed all circulating and reference collections by 25 percent, and the docs collection by half.

And it's painful. But luckily I
have librarians that I work with that are old
school and new school. So they kind of offer the
balance between it's all digital or please keep
this.

So it's been helpful in the decisions of what to deaccession. We've also looked at what's available at other depositories in our community, how accessible those are to the general public.

You know, it's nice to have a university library in the town that is also a depository. But it's private and it's not friendly to the general public.

So we, as a public library, feel like it is our duty to maintain access to all. So we've considered that greatly, or I have considered that greatly in what we are considering for disposal.

We also, of course, are receiving fewer tangible items. I think it's the nature of information right now. So by default, tangible collections are diminishing.

We've not yet been formally asked to go from a tangible collection to an electronic collection. I'm hopeful that we're not. But anything's possible.

And we are looking greatly at format as well as we are deaccessioning items. So DVDs, CD-Roms, we don't have the infrastructure in our technology to really support those things. Our IT department is resistant.

So those are things that we consider first for disposal. That's pretty much all I have. So worked out.

MS. JARRET: Well, this was not part of our plan, but after listening to Blane for the past few days, I feel like I need to say what I heard. Sorry.

So I just heard some really interesting things. That they're using off site storage, using the GPO's legal requirements document, using the cost to deaccession, not just the cost to keep.

And I, particularly, as a more seasoned librarian, liked hearing that we're

still useful. That using both the newer librarian's perspective and the old school librarian's perspective. So thanks for that.

All right, so our next topic is reference. So we asked is the way that you do reference changed? Are you using social media tools? Are you cross training other staff to do reference?

Are you offering eGovernment services to your congressional district? Are you doing more or less reference, whether it be traditional or non-traditional reference?

MS. HARTNETT: Well, yes. It's all changing, of course. And I think that the trend line for traditional in person references is down in almost every sector, is in a downward movement in most libraries.

At our merged reference point, and again, we did this two years ago and it's government publications, maps, microforms and newspapers. So we call ourselves Gov McMaps now.

You know, the plus side is I do more

integrative reference now. I've been learning,

particularly, about the riches of newspapers and

historical newspapers, the fabulous connections

4 between that content and government content.

So that's the plus side. Yes, we did some cross training when we did our tribal merge. We had some structured training for all of us in maps, microforms, government publications.

But since that time, we haven't really continued structured training. So I don't think it's the case always that when someone walks in cold to the library and asks a government publications question at that merge desk that they really, we kind of joke around that they've got about a 30 to 50 percent chance of getting somebody who really has some parlance in government publications.

So there's usually referral to a gov pubs library. And we do a lot of chat and email reference. That's a big part of what we do, particularly interactive chat through question point.

And then contact through our online
guides is another way that people reach us. I
know that's true for most people here.

EGovernment services was part of your question
and we don't really see a lot of action in that

area as an academic library.

We do a little of that around taxes, around immigration. We help people sort of navigate the immigration forms while being very careful not to offer legal advice. And state and local services, as well, we do a tiny bit. But just not a lot.

One trend I've noticed in our sort of virtual digital age that we're in are people who live locally, but they're registered students at another institution, probably taking a digital class. But yet, we're literally their home library.

And so it gets into some questions of, like, do I do a half hour consultation with someone who is, you know, in school in California but lives three blocks away?

MS. FISHER: Okay, our state

library,	law	and	resea	arch	lib	rary	has	four	major
collecti	070	т	~~ 4	<u>.</u>		0 00	- -	1 142	

Four major collections, federal documents depository, the state documents depository, we are the largest collection in our state, we are the state law library, and we have a large genealogy collection.

We have databases to fill the gaps, but those are our basic collections. And there's a lot of overlap between those collections. We have fed docs that fit in all of them.

And it becomes transparent, at least to most of the staff. There is more and more on the web, so there's a lot of usage on that. We do have decreased reference usage.

I like to think that people are finding things on the web, and hopefully finding good things on the web instead of calling us or coming in.

So that's where we put our efforts to put a lot out. All of our reference librarians, or all of our librarians do

reference, including our cataloguers.

Most of our librarians have been hired in the last five years, so there are a few that can do in depth. I talked about that a little bit earlier.

We do in house training for them, not lots, but some. And recently they started a WordPress several page subject guide thing that includes all of our areas. And it's meant for in house use so that they teach each other the depth of the different subjects.

There's not a lot that we're doing at this point with social media. But I anticipate that will increase with the start of our new state librarian.

We are still strong on face to face.
We have service points in both House and Senate
research areas, which for us, was a coup to get
over there.

And we use that. We learn the staff, we learn the secretaries for the legislators. We do as much face to face as we can with state agencies.

U

In fact, we used to be a legislative agency. About three years ago, we changed and became an agency or a division of the Secretary of State's office.

And so Secretary of State had been the chair of our library board. He was the President of the Senate. He knows our value. His staff started using us.

The thing that caught them was we have digitized Attorney General's opinions for our state on our site. But then they started calling us for other things like an old Congressional record that was not on the web.

Got it for them in 15 minutes. Took it directly to their office. They were thrilled.

Legislators become heads of agencies. When I go back, I have a one on one training session with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, which is the head of our Department of Education. Opportunities like that that build.

MS. SITTEL: Okay, well I have to

say that our reference has definitely not decreased. I actually brought some stats because public librarians like to justify our existence with statistics.

So in August of this year, our reference department answered 727 questions in person, these are reference questions, 692 questions over the phone and we had 843 non reference service type questions.

And of those reference questions, both phone and in person, I calculated that we had about six percent of those being just government information questions.

So that's not a bad percentage. And it is, you know, subject to human error because we are just hashmarking. We're so technical.

And we do have a new library director, and he likes to tell everybody when they say libraries are old hat, they're not useful anymore.

And he likes to quote that our traffic is up, our circulation is up, clearly our reference is up. We do also have, in our

1	library, an Ask Us service which is a call in
2	service.
3	So we answered 6,250 questions by
4	phone in August of 2012. So we are really proud
5	of the reference service that we offer in our
6	system.
7	One thing that I like to make use of
8	now, our library is using the live guides or the
9	lib guides. And I like to use those as a way to
10	educate fellow staff.
11	So if something is happening, if
12	it's tax time, I can throw up a lib guide that
13	gives our staff quick reference materials to
14	state and federal tax information.
15	I did it just recently with election
16	information, as well. So when somebody calls
17	about the election, they can go and find our
18	state questions. We have a local question on
19	the ballot, as well.
20	So I think that is a great tool to
21	assist our other librarians in knowing what is

We do also have a chat and IM

a hot topic right now in government information.

22

23

service. So that's sort of our way of offering alternative modes of reference service.

We have text, as well. It's not nearly as popular as the IM. We actually just adopted a new IM service because Meebo went dead, as I'm sure all of you, or many of you are aware.

And our new service is much more prevalent on our pages now. So we've had an extreme increase in our IM usage, as well. So that's been a really great thing.

And I would advocate for letting your docs librarians work your public service desk, if they don't now.

I think it's a great way to cross train and to let your other reference librarians know what information is available through your department or through the government, through federal information. And I think they use it, and they don't always know they're using it. Thanks.

MS. JARRET: I think this was all really great. I was writing down things to say, but I was also writing down things to take back

to my institution because I really am a reference
librarian at heart. So this was my favorite
question.

So it seems like, to sum up, that we are doing more integrated reference. We are cross training ourselves. I think when we asked that question, you know, I was thinking that we were asking are you cross training people to learn government information.

But we're also learning maps and microforms and newspapers and all sorts of stuff. Interactive chat and IM reference.

Maybe some decreased traditional reference or not.

I have a co-worker who likes to say reference is looking up. So you're supposed to giggle at that. That's kind of a bad pun.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: No.

MS. JARRET: Yes. Now she gets it.

I won't tell her that there was a pause before
you got that one. I like the idea, well I don't
because I'm an introvert, of Janet's idea of
learning the names of the staff.

I do think learning names is great, of the people who are your, you know, big sort of heavyweight stakeholders. But you know, in a law library, we do a lot of that personal service where we deliver things to people's offices. So I was glad that that was mentioned.

I like the idea of the lib guides and WordPress, ways that you can sort of use the virtual information both to educate your users, but to educate your other staff, and having that strong web presence.

So great job. All right, so the next topic is advocating to administrators. So we asked what's the most important message for documents librarians to relay to administrators?

What are your most convincing arguments in favor of staying in the program? What's your elevator speech? So you get in the elevator and your administrator gets in the elevator and says say, how's it going down there in gov docs? What do you say?

Or another question we ask is what's

б

in the executive summary of your annual report?

MS. HARTNETT: I'm working on crafting kind of a phrase that I want to use more at work. We've already started using it, and

I'm wondering if any of you are using it.

Government documents, the other special collections. As library priorities have changed, I'm talking you know, libraries all over the country, as our priorities have changed, it's those special collections that have to continue to get focus and are not being left behind.

In many cases, special collections are sort of where it's at. And we are like the other special collections. We don't have that aspect of being an archive or being a place where you have to come in and surrender your backpack and get a visitor pass.

But we are, in many ways, a mediated collection. We do so much more now that is sort of like curation, aren't we? Aren't we all doing a little bit more that feels more like curation?

1	So when you're curating
2	collections, you might want to have things like
3	special projects or dedicated money to tease out
4	different themes, depending on what your needs
5	are.

Convincing to stay in the program I don't really have to do because there are so many curricular tie ins with our collection. We've got a great program in poly sci, public affairs, American history, international studies, communications.

We have a college of the environment, that's a no brainer. Ethnic studies, we've got a business school, a law school, school of education, a big medical school, health sciences program and a school of social work.

So I don't feel like I have to do a lot of hard sell of staying in the program or that our collections are relevant.

My elevator speech? It's going to have a very familiar ring. It's really exciting that we're designated by Congress to offer

information to the public that is official, 1 digital, and secure. The executive summary of my annual 3 4 report, it's still got all those elements of, like, our processing and circulation statics and 5 6 reference statistics. Lots of instruction statistics, 7 lots about my committee service and other 8 people's committee service. But it's also got 10 stuff about the events that we do. We do an annual reading of the U.S. 11 Constitution, a live reading. And that's a 12 13 campus wide event that draws some attention to our collection. 14 This past year, I was also involved 15 16 in a really cool panel about street protests in Seattle and the history of street protests in 17 Seattle. 18 19 And there were ways that we could point to our collection for an exhibit that went 20 along with that. 21

luxury of having had a previous state librarian

Okay.

I have the

MS. FISHER:

22

23

who was very active in documents, and got it.

And told everybody about it.

Everybody being all of state government, and everybody else. So she did the elevator speeches, she did the connections, she was very active and very strong.

And she left a year and a half ago.

And so yes, the Secretary of State and the

Assistant Secretary of State have that knowledge
as their background.

And they carry it forward, and they have during the year and a half. But when it comes to what I would say is that we don't separate out levels of government.

We do government information. We do eGovernment. Sometimes separating out federal from state is a bad thing because it's not uncommon for our legislators to say unfunded mandate, why are you doing it?

Again, legal requirements, thank you very much. But we have to be aware of that.

As we answer questions for legislators or agency leadership, we note that it came from the

1 depository collection.

And it gives us an opportunity to talk about authentic, trustworthy sources, the place where the commercial sources get their information.

And noting that we have a network that we can rely on is very good. The depository network is strong, and we communicate. And we communicate around the U.S., we communicate within our state. It's a very strong thing to refer to.

Also, with our agency leadership, the Secretary of State, the role of oversight of the depository collections within our state is noted. It's something that I mention and it makes a difference.

MS. SITTEL: I'm horrible with elevator speeches. And I love the graphics that people are coming up with now that are those long lists of the value of librarianship.

And you know, you can equate the number of libraries to the number of Starbucks coffees and things like that. I like those

types of elevator speeches.

Though, I've not yet devised one. I plan to. I don't actually really get to talk to my administrator. I do have a department manager that advocates strongly for us.

So that's a good thing. Having somebody on your side that can talk for you. We do do eGovernment. I forgot to mention that in the reference part.

But I think eGovernment is sort of this double edged sword where an administrator hears eGov and so then they think oh, well that's a great service thing that we can tout, and it means that anybody can do it, or you don't need these collections to support it.

So although I am an advocate for eGovernment, I think it's misconstrued by some directors or administrators. What else do I have? We also, I made a note, sorry, did you have something?

MS. HARTNETT: I was going to say, set them right with your elevator speech.

MS. SITTEL: Right, right. So I

1 will say that we're secure and digital and 2 official. MS. HARTNETT: 3 Yes. MS. SITTEL: 4 I made a note about 5 Cass saying the special collections are, our local collection in our library is a great 6 7 resource. And right now, our administrators 8 are really big on local history. We get a huge amount of requests dealing with local history. So I'm trying very hard to almost push our local history collection 11 under our history specialist so that she can add 12 that content to CONTENTdm and make it available 13 to the public more readily. 14 And so finding those gems, that's a 15 16 great suggestion, to find those gems in your collections that you can show them. This is why 17 we're here, this is why it's important to save 18 these things. So that's about all I've got. I promise I'll come up with an elevator speech.

9

10

19

20

21

22

23

I think we have some MS. JARRET: good ideas here. Government, I like government

documents, the other special collections.

Official, digital, secure. Authentic,

trustworthy sources.

Where the commercial vendors get their information. If you're an academic library, tying the program with the curriculum, doing special events like a Constitution reading.

But I think that clearly the message is that this is hard. This is really, I think, the hardest question. And I used to be a law firm librarian.

So there's nothing like a partner coming in the library and wanting you to justify your existence because your existence takes money out of his pocket. So I hate it. That's why I moved to academia.

Okay, so enough about that. Next question. What's next, the future. So this is a very open ended question. What's the future of the FDLP in your library?

So we kind of wanted to tease out the difference between your type of library

1	generally and your library specifically. And
2	the difference between the FDLP and government
3	information.
4	And so this is really kind of a murky
5	area. So I don't think any of us have a crystal
6	ball. If you do, let me know.
7	MS. HARTNETT: Oh.
8	MS. JARRET: Those were the
9	questions.
LO	MS. HARTNETT: Okay.
11	MS. JARRET: They were in there.
12	MS. HARTNETT: The questions have
13	been read. So what's the future of the FDLP?
L4	What's the future of libraries?
15	We're pretty involved in what's
L6	called the balance scorecard approach, which
L7	it's a method used by Association of Research
18	Libraries.
19	So in evaluating how we're doing,
20	we're looking at a bunch of different factors,
21	internal and external factors, evaluation based
22	on assessment and potential for growth.

So along with that balance scorecard

approach, our university has mandated, and I forget the catch term, it's like a two and 20 approach of looking to the future.

So at every juncture, every single year that you look ahead, you have to look ahead two years and 20 years at the same time and be holding those thoughts in your head.

And that's actually been kind of a useful hook for me, personally, to think about our changing situation. And you know, when I answered the question about our changing staff configuration, I didn't tell you that these people all retired.

Maybe you wondered where the five librarians went, if they were taken up in the rapture or something.

They all retired. So the future of libraries, the future of this program, it's consortial. There is an answer. It's consortial, it's collaborative.

Yes, I just came from the ASERL panel before, but the idea is to come together to do something and relieve pressure on each

1 | individual institution.

So in my region, we're looking at the potential of a shared regional. We do have a regional, which is our state library, which is also part of our Secretary of State office.

But we are looking to perhaps ramp that out so that the collections might be shared by we think it's going to be about four or five institutions in the states of Washington and Alaska.

We're also really changing coordination within our consortium. The Orbis Cascade Alliance is making a big change that we're moving to one shared ILS.

The whole group of 30 libraries in Washington and Oregon is moving to Ex Libris. But one iteration of Ex Libris, we'll be all working on the same Alma system.

And that has a lot of possibilities to coalesce with this potential shared regional collection. There's a lot of excitement.

I've even heard our dean say to our staff that there will be times when we're not

And that's profound, but that's

1 ||

sure if we're working for the University of Washington or the Orbis Cascade Alliance.

3

2

4 where it's at. So I say there will be times when

know,

5

we're not sure, you know, gosh, what would be the

6

equivalent with the FDLP?

You

depository.

7

depository library here, we're working for our

if

we're

like

moving

8

depository, or if we're working for this shared

10

And one more note. I totally

11 12

believe that we have to move beyond the silos of

13

the lambs. That's a catchy title that someone

14

else though of. But the lambs, of course, are

15

libraries, archives and museums.

So

cultural heritage groups.

16

we

are

think

17

continued, again, coalescence with those other

18

MS. FISHER: Okay, future. It's

20

19

always a question. And I know at least once, as

21

a group, our Arizona depositories were convened

22

to talk about the possibility of the regional

23

pulling back to selective status.

because it's something that will help you when you flip back to our earlier topic of advocating.

Think about it, and take note

And just retaining, probably, those things with the Arizona focus and those legal materials that we get. It comes up. We talk about it. But we do it as a state so that the selectives are not out of the loop, that they know what thought pattern is going on.

State libraries are leaner all the time. Staff of regional's in state libraries will decrease, is decreasing. And I believe that state libraries, as depositories, will also decrease.

In Arizona, we often look at collections in terms of usage and outcomes. This is mostly thinking of LSTA kinds of thought patterns. But it fits into annual reports, it fits into justifications.

How has getting access to our federal documents information changed a person's life, made it better? What anecdotes have we collected?

I think the future of government 1 information in my library is good. But it's 2 very focused on the state and as I can expand that 3 4 to talk about federal government information, that's even better. 5 6 I was thinking about the system, and 7 I know the system needs to change because, well I don't know, look around. Look at what we've been saying in the past few minutes. 9 10 Retirements, getting older, been 11 here how many years? How many times have you attended this conference? The system needs to 12 be nimble, the system needs to change some. 13 And we'll work on that, won't we, 14 Robbie? 15 16 MS. SITTEL: Yes. MS. FISHER: Okay. Words I thought 17 of for future and what we need to do, some 18 19 approach, I'm looking at the last collection. 20 What approach is promising? Collaborate, integrate and mentor. 21 But when you mentor, Cass and I had this 22

conversation, we always think of mentoring down.

1 For the upcoming people, mentor up, too.

You're going to have to train those administrators. So that's it. Oh, I only got one sign. You thought Sherry was bad. Marie, Marie's a taskmaster.

MS. SITTEL: Okay, I think the FDLP in my library, it's there to stay in one way or another. I do think that library administrators like the tagline of keeping America informed.

And my director's tagline is libraries change lives. So I'm going to start having those stories where I can point out how docs or gov information has changed lives. And that's definitely becoming part of my elevator speech.

I am all for collaboration. I have the joy of working in a state with a state library that is all about collaboration and education and informing our state librarians, those in our state of all of the benefits of government information.

So I don't plan on going anywhere

1 with regard to documents. So I'm fighting until 2 the bitter end. Okay, well this was 3 MS. JARRET: 4 And the only thing I'll say is that there 5 are a lot of great song lyrics in here. One way 6 or another, and of course my favorite depressing 7 one, which is it's the end of the world as I know it, but I feel fine. 8 9 Okay, so now we're going to open this 10 up to questions first from the council and then from the audience. Don't forget that if you 11 want to do the index card thing, that you can do 12 13 the index card thing. 14 Dave's got his hand up. Okay, so first let's do, we've got a nice generous amount 15 16 of time. So questions from council? Okay, Larry? 17 18 MR. ROMANS: Larry Romans, 19 Vanderbilt. I'm so shy, I almost filled out a But I was interested in Robbie's comment 20 about the academic library in her area and it has 21

a reputation of not being friendly.

MS. SITTEL:

Can I say the docs

22

librarian is incredibly friendly, though. It's just the institution, in general.

MR. ROMANS: Well, and that goes without saying. The thing that concerns me as a university depository academic, depository with a public library, you know, in our area, is that it's very difficult for us to get across to all of the librarians in the public library that we want to help.

And we have a reputation from quite some time ago when you had to fill out a form in order to be a member of the public to get into the depository.

And now we're available 12 hours a day to the public. And I'm hoping that you have talked to them about what their attitude is, and that you try to put it in the best possible light when you're talking to your colleagues because I think most of us in academic libraries are really oriented toward helping the public and that we can only do it with your assistance.

MS. JARRET: Thank you. And I neglected it in the slide forward, and to say

1	that the Q and A can be on any of the five areas.
2	So it doesn't just have to be on the last one.
3	So anything else?
4	MS. SITTEL: Yes, I do want to
5	respond to that. The institution is a private
6	college. So they limit access to their
7	students.
8	But if anybody was to walk through
9	the door and say I need to see government
10	information, I know the librarian herself would
11	come forward with that information.
12	Whether or not the clerk at the desk
13	would recognize that that's a legal obligation
14	is another question. So the onus of that falls
15	on the library.
16	There was something else that you
17	said that I wanted to comment to. If it comes
18	to me, I'll let you know.
19	MS. WEIBLE: Peggy, can I follow up
20	on this? Arlene Weible from the Oregon State
21	Library. We have this issue in our city, as

23

well.

We have a state library very close

to a private university library. And so we have had these challenges a lot.

And what we really have done to overcome some of that, and you can't overcome all of it. But we really know the people that they need to talk to.

So when you're sending someone over to the private university or the institution that is unknown to the patron, you give them a name of a person to ask for.

So when they go see the clerk, they say I need some help, they say I need to see this person. And you know, it's a little small little thing, but it's made a huge difference.

And often what will happen also is that librarian will give the other librarian a call, heads up, I'm sending a person over. So I think that makes a huge difference.

But some of the barriers are just impossible to overcome. People don't want to pay for parking. You know, so we have to be realistic that not all institutions are friendly for a variety of reasons.

But what we can do is try to make it
as easy as possible when we have to send someone
to another institution. And that means do your
research and make sure they have a name or they
have something really specific they're asking

And I think that's the least we can do, and it may make a difference.

MS. SITTEL: I have one more follow up. We do do that, actually. We get the person their name. But even beyond that, we will just call and get the information from the library ourselves.

And that's really the best step is not even to send them, but just meet their need at the point of need rather than sending them on a wild goose chase.

MS. JARRET: All right. Anybody else want to talk about staff collections, reference, advocating? Questions? No? Larry? So Larry, what you do is you push your button so it's red.

MR. ROMANS: I did do that. One of

for.

the things that I hear a lot from people who get integrated into general reference, while it's nice to be able to indoctrinate fellow librarians about the value of government information, is that it's still a situation of whenever somebody says the word government, that it goes to the documents librarian.

So that you end up learning all their stuff, but they don't learn your stuff. Has that been the experience that you folks have had?

MS. FISHER: Sure. The difference in most libraries is that libraries are separated out by subject. You have your subject specialists.

But documents, it's a publisher.

And so all topics are covered by that publisher.

So yes, we learn a lot and we are some of the best librarians out there because of that.

MS. HARTNETT: Yes. Within the, let's see, four, six of us staff and librarians who technically are still in the government publications unit, there's a variety of feelings just like what Larry articulated, that yes, yes,

we have to learn all their stuff.

And you know, they still just refer the government publications questions to us. So that's a double edged, you know, don't we want some of those questions still coming to us?

I mean, it gets hard to figure out how you really feel about it. But the other thing is, for me, I still feel like that benefit of my learning more and my becoming a better, more holistic librarian is worth it.

And physically, when I'm on the desk, I am mostly loading microfilm into machines for people. That is most of what I'm doing now.

Lemons into lemonade, I'm a people person. I'm a kinesthetic learner and I like handling the film and talking to the people.

And frequently, people who are coming in and using microfilm, which is a lot of times used for older non-digitized newspapers, they're writing a book and they're very interested in talking about what their book's about.

So again, you know, this whole panel is about, like, how to make do with little or you know, doing more with less. Well, it doesn't really cost anything to have a meaningful conversation with someone about their book.

But the connections that we make might actually impact the future. You know, you never know when those kinds of connections are going to impact the future of your library in some way.

MS. JARRET: Great, thank you. Anybody else want to? Council, if you think of something later, you can wave your hand.

MS. SITTEL: I was going to add to that.

MS. JARRET: Sure.

MS. SITTEL: Since we do have an integrated desk, and we do have subject specialties, and I do think that our subject specialist librarians become versed in the government information that is significant to them.

Our business librarian, of course,

1 knows information about patents, and trademarks 2 and all of that. And those hard questions still 3 come to me. 4 And I'm so glad that they do because it's so much fun for me to look for legislative 5 6 history for a former state legislator, or to help a tribe with tribal information. 7 I'm glad that they don't want to do 8 that so that I still can. 9 10 MS. JARRET: So does anybody in the audience want to walk up to the microphone? 11 Fill out an index card? I'm sure that you have 12 13 things to add to the discussion. As Bill's walking up 14 MS. FISHER: there, I wanted to say that some libraries do 15 16 integrate their collections with the rest of the collection. 17 that means that the subject 18 19 specialist does include the government documents in that. 20 MS. JARRET: 21 Okay. Bill Olbrich, 22 MR. OLBRICH:

Louis Public Library. One of the problems with

And

So

integration is, we have found in our renovation and moving back and forth is that the subject specialists suddenly decide they don't want those old documents in their stacks. And we get floods of them, and the cataloguers don't want to reclassify them. it just horrifies them that we would do this. that's been a problem. first word.

But my question is pretty simple. Cass, you had one of your wonderful bon mots that said something of the lambs, and I didn't get the

I was quoting the MS. HARTNETT: title of an OCLC white paper, which was entitled Beyond the Silos of the Lambs.

So the silos of the lambs are the way that libraries, archives and museums have been considered such profoundly separate distinct areas, sectors. And now we're getting Those boundaries are disintegrating. closer.

Those silos would MR. OLBRICH: pretty much crop the --

> MS. HARTNETT: Those silo walls --

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MS. SITTEL: I do just want to
2	mention about the inter filing. We do have some
3	items that were inter filed throughout history
4	in our library for various reasons.
5	And we are, of course, doing a major
6	weeding project. So having that depository
7	stamp in the document is a great thing because
8	I can look at all of our librarians and say if
9	it says depository, it has to come to me first.
10	MS. FISHER: The little logo
11	stickers also
12	MS. SITTEL: Are very helpful, yes.
13	MS. HARTNETT: So isn't it funny
14	that those little hooks actually mean something
15	as we transition to a more digital future? You
16	know, that this is
17	MS. JARRET: Okay, go ahead.
18	MR. MORRISON: Hi. Dave Morrison
19	from the University of Utah Marriott Library.
20	And we had a situation where we basically did
21	away with the organization of the library into
22	subject areas such as documents divisions.

23 And many folks who enjoyed working

with the public like myself ended up going into
what we call the knowledge commons.

So initially, there's an awful lot of concern over what that will do to dilate the knowledge of the documents information that we have in our library. But our administration was so much in favor of continuing that that they set up a system of teams.

And I'm pleased to say that we do have a documents and maps team in the library, and it's actually there's more people working as a part of this team because they're people who are actually interested in documents in our library who hadn't been formally a part of the documents division, like our maps specialist.

And there was one of our full time professional non librarians who's always worked with our documents materials and loves them, and he's now able to be a part of this team.

So you know, there are people who also become a little bit infected with our love of the materials, and would like to join us once there is no longer a structural division like

being a part of it in a documents division to prevent them from doing that.

But I also would like to say that we have a bit of a distance from the physical collection now because of the changes in our library.

And I think that that's something that many people have felt over, you know, the last dozen years or so. I feel like I no longer know the physical collection as well as I feel like I used to. Thanks.

MS. HARTNETT: I think I hear Joni Mitchell somewhere singing about both sides now. I mean, a lot of this feels like sort of how the internet has changed our lives.

There are some losses. Something's lost, and something is gained. There are some losses. We've lost that proximity. You and I have lost the proximity to our physical collections.

I've certainly lost the colleagues and mentors who were 15, 20 years older than I am who have now retired who taught me every day.

We've lost the culture of a separate service point.

But yet there's this government information or documents team that you're talking about. I'm on our data services team. My colleague, Marilyn Von Seggern at Washington State University, they have a government information sort of team or interest group.

Note to self, I might need to, you know, pursue something like that with us because there are cataloguers, there are library science students, all of whom are interested in government information in one way or another.

By virtue of my sitting on that data services team, I'm always bringing up government data in that context. So I get my little message in there, as well. Proselytizing.

MS. JARRET: Okay. Anybody else have anything to add or to ask?

MS. STEWART: Julia Stewart, Southern Methodist University. And I have a question for everybody that touches on all five of these areas.

	I'm in an academic library, so a lot
	of what the three of you said I can see in
	different areas of my work. And I was impressed
	with a lot of the solutions that you had and some
	of the boundary crossing.
	But my question has to do mainly with
	advocating to administrators. But I'm
	wondering, have you ever had a situation where
	you've had to say or you needed to say no.
	You were maybe given an opportunity
	to shine or, you know, blue sky or do something
	with your collection but because of maybe time
	or staff or whatever, you just really couldn't
	do it.
	It was a boundary that you just knew
	you couldn't do it. I mean would you say no? Is
	there a time you would say no? Or will you do
	it all?
	Or for each of you, when have you
	said no, if you have and how did you do it and
-	i I

I can talk about it, MS. FISHER: but I'm not sure I can think of a situation right

could you give me an idea of the situation?

off the top of my head. My basic answer is no, I don't say no.

I think of something that I could offer instead. So it's that's a great idea. Here's something that I can actually do and here's how much time I'll need to do it. Or here are the resources I need to be able to do that.

And if they're pushed, well I'll go close to saying no. But there are certain times when no just pushes the wrong buttons. So think of a different approach.

What can you do? And promote that. You know, in the state library, we used to have training. And we had this one guy come and talk about if you're interviewed.

Kind of refers to the debates. If you're being interviewed and they're asking you a question and you answer part of it and then they interrupt you with the next question and they start asking you that and you still have things from the other question.

Answer the other question first.

Tell them what you want them to know and then you

can go back and answer their thing. So you know, promote yourself. Promote what you can do, and then deal with what they want in a nice way.

MS. HARTNETT: It's hard to think of a real good example of saying no. But one that does come to mind is I've sort of gotten questions of do you really need to, in the case of the specific example of this large intake of documents from a Seattle public library disposal, do we really need to look through that stuff?

You know, do you really need to evaluate it? Do we really need it? And can you maybe not do that? I said no, I need to do it.

MS. JARRET: I actually had that experience sort of related where I was offered a huge set of Washington State Supreme Court and Appellate Court briefs that we don't have, that were never going to be part of our microfilming project that we were doing.

And I knew that I was going to have some push back because we were going to be losing a lot of space next year. And so I'm not ever

really comfortable with that asking for forgiveness is better than asking for permission.

But I did strategically talk to people behind the scenes and get good arguments.

And it wasn't actually my director, because my director, I know, would want this stuff.

It was the people who were actually going to have to physically deal with the stuff. And so I ended up compromising. We're getting it, but we're just putting the boxes on some empty shelvings, we have shelving.

I would actually like to have a plan right now. I would like to be unpacking, making those briefs accessible. But first things first. We're going to get them, we're going to put them on the shelf. Then we're going to worry about them.

So I think part of this is stretching our own personal boundaries to do things that maybe we weren't comfortable doing before. So I think that's actually a really great question.

And did you have something to add? No, okay.

So Marie?

MS. CONCANNON: Marie Concannon,
University of Missouri. About saying no to your
administrators, your administrators may be
interested in your professional opinion.

And I think any good administrator wants to know what are your thoughts about this.

And give them your honest thoughts.

But if your administrator wants you to do something after they hear your honest thoughts and you still disagree, I would strongly, strongly suggest you say yes to your administrator because these are the people who have hired you and who pay you.

You know, bottom line, they're your boss. So be respectful of their opinion after you've given them your thoughts. That's what I would say about that.

And I also have another thing about advocating to administrators. A suggestion that you might consider leveraging your documents collection to capture the attention of your elected officials, particularly your

congressional representative.

Okay, not just state level officials. I'm talking federal officials. This could be of great interest, not only to your library's administration, but those to whom your library administration answer.

So if you're part of a larger institution, a university, a whatever, those people who are your boss' boss may be very interested to know that your congressional representative is interested in some aspect of your library so much that they are coming to visit you.

Consider inviting them to come to your library to give a speech, to be a specially invited VIP for an event. You can leverage that to get media attention for your library. You can get kudos all over the place.

You can get a nice pat on the back, and finally at the end of it all, your government documents collection will be seen automatically as something which is a great calling card for your library.

So there's lots of positive things you can do with your documents collection to get prestige for your institution. Thank you.

MS. HARTNETT: You know, I just thought of one thing that was not so much saying no to administration, but trying to say no to, like, sort of a web design group within the libraries when we adopted that lib guides platform that many of the people in this room have also adopted at their institutions.

You know, there had to be a set way that every guide looked. And it had to have standard tabs, and the tabs were find books, find journals, find ejournals, you know, and these sort of things.

And we said we don't fit into those categories. And then we were kind of told that you're going to. So you know, yes, for the roll out of these guides, we made ourselves fit into find books, find ejournals.

And as now three or four years have progressed, we've gotten some leniency to change our pages to really match what government

1	documents need, which is not find books, find
2	ejournals.
3	So initially, we had to say, you
4	know, we wanted to say no. We were told you have
5	to go along with it. But then as time
6	progressed, we were given some leniency.
7	And sometimes that happens.
8	Sometimes you have to fake it until you make it,
9	right?
10	MS. JARRET: Yes. Okay, thank you,
11	Cass. Do you have another question?
12	MS. CHAPA: I didn't really see this
13	topic
14	MS. JARRET: Please tell us who you
15	are and where you're from. Thanks.
16	MS. CHAPA: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm
17	Joan Chapa, I'm from Marcive. I didn't see this
18	topic covered, but since you talk about doing
19	more with less, I thought I would put a plug in
20	for the cataloguing record distribution
21	program.
22	With libraries having limited

budgets and shrinking staffs, I invite you to

take advantage of this program because it is
free. The only criteria is that you are a
federal depository, and everybody here meets
that criteria.

And so if you are losing technical
services staff, you don't really have

services staff, you don't really have cataloguers or the documents tech processing people to create cataloguing.

Take advantage of this program.

There's still lots of slots open. And it is free. So you can talk to Melissa Fairchild from GPO or Jim and I will be outside, too. And I would like you to take advantage of that.

I think that we have at least one member up here that is taking advantage and that's Robbie. If you want to talk about that, that would be great. Thank you.

MS. SITTEL: We are part of that.

MS. CHAPA: Two, two. That's right, two.

MS. SITTEL: We chose just to do digital born items since it's more difficult or time consuming to actually go to the new

electronic titles listed and pull what's relevant.

So we are very grateful for that service and do plan to continue in the program.

MS. JARRET: Okay. Anybody else?
Any final thoughts?

MR. IVERSON: David Iverson, Minot State University, Minot, North Dakota. To the comment about getting cataloguers and other people interested in government documents.

Six years ago, I took over the responsibility for government documents at my institution after our longtime head reference and government documents, George Clark retired after 39 years in that job.

And he and his associate, Donna Just, who has been at this meeting in past years, approached me and asked me if I would be willing to take on responsibility for government documents because they had noticed as the cataloguer, that I had shown some interest in the documents that they would send my way to catalogue.

And I said sure, I would love to. So they went to the director, and the director said sure, sounds good. So it can and does happen. So I'm now the cataloguing and the government documents librarian.

And I've never been so thrilled in my life to catalogue government documents. They are just a fascinating collection. So it can and does happen.

MS. JARRET: Thank you. Okay, well let's give everybody on the panel a big hand. I really appreciate you being here. I wish I had some clever song to end with.

All I could think of is The Byrds, you know, a time to weep and a time to dance and all of that because I do think that one of the things we need to do is just acknowledge that times are hard.

It's okay to acknowledge it. But we do need to keep calm and carry on and make it work and do more with less. So thank you very, very much and enjoy the rest of your day.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter

went off the record at 11:59 a.m. and went back 1 2 on the record at 2:00 p.m.) 3 4 5 A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N 6 (2:00 p.m.)7 MS. LASTER: Good afternoon everybody. Welcome to the third FDLP forecast 8 study session. We do need to get started 9 10 because we have a very full lineup of speakers for the afternoon. 11 So if you would all please take your 12 13 Thanks. My name is Shari Laster. I'm at seats. the University of Akron and I am the chair of the 14 Depository Library Council. 15 16 I'll be moderating the Q and A for today's session. I would like to remind all 17 speakers and all folks who are asking questions 18 19 to please state your name and institution each time. 20 This is particularly to help those 21 who are following along using iCohere because 22

they can't see our faces and they may or may not

23

remember our voices.

So please keep that in mind. I will do my best to subtly remind you if you seem to be forgetting. With that, I am going to turn it over to Mary Alice Baish to introduce today's speakers.

MS. BAISH: Thank you very much, Shari. And I just want to add a note of thanks to Shari Laster and everybody on Depository Library Council for being so generous in loaning us part of your time for plenary meetings that you normally have so that we could fit in these daily forecast projects and discussions.

So really, Shari, thank you so much. The support that this project has received from members of the Depository Library Council, and as I've said before this week, from the community has been overwhelming, and we're so grateful.

And I want to also welcome all our wonderful virtual attendees using iCohere.

Many of you have sent comments of gratitude to Cindy Etkin who has been wonderfully working on this effort over in the corner of the room.

And so please keep your comments and questions coming in, for those of you attending virtually, as well.

We're going to keep to the same format that we have every day. We have a number of presentations from LSCF staff this afternoon. I hope you have your agenda.

I'm not going to introduce all of them. I think they're familiar faces. We're going to start with Paul Giannini who many of you who were here Monday met. He's the Senior Business Intelligence Analyst at the U.S. Government Printing office.

Following Paul, Cherie Givens, Program Planning Specialist reporting to the superintendent of documents, David Walls, our Preservation Librarian, Kelly Seifert whom you all know who gave a great presentation the other day on our promotional efforts.

Christina Bobe and Mark Ames are joining us this afternoon, and they are with our education outreach. And I think all of you know them very well.

facilitate QA.

And after we do our presentations, and we'll be monitoring the clock very carefully. We have an hour and forty five minutes as we did yesterday. Shari will

And then Blane, I want to thank you for the excellent summaries you've been providing at the end of every session. So welcome to Day 3 everybody. And thank you for coming, and we look forward to your questions and your participation.

MS. GIVENS: Hello, everyone. I'm Cherie Givens from GPO. I'm going to jump Paul in the queue and start us out. So what I'm going to do is, wait, first I'm going to get my papers together.

What I am going to do is talk a bit about, just a brief recap of the methodology and how we went about it for some of the people who may not have been here on Monday.

And then the next thing that I'm going to do is just go ever so briefly through a few of the statistics that we have that sort

of illustrate who participated.

So okay, so just a brief recap.

What we're doing is a mixed methods study. And
what we're doing is we're getting both
quantitative and qualitative information from
you. And we got this through the
questionnaires, the library forecasts and the
state forecasts.

And then we also got additional qualitative information through our state focused action plan, which we will be trying to quantify that, as well.

And we're able to do that once we've broken it down into themes and we'll be using a number of different software and mechanisms in order to do that.

So where we are now is that we're right at the end of phase one. So as many of you recall, in phase one we were doing the completion of all three of those, the library forecast, the state forecast and the state focused action plan.

And then from there, we were coming

up with our preliminary analysis. Now, what we're providing to you today is the very, very preliminary. And we're moving forward with continued analysis.

And then we're also starting the beginning of phase two, which in phase two what we've done is identify areas for further investigation, and looking at where we're going to be doing targeted interviewing and focus groups.

Now one thing I should say, I realize that I talk quite fast because there's so much to say. And in just six hours, it's difficult to be able to say all the things that we would like to share with you about our research.

But if I am speaking too fast, just please wave to me, or you can even call out my name because I get excited about -- okay, there we go. I get excited about all of this. And when I do, I tend to talk fast.

Okay, so I wanted to share a little bit about, so Monday I talked about this sort of this big umbrella that we have in terms of coming

up with the codes.

So we're looking at the different themes. We're working in teams to identify what are the common things that we're seeing. We're using the words that you've given us and trying to keep our own bias from intervening as we decide which things go in which categories.

In addition to that, we're creating a code book, a preliminary code book where we decide that we see these themes, and we could put them under these different umbrellas.

Now the umbrellas that we've devised so far are not our permanent umbrellas, which is why I didn't put them on the screen, because they're subject to change.

But there has been some interest in what exactly are the categories or pseudo-categories as we have them now that might eventually become our permanent categories.

So I thought I would talk just a little bit about that. Now you remember that I showed a slide and showed the different colors and how we were color coding them.

Some of the things that we're looking at in the main themes, and some of the things that you'll hear about later today that came up consistently are things like training, marketing and preservation and access.

So one of the categories now, our pseudo-category and we won't call it a permanent one is training, education, mentoring and web conferencing, because we hear this coming up in a number of different responses.

And we also see that there's a call for this even in state focused action plans. So this is one of the areas that we have.

Then another one, obviously, and we'll be talking about it more is marketing.

Marketing is a big issue, and there's discussion about wanting customized marketing, marketing for specific regions, training on marketing.

There's just a number of different things. And it's something that a number of people have raised as an issue and that they would like to know more about.

So it's one of the reasons that we

focused our discussion of the library forecast on marketing. Another area that we see coming up a good bit is FDsys and FDsys training.

How wonderful that we've already been able to release a module on FDsys training, and we've been doing extensive training.

One of the reasons that we have this sort of a breakdown where we're already in process with some things, or have some things done is that at the time that we wrote the questionnaire, several things were in processes but hadn't yet been released.

And it's just a happy coincidence that this is one of those things. We had anticipated correctly that this was a real need, and we've already begun to address it.

Then another issue that we see coming up in multiple responses is a request for improved links on PURLs, some favorable comments about PURLs and how useful they are and things of that nature.

So this is a preliminary area which will likely not make it to the full fledged

1 category once it's done.

Another area that comes up, and people had raised this issue just yesterday, in fact, is has there been any talk about Title 44 and program governance.

And we do have a section for that.

And this is something that our superintendent of documents and our head of LSCM will be discussing more tomorrow. So I won't delve into it.

But I will just say that one of the categories that we have so far been coding for is Title 44, program governance and third party partnerships.

Looking at what you've said about what sort of change you might want and what the responses are and pulling them together into one location.

We also see coming up a lot items, selection and distribution. Also, five year retention, the questions about five year retention, the rules for waiting, discarding and substitution.

Now, I recognize that those are

things that deal with program governance and Title 44. But because they are so specific, at this stage we have them separated.

Then we also see comments about the tangible collection and how useful it is. We also see comments about a desire to move more into the digital and things of this nature, and how do we balance this?

We're also seeing a lot of discussion about preservation, digitization, access and harvesting, some discussion about authentication.

And we have one category that's just sort of a holding place category right now, which I have titled it, and this will not be its permanent title, is outside of agency parameters.

And by this, I mean, I'll give you an example because I know that could bring up anything, but I had to give it some sort of a place holder.

And what I mean by that is that sometimes when we asked you about what was going

on, we received responses like we're having economic and budget crisis in my state.

That's very important to know, and that really gives us a sense of what's going on, what are the current and most pressing issues. But at the same time, it's not something that the agency has control over. And so that's why I put it into outside of agency parameters.

Another big area that we see, and this is my giant oversized golf umbrella because it's covering far too much at the moment, is new and improved services and outreach because outreach has been talked about in a different way than related to education.

It's been talked about in terms of wanting to reach out, asking GPO to reach out specifically to you about issues that you have. So we have new and improved services and outreach.

There are so many different things contained under that big holding umbrella that those will be broken out into further categories or made into official categories later. But at

this time, it's not quite there.

Then another major area that we see coming up is cataloguing. And I have a long, run on section because to me, these all seem related because I haven't been cataloguing since 1995.

So I have cataloguing, CGP, metadata and bibliographic control. And yes, those will definitely need to be broken out into different categories.

And then we have one other area which is meetings and conferences. And you may be wondering why does this come up as a separate area?

Except that we've had a couple of responses that indicate that in addition to training, that you would like virtually and in other areas, at least one or two comments are referencing training that they want specifically at the conference or things that you would like to see, that the community would like to see us do in these conferences.

And to me, that's an important enough issue that when we talked about it and

when I raised it as an issue with the group, they said yes, this is important enough that it needs its own section.

So those are the different things we're looking at. So now, of all of those things that I had said, what are the top five? What are the top five that we have been saying?

What we've seen are comments about program governance, wanting more flexibility in the program, and comments about liberal retention, withdrawal and disposal.

We're seeing issues raised about cataloguing and bibliographic control, a desire to have everything cataloged because that would be great, especially pre 1970 cataloguing.

We're seeing training and education, which we know because we've been hearing about this just about every day. Not only the efforts that GPO is prepared to make, but also, all of the wonderful things that the community has been doing, and we've been seeing those in the state focused action plans, and talking about them in different sessions.

We're also seeing information, comments about item selection and distribution. Things like the idea that you would like to have this by geography, title, subject, agency, congressional committee, those sorts of things.

And a number of different changes are going on to make those things happen. And then finally, we're seeing, of the top five, number five would be preservation, digitization, access and harvesting.

And again, that's a giant umbrella that will eventually be broken down. But this is just the holding place because these are the key words that are mentioned each time these related thoughts have been pooled together. So that's what we have so far in terms of our preliminary organization.

And the reason that I bring this up now is that we're using, as I mentioned before, the state forecast as a model for how we're going to code the library forecast, because although we looked at both of them together and we read through them, to try to pull together 775

appropriately.

So what we did was we used this one as a model. And one of the things that we did

was we looked at Question 18, what would an ideal

insurmountable task, and to be able to code them

responses between mid July and now was

FDLP look like.

And we looked at Question 20, is there anything else you want to tell us, because we figured these two questions would give us the greatest variance of answers and give us the best idea of what the possibilities were in terms of things that people might talk about.

So for Question 20, the top things that we saw that people were discussing and thought were major issues that maybe didn't occur other places, one of them was a concern about privatization.

Concerns that people may no longer have free public access to different types of federal information. There was also a concern about limitations on access, that with limitations of computer time at particular

1 libraries, this might impact it.

There was a concern about having a lack of depository libraries nearby in certain areas, and how will we get this information to everyone in a particular state to the people who need it.

Again, access and preservation came up with a focus on things like virtual depositories and digitizing the historic collection.

And then expertise. There's been expressed a concern that we need to develop shared expertise. The coordinators are retiring and they're not being replaced, and that there's diminished expertise on the staff and that the staff themselves are limited. So this concern was expressed.

And then finally, there was discussion about the tangible collection, about wanting to balance the current and the legacy, and about wanting to balance the tangible and the digital.

So these are the ideas that

influence us in terms of categories when we were thinking about how we were going to come up with our themes for the library forecast. We've stayed true to going with what we heard, what we read, what was in your actual words.

But in terms of picking what topics we were going to focus on, we moved forward with training, marketing, and preservation based on its frequency as it was appearing in the state forecast and in multiple questions, and also as it was appearing in many of the library forecast questions.

Okay, so I won't run through all the different percentages here. But this is just a visual image, again, that many of you saw the other day that shows that we already have 775 valid library forecast submissions.

In addition to that, we're continuing to get new ones. If you haven't submitted and you want to submit, we would be glad to get this information. It will help us and it will inform the national plan. And it will also help us as we move forward with

strategic initiatives.

Now looking at who participated, so these numbers represent the percentage of those who could have participated. Not of those who did participate, but of all the regional libraries that could have participated, all of those that are in the program, 81 percent did participate.

Of all of the selectives who could have participated, 64 participated, which these are really high numbers if you think about what the average questionnaire brings back, what is the average amount of feedback we get.

Now we can look at it another way, which is to break it down by who participated. And we can see that our total of 65 percent of that 90 percent participated were from state libraries.

Special libraries also had a good showing at 57 percent. I know the service academy may seem like a small number, you say oh, 25 percent, but there are only four service academy libraries. So one in four, that's not

1 | too bad.

And also, we hear that there's real pressure, and that we were likely to get more submissions. But we recognize that people are busy and this can be difficult.

Also, we have 57 percent of public libraries. What a wealth of information we have there to really understand what's going on for public libraries, and what may be their unique issues.

Great showing from highest state court libraries and a good showing from federal libraries. We can see some of our highest numbers come from academic law and general academic libraries.

I won't belabor the point, since you have this slide, but I just think it's an interesting breakdown. And it shows us that we have a high level participation from all different sectors.

Finally, participating by size. So when we look at this, this is really great as well because we can see that all different sizes of

libraries are represented here, from 73 percent at the large to 56 percent at the small.

I mean, that means that we have an amazing amount of information so that when we go back and we're analyzing this, one of the ways that we can analyze it is by the responses from these different sizes of libraries.

So we can figure out whether what we're seeing is that there are unique issues for small libraries as opposed to medium libraries.

Or there are unique issues for state libraries as opposed to academic law libraries.

These are all really great categories to analyze. And not only for GPO to analyze them and look at what might be done for the future, but also when we release the data for other researchers to investigate.

And also just to see if you're from one of those libraries, if you're a medium sized library and you want to know what it's like for other medium sized libraries, this is a great way to find out and a great way to get more information, and to possibly even think about

1 networking and strengthening ties 2 community that may be helpful. So with that, I will turn it over to 3 4 Mr. Giannini. Thank you. 5 MR. GIANNINI: Well, good 6 afternoon. We're going to have some fun with 7 data. I want you to picture, in your hand, a diamond. And look at that diamond, you just see 8 a diamond. 9 10 But if you look closely, it's got And I thought this would be an 11 facets. interesting aspect to do is that we have 775 12 13 FDLPs in our database. Well, we have a number of those FDLPs 14 here on site. We have a number of FDLPs 15 16 listening in on iCohere. And we have a number that aren't here. 17 So how do you all compare? Do you 18 19 all bring in a different viewpoint? Is your group here different from the ones that are 20 listening to the ones that aren't? 21 That's what I love about data. 22

can tell you a lot of good stuff if you just step

23

back, look at it and say hmm. So let me give you some numbers about yourselves.

First, the data came from Cindy. She gave me October 4th's registration data. We have a timeline we had to work on. So I used that, the on site information from October 4th.

On Monday, she gave me the iCohere registrations. So that was grasped by me, taken, massaged, looked at, and we're going to start going through some slides in a minute.

There are 138 FDLPs on site right now. But there are also 62 FDLPs that are uniquely on line. In addition to the on line and the on site, we have 25 FDLPs that are in both.

So total on site, I have 163 FDLPs that gave us a survey. And there's 87 FDLPs online that submitted a survey. There are 550 FDLPs that did not participate that are not here on site or on line.

So let's begin the look. But I want you to ask yourself some questions. As you go through here, sometimes data speaks very softly. Sometimes it speaks loudly at you.

1	I want you to look at thi
2	information as we're going through and say oh
3	that confirms what I felt. Or that surprise
4	me.

And then at the end say, is there something I would like to drill down to because those facets that we're looking at, those who are on site, those who are on line, those who aren't here, you've got all those other categories and typings that we have for groupings that we could drill down further, if so needed.

Let's see how we're going here.

Okay, so depository types. Now, Cherie mentioned we have some interesting information coming from the depositories.

From those who are here, we're about 58 percent in attendance that representative of FDLPs. But those who aren't, 43 percent aren't. So regional depositories, only two percent of those aren't in attendance of that grouping.

So interesting information is your depositories are well represented here. They exceed what the group total would be. Group

1 | total was five percent.

Can you all see those numbers pretty good out there? Oh good. I was kind of hoping that they would be blown up enough so that you could see what was going on.

MS. JARRET: No, they can't see them.

MR. GIANNINI: Oh, they cannot.

Oh. Take my word for it then, all right. All right, well see, now you can look at the pretty picture and see that we have a nice demographic here.

And you can see we've built out and we're spreading out into the -- no, no. That's not what we're doing here. Type of designations. There are ten different designations.

Let me point out some highlights here. The representative is the big row that you see standing high. And of those, the first one closest to you is the no group, that are not in attendance.

The ones in the back, the second

tallest in the back, those are the ones who are

here. I mean on line, sorry, on line. Those

that are on site are the red one, if you can see

the red one.

All right, so what can we glean from this? That's the question you need to be asking yourself. I don't always give answers, okay? I like to ask questions.

All right, library types. Again, we have ten different categories in our federal depository library directory. All right. Some interesting key bits here.

Public libraries, 18 percent of them are not here. Grouping, 18 percent of the public libraries are in a group that are not here. You know, that tells you who has the money to be able to come here, the locality, stuff like that.

So that helps you formulate your meetings and stuff like that. So who can be here, who cannot be here? Your academics definitely can be here, and they definitely have a big voice, 67 percent. All right.

And by the sizes, the large libraries are definitely going to be here, and

they are showing themselves quite well with

4 their presence.

Okay, now that we've looked at a few little demographic information, let's ask some questions and see what's going on. One of the questions that was asked, Question 16 has to do with barriers to access.

Well, everybody on line and in here does not perceive a barrier to access, whereas the ones who aren't here seem to be thinking that they do anticipate a barrier.

Well, did I misread that? Yes, I'm sorry. I did misread it. I've got to read my notes correctly. Yes, you all, 92 percent of the group that's both on line, they anticipate barriers.

Sixty one percent who are here, or 67 percent who are here think there's barriers, and another 61 percent who are on line think there's barriers, whereas those who aren't here, 47 percent don't perceive there's a barrier.

So you know, there's a difference of perspective of the group here. All right. Greater access, everybody seems to think that that's pretty beneficial.

Increasing cataloguing services.

Take a look at the data. The group that's not here, 39 percent does not see that as being extremely beneficial. But those who are here or on line find that to be quite beneficial.

Collection and development and management tools. Again, the group that's not here, 28 percent only see that as extremely beneficial, whereas the group that's present in this room, around 50 percent think that that's very beneficial.

So we can see that there's a bias or a different theme flowing through. Now your education, online communication, information. Those who are here see that to be quite beneficial, whereas those who aren't are having less of a inclination of seeing it extremely beneficial.

So that would cause one to say well,

what's different about the two groups? And try
to drill down into it a little bit further.

The mentoring aspect. Again, those who are here see that as a positive, whereas those who aren't, they're not so sure, 50/50 about that.

And then these multiple answered question coming up. In the next five years, is your library interested in participating in shared housing agreements throughout your depository regions, your multiple state regions, you're already participating, you're not interested.

All right, well the group who is not interested is not here. And that's quite obvious by that high number, all right?

But those of you all who are in attendance, you have a tendency to be more favorable for these things, about the rate of two to one over the other instances. So I thought that was pretty interesting.

So you can find a positive in a negative situation. Okay, all right.

Permanent digital collections, committed to preserving it. Oh dear. Let's look at that one,

Those who are here are a little bit more likely to support that. About two to one over the ones who aren't here.

Most of the time, you know, like I said, there's a big row in the back that says need to preserve or host. But you got to look at the step forward and see what else the next level for preserve and hosting, that's the ones in the red color.

So there's potential. Work with those with potential. All right. And then would you be willing to commit to collection? Again, those who aren't here said a resounding no to that.

But you all who are here and on line have said yes at a higher rate, around 60 percent. So I thought that was interesting to be able to take a look at the data that we have, how you all look as a group here, on line and those who aren't.

Be aware of the differences.

That's what the data analysis always brings out.

Ask yourself why these things are occurring.

And hopefully, you'll get some good answers to

direct you for the future.

Now, I'm going to turn it over to David.

MR. WALLS: Okay. There we go. Good afternoon. I'm David Walls, the preservation librarian at GPO. And in the interest in making sure that everybody has a chance to present, I'm going to sort of cut to the essentials and skip through a couple of slides.

So dash forward here until we -okay. Preservation themes from the library
forecast, I shared a bit yesterday about themes
from the state forecast.

What I did is go through the favorite question that I had, what would an ideal FDLP look like? In the library forecast, looked at the 775 responses and didn't really code them according to the methodology.

What I was really just going through and rather than coding every single response, I was going through and gleaning out preservation related themes.

And then I also did that for the other favorite question, which is is there anything else you would like to tell us.

And this picture, the merges of what preservation is to you all and the wonderful thing to me is that it's well rounded and looks like what a good preservation program would be for all of us.

The preservation of the legacy tangible collection comes out very strongly.

This is not to say digitize the legacy tangible collection.

But people actually specifically spoke up and said we need to preserve enough of the paper. The digitization of that collection is paramount to increasing access, but also in to preserving a lot of the content.

People talked about the digital divide. There is the reality in 2012 that for

the long term preservation of information, there's no longer really an analog solution.

If this was a decade ago, we would be talking about microfilm as a factor in that preservation. And while microfilm is still around, it's becoming very rapidly an outdated technology.

And I hear from a number of librarians that if people come into the library, they pull out a roll of microfilm to show somebody who's somewhere between the ages of 18 and 25, they get such a strong negative reaction from it.

So really, in terms of the future of preserving information, if we're talking about migrating information into the future and increasing access, we're talking about digitizing it.

There's a great concern for born digital content, content that is put onto FDsys, but it also shared among some of the libraries.

And for the preservation of the web content that federal agencies are now using primarily to

present information to the public.

Digitization was a huge theme. It came throughout almost every single question. People would say, you know, this is really what we should be about is digitizing the collection.

Access is not, in and of itself, a preservation theme. But when people said things like they wanted permanent access, there really is no such thing as permanent access to digital content without a robust preservation program.

Authentication is huge because we all want to be able to know that the information that we have access to is authentic. We have one of the best methods of authenticating digital content that virtually exists on FDsys, the eagle symbol and things like that.

We also have some encouragement to try to find out if there's ways that we can provide different tiers of authentication for content, digitized by library partners.

Which brings me to partnerships.

People spoke out strongly for partnerships.

That we should be partnering with libraries because digitizing the legacy collection is a task too great for GPO to go it alone, and the libraries can't go it alone, either.

So we're looking to develop partnerships to be able to digitize and preserve the legacy collection. Partnerships with federal agencies are very important because they have the born digital content and the web content.

And we need to reach out to them to be able to make sure we're getting as much as we can harvest, an archive of that federal web content.

Training for digitization was a huge theme. I put up the sort of very Pac-Man looking slide with, like 97 percent of people said they wanted training. And so that's going to be obviously something we're going to be offering in the time ahead.

If you had to ask me what an ideal FDLP preservation program would look like, these are the component parts of it. And to give it

a little bit of what the actual natural language
looked like and what people said, I just grabbed
some comments, some actual quotes that people
had out of those two questions.

And you'll notice that the first two are about partnerships, about working with libraries for preservation, the digitization and facilitating of partnerships for cooperative archiving efforts.

And the third gets to that concept of actually figuring out some other way to provide a multi-tiered level of authentication for digitized content.

You see the strong request for digitization. And I'm certainly not going to argue that we need an authentic and reliable preservation program. That's wonderful.

So this is just a quick view of some of the themes that came out of the library forecast. In the interest of giving everybody else time, I'll zip on. So thanks very much.

MS. SEIFERT: Good afternoon, I'm Kelly Seifert. And here with me are Mark Ames

and Christina Bobe. And we are going to discuss the individual library forecasts in relation to education, marketing and affiliations.

And when we started this analytical process, the entire forecast team, we divided up into smaller working groups based on topics.

And those topics were driven by the questions itself.

So if you probably noticed that both the library and the state forecast questions were grouped by topic. So we just took those topics and divided up into smaller teams for this qualitative analytical process.

The first topic that we are going to talk about today is education and training. And the working group for education and training is myself and Mark Ames and Amanda Colvin. Amanda, will you wave?

And we basically took a look at, on the library forecast, each of those questions that related to education and training, reviewed those, the qualitative responses, and then also took a look at what we were currently doing at

GPO that might meet some of those needs, what we identified that we could do, and then also anything that was already planned or in the works.

Just a very brief look at our working group logistics. Cherie already talked to you about our methodology. But to be a little more specific about our specific process, we did a plain language review of all 775 responses.

We read every word, and then we looked to group those responses into themes. The themes were pretty broad, but we wanted to make them broad so that we could revisit them and break them down into smaller themes, if necessary.

We also took a look at the comparable state forecast question, if there was one, for those education related questions. Repeated the same process and then took a look at both of them compared together to see if there was a level of consensus.

We also really briefly looked at other questions within the survey that referred

to that education theme. For instance, in the ideal FDLP question and the what else do you have to say, there were lots and lots of mentions of training.

But we have to be very careful about that for the methodology. For instance, if one library had said 12 times that they wanted FDsys training, we don't want to unfairly weight that one library's view of FDsys training and portray that to be 12 unique responses.

So that's something that we are examining the unique mentions of education and training and other questions. But it's going to take a little more pointed look.

We also created spreadsheets with tallies of all the different themes. And we noticed that in most of the responses, education and training, those terms were used interchangeably.

Also as a next step, when we get back, we'll be inputting all of this qualitative data into our qualitative analysis tool that Cherie talked about, NVivo 9.

We'll also be re-reviewing that, our plain language review and delving even further into it. So it's just important to note that our findings are preliminary in this case.

So the scope of our analytics. The education working group focused on individual library forecast Questions 19 and 20, which I will tell you, remind you what they are, and then the state forecast Question number 8.

So we'll start with Question 19, would you participate in GPO facilitated virtual meetings or seminars on topics of interest to the FDLP community?

So this question had a standard yes/no count, and it also had the option for open ended response. There were 666 yes responses and 109 no responses for an 86 percent yes rate.

So let's look at some of the qualitative data. Top ten training needs, this top ten list will not be as entertaining as David Letterman's, but it will be very interesting.

So the number one most prevalent training need expressed was the need for

training on digital and online government information products not from GPO. So this is American Fact Finder, too, was everywhere, all over this.

So many of you mentioned very specific government information resources such as American Fact Finder. And we are making note of those as we delve further into the analysis. But for the initial run, these were all grouped into one overarching category.

Second most prevalent need expressed was the need for training on GPO's federal digital system. Third was the need for training on how to market and promote your depository.

Fourth was the topic of digitization. And I brought some sample responses to give you a flavor for what we kind of grouped into this category.

Sessions on cooperative digitization projects, training on digitizing your collection, finding digitized government information, digitization standards and

methods. So these were the type of responses
that we put in this category.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The fifth most popular need expressed was collection, development and management training. And some of the items that were grouped into this topic ranged from collection management techniques to the de-selection process to collection development and collection maintenance.

Number six, newer, updated GPO services or tools. That one's pretty self explanatory. There was a lot of need expressed for when we make a change or enhance a product, to give you additional training on that.

Number seven was under the category of cataloguing, some sample responses. Cataloguing electronic resources, retrospective cataloguing projects, and then there were many requests just labeled cataloguing in general, with no further expansion on that.

Number eight was developing an online collection or transitioning to an online

depository. Many responses on both of those specific requests in that category.

Number nine we grouped into legal information for now. Some sample responses are law related resources, legal research and legal materials beyond cases and statutes. And number ten was requests for training on statistical resources and research.

Those that didn't make the top ten but were other pretty popular requests, virtual meetings and conferences, information about the FDLP, including its history, its structure, the future of the FDLP and GPO and Title 44 reform were also in there.

And then the request for curricula for new FDLP librarians and coordinators. And then there were about 50 different, unique responses that didn't really fit into any of our initial umbrellas, anything ranging from knowing your community to succession planning.

So then we took a look at the comparable question on the state forecast. As I said, we repeated that same process.

And preliminarily, the top six needs that were expressed in the library forecast were also expressed in the state forecast. So there was preliminarily some level of consensus there.

Okay, so GPO's path, you've heard about the FDsys training initiative this week, very often. I'm giving you a couple of stats up there.

One question that you might have is the combined sessions. So we did 46 classroom, 22 webinar, and one session where we broadcasted a live classroom session. That was part of our interagency depository seminar.

We also have 32 videos planned. The first is playing out in the refreshment area. There are two more in production as we speak. That's advanced searching and FDsys help tools.

And there are a wide range of other videos that we have scripted and ready. They just need to go into the production process. And that's anything from tracking legislation to using metadata to tracking regulations.

It's important to mention because we

haven't yet that as part of this FDsys training initiative process, we had a working group that convened and created a comprehensive FDsys curriculum.

So that includes talking points for every trainer to make sure that we're all on the same page. Session presentations, slide presentations, handouts. We developed class exercises.

So we've actually received a couple of requests from folks that have taken some of the webinars to share with them the actual materials that we've developed.

So as we are working with our web team and Karen Seiger's group to, on that new training information page in the new version of FDLP.gov, that's something that we're working through providing wider access to.

As you may know, we also have the webinar archive. That will be linked from that new page on FDLP.gov that will be created so that any of the past webinars that we've provided on FDsys you'll have access to.

And also, we will be offering some re-broadcasts of previous webinars as refreshers or for new staff coming in, intermittently we'll be re-offering some of those webinars that we've offered this year.

And also, in case you haven't seen them or noticed, there is a table out in the refreshment area, the FDsys training team and some staff from GPO's programs, strategy and technology group are out there to provide you with demos or answer any FDsys questions.

What we do offer that will be more prevalent on that new FDLP.gov page is the ability for you to request customized FDsys webinars, either on a certain aspect of FDsys or just a private webinar for your staff or for libraries in your state or however you would like to arrange it.

You can request those now by going to SGPO. There's an FDsys training category. Or you can contact me directly. My contact information's in the packet, and we'll be happy to set that up for you.

And also, as we went through this process, we really documented our process for creating this curriculum so that as we move forward and expand the initiative, the process will be repeatable and we can apply it to other topical areas other than FDsys.

Okay, so our next steps. We want to expand the use of the elearning platform by GPO, as we said. So not only do we want to train on FDsys, but we want to go beyond that.

We also want to express, by that number one need in Question 19, we want to offer training opportunities from other agencies and government entities that we would facilitate and that we would administer to provide you with that content.

The other expansion of the iCohere tool would be to share the use of that with the community. If you were in this morning's council session on training, we made a little bit of a mention of that where our goal is to, if you're familiar with the past use of OPAL, to also extend that to the community.

So we would facilitate your sharing, your expertise and best practices with the community. And then also, we are planning to hire several curriculum specialists at GPO that would help facilitate all of this as we move forward so that our FDsys training initiative becomes an FDLP training initiative that's more widespread.

Okay, so what's next? We are going to use that NVivo 9, which is the qualitative, analytical tool to go through these responses again and further more staff review that plainly would review, again, and delve a little more deeper into some of the themes that we've identified.

Also, we have an initial FDLP education initiative project plan. We have started to outline training priorities, driven by these responses.

So we want to make sure that everything that we heard from you drives the nature of this training initiative. And moving forward, we take your lead and offer what's most

1 important to you first.

Okay, so next is Question 20 of the individual library forecast. Would you participate in a mentoring forum hosted by GPO for new or existing coordinators?

For the library survey, we have 428 yes responses and 347 no responses for a 55 percent yes rate. Now, the first thing to mention is that the mentoring forum has been a recurring theme that we found so far in the state focused action plans.

So it's not only something that we're examining, but it's something that you've said that you want to do yourselves. So our next step is to really investigate how to establish a GPO facilitated mentoring forum or program of some type.

Now, one of the things that we'll need to do is gauge the type of interest from you. So in the question, we just asked if you would be interested in a mentoring forum.

We need to gauge who is interested in being a mentor, who's interested in being a

1 mentee and who's interested in just contributing

knowledge or contributing anything to that.

So we'll be delving into that, and this could be something that's part of a focus group that Cherie was speaking of on Monday about our next steps.

This is also something that if you're preliminarily passionate about this subject or interested in it, please feel free to contact myself or Mark Ames and we will start documenting anyone who is particularly interested in this topic, as well.

Okay, so that wraps up that topic.

Our contact information is here. It's also in the initial packet that you received.

Okay, next we'll move on to marketing and affiliations. Another group that was formed, we went about the same process for marketing and affiliations. So I won't re-review that.

But we separated the topics for the purposes of this presentation. There were six different questions that fell under the

marketing and affiliations topic.

So I'm going to start with the marketing questions, and Kristina is going to continue with the affiliation questions. It's also important to note, as we talk about the marketing questions, that the terms marketing and promotion were really used interchangeably.

And that's just a common practice in the general public. That's a common practice that we've done over the last couple of years. What we are truly doing and what our true goal is promotion.

We're not really selling anything.
We want to promote the awareness and the availability and the expertise and all those great things.

So moving forward, I'll refer just to promotion, but for the sake of you following along, marketing and promotion was used interchangeably.

So those questions were 22 and 23 of the individual library forecasts. And 22 is does your library market its FDLP collection and

services to local non depository libraries or in other venues where members of your community could learn of them?

This question had a standard yes/no count, and then the open ended response where you could tell us how you marketed your collection. So we had 320 yeses and 455 nos, for a 41 percent yes rate, and a 59 percent no rate.

It's important to mention that in this particular question, and I know in a couple of others as we start to delve into these individual library questions, the standard stat is what you see here.

But as we started to look at the qualitative answers, we found that some people that said yes actually appeared to mean no. For example, yes we market our services and collections. And the open ended response was we don't do that, but we would like to.

So as we move forward, it's just important to note that we will have to take a closer look at exactly, we flagged all of those responses that we think should perhaps be a

different answer just to look further into them.

So as we move forward, this stat could possibly change. But that will take a lot more review.

Top ten list number two. The top ten ways you promote. The most prevalent way that you expressed that you promote yourselves is through your library website. That was in a vast number of responses.

Next most popular is relationships with area libraries and consortia. Now I brought a couple of samples for this to give you a feel for how we've grouped this.

Communicating informally with local libraries, marketing services to libraries within our state, through librarian networks, and presentations at staff meetings at other libraries. So those are some samples.

Now, we lumped programs, workshops, classes on depository resources kind of in the education umbrella as the third most popular way you promote.

Some samples are hosting webinars,

presenting workshops on using government information, and teaching to students and business groups.

Online subject guides, the number four response. The responses that we grouped in here include lib guides, subject guides, research guides and web guides.

And local community and government outreach and partnering. So if you host census workshops and you indicated that, that went under this umbrella.

If you speak at local civic organizations, senior citizen centers, the local historical society, and local high schools as indicated by a number of you, that also got grouped into this category.

Number six, participating in local, regional library conferences and meetings. Everything from presenting to attending and networking at these events was grouped in there.

Offerings in online catalogue.

That was pretty straightforward. Some people just said through our online catalogue, and some

said through our statewide catalogue.

Blogging, this one was pretty general. A lot of folks just said the term blogging or blogs. A couple of people really expanded on that by saying blog entries on government information resources or using our library's blog.

Number nine, displays and exhibits.

This category includes online displays and exhibits and in person displays and exhibits.

And then number ten was brochures.

Many of you mentioned brochures. Most folks did

not indicate whether they were GPO provided

brochures, brochures of your own creation, or

brochures from some other government resource.

But brochures were also prevalent.

And then a couple of other popular answers, but didn't make the top ten. Email distribution lists, Facebook postings, articles in local newspapers, and a lot of folks indicated announcements about their anniversary or announcements about special events or new services.

Tweets were very popular. And then local radio. And many folks indicated through public service announcements, and some even indicated through radio interviews about your anniversary or special event.

So the next Question, 23, how can we assist in helping you with your marketing? Top ten. The number one answer was either left blank, which I indicated as no answer or not sure.

So there were a lot of question marks that, you know, I decided were not sure, no answer. That was the number one answer.

And as we started looking, as these started trickling in back over the summer, this was one of the driving forces behind the new FDLP promotion plan that we're creating to give you help and answers to try to guide you along in this process.

Number two was free promotional materials. And lots and lots of folks put this. It was very generic without any elaboration in many, many cases.

So we know you want some swag, and we're working on it. But in this particular umbrella, it wasn't indicated exactly what type you would like.

The third most popular was flyers. Most folks just said flyers, but there were several that elaborated. Flyers on fee based sites, flyers on the FDLP, flyers on specific collections in your libraries.

Posters was number four. Fifth most popular, media spots, TV and internet advertising. And the answer is I would love to. That one's difficult because of the cost restriction, of course.

That's why we've done this contract with NAPS to at least put out the print advertisements and the radio advertisements that we're working on.

The most creative answer in this entire 775 question. If you're out here, thank you. One of our folks wanted us to secure an episode of Parks and Recreation to be about the depository library in Pawnee, Indiana where the

1 sitcom is set.

I love it. I would love to see that.

And they don't give a hoot who Kelly Seifert is,

but I did email NBC to talk about this. I loved

it. I can't promise anything with that, but I

did email them.

Okay, number six. True story. Customized downloadable templates. Lots and lots of folks really want white space, either on the printed ones that we hand out for their library sticker.

Or also many folks indicated, as I think Barbie said yesterday, was that they want an actual template online that you can fill in so it doesn't appear to be our brochure with your sticker on it. So we are investigating that.

Number seven, this request was all about training, tutorials, curriculum, tools, webinars, training.

Number eight was for training on marketing itself. And you see the crossovers in links between those education questions and the marketing questions. There's a lot of

1 crossover.

Number nine was for public service announcements. And the tenth most popular response was that they're satisfied with what we're currently doing to assist you in the effort.

A couple of other popular requests, marketing guidance and best practices. And that was put, right now, in a different umbrella than the training on marketing because this was along the lines of marketing plans and tips and tools. So that was umbrella'd into this FDLP promotion plan umbrella there.

Social media and web 2.0, a big request for us to create user guides and web guides. A lot of libraries said that they didn't have time to do that, and so they would like us to create them for them.

And then a lot of libraries requested a promotional website content or templates for library websites. So if GPO were to design a website template and offer it to you for use for your own library. And then

1 bookmarks were big as well.

Now, seven percent of the responses, so not overwhelming but important to mention. Seven percent of the responses were these three things.

We don't have a need to market, we are doing just fine, we don't need your help, and we don't have time, we don't have staff, we don't have money. So all things that you already know.

The reason we bring it up, and the thing that we would just like to emphasize is that there's always a need for marketing.

If that is something you feel that you have a special niche and you have a certain user base, there's always a need to continually update those folks or try to pull in different folks.

The need for our help is not needed, that's great. A lot of you are wonderful at doing this. But we just like to remind you to still try to follow what we are offering and providing and just check it out.

ρ

It's very important that, you know, the entire community and GPO is putting the same foot forward, that our branding is consistent and our message is consistent.

So I've seen wonderful things come out of the community, but just as long as we continue to work together on that and just keep tabs on what we're all doing.

And then, of course, we completely understand the no time, no staff, no money for marketing. If you have to make your priority list, marketing always falls to the end and that's completely understandable.

What we've tried to do, and I'll explain in the next slide with our new FDLP promotion plan is include tips and tools and tricks so that it won't require a lot of time of you.

It won't require a lot of staff, and in many cases won't require any money or very little money. So we've tried to keep that in mind as we're planning moving forward that these were pretty relevant responses that we got

1 there.

I won't really go into this because I know we have a lot of time. But I just, our past marketing efforts. We did a couple of things in the '80s, your standard posters, brochures, stickers and bookmarks.

Many of you were around for the 2001 Make the Connection campaign. In 2008, we launched the Easy as FDL campaign.

And we followed that up in 2010 with a refresh because we found that a lot of folks were coming back to us saying we did all the ideas that you gave us in the 2008 plan. What else do you have? So we tried to give some new ideas in 2010 for that.

What's next? Yesterday at the LSCM update, you heard me introduce this Government Information At Your Fingertips campaign. We are launching this as we speak. It is branded on our new brochures that you have a sample of, and we are just about to launch this FDLP promotion plan.

Now when you leave today, stop by the

registration desk. There is a preview copy of the FDLP promotion plan for anyone who's interested. Along with that, we have some ask me about federal depository libraries buttons for you just to kind of get the momentum going.

This same plan that you have access to in print out here will be made available on FDLP.gov in the coming weeks. And I gave you a quick synopsis of that yesterday when we spoke at the LSCM update.

But it really works to set the stage for why this is so important, explain what we're going to do to help, explain some tools and tips that you can use in your library and online to do this, ways to focus your message, and then a list of past resources that are still relevant that you can look into even further, if you're particularly excited about it.

I also had a couple of folks ask me yesterday about the GPO video that you saw in the Monday morning presentation. As of this afternoon, GPO put that on its YouTube channel.

And I believe they did a Facebook

announcement about it. So if you want access to
that video, go to GPO's YouTube channel. It's
accessible from the bottom of GPO's main agency

4 website page, so you can find it there.

These are some of the new promotional materials coming up. I went through these yesterday. The posters, screensavers and also images for LCD screens, bookmarks, a new sticker, and a table tent.

So a lot of these have the FDsys, FDLP, CGP theme. And they're not quite available yet for order. They're in the printing stage. So in the coming weeks, they'll be available for order.

These are the new brochures that you saw. These are a step ahead of the promotional items. So these are done. They have been printed. We have received them. Our Pueblo location has them and they're working on getting them ready to be able to ship.

So these will be available sooner than the other promotional items. So pretty soon, you'll have the availability to order

these brochures on FDLP, FDsys and the CGP.

So our next steps. As I said, as we were receiving these individual library forecasts. I was pulling these Questions 22 and 23 of all of them every time we received new submissions and looking at what was stated in there.

And we incorporated the most popular and as much as we could into our plans and into the FDLP promotion plan. So a lot of what you'll see in there is stuff that you've suggested and stuff that you've said that you wanted.

So that is a work in progress. So as we go back and continue to do more analysis on these questions, we'll continue to enhance the promotion plan and the tools that we're giving you.

But this is a start. And that plan, as I said, will be made available soon on FDLP.gov. But grab one today when you leave, and I hope you enjoy it.

Next, I will turn it over to Kristina, and she will go through the

affiliation questions in the individual library
forecast. Thank you.

MS. BOBE: Okay. I have nine or ten minutes? Okay, hello. I'm Kristina Bobe from GPO and Cherie has just informed me that I have nine or ten minutes for my some 20 minute presentation that I've timed very carefully.

So I'm going to either talk fast, cut things out, or both. As Kelly mentioned, my name is Kristina Bobe. I'm an outreach librarian at GPO, also a former depository coordinator.

So I was very interested to see the range of responses for these questions. My role in the project was to review the responses for the affiliation category in the individual library forecast survey.

So that corresponded, as you can see here, to 21, 24, 25 and 26. So in reviewing these responses, we assigned themes in a very preliminary fashion.

And responses could fall into more than one category, along the lines of what Cindy

and Robin described in a way, in the state focused action plans.

These could be words or phrases that were observed in the responses, or something outside of that. So this afternoon we'll look at some of those, and I'll present some preliminary numbers and some insights on these responses, as well as a little bit of additional information.

And a bit more about why we're looking at affiliations here. I took David aside last week at GPO and I said just give me a brief overview of why we're asking these questions again.

And I think he had a good way of putting it. He said that libraries develop relationships and partnerships. And we may learn about them, but we don't always hear about them consistently.

So these questions about affiliations give us a much better sense of what kinds of relationships are being developed out there between libraries, like those between FDLP

and non-FDLP libraries and help us in planning for the future.

So it allows us to consider how GPO can assist or facilitate in that process. Question 21 asked you all does your library have formal or informal relationships with local non-FDLP libraries to provide federal government information?

And the response was either no or yes. And please elaborate on that. The count from the 775 respondents was yes, 45 percent or no, 55 percent. So almost half of you responded that you have some type of relationship with local non-FDLP libraries.

And I have another top ten. And we're just going to go through these really quickly. The most frequently observed response was in the category of just informal referrals.

So libraries responded with a notion of having formal or informal relationships with local non-FDLP libraries by way of informal referrals, frequently driven by factors such as geographic proximity or shared knowledge of each

other's collections, or subject expertise.

So the specialized nature of a library, a law library for example. And knowledge of FDLP status, word of mouth and old fashioned networking.

Interlibrary loan, longstanding function of libraries, the second most frequently noted response. No surprise there. Libraries citing a practice that has an established structure, guidelines, costs, agreements and so on.

Like the informal referrals response, many libraries described informal relationships. So these could be described similarly in relation to geographic proximity. We are located down the street. Informal relationship with the local public library, informal relationship with area high schools.

Providing access to local libraries that are aware of government information expertise was another common theme in the responses.

So libraries described the access

that is provided to their collection by virtue of their FDLP status, both in terms of physical access and virtual access to online or electronic resources.

And sharing a catalogue was frequently mentioned as an example of a formal relationship between local non-FDLP libraries. So like, consortial catalogues.

Going down the list, we had formal relationships, formal arrangements between libraries such as those previously noted like interlibrary loan. But also consortial arrangements or agreements, formal service agreements and the like.

And many libraries offered instruction or workshops to patrons or visitors or promoted those services to patrons. Government information, census workshops again, were some of the examples that were provided.

Some libraries also noted a limited scope of services, or their participation in providing services in response to a lack of other options or other libraries.

So mentioning libraries that had relinquished FDLP status and no longer focused on government information. Like, we are the only depository in our area.

And again, shared housing or selective housing agreement were noted in responses established or proposed or in the works.

And circulation of documents was noted in the sense of circulating items to non-FDLP libraries, shared catalogue and circulation policies. And again, in relation to interlibrary loan.

And some other things that we noted, collaboration with other libraries in general, other cooperative agreements, schools coming to visit the FDLP library, high school students, middle school students looking for materials for their homework, participation in professional associations, reference services and distribution of posters or brochures.

Question 24 asked you all if your library has relationships with local non-FDLP

libraries to provide federal government information? Do those libraries market your library's FDLP collection and services? That's a mouthful.

The structure of the response here was don't know, no or yes, and please describe how. And here we had some interesting responses, actually. The yes count was 13 percent, the don't know was 38 percent, and no was 49 percent.

So the response here was predicated upon if your library has those relationships. So there was a definite trend favoring the top two responses. And I just have a top five here because there were such few affirmative or yes responses.

The most common response indicated some sort of referral from non-FDLP libraries like we saw in Question 21 where libraries responded to the question of whether or not they were formal or informal relationships, informal referrals was the top response.

So correspondingly, we see the top

response, including the topic of referrals. Like Kelly mentioned, linking to FDLP library's website was the second most frequent mention of a method of promotion at the non-FDLP library.

And I think this underscores the importance, I'll step back for a bit and be a depository coordinator again, of having an updated and accurate and working website since the traffic to your site or web based research guides come in from computers, come in from smartphones.

And if someone is out there looking for information, have that accurate information on there. I get at for people in assessments for that.

Word of mouth was the next most frequently mentioned aspect, and again, reflects the informal nature of those working relationships between libraries.

Distribution of brochures, flyers, business cards, posters, hand outs specific to any events, programming or workshops was another strategy.

And libraries also mentioned cooperative training and workshop opportunities on government information resources, Ben's Guide, individual library resources and so on.

And here, this is going to, I think, echo a little bit of what Kelly was just discussing. In many cases, the actual answer was no.

So the wording of the question, if your library has these relationships with local non-FDLP libraries, led some libraries to respond with something like we don't have relationships, therefore, or they would just, you know, say not applicable.

So libraries that answered no to Question 21, does your library have those relationships often followed up with not applicable. And it was noted in the narrative responses, and occurred with some frequency.

But other ways in which non-FDLP libraries marketed services included usage or reference to library catalogues, FDLP library catalogues, and the collections of course, that

you have and general mentions of the library.

How am I doing? Am I talking fast enough? Question 25, is your library planning to enter into new or additional relationships with local non-FDLP libraries to provide federal government information?

You could either say no or yes, and then describe those relationships. Here, the yes was 11 percent planning to enter into new relationships with non-FDLP libraries and no, 89 percent. So just a little bit over ten percent responded yes.

Again, we're just going to look at the top four because of the number of yes responses being so low. But of those who responded yes, the most frequent relationship was along the lines of contacting or communicating with libraries either in person or by phone or by email.

Again, reflecting the informal nature of the relationship and also kind of lacking the distinction between FDLP and non-FDLP status. Outreach to libraries was

1 of

often described as being more based on geographic proximity or some other affiliation, and we've seen this in other responses.

Also frequently noted was basic strategy to maintain the current outreach or communication efforts. And so those libraries that are already in the process of engaging other libraries just plan to stay the course in that regard.

After that, libraries expressed that they had plans to eventually develop new or additional relationships with non-FDLP libraries, but not immediately. So yes, but not now.

And it may be based on what was described in many responses as staffing issues, remodeling or expansion of the libraries, or just something that has been discussed informally up until this point.

And then other responses noted plans to speak at local schools, or hold workshops that included instruction and training, or general information on how to access government

information.

And then further down the list, libraries said that they had plans to work together or were already implementing formal arrangements.

There was interest in outreach, but not really sure where or how to start, and I think that ties very well into the marketing that Kelly was just discussing.

Plans to include local, non-FDLP libraries in training and workshops. And even plans to recruit new libraries or fill vacancies in FDLP library designations with some electronic or virtual depositories. But again, no formal plans as of yet.

And finally, Question 26 asked is your library planning to enter into new or additional relationships with other FDLP or depository libraries to provide government information? And here you could answer no or yes, and then tell us a little bit more about it.

And here, a few more of you answered yes, so 26 percent out of the 775 respondents

answered yes. And then 74 percent said no. So here we saw an interesting trend.

Again, this is among libraries that answered yes to the question that the library was planning to enter into new or additional relationships.

They said yes, but then they said no firm plans yet, but an openness in forging new relationships. A lot of openness, actually a lot of optimism, maybe coinciding with the development of a state plan, or something along those lines.

So we don't have immediate plans, but we're very open to ideas and discussions with fellow depositories with the regional depository, or even working with federal agencies.

And then also noted were very general plans to work with other libraries locally within the state or region. Some discussions may have been taking place, while some are fairly concrete. Others responded that plans were still very preliminary.

Numerous libraries responded they were currently participating in ASERL with no mention of any other future relationships on the horizon.

Then many libraries also expressed a desire to maintain current relationships, and noted the success of those relationships. So we are in a great relationship now, and we aspire to continue in that relationship.

And then others noted that they wanted to collaborate or create or implement shared services such as catalogues, workshops, training, de-duplication of tangible collections, reference services, creating or continuing professional meetings and organizations, and that also came up as a theme.

And then further down the list, there were plans to collaboratively digitize documents, others wanted to continue to maintain successful collaborative relationships, regardless of FDLP designation, motivation or desire to discuss potential relationship building in future meetings, talking about

meetings that were coming up in the fall and was like, this would be a good thing to talk about, specific plans for establishing formal relationships and collaboration in managing collections, again specifically tangible collections.

How can GPO help you with all this? Well, it can take a look at a few aspects. So in reviewing these responses, we recognize that there are initiatives and activities at GPO that can help to support or facilitate these many observations that you shared with us.

We work with libraries, and we consult with them as they developed these shared housing agreements. We maintain these in our official files back at GPO.

And when libraries have questions like how can we do this? Well, GPO can consult with you and we can share templates, we can give you examples, or even give you actual agreements to share with you.

The same goes for memorandums of understanding. So for libraries that may be

considering any formal arrangements for collaborative collection management activities.

And we encourage flexibility in cooperative and collaborative relationships.

And there are many ways to collaborate while you still ensure public access.

And also, in the assessments, we consult with individual libraries during the public access assessments and frequently share ideas and plans from other libraries, either during the assessment or during follow up.

And I think this was also noted by Robin as well during the LSCM update. But this is one of the things that we do.

We also institute formal partnerships. And these can take many different forms like content partnerships, service partnerships, hybrid partnerships.

I am not an expert on partnerships, but there's a wonderful detailed information page on the FDLP desktop that goes into much further detail on this.

And tomorrow's session at 10:30 on the Public Health Reports is going to present information on one of the partnerships between GPO and the Association of Schools of Public Health.

And one more thing that occurred to me was that, one thing that when we were talking about training, that this was mentioned also in the LSCM update and I think referred to here is that we can also leverage contacts with federal agencies that we have, like, in the interagency depository seminars, and also facilitate training and education with subject matter experts at these agencies.

And we have materials that we make available on site, and now we're exploring and capturing some of these sessions so they're available in electronic format for you to look at later on.

So just to let you know, to lead into that, a recorded session of today's session, a recording of today's session will be made available after the conclusion of today.

1	And again, please feel free to
2	contact Kelly or myself about any questions that
3	you have about this portion. And thank you for
4	your interest in the topic. And we'll be happy
5	to answer any questions. Thanks.
6	MS. LASTER: Thank you, Kristina,
7	for covering so much material so very quickly.
8	This is Shari Laster, University of Akron. I
9	would like to open the floor for questions at
10	this time.
11	MS. SMITH: Lori Smith,
12	Southeastern Louisiana University. This isn't
13	a question so much as another marketing idea.
14	At my library, the reference
15	department has started a campaign to get
16	students to put a label with their name on it on
17	their flash drives because they leave them
18	behind so often.
19	And there's no way to tell who it
20	belongs to. And they often don't remember what

So I thought maybe if GPO would print

color it was. So at the reference desk now,

they're giving out labels.

21

22

little labels that could be used to label the 1 2 flash drive with a space to put the person's name, depositories could give those out. 3 4 MS. SEIFERT: Kelly Seifert, GPO. 5 Noted, thank you. 6 MS. HAGER: I'm Frances Hager from 7 Arkansas Tech University. I was wondering if the brochure, or the new sheet that was in our 8 packet, if it could be made available as a Word 9 10 document so we could personalize it for our 11 library? Kelly Seifert, GPO. 12 MS. SEIFERT: 13 I see no reason why not. Sure, you got it. 14 MS. HAGER: Thank you. 15 MS. SEIFERT: Coming soon. 16 MS. SINCLAIR: Ηi, I'm Gwen Sinclair with the University of Hawaii at Manoa. 17 I think that some of the libraries in my state 18 19 did not really understand what you all were 20 getting at with the questions about relationships and affiliations. 21 22 And that could account for why you

got so many no responses, because they just

1	didn't really understand what you all were
2	trying to get out of those questions. Thanks.
3	MS. CARMICHAEL: Kathy Corrine
4	Carmichael, University of South Carolina,
5	Aiken. And I want to go back to the beginning when
6	Paul was talking.
7	I'm very interested in small
8	selectives, being one. And I was wondering, how
9	did you categorize the size of the library? Was
10	it by the size of the collection, of the actual
11	library, or the size of the government documents
12	collection?
13	MR. GIANNINI: Paul Giannini,
14	Government Printing Office. It was from the
15	Federal Depository Library Directory. They
16	already categorized it that way.
17	Small, medium and large were by
18	volumes. Large was over a million, small was
19	under 250,000 and in between those two was
20	medium.
21	MS. CARMICHAEL: Okay, thank you.
22	MR. GIANNINI: You're welcome.
23	MS. MCANINCH: Sandy McAninch,

1 University of Kentucky. Do you have any plans to go back and try to gather data from the 2 questionnaires that you classified as not valid? 3 4 I assume because they didn't follow 5 the right process toward the end of 6 questionnaire because I know that we had 100 7 percent response in Kentucky, but I understand one didn't go through. 8 But those are valid responses, as 9 10 far as I'm concerned. Are you going to try to 11 get back to those people and get them to fix whatever it is they did that you didn't think was 12 13 valid? 14 MR. GIANNINI: Paul Giannini, Government Printing Office. The one from 15 16 Kentucky that was missing came in after the date of June 28th or July 2nd, really. 17 So the decision by Mary Alice and her 18 19 staff determined whether your last one will be entered into the data. We did receive it, it is 20 It just came in late. valid. 21 (Off microphone comments) 22

MR. GIANNINI: Okay, since this is

preliminary analysis, we'll probably most likely add it for the final.

MS. MCANINCH: So you will be adding more of those?

MS. CANFIELD: Jane Canfield from Catholic University in Puerto Rico. Realizing that there are always budget constraints on the materials that you produce, I'm still going to ask.

Do you have any plans for producing any of those marketing materials in Spanish as well as in English? I cannot possibly be the only person here with a Spanish speaking population.

MS. SEIFERT: Kelly Seifert, GPO. Interestingly, in the last campaign, the Easy as FDL campaign, we offered postcards entirely in Spanish. They're still available now on the site, I believe.

I have to check with Lance. But I believe so. We had a really low order rate on those. But if we do have a number of folks, that is something that's always possible.

1 It was very easy to translate that 2 So we did not go ahead with that this postcard. time because last time it just didn't have any 3 numbers with it. 4 5 MS. CANFIELD: I ordered. I'11 6 take any you have left. I will also, very 7 happily, stick my neck out and say I will work with helping translate, as well. 8 Kelly Seifert, GPO. 9 MS. SEIFERT: 10 What we did last time was we went through a translation company just to make sure that we had 11 it right. 12 13 And we asked a couple of people that spoke Spanish in the building, and we got a 14 couple of different translations. So just as an 15 16 FYI, we will approach it the correct way. (Off microphone comments) 17 SEIFERT: Right, right. 18 Ι 19 think there's a standard federal government 20 Spanish translation, and we ended up going with that. 21 22 MS. Barbara Miller, MILLER:

Oklahoma State University. Kelly, when you

1 spoke about partnerships with libraries and other groups, I'm hoping you consider partnering 2 with institutions like ALA because we have a few 3 4 ideas that we would like to present to you. 5 MS. SEIFERT: Kelly Seifert, GPO. 6 Absolutely. We want all of the information and 7 partnering that we can in that respect. MS. LASTER: We have time for one or 8 9 two more questions. Lori? 10 MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. I wonder if 11 there's a possibility to get marketing materials 12 13 aimed at different age levels, in addition to 14 languages. I'm going to go to an event in the 15 16 spring where there's going to be a lot of parents and children. And I think it would be nice if 17 I had something other than just Ben's Guide. 18 19 know, а general But you FDLP 20 promotional thing about, you know, to tell kids hey, there's documents libraries you can go to 21 22 later when you're doing research.

MS. SEIFERT: Kelly Seifert, GPO.

Yes, if you are staying for the next presentation, is it the next presentation,

Karen? After the break there will be a Ben's

Guide portion.

I know Karen and her team are working on a number of things. I know you said other than Ben's Guide. We did have a number of responses that indicated the different age levels.

It was a low number, but it was still prevalent, so it's something that we can look into.

MS. HARPER: Beth Harper,
University of Wisconsin, Madison. The
statistics at the beginning, talking about how
people responded who are here and who aren't and
who are on line and here, that was interesting.

I don't think I caught all of it.

And you said something about slides. I don't know we got the slides. And I'm also wondering if that was kind of just as an interesting set of facts, does it play into the survey? You know, okay. I wanted to make sure.

1 MR. GIANNINI: Paul Giannini, 2 Government Printing Office. No, it was just fun facts. 3 4 MS. HARPER: Oh, okay. 5 MR. GIANNINI: It won't be used to 6 guide what's going on. And I believe my slides 7 will be put on the FDLP desktop. 8 MR. O'MAHONEY: Pardon me. Dan 9 O'Mahoney, Brown University of Providence, 10 Rhode Island. This is just a general question about marketing because my lack of information 11 about it. 12 13 Are there ways to track, sort of, which of these great ideas is more effective in 14 producing the desired results? 15 16 MS. SEIFERT: Kelly Seifert, GPO. With our national contract with NAPS, they have 17 a lot of tracking. We get regular reports on how 18 19 many websites it appeared on, how many page views 20 they got online, how many print publications or FDLP articles were distributed to. 21 22 And the same goes with the PSAs that

we distribute to the campus radio stations.

usually do followup and see how often they were aired and things like that.

So those kind of things are very

So those kind of things are very trackable. The brochures and the flyers and the posters that you have the ability to order for free, they're a little more difficult.

Sometimes our PAA folks will follow up during conversations, do you find them useful? Do you use them? Did people take the flyers? Things like that.

So we do collect that. It's just harder once they leave Pueblo and once they leave GPO to track exactly how much those tangible items are used.

MS. LASTER: Okay, last question.

MS. WEBB: Hi, Paula Webb, University of South Alabama, Mobile, Alabama. This is just a suggestion. Use the college base. There's a lot of film schools out there.

And what a wonderful place to offer for, maybe, \$200, \$300 for a student to submit a PSA for the Federal Depository Library. And then they could have a contest, and then the

winner would be the PSA, and that would be a way 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

of getting promotional materials at a good cost.

Kelly Seifert, GPO. MS. SEIFERT: Thank you. That's a great idea.

MS. LASTER: Just have one quick clarification. The FDLP.gov and Ben's Guide presentation will be in the Wilson Harrison Room. And now I would like to turn it over to Blane Dessy for today's meeting summary.

MR. DESSY: Good afternoon. Okay, Cherie, how much time are you giving me? seven minutes. Actually, I could give back a couple to Kristina if you feel you need two more minutes to finish your thoughts.

I want to go back to a comment that Kelly made about Parks and Recreation. I don't know how many of you watch it, but if you do at all, you know that Tammy, the evil librarian who runs the city library is sort of an object of ridicule.

So I was just thinking, well how could we make this interesting when Tammy would be the one involved. I don't know.

watch too much TV in my spare time.

But anyway, if you don't watch it, it's funny. And there actually is a hysterical librarian, Tammy the evil librarian.

My other thought, though, is that if we could only come up with a show about FDLP and vampires, it would probably go to number one on, you know, CW or something like that. So maybe you need to think about that as an alternative to Parks and Recreation.

Just some thoughts that I wanted to sort of bring back to the four because I think they were important thoughts, at least they were to me.

And that was the incredible response rate to the survey. Now I know last year when everyone was asked to do the survey, there were some concerns that it was going to be an imposition. There was not enough time. We've been surveyed to death, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

However, 81 percent of the regionals and 64 percent of the selectives took the time

to complete the survey. I think that's really significant that while we might have thought it was an imposition, a majority of you felt impelled to complete that survey and to send it back.

I think that shows a commitment, that even though that survey may have been a little onerous, enough of you cared to fill it out to make sure that your voices were heard in this whole data gathering process.

So I think that's a real success story for this group of people, considering that we've all been surveyed to death.

I thought it was interesting, too, when Paul was talking about the differentiation between statistics. And I thought, well, how am I supposed to make sense of what that means?

And I thought, well, it makes sense to me because, of course, the people who are here are a self selecting group. And obviously, you felt it important enough to come here.

You somehow had to marshal the resources to get here, whether that was time,

money, childcare, pet care, whatever it was. And so I'm not surprised that those of you who are here held much stronger opinions about the issues than those people who couldn't be here with us this week.

I mean, that made perfect sense to me. I thought, well of course, the people who were most zealous, if that's a good word, are the people who are here.

And the people who are most committed to sort of sorting out the issues are the ones who found a way to get here. So I think Paul's statistics kind of bear that out.

I heard, I mean, there was a lot of data this afternoon. And I mean, there were top ten lists and top five lists and percentages.

But here are the issues that I heard.

I mean, I guess, I'm going to redo your themes, since you were all sorting things into themes. I'm going to do my own metadata structure on your stuff.

According to me, there were actually seven themes that I heard talked about, right?

And I'm just going to go over them quickly
because to me, I always like to be able to put
my ideas into buckets, and then I know what to

do with the bucket.

So preservation, I'm just going to in the order they were talked about this afternoon. Preservation, education, marketing and promotion, affiliation, collections and cataloguing, services, and government.

I mean, that's seven. And so I thought okay, I think that captured everything that we were talking about this afternoon. I mean, we were kind of using different terms or sorting them in different ways.

But I think I heard about seven big themes coming to the four this afternoon. Seven themes that a majority of the depository libraries felt were significant enough to talk about.

And then I thought well okay, now, what are we going to do with those seven themes?

And I thought well, how are we going to sort this out, what happens next?

And I thought oh, remember Blane, we're in Phase 1. Right? So we have all this data now, which we all know is going to continue to be massaged and sorted.

For any responses that came in late, they're going to be added in. The staff here is going to be crunching numbers until they retire, I think, or until they're driven mad by crunching numbers.

But it appears that they're going to be working the numbers and working the numbers and working the numbers and working them so that they become even more relevant, and you can make even more discriminating decisions based upon those numbers.

But this is Phase 1. And just out of Phase 1, look how much data and insight into the program you already have. You've identified some very common themes, some very important themes.

You're going to move into Phase 2, which is where there's going to be followup with the respondents. There are going to be focus

groups. Then you're going to move into white papers, and then a national plan.

So I feel very good about this. I mean, to me, to think that you could get that many people to agree on seven ideas is really significant.

And I want to recap something that Robin had said to me this morning is what GPO needs to hear from us now are some very specific examples.

If we're going to talk about preservation, education, marketing and promotion, affiliation, et cetera, let's get down to specifics. What are those things that can really be done? Who should be doing them? What's it going to take? And when do we want it?

And if we can get down to that next level of planning, I think this will have been a very successful exercise. So congratulate yourselves, applaud yourselves for responding to the survey.

All of you took time out of your schedules to do that. You've been here very

1	patiently with us all week. And I think you have
2	about a 15 minute break now before you go on to
3	your next sessions.
4	Thank you, everyone on the panel.
5	And thank all of you.
6	(Whereupon, the meeting was
7	concluded at 3:44 p.m.)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

+ + + + +

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE
AND
DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL MEETING

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2012

+ + + + +

+ + + + +

The Conference met in the Crystal Ballroom in the Doubletree Crystal City, 300 Army Navy Drive, Arlington, Virginia, at 10:30 a.m., Sharalyn J. Laster, Council Chair, presiding.

PRESENTING:

SHARALYN J. LASTER, Depository Library
Council Chair

MARY ALICE BAISH, Superintendent of Documents, GPO

DORY BOWER, GPO

BLANE DESSY, Executive Director, FEDLINK, Library of Congress

FANG GAO, GPO

ABBIE GROTKE, Library of Congress

JANE SÁNCHEZ, Director, Library Services & Content Management, GPO

DAVID WALLS, GPO

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:
SHARALYN J. LASTER, Chair
STEPHANIE BRAUNSTEIN
CHRISTOPHER BROWN
HELEN BURKE
MARIE CONCANNON
BLANE DESSY
STEPHEN M. HAYES
PEGGY ROEBUCK JARRETT
ROSEMARY LASALA
SUSAN LYONS
MARK PHILLIPS
ARLENE WEIBLE

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

	cil Session - Web Archiving and How it Fits the FDLP by Abbie Grotke, Library of Congress David Walls, GPO Fang Gao, GPO Dory Bower, GPO
	Forecast Study - Summary Discussion & ce Roles by Blane Dessy, Executive Director FEDLINK, Library of Congress Mary Alice Baish, Superintendent of Documents, GPO Jane Sanchez, Director, Library Services & Content Management, GPO Shari Laster, Depository Library Council Chair, University of Akron
DLC V	Wrap-Up by Shari Laster, Depository Library Council Chair, University of Akron185

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(10:30 a.m.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Hello, everyone. MR. PHILLIPS: Wow. That was great. Exciting audience. I'm from the University name is Mark Phillips. of North Texas and I'm representing the technology and infrastructure working group within council and the topic that we prepared for you today is on Web archiving. And we've got a panel to talk with us today, really, divided up into two presentations, and I'm going to go through and introduce our speakers.

We'll have both presentations, open it up for questions from council, and then we'll open it up for questions from the audience, so we'll be saving all of the questions for the end, if that's all right.

Our first speaker is Abbie Grotke from the Library of Congress. She's the Web archiving team lead with the Office of Strategic Initiatives and her presentation is Web Archiving at the Library of Congress and Around the World. It's up there. You can read it.

The second group is kind of a team 2 presentation from GPO and their talk is entitled Web Archiving for the FDLP: GPO's Harvesting and 3 4 Archiving of Federal Web Content, and that's 5 going to be presented by three speakers, David 6 Walls, who's the preservation librarian, Dory 7 Bower, who's the archive specialist, and then

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

librarian.

And they all are part of the library services and content management group and I will turn it over to them and let them start.

Fang Gao, who's the supervisory cataloging

MS. GROTKE: Good morning, So I'm going to give you a sort of everybody. introduction to what Web archiving is, how it works, show you what a typical workflow is, talk about what some of the challenges we have, talk a little bit about what's going on around the world because, certainly, the four of us aren't the only ones doing Web archiving, and talk a bit about some of our collaborative archives, including our end-of-term archive, which some of you may have heard me present last year on the topic with Tracy Seneca from the project team.

So what is Web archiving exactly? Most folks at this point have a general familiarity, but I will go over, sort of, what the basics are. It's the process of creating an archivable or preservation copy of a Web site. So it's not downloading by Save As in your browser.

It's really trying to represent what that Web site looked at at particular point in time, including the look, the feel, the navigation, so it's a snapshot at a particular in time.

Web archivists often capture sites over periods of time and multiple times. So we're trying to capture changes in Web sites, document when content is removed or added, that kind of thing. It also captures as much as we possible can from the Web site, and again, we'll talk about the challenges in doing that, but we try to preserve text, images, audios, videos, PDFs, any content that might appear on that Web site.

Now, you can archive just a single document, but often, at least what the Library of Congress is aiming to mostly do is archive entire Web sites or parts of Web sites that are of interest.

So why do we actually archive the Web? Well, there are a lot of events unfolding on the Web, such as the events in the Middle East recently. A lot of the content that are being reported out are only on the Web. We're documenting changes in the Web, as I said.

We're documenting changes in the records of governments, not only in the U.S., but around the globe, and capturing what the citizens of those countries might be creating and posting on the Internet.

Some archival organizations are also capturing their entire domains. We don't do that here in the U.S. because it's really hard to identify what the U.S. domain is. We can't just say .gov, we can't say .com, but others are a bit luckier, such as our friends in Iceland who can easily identify what the Icelandic Web is,

or the National Library in France archives all of the .fr for instance, and some of those libraries are mandated to do that.

So how does it work and what are the challenges? This is a very simplistic view of the basic workflow that most of us undertake when we're archiving the Web and there are various policies that are in place at institutions that drive what types of content is selected, what types of content jou can archive based on legal or copyright policies that might be in place, and also, what we might be able to accomplish with the crawling tools that we have.

So some content we just can't archive with the crawling tools that are in place right now. So the basic workflow includes selection of Web sites, we have to know what we're going to archive before we archive it. Unless you're doing the whole domain crawl, selection is a really key piece.

The Internet archives, archive.org, large Web archive that you may be familiar with, they aren't really selecting content, so it's

not a very deep or thorough crawl of the Web, even though it's a lot of content.

What some of the libraries and archives are doing is a more thorough, selected, focused crawling of content, so selection is an important part. And we call those seeds; the starting point for the crawler.

We also give instructions about what other content related to those seeds we want to archive and how deeply we want to go. So we have to scope the seed to make sure we're archiving a complete picture. We want to tell the crawler to go get the Facebook page that's associated with a campaign Web site, for instance, so we want to tell the crawler and give the crawler some instructions.

So we send those instructions in the form of a seed list, and I'll have an example a little bit later on, to the crawler and many of us are using something called the Heritrix web crawler, and it's an open source tool that's available, and was developed by the library and archives community.

The crawler goes and visit those
seed URLs and discovers other URLs on that page
and captures all of that following the rules that
we've established. And then we process that
content and store in something called the .ware

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

archives.

Access tools are need to view this content, so you've probably heard of the Wayback Machine at the Internet archive, there's an open source version of that that many of us use to present the web archives to our staff for processing or for the public access.

format, which is an ISO standard format for web

There are various tools out there developed or services that are that available for people interested in web archiving. Some are in-house tools, such as the Library of Congress has developed a tool that I'll mention a little bit more in a moment, we call them curator tools because they help manage the workflow and some of the processes necessary URLs, manage permissions, to manage the developed the seed lists, and these can be very

helpful.

Again, some of them are open source or available to the general public, such as the web curator tool, but also services or subscription services, such as Archive-It and Web Archiving Service that smaller institutions who may not have the technical infrastructure to do web archiving can use, pretty easily, to develop collections.

There are also a new crop of tools coming up that are serving, sort of, business needs, such as the archiving of a particular company's Web site for legal reasons, or for compliance reasons, so we're seeing a new crop of tools devoted, particularly, to getting a really good snapshot of one web site, so there's a new class of tools out there, such as Page Freezer and a few other tools.

So some of the technical challenges,

I won't go into great detail here, but the web

crawlers are very good today, but they can't

really keep up with what's going on on the web

in terms of the multimedia, Flash content,

Javascript causes some problems, we sometimes have trouble with things like Flickr and social media content.

We can often archive this content, but then the Wayback Machine viewer sometimes can't replay it. So there's the crawler and there's the Wayback tool, and both of them need to be functioning to be able to look at some of the content. But we can know that we've archived content so that when the tools do catchup, we'll be in good shape.

So some of the legal challenges. Legal deposit legislation is available in some countries that allows them or mandates national libraries to collect and preserve web resources. Not all countries have this. I'll talk about the International Internet Preservation Consortium in a moment, but we just launched a new web site which has a list of all the countries and what legal deposit legislation is available in those countries.

In the U.S., there is no law that, sort of, covers this for the Library of Congress

or for other libraries. There is the Section 108 of the U.S. Copyright Act, which, there was some work in recent years to address digital preservation and web archiving, but that has not moved forward as quickly as we might like.

So the Library of Congress and a number of other libraries take a variety of approaches when it comes to archiving material, usually with government content, we don't seek any notifications, but in some cases, we notify web site owners that we are crawling and are providing access.

In some cases, we ask permission to crawl that content. In other cases, we ask permission to provide offsite access. There's something called robot.txt exclusions. If you're familiar with the robot.txt file that can appear on a web site, some libraries respect that when crawling and others decide not to.

And there are some discussions around Fair Use and collecting. There was an ARL report recently that best practices that, sort of, suggested that libraries would be able

to collect web sites under Fair Use.

So just to touch a little bit about the web archiving that's going on around the world. I mentioned the International Internet Preservation Consortium. It's currently 49 members, national libraries and archives, universities, service providers, such as the internet archive are involved. We meet regularly to discuss issues of harvesting, preservation, and access.

There are training and education programs. We work on collaborative archives together. It's really a fantastic group and a way for all of us to gather together to discuss similar issues. We're all, sort of, in this together. It's still a very new field, so we're very excited to have this out there.

Just a few resources that you might be interested in. There's a Wikipedia list of web archiving initiatives that lists a lot more than what are in the IIPC. There's also this neat timeline at timeline.webarchivist.org, that has been published based on the data in the

Wikipedia initiatives list, that lets you walk through a timeline of when web archiving programs started up, so that's really handy to see.

I won't go into great detail here, but at the end of 2011, the National Digital Stewardship Alliance, of which the Library of Congress is a convener of, and the content working group that I'm a co-chair of, we initiated a web archiving survey and we had 91, I think, responses.

This is available on the Library of Congress web site if you're interested in seeing what types of results we had. We found a lot of universities are doing web archiving, a lot of archives, not as many museums that we might hope, but it was an interesting snapshot of where things are in the U.S.

So a little bit on web archiving at the Library of Congress. We've been archiving since 2000, so we're, I guess, 12 years in now. We mostly do event and thematic collections and we have a couple of approaches that we take. So

we do our large-scale collections, such as our election, we're archiving all the campaign web sites for the election right now.

Those are very large collections and we don't really have the capacity, internally, at the Library of Congress to manage those, so we contract those out to the Internet archive under our crawling contract with them.

That helps us because they're able to monitor the collections 24 hours a day, which we can't do, since we're on the government time. We go home at 6 o'clock. So those allow us to document events, themes, on a particular topic over multiple frequencies. Sometimes we have a start and end date to a collection, depending on the event.

Sometimes we're crawling things ongoing over the course of years. We have a variety of frequencies that we're archiving, typically weekly or monthly, sometimes we do things annually, depending on the web site. I'll talk about the collaborative archives that we do later.

We do do a little bit of crawling in-house. We have the Heritrix crawler installed and the Wayback Machine, but it's really limited capacity at this point. We do some testing, special projects, we archive our own content, and then if something comes up that we know the site is going away within the next 24 hours, we'll archive that.

So our statistics as of early-October, we have about 55 collections, 13 of those are currently active. The big number there is the 374 terabytes, which is growing rapidly, and I'll mention why in a moment. The documents number is really anything that is making up all those web sites in our archive, so that's images, text, PDFs, all the bits and pieces that make up web sites are in that billions of documents.

So you can see, over the course of the years that we've been doing this, the growth in our archive data has grown tremendously. We used to collect about 5 terabytes a month. We're now getting about 10 terabytes, partly

because we tried to do a concerted effort to get more YouTube video, and I think we got too much, so we're scaling back.

We've been working with the Internet Archive in the last couple months about trying to figure out why, for instance, a collection of 17 URLs ended up being terabytes and terabytes of data, so this is the kind of thing that you have to look out for. You have to monitor the collections. You have to see what you're getting and ensure that you're getting content that you really want.

I think in the case of YouTube, we're getting multiple copies of a particular YouTube video, and when you total that up, it's just out of control, so we're trying to reduce duplication there.

So selection policies, as I mentioned, are a big player in what people archive and collect. Ours are highly selective, as you might imagine, again, we can't collect the entire U.S. domain. We have to focus in our efforts. We don't have any staff

working full-time on selection for web archives right now, so people are fitting into their reference desk duties, or their other duties at the Library of Congress.

We have a general policy that's available on the public web site, which is being reevaluated, it really needs to be looked at every couple of years to make sure it's up to date. There are supplemental guidelines, we have a staff member that's focusing a lot on developing other guidelines for the selecting officers.

One area that we'd -- what was I going to say? I think that's it. So the staff in library services and the law library actually do the selection of the web site, my team mostly works on the project management, and the development of the tools, and helping move the projects along, so that selection is happening around the library.

Our staff at the library, we have five working, almost full-time, on web archiving, and again, the recommending

officers, it depends on the collection, but we can have up to 20 or 30 working on any given web archive; usually it's one or two curators working on a particular archive.

So just some of the themes and topics that we cover, again, the elections. We're in the heat of that. I think there's about 1200 sites that we're currently archiving for that. We have a public policy archive that's ongoing that collects materials related to the elections, but also topics, just general public policy topics.

We regularly collect the Congress Congressional web sites, house.gov, and senate.gov, and committee sites on a monthly basis. We're doing other collections with our law library, such as a Legal Blawgs Archive. We're working a lot with our overseas offices in the Library of Congress to document events and elections in their regions of the world, such as Indonesia and India.

We have done a 9/11 collection and worked with others in our collaborative

archives, mostly, on documenting disasters and emergency events. And then we work with some of our other special collections divisions on topical archives related to their print collections.

So talking a little bit about the tool we use, it helps us manage the entire workflow, so it's a way to nominate URLs, send them permission notices, prepare the lists for crawling. We have a quality review aspect. So once something is collected, then we also review it after we've archived it to make sure we got a good capture.

Sometimes we put things, we will decide we need to refine the scoping and the instructions to the crawler to make sure we're getting a complete capture. That's kind of a back and forth.

You have to go back and revisit your URLs pretty regularly to make sure that they haven't changed domains, that the content hasn't changed drastically from what you put it into the collection for, so going back to the seeds that

you've added is really important to make sure that you're still getting the content that you want and that the crawler can handle it.

We also have some administrative functions, so our team can help manage the collections, and we're working on adding a cataloging element to this. There's staff in the acquisitions and bibliographic access part of the library that actually do the cataloging, but we pull in a lot of data that's from the web archives itself, and I'll show you some records in a moment on that.

So researcher access is available for some of our archives, not all of them. The rest are in various states or production. For instance, some of them are catalogued, but we don't have server space, so we're waiting to open up server space to allow access to those collections.

Access is available through loc.gob\lcwa. And when you go into a particular collection, you can browse or search the records. So we're not searching the archived

resources themselves, but we have catalogued each of the resources that have been selected by the nominators.

We catalogue in MODS, so it's metadata object descriptive schema, so they're pretty basic records. Again, we pull in some data from the web archive content itself. We extract data from the archive, such as the title, the abstract, the dates captured, and then the catalogers take that base record and add subjects, and languages, and other content to that.

And you can see in this one, the access condition statement is restricted to onsite users only. For the 2008 election, Barack Obama's campaign site never responded to our request for offsite access, so this one, you have to come onsite.

We've had some changes in thinking about campaign sites by our lawyers, so we're hoping to renotify all of the sites that didn't respond to our requests for permission. It's not that they denied us permission, it's just,

they never responded, and that's a big challenge with some of the permissions issues. We're hoping to renotify them and just open up access to these resources.

So access is, again, through the Wayback Machine. So if you look on the record and you clicked on archive site, you would get our version of the Wayback Machine. So the Wayback Machine always has dates, always shows the URL, but you can customize it to make it look like your web site, and we've done that here. We've added a thumbnail that you can see the dates captured over time.

And here's an example of a site in the archive. Most web archives at this point include a banner at the top of some sort that identifies the project, or the collection, the dates captured, some allow navigation through the archives. We try to say that, you know, some things won't work here. If you were to type into the get involved box and hit sign-up, you wouldn't actually get to sign-up, obviously.

You can't search search boxes,

2 to d. d. d. t. d. 5 a. 6

collaborative archives really helps us respond

things like that, so we want to make it more clear to researchers that there are limitations. We didn't used to have these banners and we added them, I think, maybe around 2004, and our early archives we used to get, you know, emails into our email account saying, can I have some campaign posters, because they thought we were hosting the web site, so this has been very helpful to say, no, you're in an archive. You're not on the live site.

So at the Library of Congress, we're working on improvements to access. There's a project across the library to better allow researchers to search across all of the library's content, whether digital or just other materials, so we're working to integrate the web archives into that interface, so we're pretty excited about that.

And we hope to, just found out yesterday, we'll be soft-launching that, probably in December.

So collaborative archives, building

a lot more quickly to events that are unfolding around the globe. Often times, the Library of Congress wants to archive more content that it can, but because of our extensive permissions

regime, we benefit more by working with others

who might not have the same policies in place.

So we can apply our selecting officers, or our subject experts, to projects where we might not be doing the collecting ourselves, but in all, it benefits the community as a whole, so we're able to archive more content. By bringing in other partners, you can bring other expertises, whether subject, technical, or language expertise.

We have some people in our African and Middle East division who are helping identify content in other languages that the Internet Archive wants to collect, but they wouldn't know what to select, so that's been very helpful, and we learn a lot from working with other partners.

So here's some examples, September 11th archive was our very early example of this.

On September 11th itself, everybody picked up
the phone and said we need to collect. Internet
Archive started archiving almost immediately,

Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, I'll talk a little bit about the end-of-term archive in a moment, but you can see some of the other topics that we've covered. And then also, in 2012, the International Internet Preservation Consortium joined together to archive content around the Olympics.

and then the library joined forces soon after.

So anybody who wanted to participate from the membership was able to identify content from their regions of the world and contribute to one archive, so that was really exciting. So I'll talk a little bit about the end-of-term archive.

When did we start those conversations? 2008, a group banded together to document the end of the Bush administration and the transition to Obama's administration. It was Library of Congress, Internet Archive, California Digital

Library, UNT, and the Government Printing Office. Harvard University has joined us this year to work on the project as well.

We realize that one institution couldn't, alone, figure out and archive all of the government web. So we were all members of the IIPC, we were all meeting in Australia at the time, and decided to work together to archive this content.

We enlisted the help of volunteers, so we -- or I'll talk about that in a minute. So some of the projects goals were to work collaboratively to preserve U.S. Government sites. We wanted to document the changes in the agency sites during this time. We knew that some would change drastically.

We were concerned about content disappearing and we wanted to make sure we were capturing those changes. We also were already collecting in these areas, so we wanted to enhance our own collections. Part of the project was to, each of the project participants archived pieces of the government domain that

they were interested in, and then we merged it into one large archive that many of us were preserving long term.

There is public access at one location, hosted by the Internet Archive and the California Digital Library did a front end to that, so even the presentation of the access piece is a collaborative effort.

So the data sources for this project, we worked with lists from usa.gov. This year, we've got data from data.gov and the Stanford WebBase was one of original sources. We try to pull in lists from anywhere we can. There's no one big master list of all government domains, unfortunately.

And we noticed in the 2008 archive that there was a lot more content appearing on .coms and .edus that aren't showing up in some of those lists, and all the social media accounts that we're grappling with right now.

We rely a lot on volunteer nominations, so we have bulk lists to work from, but we also know that they aren't comprehensive,

so we've put a call out, and many of you may have seen it, to request nominations of URLs for things that we might focus in more thoroughly and capture more completely during this time.

So the focused crawl of those sites will happen on a more frequent basis than the bulk crawls, which we'll do a couple times over the course of the project. I did want to mention, this time around, Debbie Rabina, at Pratt University, who was here earlier, she offered up her class this year to help us out.

So she's been writing about it on her blog. It's been really great. Their going through and identifying all social media associated with all of the government agencies, and that's just something there's no good list of anywhere that we've been able to get our hands on. So they've been doing a great job and they've put in a couple hundred cURLs at this point, I think.

So again, we have a couple approaches to the crawling. We take the whole list of everything that we know of in the

government domain and we do a couple of broad comprehensive crawls. One of them is going on right now, so we started our baseline crawl.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

We'll do another one, depending on the results of the election, we'll figure out when to do that in 2013. And again, we do prioritized, or selective, crawls based on the interests of the partners and who's participating. We focus a lot of efforts around the election, obviously, and around Inauguration Day.

So the 2008/2009 archive, we had about 3000 sites, and again, defining sites is a little difficult, which equaled over 16 terabytes of data, so all of the combined archives that we did together were merged into one bulk archive, and that's what's available publicly now. You can see the list, sort of a seed list, on the right.

It's not working. Next. Oh, he left. Oh, here. It worked. Yay. So we are actively soliciting nominations, so if you have any interest in helping, you can either just go

right to our nomination tool, which the University of North Texas has built for the original end-of-term archive, but also has been in use for quite a few collaborative archives, or you can contact us at eotproject@loc.gov, and we'll get back to you about how you can help.

We have a related Election 2012 project again with Harvard University Library, so you can also contribute to that, and we have a Twitter account which you can follow, but we do encourage you to help us identify resources that you might think are at risk of going away or of change, so we're interested in learning more about what you're interested in.

So we'll save questions for later and I'll pass it on to David.

MR. WALLS: Good morning. Hi. I'm David Walls, the Preservation Librarian at GPO, and Abbie set the stage for a very good reason of about why web harvesting is important and I'll be telling you about, sort of, the background of what we've been doing at GPO.

To my left is most of the members of

the web harvesting team, beyond Abbie here. We've got two other members that are not with us today, but Dory is going to be talking about the actually, sort of, workflow procedures we are currently working on; Fang is going to talk about the ever important cataloging and metadata aspects of that.

So I'd like to kind of go back to the beginning and set the stage of things. And everybody knows the story of how GPO has been around for a 150 years and the Federal Depository Library Program joined it in 1895, officially, and the reason for that relationship was that, the library program was really now right at the printing press.

So all those publications that came off the printing line could be selected, those that were in the scope of the program, and distributed to libraries. So really, we've been doing web harvesting, only since about 1996, but we've been harvesting content for things that we're within the scope of the library program, from a print stream, for a very long

time. For us, the medium is really the only thing that's changed.

The big change in 1993 was that, digital became an official part of what government publications were about, and as Bill Clinton said, that this new digital world will provide valuable insights into the most effective means of disseminating all public government information.

This was very prophetic because, as we know, the most effective means of doing this, and what most people desired, was to be able to access government information on the web. So even though we have a history of harvesting publications, and if you can remember back to what web sites looked like in 1996, little of them were little more than a landing page with a list of PDF reports that they intended you to actually printout and use, and not even really use it on the page.

But in 2012, this is what most government publications look like. So if we're really to provide permanent public access to

government information, we have to figure out

1 ||

_

how to harvest these publications that are within the scope of the Federal Depository Library Program and make them available.

So this is our commitment to what we

So this is our commitment to what we intend to do as far as harvesting. We have a, sort of, fork in the road in our workflow. There are some web sites, as we look at scope content, that really only have a PDF publication or two that's within scope, and so that's what we harvest.

We go in and literally do a right-click and pull off the publication. For those that are more involved than that, we use the Heritrix harvester that Abbie mentioned, and part of our workflow process is to actually look and determine what is within scope on that site.

Our goal is to create a facsimile copy of the web site to preserve as much of the original functionality as is technically possible. As Abbie pointed out, you can't really necessarily harvest all the functionality and maintain it. And what should

be Number 4 is, we have a commitment to classifying and cataloging all of this web-harvested content.

In 2011, we began a pilot program with the Internet Archive and we've been using the Heritrix-based Archive-It web service to harvest this content. And we decided to outsource, basically, the expensive IT infrastructure to Internet Archive. We did not implement the Heritrix harvester in-house.

We basically went through the Archive-It web service. This saves money and we are, of course, using the Wayback Machine to host the content that we harvest. What we kept in-house was the expertise of the librarian to be able to go out and look at pages, determine the scope, determine what we actually wanted to harvest, what was valuable off that page, and to create the metadata and cataloging records of that site.

So for the web archiving actual process, we developed context with agency webmasters, librarians at other federal

agencies, and we reach out to them because we discovered that not all of the content on a site is easy to harvest and we are in the process of developing formal partnerships, reaching out for some format content on sites that is not very easy for the Heritrix harvester to harvest.

We are also a member of the International Internet Preservation Consortium and we've been a member for a number of years, but they keep having the conferences, since it's a national organization, in places like Singapore and the Netherlands, which makes it very hard, when you have a travel ban, to be able to get to.

The conference was in Washington, D.C. this summer and we took full advantage of that, and were able to participate, and we've also participated on some phone conference calls and things. But this is the group that is really working together to try to figure out how to harvest the web.

We work with the Internet Archive as well and Heritrix harvester to, as the web is a

very dynamic medium and it changes all the time, and so we're working together to try to figure out how to best harvest it.

We have other partners that we work with, the National Archives, the Library of Congress, and UNT libraries. For, at least the Library of Congress and the National Archives, these are two other federal agencies that harvest portions of the federal web. And as we began talking about our own respective programs, we were a little bit worried that we might have a lot of overlap.

And much to our surprise in some conversations this summer, I guess our joy, we discovered that, due to our individual agency mandates, what we're intending to harvest is quite a bit different. The Library of Congress is focusing more on the elections and cultural aspects of the impact of elections and things like that having to do with American politics.

The National Archives is really harvesting web sites that are declared by the agency to be an official record of that agency's

activities. That's what the National Archives does. We're looking more at government publications.

The web site, as the presentation to the American public of what, say, if you remember from a previous slide, the Consumer Finance Protection Bureau is all about right now this week in October in 2012. It will inevitably change and we will go back and harvest more of the site as the site changes, but we're interested in keeping that site as a publication; available and accessible.

So for our pilot program, we basically sat down and looked at some sites that were difficult to harvest as a test of our ability to do that and our ability to catalog, and our cataloging and metadata, but as we look forward into the future, one of the things that we've seen as a niche for our potential future harvesting is the Y 3 class.

I'm not a cataloger and SuDoc still, after two years, kind of eludes me a little bit, but this is, essentially, the class of small

independent federal agencies and commissions.

These were always documents, even in the world of paper, that we had difficulty getting copies of. This area was a large source of fugitive documents.

Most of these organizations have abandoned print and are not publishing completely on the web, so this is an area that we think is a very fertile ground for providing permanent public access to this kind of content. And I turn it over to Dory.

MS. BOWER: Hello. I'm Dory Bower and I'm going to get more in-depth of the workflow that we've been doing as part of this pilot project with automated archiving and show you some of the work that we've completed.

When we begin with our workflow, we begin with scope determination. And what this is is, we create a seed list to tell the crawler what is in scope. So when we begin our process, we begin with deciding what agency's web site we are planning to harvest and that will be the top of our seed list.

б

So I've given the example here of the Holocaust Museum, ushmm.org. And as the default is setup with Heritrix and Archive-It, all subsequent directories under that main URL will be captured. So anything, like the example I've given here where it's slash education, slash about, slash contact, anything like that will automatically be harvested and captured.

What we are looking for when we are doing scope determination are the subdomains. And the subdomain is the division of a larger site named to the left of the host name. So the example I give here is resources.ushmm.org. So anything like this will not automatically be captured by the harvester, so it will have to be listed separately in the seed list.

So what we literally do is, open up the web site, open up all the pages, and go through the entire web site looking for all of these subdomains and we list them separately in the seed list. Once we have our seed list, then we always run a test crawl on Heritrix.

The test crawl allows us to see the

data without actually pulling it from any servers and archiving it. At this time, we find it's a good time to contact the agencies. By policy, we do contact all the agencies of web sites that we will be capturing. And we have a form letter that we email to all the agencies that says, in about 48 business hours, we will be archiving your web site.

And we look for emails of, generally, webmasters, or if we can't find something like a generic webmaster email, we look for CIOs and what their email addresses are.

Once our crawl has completed, that's when we begin our quality review. And the Archive-It service provides us with a lot of reports and we look through all of the reports available. And we're looking at a number of things, including, we're checking the URLs, what it decides is in scope and what is out of scope, we're looking at the file size to see if we're capturing something that looks too large, and we're looking at anything that could be blocked by the robot.txt exclusions, as Abbie talked

about earlier.

At this time, we do have to make a lot of changes, usually, in scoping. One example I'll give, that a lot of people come across, is calendars, and calendars can just run, and on, and on, and on, so we'll have to make some scoping changes to not capture all of that data.

And another thing we are doing is, we are looking, what is blocked by the robot.txt exclusions, and if it's something that we think is relevant for the site. One thing I'll mention is Facebook. All of the agencies have their own Facebook web sites and they often are blocked by the robot.txt exclusion, so we'll put something in there to say to go behind the robot.txt exclusion for certain URLs like that.

Once we've made all the changes, that's when we run the actual archive crawl. And while we're running the archive crawl, we find that this is a good time to begin scoping other web sites that are in the queue so we can have a continued process.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Once the archive crawl is complete, that is when we're able to look at it on the Wayback Machine, which you've been hearing a lot And this is when we can actually see what the web site will look like. And I mentioned challenges here because Abbie mentioned some of the challenges earlier. One of the big things is Java. that and database we see, functionality.

And this is when we do actually see it, when we're looking at Wayback. And so at this stage we are doing, again, a lot more QR and we are trying to fix things. We can run patch crawls, we can look if there's some possible embedded metadata that's been blocked by text exclusions, and we'll sometimes run small little crawls to try to capture more data.

So we really are trying our best to get the best possible facsimile that we can of a web site, but you do have to understand that there are these challenges and sometimes you will notice that there could be some content that is not exactly the same, but it's not an exact

science yet.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

At this point, we have eight sample sites for viewing and we are welcoming feedback. And so we would like everybody to go and look at the sites and to provide us with any feedback you may have, and I have the web site listed here, fdlpwebarchiving@gpo.gov.

And the sites are accessible in two locations now. First, on the CGP, and second, through Archive-It, Internet Archive's hosting site. Here's the view of the two locations, the CGP and the Archive It's homepage.

First I will speak about the CGP and recommending choices I'm here, two for First is keyword title searching searching. and the second is using the expert search mode. And you can type in WCAT=web archiving. And so here, on the display, I have the view of the expert search mode and in the search field you can just type WCAT=web archiving and this will bring up the entire collection of these sites that we have in our web archive collection.

And secondly, the second access

23

point is Archive-It. And where it says, I don't know if you can see it there, but it says explore collections, you can simply type in GPO.

Now, here's a view I'm showing that I did a title keyword search for the Holocaust Museum. And I don't know if you're able to see it, but I had a search result of 19 records. And so scrolling through you might say, okay, now what's the site I'm looking for? Well, we do have a way to easily identify the web archive content, and I have it circled there, that we have Internet with in the SuDoc number.

And so I've pointed out there where you can see that Internet is in the SuDoc number. And then that's an easy way for you to know this is the record I'm looking for. This is the web archive content.

Here, I'm showing the example of when I did an expert search, typing in the term WCAT=web archiving, and here are the eight sites that we have now, all listed there, and I've circled also that you can see all of the sites have Internet in the SuDoc number.

This is an example of searching using Archive-It and in the explore collections, typing in GPO, and it comes to our page showing here the Government Printing Office, and if you can see there, it displays that there is a total of eight results, that all of our eight sites are on here.

Through either of these means of searching, once you have decided the record that you'd like to look at and click on it, you will come to this page. And this page indicates all the dates that the web site was archived. And so if there's a particular date you're looking for, you could click on that.

For this example, I have just clicked on the last date that we archived this page, August 15th, and then it brings you to the archived web site itself. And as mentioned before, you know that you're looking at the archived web site because there is the banner at the top indicating you're looking at the archived web site, and that it was collected by Government Printing Office on the date August

15th.

And so you would be able to, then, navigate the site as you would have navigated the live site on August 15th. And so I encourage everybody, again, to look at it and provide us with any feedback you may have. And now I'm going to turn it over to Fang who's going to speak more about our metadata.

MS. GAO: Hello, everyone. My name is Fang Gao from GPO. So in what follows, I'm going to talk about metadata creation for our archived content. As we all know, to help our user access the harvested content, metadata creation is essential. Okay.

So on archived site, we are creating Dublin Core records and also, in order to better meet our user's information needs, we have the flexibility of creating metadata at different levels; at collection level, seed levels, and document level.

In terms of the content standard, we are using, for metadata creation, we are following RDA. RDA stands for resource

description and access and is the new cataloging
standard replacing ADCR2. I'm sure a lot of you

already heard about RDA.

model. FRBR stands for functional requirements for bibliographic records. So by following RDA and FRBR, we are helping our users to find, identify, select, and obtain government documents. So let me just stop here and do a quick survey here. So how many of you have already started RDA training? If you can show your hands.

Okay. Thank you. And how many of you have decided that you will implement RDA? Thank you. So let's see, in the updates the other day, given by Lori, we talked about we probably will implement RDA in the Spring next year. And that's also the date, I think, Library of Congress, and some of the other national libraries, are the date deciding when to implement the RDA, this March 31st next year.

So for our project, we are creating RDA-compatible records. Okay. Here is a

screenshot of the Dublin Core record archived site. As you can see, some of the common fields we have are titles, creator, subject, and

4 description, and publishers, and so on.

Apart from these usual fields, we also have some customized fields, like item numbers and SuDoc numbers, because these are the important selection tools, so we thought we should include them in Dublin Core records.

So when you search in Wayback Machine, you will be able to search on those metadata and find the records. However, our work does not stop here. We also want to have archived content represented in CGP. And CGP stands for catalog of U.S. Government publications.

And CGP is the national bibliography of the publications of United States Government. So if we follow our normal workflow, we will be creating brief bits in all our systems and doing cataloging, OCLC, ask for the records into our local system and overlay the brief bits.

However, in this age, the age we are

all talking about doing more with less, so we have to come up with a way to get the work done more efficiently. So we talked to our system librarians and explored the possibility of doing crosswalk and converting Dublin Core records through MARC.

And our catalogers and the system librarians, we work together and come up with a metadata mapping profile. And our cataloger, Liselle Drake, and she is here, she has played a very important role in coming up with the mapping profile. And we have successfully converted Dublin Core records into MARC records.

And here is a screenshot of the record. I know it's too small, you probably will not see it, but if you look at this record and look at the 245 field, you probably will see something is missing. You might think there is something missing there. In the 245 field, it's just the title. You do not see the GMD is subfield H, you might think something is missing, but it's not.

As I said, these are RDA-compatible

records. So in RDA, we are actually having three new data elements replacing the GMD, the general material designations. So they are coded. These three fields are for content type, media type, and carrier type, and they are encoded in 336, 337, and 338.

And you will know these are RDA records if you are looking at field 040 with an indicator subfield E RDA. Another thing I want to point out is, if you look at our 110 field and 710 fields, you see the related terms, because in RDA and FRBR, we've put an emphasis on relationships, relationship between creators and the resources that it's associated with, relationships between words, manifestations, expressions, and items.

So here, in this example, we have -yes, it's too far away for me to look -- okay.
So in this example we have, this record is for
United States Holocaust Memorial Museum and the
creator is United States Holocaust Memorial
Museum too, so we actually used the related term
creator and code it in there so that way the users

know, what is the relationship between the corporate body and the title; the resource?

And if you look at 336 and 337, 338 fields, we've used the terms text, still images, sounds, moving images, including those terms to tell what are some of the formats that's included in this web site. So it just gives you more information about just, you know, its electronic resource, so it gives you more information.

Okay. So what does all this mean for us? Okay. So from this pilot, we definitely need to make workflow adjustments and we would encourage collaborations across different units. And we also find there are new skill sets that we need to have, so we'll have to provide more training for our staff.

We will also follow closely, the new developments and trends in our field, such as, Library of Congress Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiatives, where we're looking at the transition paths for MARC 21 to accommodate future needs.

We are also following a discussion

closely on linked data; how to get our library data, push our data out to the wider world of the Semantic Web so that our data can be acted upon, reused, and re-purposed to reduce duplicates of effort and avoid redundancies.

We will also continue to follow RDA-type guidelines and instructions in describing government information, publications, in all formats and media.

So what are our next steps? So following any announcements through our FDLP web site, we definitely want to welcome your suggestions and feedback on nominating sites, and also, things like SuDoc numbers, because at first we thought, can we do classified things, cataloging our content, without SuDoc numbers?

But then we thought about, since SuDoc numbers and item numbers are the important selection tools, we should include it, but then we'll be, you know, just the stem of the SuDoc numbers suffice for our purposes? So we would like to have your input in that.

And also, we are going to get more

staff involved in this process and integrate the process into our regular workflow. So this is not replacing any of our existing workflows, this is in addition what we've already been doing and integrate the whole process into our regular workflow.

We will also be fine-tuning the crosswalk process from the Dublin Core to MARC records. And also, since all these records are not in OCLC yet, it's all living in our local IOS systems, so down the road, we'll be thinking about how to batch load all these records in OCLC so that we can share everything we've done with the wider communities.

So that's all for me and now we can open it up to questions.

MR. PHILLIPS: So before we're going to open it up for questions, I've actually got a few comments. You know, we're in this whole restate everything that we just heard, which I think is an interesting thing. Just kind of thinking about the two presentations, one really exciting thing for me, I do a lot of

web archiving work at my institution and, you know, you have to step back and realize that not everybody does this every day, which is what we do.

But I think it's really exciting to see, not only GPO and the Library of Congress, but also, the National Archives, to really start about doing web archiving, and doing it in a standard and a, kind of, best practices sort of way. I think there's going to be a lot of opportunities down the road that we haven't even realized yet.

David mentioned, you know, talking with these different agencies and seeing what they're doing so they're not duplicating effort. Web archiving is one of the situations where the more duplication of effort there is, the better the product is, but with limited resources, it makes sense.

One of the really exciting things about the approaches that these agencies are using is that, there's the possibility of pooling this content later and actually creating

a completely different kind of product than what they're individually doing for their own purposes based on their own policies and guidelines. That's exciting.

One of the exciting things is that, as it should be, the web is considered part of the collection policy of a lot of these institutions. And it's no-brainer, but it took a while, but it's progress, and that's really exciting.

I like to see, on one of the slides, it talked about the web as publication. That's really exciting, the thinking about it in that terms. Technology challenges, there's a huge number of technology challenges. Harvesting, access, and that doesn't even get into the policy challenges, but just the technology.

Generally, web archiving, we do a really good job with about ten-year-old technology. So if we were out there crawling the 2002 web, we'd do great, but it just moves faster than we can do. A good example is crawling YouTube. The act of crawling a site

looks exactly like, hey, I'm trying to download this so I can keep it for myself and share it on a file network.

It's look exactly the same to the engineers at Google and they have dozens of engineers who are just coming up with new ways to keep crawlers from crawling YouTube. And whereas we've got maybe one person that's really trying to figure it out, and every time we reverse engineer the process, they're four steps ahead, and a lot of that has to be handled just with policy and discussing.

And I think by moving these discussions up into the federal agencies, the national libraries, groups like the Internet Archive, and through international organizations like IIPC, we're able to make a lot more end roads with groups like Facebook, Google, Twitter, and Flickr, than if we could do it all on our own, which is exciting.

I'm actually to see workflows and process that not only are new in libraries, but also incorporate existing tools, and workflows,

and people, that's really exciting. So the idea that, yes, I want to start doing this.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

We need to go hire this new person who we don't have money, or we don't have an open line to do, it's retraining, and retooling, and moving our existing expertise into this new area. It's just a different format and it takes new acquisition tools, but we're still trying to get the thing. That's really exciting.

The two really interesting things that I think for kind of next steps in this area. One is, there was talk about that end-of-term web archive, which, the 2008 crawl was a 160 million URIs. It's 16 terabytes of data. Let's just talk about the PDF content in that.

Ιf say that that's can interesting set of content for all of us. We kind of recognize that a PDF is a document-like There are 4.5 million PDFs in that; thing. What is that stuff? unique PDFs. there's a huge opportunity for research in this There's opportunity area. huge collaboration and trying to understand what this content is.

Of course, let's say half of that is completely out of scope of the program, well, that's still over 2 million documents that could be in there. And I think just figuring out new ways to go look at that, that's a massive amount of data. We can't just look at it in the standard way of just one person or even a 100 people just going through and looking at it and deciding if it's in scope or not. So I think those are some really exciting opportunities.

And now I'm done. Yay. So if I can open it up to questions from council first.

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Stephanie Braunstein, LSU. My question is for Abbie and you mentioned that you had archived material from Rita and Katrina, and since I'm from Louisiana, I was hoping I could find that, and when I went to your site, I didn't see it listed.

MS. GROTKE: Abbie Grotke, Library of Congress. Did I get that right? That's actually one of our collaborative archives. So the Internet Archive hosts that. So if you

visit the Internet Archive. There is a link 1 2 from our loc.gov\web archiving collections page, at the very bottom. It's not through our 3 4 public access, but there is public access through the Internet Archive. 5 6 Again, the collaboration aspect, we 7 help contribute URLs to that, but we don't have a copy of that archive ourselves. 8 MS. BRAUNSTEIN: But will I be able 9 10 to tell my constituents how to find it? MS. GROTKE: 11 Yes. Okay. 12 MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Thanks. 13 MS. GROTKE: And if you can't, let me know and I'll track it down for you. 14 MS. Shari 15 LASTER: Laster, 16 University of Akron. This question is for Fang. Will you be able to share your crosswalk for DC 17 to MARC and if so, when do you think it might be 18 19 ready for public consumption? 20 MS. GAO: Fang Gao, GPO.

definitely, I'll have you get in touch with our

system librarians and we have our cataloger,

I'm sure they would love to

21

22

23

Liselle Drake.

share that with you. Yes.

MS. LASTER: Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: Other questions from council? Questions from the audience? And just a reminder, please state your name and institution before you --

MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Arizona State University College of Law. Thank you for a wonderful presentation. It's been an area of mystery and I've learned a lot today. My immediate sense of confusion is the bottom-line about extraction of, at the document level into what we would think of as access for us.

So, for example, I think I understand that the web site is harvested and archived and that the metadata is created for the site, is somebody, somewhere, selecting major publications within the web site to extract and index specifically so the documents themselves can be determined or do we just have to find them using Archive-It? Does that make sense as a question? Thank you.

MR. WALLS: David Walls, GPO.

That
look
look
we p
repo
indi
anot
high

That's a great question. Right now we're looking at our ability to harvest the site, but we plan to, in cases where there is a definite report on the site that could be highlighted individually, we would go ahead and create another catalog record specifically highlighting that, and that it is a part of that bigger site.

And in some cases, depending on how the web site is designed, you could create the actual link and put it in the CGP of the actual link that would take you to the PDF on the page itself. Not all of them are designed that way, but we try to get you as close as possible.

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island. First question for Abbie at LC, you mentioned that, as part of your periodic crawls, you include the main House and Senate sites, and the committee sites, to what extent, if any, are member's sites included in your crawls?

MS. GROTKE: Yes. We're getting all the member sites on a monthly basis. Abbie

Grotke, Library of Congress. Sorry.

MR. O'MAHONY: Great. And then just more generally, for both of you all, in the course of your conversations in trying to learn about what each other is doing, and lack of duplication, and all, are there individual agencies out there that are involved in this kind of activity as well?

MS. GROTKE: Abbie Grotke, Library of Congress. As a part of the end-of-term archive, we've had conversations with some agencies that are very concerned about archiving their own content. Some of them, I think it was the Department of Labor in the 2008 archive, contacted us and wanted to participate, but they wanted us also to archive on a very specific date, and we were unable to do that, so we suggested that they get an Archive-It account, I think, to do that. I think they did.

We've also come across some Senators or Congressman that are subscribing to Archive-It, they have archivists on staff that are doing that. So we're seeing a little bit of

that. They may not be as aware of what we're doing, so we're trying to get the word out about

the archiving that we do and how they can access.

Part of the problem with the LC's congressional archives is, we don't have good public access for that yet. You may have seen the new beta.congress.gov, we're hoping with this revamp of how we provide access to the archives that we can link from the member pages in congress.gov to the web archives for that member. So we're really excited about being able to link those two resources eventually. We're not quite there yet, but we're working on it.

MR. O'MAHONY: Okay.

MR. WALLS: And I'll just follow-up with that. In our case, when we reached out and did the notification, in a lot of cases you hear nothing and you assume within 48 hours you can go ahead and harvest the site. They have no objection to that, because that's our current policy.

But in the case of the Holocaust

Museum, I got this glowing email from the person in charge of their web site saying that we had solved him a world of worry because he was trying to figure out how to get the money to harvest the site himself and figuring out what kind of access he would give to it, how he would let people know about it, and because that was something his director told him he had to do.

And so he's been very enthusiastic about our harvesting and as we've harvested it and made the cataloging records available, he's one of our biggest fans right now, and he's telling other colleagues of other federal agencies that if they've got content that's of interest to us, within the scope of the program, that they should contact us.

MS. HALE: Kathy Hale, State Library of Pennsylvania. I'm very excited about this. I was part of the group that, when they went out and did the crawl on the EPA and you gave us things to look at, I think that was something that you could do again. I'm sure that there are people out there that are very

interested in making this a success.

So if you use us, I'm sure that we will respond. I'm also very excited because we can also take this to a state level because that is one of the big things that most states are also going through, in that, we can capture those archive kinds of things, or those webs, because they are constantly changing, so I'm very excited to go back and try it on a smaller scale in Pennsylvania.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mark Phillips,
University of North Texas. Just to kind of
follow-up to that comment. I think there's
actually a lot of really, really exciting things
that are happening at the state level in
archiving, and if you just actually go to the
Archive-It tool and look at the number of state
libraries and state institutions who are
primarily focusing on state publications, it's
really exciting to see so many there.

And, yes, it's, at all levels, state, local, national, international, really exciting to see that moving forward.

MS. HARTNETT: Cass Hartnett,
University of Washington Libraries. How hard
would it be to get back to an earlier slide? I
think it was from either Abbie or David's slides
that showed, off to the right, sort of an
alphabetical list of domains that were captured.
I remember seeing afterschool.gov, that one, you
know, just stuck out in my mind.

Early on -- yay, isn't that nice?

My boss keeps asking me from time to time, you're the U.S. documents librarian, why don't you point to something on your site that's all these, sort of, cross-agency or multi-agency portals, or, you know, early on in the government web we did this. We pointed to nutrition.gov, seniors.gov, even usa.gov doesn't do that anymore.

And when I saw that alphabetical list of domains I thought, even that, itself, is a cultural artifact, and even that, itself, is informative. I mean, this is a silly operational question, but is there such a list somewhere that I can just point to?

MS. GROTKE: Abbie Grotke, Library of Congress. Yes, I think I took this screenshot from the University of North Texas nomination tool. This is from the 2008 archive. And there's a way to just run a list of everything that was in that crawl, and I think this is in there. That's out there on the web so we can point you to it if you would get in touch —

MS. HARTNETT: Okay. Yes. I think a lot of documents librarians would be really interested in being able to point to a list like this, even if the sites, like amberalert.gov or afterschool.gov aren't even live, just to know about --

MS. GROTKE: Well, and these were all archived as a part of the earlier archive and the archive copies are publicly accessible through -- I don't think -- I may have missed the -- it's eotarchive.cdlib.edu, I think. So all of these have been archived as a part of that earlier collection and are publicly accessible now from that time period.

MS. HARTNETT: Great. So I'm just

a couple steps behind. Thank you.

MS. GROTKE: Yes, but we can get you the links.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mark Phillips, University of North Texas. That brings up another interesting thing. So in this slide that says that there were 3000 sites that were archived. And really, that number means there were 3000 seeds, roughly, that were added to the tool.

And for most of these tools, it was done at that domain level and subdomain level. When we actually did the crawls, we ended up with, like, 13,000 subdomains in the federal web. I think it's going to be really interesting to look at the number of subdomains and what they are from 2008, and then as we do this crawl in 2012, there are whole programs that, I mean, obviously, have gone away and some we don't even know about.

One of the challenges of web archiving and we're still trying to work with this, and it kind of goes into that access piece,

as time goes forward, you've collected it, but you can still lose this content just because the institutional memory of, oh, yes, there happened to be this afterschool.gov site ten years ago that no one linked to within the archive and how do you re-expose some of that content?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And it goes along with the question about pulling out the publications and describing the publications at that level. one of the really exciting things is that, if this was all captured in a really, kind of, standards-based way, there's some interesting technologies and techniques you can use to extract, not only content, but also the relationships between different sites, it's, you know, working with the graph of the content and the same idea of saying, you know, this is the most important document in the federal web based on who links to it.

You can start to say things like that, which is really kind of interesting, especially as we look at government information.
You know, what are the most linked to content?

What content is most distributed across the federal domain? What's content that changes the most in the publications sphere?

So there are a lot of really interesting questions you can start to do, especially as you track these things over time.

MS. SELBY: Yes, Barbie Selby, University of Virginia. This has been a great program. Very educational. And my question, kind of, is a little bit like Cass'. There's access through the Internet Archive, search by GP of the library, there's access at LC, there's access at the Labor Department, there's access at North Texas, have we talked at all, I would just like to know if there could be one place, you know?

The Internet Archive has a U.S. Government archive library, or whatever, I mean, it just seems like we've got pieces all over the place and I get that we're evolving now, but that's just a thought.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mark Phillips,
University of North Texas. So there's a project

currently. It's a collaboration based out of Los Alamos National Labs, Old Dominion University, called Memento. And so that problem that you just describe is actually much, much larger than it is.

When France goes through and captures the French domain, they also capture .gov materials, and when the U.K. does that, they also capture .gov materials, and those are over in France, and some of them are over in the U.K. I mean, they're all over the world in so many web archives.

And what the folks are working on is a set of technologies and protocols that would then allow you to, not only investigate the content that's at the Internet Archive, and GPO, and UNT, but actually, go through and say, who, throughout the entire world, has this content. So you can actually start to build collections from, you know, well, we have the banner from France and the footer from the Internet Archive, and then we have this image that's the most relevant to your request.

3 4

And that, right now, is showing up in some grant work that the folks at Los Alamos and Old Dominion are doing. They've gotten massive, massive amounts of these, kind of, lists of who has what for what moment in time, and they're building these, just, gigantic databases and mechanisms for allowing Firefox plug-ins, and other tools, and web apps, to say, you requested that, we can actually build that from a number of pieces, and we can get you a much better picture of where that's going.

But I think that's one way to start moving down the road of providing this, kind of, universal access to all web archives, or at least to know that they exist somewhere. I think that's the biggest problem. You know, there's so much work in this area and, yes, everyone's in different stages of access versus it's just sitting on a server.

You know, we captured it, but we don't have access to it, but I think there's a lot of forward movement in there. It's really hard.

MR. JACOBS: Hi. James Jacobs, Stanford University. Great panel, all of you. Just thinking about, and I've been thinking about, QA for a while, quality assurance, and wondering if you have any thoughts on crowd

sourcing that process?

MS. GROTKE: Abbie Grotke, Library of Congress. I was just talking about this yesterday and how, maybe, with the End of Term Archive, something like that, it would be great to be able to open it up, we'd probably have to do that while the crawl was going on, or if we were able to, at some point, get the resources to do an annual crawl of the government domain, we could then get better feedback from users about what we missed; what we could improve upon in the crawl.

You know, we just don't have the resources to do that ourselves. I think as these collaborative archives go, a lot of challenges come, like, who owns the QR piece? That's a lot of work. At LC, with our archives that we curate, we do extensive QR, but we just

don't have the resources, for the size of this kind of archive, to go in and do that.

So it would be great to open it up. We just would need to figure out how. There was a workshop at the IIPC meeting in May about crowd sourcing and exploring how we might do that. We talk a lot about it in terms of selection of content, but not as much with the QR.

MR. WALLS: David Walls, GPO. My thought was that, you know, we've got eight sites up right now and there are certain technical limitations. You will go to some of those sites right now and see, maybe, a video that doesn't play and things like that.

Knowing that this is a very active community that looks at stuff, and we've got that web address, and we want you to respond, we were thinking that maybe it would be good to tell you the things that we know don't work, somehow, in the record, and if anyone out there is brilliant and knows a workaround and how to make the content work on the site, to let us know, because we think that you'll find the flaws and errors,

at least at this stage, with it being relatively small.

But that is something and we go through the site, test the functionality after a crawl, you know, play with it, test drive it, make sure it works, and we also go back to the Internet Archive when we run into some sticky areas, and they help us try to get through, see if there's a workaround, technically, to make something work better.

And we did that with the Holocaust Museum.

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. This is a, sort of, aspirational pie-in-the-sky, sort of, question for any of you. What could we, as the American public, ask federal agencies to do internally to make this easier, or to ensure that the web-based information is getting archived, you know, for those of you who are doing it from outside, or to require them to do from inside, in terms of information policy, what should be happening, who should be doing it, to make this

work better?

MS. GROTKE: Abbie Grotke, Library of Congress. We've done quite a bit of outreach as a part of the End of Term Archive. Chris Carpenter, from Internet Archive, and I have recently spoke to the federal, I'm going to get the name wrong, web managers council, or group, to try to spread the word about what we were doing, to try to solicit lists of URLs from them.

We got a bit of feedback from some of the members that were on that call. We also work a lot with the usa.gov and the GSA folks. The domain closure project that happened fairly recently, they reached out to us and we crawled some of that content, so we hope to continue that dialog with that layer.

It's been a little bit hard for us to reach out to the agencies specifically. We've done some work on the digitalpreservation.gov blog talking about how to build a preservable web site. That's important. We want to reach out more to even our Congress.

The House has web sites, there are so many of them and they don't really have any -- they can go off and build them however they want, so there's a lot of problems with crawling some of the House content, Senate's a little bit more controlled, so we're trying to reach out to

them as well.

MR. WALLS: Abbie's further along into this than we are, but, you know, again, the biggest problem is that web sites are designed by webmasters to inform the public. They're not designed to be harvested. They're not designed to be preserved.

And the technology that we have to preserve the 2002 web, or as, sort of, Mark said, I mean, Heritrix right now is a tool that basically allows you to harvest a site, mostly, using the tools that run the Internet, technology that runs the Internet, right now, and so the big challenge going forward is being able to keep those tools available that run the older sites as well as the new stuff that's coming along.

I think it's just awareness. I
mean, if you could draw an analog back to the book
publishing world when publishers printing or
really cheap paper began to be aware that
librarians were really concerned that their
books were getting brittle and falling apart,
and we had some of those conversations, we had
some influence, I don't think a lot, over that.

And even in the electronics industry, there was some slight influence over changing, you know, making things a little bit easier to preserve, not much, but I think it's just a dialog letting people know that, you know, government is interested for the American people.

Agencies like NARA, GPO, and LC, we have a job to do to preserve this for future access, and that they're a part of that too.

MR. PHILLIPS: Time for two more questions. There's actually one more from council and then we'll go to the audience. Let's have you go first.

MS. CONCANNON: Just an

observation, federal agencies can government information by way of web sites, and they can take them down at will. Regional libraries cannot throw away a print copy of anything that originates from that agency, so we're being held to a much higher standard of preservation.

It's a crime for us to throw away a print item that's out of date, yet, they can take information from the web and then take it down. I think there's a serious disconnect between the level of standards that libraries are being held to versus the agency that prints them and I think that we should just keep that in mind.

And secondly, if preservation on a web server is considered good enough for the Library of Congress, for the National Archives, then it makes me ask, why is preservation on a web server not good enough for a library which is interested to digitize a historic item and then put it on their web server?

MR. PHILLIPS: That was Marie Concannon.

MR. WALLS: I guess, this is David
Walls, GPO, those are all great questions. The
whole process of recognizing authentication in
the paper document world and the transfer
between that and things that are digitized, it's
like right now, the difference between digital
documents and information that comes over the
web versus stuff that is born digital and given
to us by agency deposit, is still considered to
be very different animals, even though it's all
digital content.

And I think that it needs to be a further discussion, a maturation, of this as we become more familiar with it and start comparing the fact that it's digital content. I don't know whether that really addresses it, but that's some things that we think about.

MS. CONCANNON: Marie Concannon,
University of Missouri. That's perfectly fine.
I simply present this as food for thought.
Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: All right. One more question.

1 MR. OLBRICH: One more question. 2 Bill Olbrich, St. Louis Public Library. two questions. Do you have the web address for 3 4 this Memento project that you just talked about? 5 MR. PHILLIPS: I don't, but if you 6 consult the Google. 7 MR. HAYES: It's mementoweb.org. 8 MR. OLBRICH: Thank you, Mr. Hayes. Second question is, and my colleague Marie has 9 10 brought this up, how can we help? How can individual depositories participate in this 11 program? There has never been a time since 1895 12 that we've been entirely silent, and in many 13 cases, back in microfiche, we help set the 14 standards for the entire industry on the 15 16 blowback. What can we do to participate in this 17 18 program? 19 MR. WALLS: That's a good question, This is David Walls from GPO. 20 Bill. Thank you.

colleagues to my right here who have lovely

21

22

We are in the process of looking at a nomination

tool ourselves, given the fact that I've got two

working nomination tools. It may be a case of borrowing one. And in that case, we would love for folks like yourself to nominate web sites that you feel are certainly valuable information tools that you would like to see harvested and preserved.

We're almost there. I was thinking of saying that's like one of the points on a slide I could have said, for the road ahead, that we're working on, but I didn't get into that, but that's a next step for the future.

MS. GROTKE: Abbie Grotke, Library of Congress, and most immediately, you can help us contribute URLs to the End of Term Project. So we're, again, actively soliciting nominations. If you have any questions, just email that URL and I can help you out, if I answer that email, and follow us on Twitter.

MS. SMITH: This is just a comment.

Marie Paige Smith, Nova Southeastern University

Law Library. It's mementoweb.org, not

momentoweb.org.

MR. PHILLIPS: All right. Well,

1 let's give another round of applause for all of 2 our speakers. And I guess we break for lunch. (Whereupon, the foregoing matter 3 4 went off the record at 12:01 p.m. and went back 5 on the record at 2:00 p.m.) MS. LASTER: Good afternoon and 7 welcome to day 4 of our discussions of the FDLP forecast study. My name is Shari Laster. at the University of Akron and I am the Chair of the Depository Library Council. I'd like to welcome everyone to this afternoon's final session on this topic. I would also like to 12 13 welcome all of our virtual attendees. As with previous days, whenever 14 15 16 17

6

8

9

10

11

18

19

20

21

22

23

you're at the microphone, please remember to state your name and institution, because those who are listening from their workplaces and homes can't tell us apart by our faces if they can't see them, so keep that in mind whenever you're speaking. With that, I would like to turn it

over to Mary Alice Baish.

BAISH: Thank you so much, Shari, and welcome everybody to day 4 of our 2012
meeting and conference. And before I begin, I
would just like to invite Peggy Jarrett to
approach the stage for a moment. Shari, I
promise this will be short and sweet. Thank
you.

MS. JARRET: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library and member
of council. Traditionally, council
acknowledges the Chair in the spring as she wraps
up her term, but we also wanted to do a public
and tangible thank you to our Chair, Shari
Laster.

We bought and signed something for Shari and I noticed that one of the inscriptions perfectly summed up Shari's leadership. "You are a wonderful model of excellence, as Chair, as colleague, and as government information professional." Thank you.

MS. LASTER: Well, thank you. I've been asked to open this and say what it is. It feels like a book. It's a Statistical Abstract. Oh, my goodness. Thank you, guys. Oh, my own

personal Statistical Abstract. Thank you.

Thank you, Peggy.

MS. BAISH: So in what other forum would the give of the Statistical Abstract react in such an enormous big smile from the Chair of, none less, than the Depository Library Council, so thank you, Peggy, and let me just say again what a pleasure it has been working with you, Shari, during your year, and we have many months ahead of us to continue our collaboration.

So as I was saying previously, welcome to day 4 of our 2012 meeting and conference and I really want to thank all of you here today who have been attending the daily sessions of our forecasting sessions, and I also wanted to thank those of you following us on Twitter, as well as our virtual attendees through iCohere, for sticking with us to the end and the last afternoon of our program.

I've been at the U.S. Government Printing Office now for 20-1/2 months and it's been such an honor to work along side the dedicated men and women of the U.S. Government

Printing Office, and especially those of you here today whom you all know so well in library services and content management.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I think they've put on a tremendous week of educational programming for you, but a part of that contribution -thank you. Unanticipated applause for our wonderful staff, but part of the success of this week, obviously, goes to folks who are still here today in the audiences who may have had to leave early, to our wonderful library community, the brain trust of this program, and also to our wonderful agency partners for putting on such a vast array of really meaningful and timely programs. So I really want to thank all of you as well.

Last, but not least, I want to, again, thank both Shari Laster and all the members of the Depository Library Council for their tremendous support of the forecast study throughout the year, and also for being so generous in sharing this important time with our staff so that we could provide you with the preliminary analysis of the data we have

received through the forecast study.

At the very first Depository Library Council meeting I shared with you, and I've done this through the FDLP electronic newsletter, the FDLP Connection, that my goals as Superintendent of Documents was to be more transparent with the community to enrich the educational offerings and training opportunities for you, and to develop more partnerships and more collaborations with members of the Depository Library program.

Those aren't just my goals, these are also our challenges and we all, I think, are here because we believe that we can turn challenges into opportunities.

So when I think about the FDLP in the middle of the night, what words jump out at me, strength in numbers. Isn't that what we are all about? Our strength in numbers. The leveraging of our individual strengths into our collective strengths has been so crucial to the success of the program since its origins in 1813 through the enactment of the Federal Depository

Library Act in 1895 and through subsequent legislative changes.

And I also think about the importance of our collaborative future, and I just, again, want to thank all of you who have been able, to date, to complete your individual library forecasts, to complete those state forecasts and state action plans. We need this collaboration and partnership to continue.

So our challenge, last October, I just want to step back for a moment and remind those of you who, perhaps, were not here on the 4th and final day of the conference last October, we came before you to propose an FDLP research study that had two components. And the first component that we proposed was a state forecast and the second component which we proposed was a state-focused action plan. That was it. Two parts.

And it was because of several of you here and your colleagues, who, unfortunately, are not with us today, who came up to the microphone a year ago and said, we think it's

great that you want to do a state forecast, that you want to do a state-focused action plan, but what about my views at my depository library?

So all of a sudden, this two-part FDLP forecast study became a three-part study incorporating the views of the community. And I think the fact that by the June 30th deadline, 775 of you had taken the time to very thoughtfully go through our questionnaire and complete it. It just speaks volumes about your desire for this to be a collaborative project with your voice being heard.

So I really want to thank you for turning these challenges into an opportunity. Certainly, as I mentioned on Monday, and we've talked subsequently, your response has been so gratifying to us. You've provided us with a wealth of both quantitative and qualitative data, and you've heard a lot about our preliminary findings and analysis this week.

What we are finding is that your responses have been educating and enlightening to us at the GPO. They've been informative and

they're certainly going to guide us all to collaboratively move towards the future of the program.

I hope everybody can see this slide. Throughout LSCM it's referred to as Mary Alice's favorite slide, and I'd like you just to, sort of, start with me in the left-hand top corner, because I really think this sums up perfectly the process that we began a year ago.

So if you look at the left-hand corner you'll see phase 1 and the three components which I've mentioned; the individual library, the state forecast, and the state-focused action plans, and then you see how the arrows go to what we're doing this week, which is sharing preliminary analysis and data with you.

And then you see the arrows going over to phase 2 and I'm afraid I'm visually impaired and so I can't read either the fine print or what's on the slide, but phase 2 is really continuing our analysis and developing focus groups with all of you so we can delve down

further into some of the responses to certain questions.

And then as you move along to the intermediate analysis, it is going to begin right after this meeting, down to the red circle, which I believe has the white papers involved, down to our final analysis. And if you'll notice from the final analysis, there are arrows going in both directions to the LSCM strategic plan and to the FDLP strategic plan.

But I also want you to notice, go back up to where we are this week, in the middle of the top, the preliminary analysis, and you'll see that those arrows are also going down to the LSCM strategic plan and the FDLP strategic plan.

We are actually in an action mode and as you've heard, those of you fortunate enough to join us every afternoon for the forecast preliminary results, you have heard our staff say that we are listening, we have heard, and we are already beginning to incorporate what you have told us into our current plans.

So anyway, this is my favorite graph

showing the process. I want to go back for a moment and talk a little bit about the white papers. We will begin to compile white papers. They may come out in draft form. We hope to have the first one made available in March or April of this year and let me tell you what the first one is going to be about.

From the preliminary analysis and the theming that we have taken into developing the coding process that Cherie Givens has spoken about in her sessions on methodology, we have been able to identify top issues related to the governance of the program. I'm going to talk a little bit more about that in a few moments.

But what these top issues are leading us to, mapping them, as we promised a year ago we would do, to the current provisions of U.S.C. Title 44 and mapping those that are so important to all of you that cannot map to those provisions of the law, seeing if they map to our administrative guidelines and requirements for the program.

So we hope to be able to, by

early-April, have this white paper presented to you, based on the data that you have told us about, and we can identify what maps to the current law, where changes are going to be needed to Title 44, as well as where flexibilities can be implemented administratively.

And I want to remind those of you who were here with us Monday morning and were able to hear our Acting Public Printer, Davita Vance-Cooks, update you about the state of the U.S. Government Printing Office. Toward the end of her comments in reiterating her strong support of the Federal Depository Library Program, she said, and I quote, "There are many adjustments we can make within the parameters of current law to support the needs you have expressed through the forecast study."

So we have your data and in this regard, we are going to be working very hard when we get back to the office on Monday to begin the development of that white paper. This will be the first of many that are going to be among the first rollout beginning in April.

I think we can expect to see a white

paper on marketing and promotion, that we've

heard quite a bit about, and you've had great

ideas, not just in the forecast study and your

responses, but I know many of you have shared

some great ideas with myself, with Jane, and with

our staff this week that we're all adding to that

So the message that I want all of you and those following on Twitter and iCohere to understand that we are listening to you, we are here to make change, and we're going to do that change collaboratively based on the data that you have kindly taken the time to share with us.

list, and also, for education and training.

So I went over this slide very briefly on Monday, but I really wanted, now that we have our iCohere attendees, to reiterate these principles of government information. By law and tradition, these principles have come to represent the core ideology of the Federal Depository Library program.

They were developed collaboratively with the community, with the library

associations, and were articulated and published in a report to the House Leg Branch Committee, many of you know this title by heart, that shows our age, how long we've been working on this, the Study to Identify Measures Necessary for a Successful Transition, anyone who wants to join in me, please join with that, to a More Electronic Federal Depository Library Program as Required by Legislative Branch Appropriations Act 1996 Public Law 104-53.

So let's take a look at these. The public has the right of access to government information. Government has the obligation to disseminate and provide broad public access to its information. Government has an obligation to guarantee the authenticity and the integrity of the information.

Government has an obligation to preserve its information and the act of preservation includes, of course, permanent public access. And last, but not least, government information created or compiled by government employees or at government expense,

should remain in the public domain.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

As Ι mentioned, these five principles were developed collaboratively in 1996 under the leadership of then Superintendent of Documents Wayne Kelly, and they represent our core ideology. And I think one of the outcomes that those of us who have been reading the responses that you have provided through your individual library, through your state forecasts, and state-focused action plans is, everything that you are telling us, both about the current program and the future program, have validated your commitment to these principles. So I really want to thank you for that.

Also, Monday morning, I briefly shared with you this same slide because I just wanted to go over with you the vision and the mission of the Federal Depository Library program, both of which were approved by the Depository Library Council in fall of 2008.

The vision, the Federal Depository
Library Program will provide government
information when and where it is needed in order

to create an informed citizenry and an improved quality of life. And how do we meet that wonderful vision? Through our mission. The mission of the Federal Depository Library Program is to provide, for no fee, ready and permanent public access to Federal Government information now and for future generations.

And as I have said throughout my tenure as Superintendent of Documents, GPO cannot fulfill this vision or this mission alone. We need our wonderful network of depository libraries, both our regionals and our selectives, our public, our law, our federal agency, our court, we are all in this together to realize both our vision and our mission.

I'd like to quickly dig a little bit down into the mission and vision and talk about the values of the Federal Depository Library Program and they are access, collections, collaboration, and communication, expertise in professionalism, service, stewardship, and let me just make a couple comments, please, about each of them.

Access, no-fee access for anyone from anywhere to use Federal Depository resources or services. Collections, tangible and online collections of official federal information dissemination products built to support user and community needs.

And when we think about the community needs, some of the feedback we received through the forecast, and this has always really been, I think, a strength of the Depository Library Program is matching those collections, which, today, are in both tangible and digital form, to the local needs of your institution and your users.

Strong Depository Library network is built on transparent open communication and collaboration between and among depository libraries, federal agencies, and GPO. And I think our past history shows that we've done a pretty good job at this collaboration, both at the local level within your regional areas, both at your state level, and also our wonderful

national network of collaboration and communication, and doesn't this get at the very heart of the success of the program?

Expertise and professionalism, and what I just referred to recently as the brain trust. That's the dedicated and knowledgeable staff in depository libraries. It's your dedication to the mission of the Federal Depository Library Program to not only increase your knowledge and bring that of your profession to your user needs.

So really, we need to recognize, and I don't think we say thank you enough, not just to those of you who are able to join us this week, but for those who, for reasons having to do with staff, and time, and other commitments, were not able to. We need to do a better job of saying thank you.

Service, to enrich one's library experience by providing quality user-centric services and your strong commitment to service.

And again, we can do our part in helping you at your end, but you are the ones who serve at the

frontlines in the interacting with the American public.

And the last, but certainly not least, value of the FDLP is stewardship, being good stewards of the resources entrusted to all of us to GPO, to you, as a depository library, being good stewards of these resources for the American public.

So as Jane Sanchez and I are speakers this afternoon, what we're going to focus our remarks on are basically two questions from the state forecast, which also, actually, go back to questions of different numbers that we've talked about earlier this week in the individual library forecasts.

So these questions are going to frame our conversation with you this afternoon. Question 18 from the state forecast, "What would an ideal FDLP look like that met all of your current and anticipated needs for Federal Government information?"

And I really want to thank those of you who completed this at the individual library

and state forecast. We have such rich data from that. You spent time on thinking about what this ideal FDLP would look like, should look like, and we have very rich information and data from you about what you want, and we are listening to what you say.

Question 20 was meant to be sort of a catchall, "Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the current and future vision of the FDLP?" And even though many of you had gone on for several pages in Question 18, you had more to tell us in your responses to Question 20.

And again, we're so grateful for the thoughtfulness that all of you put in to, also, the individual library, but also the state forecasts. So what we're going to talk about, we've actually divided them into some of the frequent issues that came up.

Now, these are preliminary themes.

I want to reinforce the word preliminary themes,
that were identify by LSCM staff during the
coding process. And they were described a

couple of times by Cherie Givens during her presentations on the study methodology.

And they actually kind of easily came under four umbrella themes, if you will, that are listed here. And Jane and I are going to spend the rest of our time discussing them with you.

The first one has to do with program governance. Preservation, digitization, access, and harvesting. Training and education. Cataloging and bibliographic control. Item selection and distribution.

So let's take a look at the first one, program governance. What did you tell us that you would want in this new national plan?

More flexibility over and over and over again.

You identified, in your own words, the following under, we need more flexibility.

Defining responsibilities and roles. Focusing on controlling collections. Tailoring roles and strengths, capabilities, and your library's mission. I think very important, and we heard this over and over again,

not just for these questions, but for others, and I think it's always been true to these programs and the needs of our individual libraries.

Different needs and different pressures, one size doesn't fit all, and several of you indicated, after using these exact words, one size doesn't fit all, that that is one of the things that is driving libraries out of the program. We are paying attention to what you're telling us.

Next, combining collections, regional areas that cooperate to develop a 100 percent collection. And this, if I'm not mistaken, comes directly from the state forecast of those committed depository libraries in the State of Rhode Island.

And lastly, under more flexibility, consortial options. And again, I quote, "Flexibility to work within states and across state borders for services, preservation, bibliographic control, and more." So these themes we've grouped under more flexibility.

Equally important, and certainly as

often heard in your responses, both to the library, but again, to the state-focused forecasts, what came up again and again and again, generally under the theme liberal retention, withdrawal and disposition, weeding,

in other words.

I'm identifying the following in your own words. "Adapt current and anticipated technologies and workflows. Minimize the physical footprint. Streamline, simplify, selection and discard. And flexible protocols for substitution of digital surrogates."

So that kind of provides an overview of what you have told us on program governance and now Jane is going to take over and deal with a couple of the other issues that have more to do with the operations of the program rather than its governance. Thank you.

MS. SANCHEZ: Good afternoon, everyone. Let's see, where's my -- here we go. Okay. My first topic is cataloging and bibliographic control. As I described to you earlier this week, cataloging and indexing is

one of four programs in LSCM. Currently, we have a staff of about 50 who are working in our technical services group under the leadership of Laurie Hall.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And I want to tell you a little bit about what we're doing and also, already, some of the course corrections that we're making in an effort to respond to what we're hearing from all of you. And again, these are in your own words. I didn't put quotes around each one of them, but I felt that these were the important items that we could glean from the state forecast and in many ways, were very representative of what we are hearing from all of you.

You want every item cataloged, past and present. Nosmall feat. Supply, automatically, records for electronic documents. We're trying. We are working hard toward that goal. New models for batch loading and reports record reconciliation. look into that. We do have Marcive, we have some other cataloging utilities, but we will look to see if there are other models that we can develop

and emulate that better support this community.

Improve cataloging quality. Ouch. However, we're going to do the best we can. As I said earlier, in the area of a course correction, we have now, one quality assurance librarian, we're going to be hiring more. This is something that we care about very deeply and we understand the concern, and to that end, we will make sure that we have dedicated staff working on that to improve the quality of all of the cataloging product that we create. Very important.

Include all holdings in OCLC to assist in inter-library loan. We will make sure that we are doing that. We actually do catalog in OCLC and then take the records over to our integrated library system. However, we will look to make sure that everything is in OCLC.

Again, we do not take this as criticism, we take all of these as efforts that we can look to and make sure we're doing the very best we can. And if there are areas that we can continuously improve, we will. We will take

this seriously.

Enhance metadata in cataloging records. I believe some of you may have attended a session earlier where we discussed the switched to RDA. Our staff, right now, which is resource, description, I'm not sure what RDA stands for, but it's the next generation of cataloging. One cataloger, and this is a secret, told me that RDA is kind of, and I hope I don't offend anyone, dumbed down MARC.

It's similar to MARC, but it's different and it's a more modern accessible cataloging-type record. But we are moving toward RDA, as is the entire cataloging community, and that will be happening this year, and that includes the metadata.

Provide shelf-ready materials that are fully cataloged. Wow. That's important, and that's big, and I understand that many libraries have this need. When you receive the materials, you want the cataloging, you want that item shelf-ready.

This will require some doing on our

part, but to the extent we can, and we will look at this very seriously, we will try to shorten the period of time it takes for us to produce that cataloging to make it available to all of you.

We understand how important that is.

I know that it's been mentioned at least once while I was here, as you all probably know, or do not know, we do not have a collection. We get the items, we catalog them, we process them, we distribute them, but we do not have a collection at GPO.

So in some ways, it makes what we do a little bit trickier. So when we're asked to make sure we have every item passed, cataloged, we sometimes have to count on you, in the community, to help us, one, identify what may be in your collections that we don't have cataloging for, and/or, sometimes you have to help us by providing facsimiles so that we can fill in those gaps.

So I just want to make that clear, and again, it's not to say we won't do something

about it, but it is to say that sometimes it presents an interesting challenge on our part.

I showed you this slide the other day and I hope you'll bear with me as I show it again. I wanted to show you how much we are trying to do now in terms of developing that national bibliographic records inventory. As you can see in the middle is the blue circle and you see all of the various boxes and the activities that are feeding into that national bibliographic records inventory.

Some of the projects and programs that are in the little boxes going around are short-term projects or projects that we're doing on contract. And mainly, for those items, we're doing them -- for example, the Historic MoCat cataloging volumes for 1895 and -- I'm sorry, I can't even quite see what it is, 1898. I apologize. I'm kind of at that in-between stage where I need (Speaks Spanish), reading glasses, sometimes and sometimes I don't, so I apologize.

But at any rate, we're doing those two years, mainly because they're good-sized

volumes, but we're doing them as a pilot. We want to see how that goes and using that experience we can develop a process moving forward. But again, I just want to describe that one process because that is just one of many activities that we are undertaking to fill in that national bibliographic records inventory.

All of these projects are being done in the cataloging group at LSCM. As I said earlier, there are approximately 50 people, but I hope this helps when I say, we only have 17 catalogers. To some, that may be a large department, but for all the work they do, I think it's an impressive project.

Moving right along to training an education. Again, in your words, and apologies for no quotes, unlimited classrooms for virtual training; local and in-person training; curriculum development for all levels of civic literacy; online tutorials and webinars on FDsys; depository library tools and duties, federal resources.

Let me kind of take parts of the

slide and go over various parts of the slide. On the FDsys training, which we had been so excited to tell you about this week, using iCohere, since the end of February to the present, we've trained over 1700 folks on that using that utility.

I think that's very impressive. I know that we've talked about training 1700 people, but the part we kept forgetting to say was, that's just since February. Clearly, this is something that has a place and will continue. When we put out the call that we are getting ready to do an FDsys training, generally, within an hour or two, we have fully subscribed the entire class.

Each session is supposed to be no more than 200, but usually we try to cutoff, Cindy, I believe, at 170. Is that correct? Yes. Okay. We try to cutoff at a 170. We want to make sure that we have the proper bandwidth and that everyone can get in sufficiently.

If someone signed up for training, we don't want to ever have a problem once they've signed up, a technical difficulty, if you will.

In addition, we do lots of in-person training. We train on the Hill, we train locally, we train with federal agencies, we're doing as much face-to-face in-person training as we can, and of course, the virtual is very, very important.

In this day and age, it is an important component of any kind of training effort. Also, I want to announce here that one of the other things that we are going to do is, we are in the process of developing position descriptions to hire at least two or three curriculum specialists.

I believe very sincerely, since training is such an important component of what we're doing, let's make sure that we have designed training modules and we know what our training outcomes are. And I know our folks are doing a phenomenal job training, but I think we could use a little help just to make sure that we've got curricula setup.

And eventually, what we want to do is reach out to all of you expert trainers and either train with you or take some tips for you,

and since many of you work out in the libraries
with patrons, we know that we can get some good
advice from you. So training, as far as I'm

4 concerned, is wide open. This is a real growth

5 area for us.

Let's see, also, on FDsys, and I know this has been mentioned earlier this week, we have developed one training module on basic searching of FDsys. We have two more in development and they're almost ready for release, so please stay tuned.

The goal was to develop one basic training module and then identify smaller, shorter topics for training. Those are available on the web site or desktop. Okay. The next item that I'm talking about is item selection and distribution. Again, what did we hear about this?

You want flexibility; you need flexibility; we don't have enough. So going through the items, and I have comments on a couple of them, the ability to select by geography, or geographic area, title, subject,

agency, monographic serial title, congressional committee, SuDoc number.

This year, when we went to DSIMS, the new distribution system that we have, we did add an additional 900 items. So in other words, we took some of those stems that were large and we broke them into smaller.

We knew that this was something that would be embraced and engaged by all of you and be very important to all of you. We will continue to do that. The goal isn't just to split hairs to split hairs, but to make the class system as specific as we can to support your needs.

Separate print and digital versions. We are going to do that as much as we can. We have been doing that now. When we catalog, we do separate the different formats, but again, we will do more.

Develop a fully searchable national needs and offers database. We will look at that. We will do what we can. Lisa Russell is taking the lead on that, but we will work with

her and see what we can do in that regard.

Easier tracking, status updates, and ordering. Eliminate automatic additions to item profile, selections for new item numbers, again, hopefully, splitting out those extra 900 items will help in this regard. Provide fewer groups of materials under each item number.

We've worked hard to distribute fewer ephemeral items. Now, I understand that some folks have still been getting, you know, small pamphlets, that kind of thing, in general, and I'm saying in general, what we try to do is, when we get those items, we take them in, we catalog them, but we try not to distribute them.

However, if items are coming through, please get in touch with us. We'll have to do a little more course correction.

Again, this is about continuous improvement.

We know that there's always areas where we can improve.

The last item, provide selection options that better meet local needs. I think this has been reiterated earlier. One of the

things that I talk to people about at LSCM, and in general, I've worked in libraries for many, many years. I think all of us are trying to go

you based on your selections.

I know that you want finer distinctions where you can pull what you need.

I understand that. I appreciate that. We will work to that as much as we possibly can.

from a push model where we're pushing items to

We understand that each of you have responsibilities for collection development, it's part of your jobs, and we dare not push to you. We want to give you the selection tools so you can select what you need. Okay? I believe it's back to Ms. Mary Alice.

MS. BAISH: Thank you, Ms. Jane. So now we're going on to preservation, digitization, access, and harvesting. And again, we don't have the quotes, but these are also some of the major themes that we have coded and that are also in your words.

The first is proactive preservation and free access to all materials. And if you

think back to where we began this session and we looked at the missions, the vision, and the principles of the Federal Depository Library Program, what you're asking here is perfectly in sync with all of those principles.

Number two, you want everything digitized and easily searchable. We agree. Promises have been made in the past that the U.S. Government Printing Office would digitize, and make accessible, the entire content of the historic collection of the Federal Depository Library Program.

And I know we've all been waiting for this to happen, haven't we? Why hasn't it? It became clear to the leaders of the agency at that time that under current Title 44, GPO doesn't have the authority to do broad digitization of the entire legacy collection, so that's number one.

Number two, why hasn't it happened?

And if you think about it for a moment, thought differences between you and your depository library and us at the U.S. Government Printing

Office on North Capitol Street, we don't have the collections. You do.

So what we're going to be talking about during this segment of the program is all about partnerships. You have the collections and so many of you are doing digitization and we're very grateful for those of you doing digitization who are thoughtful enough to voluntarily share with us, and with your colleagues, through the registry of digitization on the desktop, exactly what you're digitizing to prevent redundancies.

Third theme, to preserve documents, agencies are putting up and pulling down from their web sites. I'm very proud of what LSCM has done during the past year on our pilot of automated harvesting and I know you heard about that earlier during the council's session on technology from our wonderful team in LSCM of David Walls, and Fang, and Dory.

So we are listening to you, we have listened to you, and we are doing our part.

We're also involved with the Library of

Congress, the California Digital Library, the
Internet Archive, and the GSA, and the End of

Term harvest as well.

And what you also want is a robust distributed system of digital preservation. We have started that process through LOCs and as we have more time to dwell down into your free text responses, we'll hear more specific ideas of how you would like us to move forward in this direction.

On Monday, I talked a lot about partnerships with federal agencies and we're very proud of our partnerships. I mentioned that at the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, Senator Schumer, in the last Congress, we were directed to work with LC, and this has been very successful, on the digitization of the historic Statutes at Large and the bound Congressional Record going back to 1873.

I was delighted on Monday and thrilled with the presence of the Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Treasure for Privacy and Information Dissemination, Melissa Hartman, to

_

announce to you the one-year pilot project with Treasury to test our ability to use our standard ingest into FDsys of content that had been digitized from the U.S. Department of Treasury Library.

And I want to thank all of you for already going into FDsys and taking a look at that content. We love it when our user statistics reflect that what we are doing is heard and is welcomed by the community and our public users.

During the past year, we have -well, during the past several years, we've made
a number of digitization, what we call, content
partnerships and I really want to recognize
those of you who are here with us today, or
following us via iCohere virtually, just tell
you a little bit about what some of them are.

So if you're not a partner with us you can begin to kind of think about where you might want to consider becoming one. These are our digitization, or our content, partnerships.

One of the earliest ones was with the University

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

of Maryland Thurgood Marshall Law Library, the historic publications of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

And why was this important for Maryland's Thurgood Marshall Law Library? Because it was so in-sync to the local needs of their faculty, their students, and their users, and the programs of their law school. So through this partnership, we are able to provide access to historic and current publications of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights directly from the law library web site.

The law library has digitized all of these historic materials that were in its tangible collection and they also current harvest current born digital publications from the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights web site. So kudos if anyone is here from University of Maryland Thurgood Marshall Law Library.

We also have a wonderful content partnership with the Southern Methodist University for the historic government publications of World War II. Southern Methodist University digitized collections of

343 pamphlets, government reports,

instructions, regulations, declarations,

speeches, et cetera, distributed by the U.S. GPO

during World War II.

And the documents in their collection contain information as topics as far ranging as women's issues, children's issues, and guides to other countries.

Another important partnership which began a couple of years ago, but we have recently enhanced it, for which I am very grateful, and that is with Judy Russell and the University of Florida.

The University of Florida is digitizing its collections of publications from the Panama Canal Commission. It's one of its centers of excellence. The National Recovery Administration, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Services, what we all remember fondly as NCLIS.

The Institute of Museum and Library Services. As the digitization is complete, the

University of Florida will also send bibliographic records for those publications and those records will be enhanced by our staff.

We will add the PURLs to the digitized publication and the records will be available through our CGP.

So these digitization efforts and the new enhancements are ongoing. We also have a content partnership with the University of Iowa. I'm not sure if anyone from that institution is here today, either in-person or virtually, we're very grateful to you for this partnership.

The University of Iowa provides access to digitized collections of U.S. Government posters, and if you haven't looked at them, you must. We had a wonderful article in a recent issue of our FDLP Connection focusing in on these beautiful posters; works of arts.

They've digitized nearly 1500 posters that promote the services, the programs, and initiatives by such agencies as the Works Progress Administration, the War Mobilization

Office, the Environmental Protection Agency, and they span a time period from World War II through the 1990s.

We also have an important content partnership with the University of Indiana for the CIC Floppy Disk Project. Through this partnerships, we are making publications distributed to federal depository libraries on those old, who remembers the floppy disks? And we're making that content, we're migrating it, so that we can make it available through the web.

And so far in this project, and which we're so grateful to the staff of the Indiana University and their commitment, contains almost 200 titles.

Another important partnership that we have has been with the University of North Texas for the Cyber Cemetery, which I'm sure all of you are well-aware of. And I'm very please to say that we have been in the process of enhancing our letter of agreement with the University of North Texas so that it will provide permanent public access, not just to their

contents of their Cyber Cemetery, but more broadly, to the contents that UNT has digitized that falls within the scope of the Federal Depository Library Program.

And we're just in the process of finalizing that enlargement to the letter of agreement. And again, we're so grateful to the University of North Texas for partnering with us.

So those of you, if that rings a bell in your mind and say, wow, we're doing this digitization project, or wow, we just bought some wonderful new, fast-speed, scanners, and we'd like to enter into a letter of agreement-type partnership with you, please come to us soon. We want to hear from you.

I'd like to describe, briefly, what these partnerships for digitized content entail. And generally, the letter of agreement defines the services and the project parameters, both on the side of the depository library and the U.S. Government Printing Office.

So really, on the part of our

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

depository libraries, they take on this wonderful new responsibility for maintaining the digital content for public access. They take on the responsibility, as have the other partners who I've previously mentioned, for service to these digitized collections.

They take responsibility for creating the metadata and doing the initial cataloging of these records. So they take and assume this responsibility and the concurrent expenses as part of their partnerships under the letter of agreements.

In return to their doing this and incurring these expenses to, again, meet and fulfill the mission, the vision, and the principles that we've talked about earlier, GPO provides notice FDIP on the web site acknowledging that partnership between our agency and the library to provide permanent Federal public access to the Government information in that digitized collection.

And I want to just take a moments break right there. I've had the wonderful

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

opportunity in the past few months to attend celebrations at both one regional depository library that was celebrating its 150th anniversary as a depository library, the University of Missouri in Columbia.

And Ι also recently had the opportunity to attend the 50th anniversary of the George Library in Augusta's State University. And what impressed me because we already know about the commitment, both as a regional a 150 years, and some of you selectives have passed that milestone, or of a selective in a small town such as Augusta, Georgia.

I was so impressed because at the event at the University of Missouri, the President of all four campuses thought this was a significant enough celebration that he attended along with his provost. And it's so wonderful to see that the library's commitment to the depository program and to no-fee public access, especially for a regional library, was recognized by the President of all four of the

University of Missouri institutions.

And I think that set level of engagement that perhaps we at GPO have not helped you to promote and I know Kelly talked a lot about how we can help with that promotion and marketing. But the same thing was true at the celebration of the 50th anniversary of Augusta's State University libraries.

The interim President was the first speaker at that celebration, part of which was televised and appeared on the Augusta State University news station that evening. So I think it's wonderful when you, as libraries, and how we can help you, not just promote and market what you do that is so valuable to your users, your faculty, and your students, to make sure that the administration of your institutions, and I'm talking about the top administrations, your Presidents, your provosts.

If you're a public library, your Boards, et cetera, are aware of the commitment that you put into helping GPO with our mission of keeping America informed. So that was just

a little diversion.

So in addition to our promoting on our web site, this wonderful partnership that we have with you, we create integrated resource bibliographic records in the CGP, including the creation of PURLs which will point users to your collections.

We are responsible for updating bibliographic records following our GPO practices for titles included in your library's digitized collections for any records which are not already in our CGP.

And as with any formal legal letter of agreement, there's also an escape clause, so at a certain point in time if the institution determines, perhaps a change of administration, that they're no longer able to commit to this wonderful partnership, we ask for notification of 90 days before withdrawing from this.

So we're very fortunate within LSCM to have Suzanne Ebanues, and I asked her to please appear front and center, and to stand up and give a big wave, Suzanne. It is through

Suzanne's diligence and hard work, and developing wonderful relationships with all of our partners that these agreements really have been successful.

So who do you want to contact if you're interested in discussing the possibility of a content digitization partnership with us? You want to contact Suzanne, and Jane, and I, or anybody else in the LCM can help you find her. So thank you, Suzanne. She does a remarkable job.

I think another point needs to be made about the importance of these partnerships and we really want to, as I mentioned Monday, we're working very hard to develop partnerships with federal agencies. Their libraries are treasure troves of content.

They've done a lot of digitization, much of which is not yet publicly accessible. But again, we're going to focus this year on developing important partnerships with more of you so that the content that you're digitizing and bringing into the program through your

library web site could also fall under the scope of the Federal Depository Library Program.

And I think it's very important why we have these more formalized agreements with you. And I just would like to call attention, I don't have a slide, but I'm sure many of you have it memorized, but on the desktop is a guideline publication entitled, Substituting Online for Tangible Versions of Depository Publications by Selectives.

It was written in 2010 and updated in June of 2010. And I just want to call your attention to a couple of things in this particular guidelines for substitution. It says, and I quote, "A selective depository library is permitted to replace tangible versions with online equivalents of depository materials, provided the library has held the publication for at least one year, your regional depository has approved the disposition of the tangibles, and the online version is official, it is complete, and it is free of charge to the user."

Have any of you heard of this before?

Yes? Show of hands. Yes. I encourage you to
go back and take a look at this document on the
desktop. Any title that appears within the
federal digital system, so those are the
examples, obviously, the Congressional Record,
bills, the Federal Register, or the Code of
Federal Regulations, those are substitutions
that a selective depository library can make.

We do encourage you, particularly, we ask that you take a look at hearings to ensure that that complete version is available through FDsys. So we don't want you to follow any sort of wholesale substitution, particularly for hearings, but to be able to compare that as you determine what materials your users continue to need in tangible format.

But as you read further into these substitution guidelines for selective depository libraries, and I quote, it states, "Any title for digitized material from content partnerships," and we could update this last, but it currently says, "examples such as the

Cyber Cemetery at the University of North Texas,

the Homeland Security digital library, the

Department of State Foreign Affairs Network, or

Dosfan."

That was one of our very, very early partnerships in the 1990s with the University of Illinois at Chicago. So you may substitute your tangible version for any title for digitized content from our content partnerships.

So I think, connecting the dots, you can see how important it is from both the broader access issue of our partnerships with your libraries on your digitized content, but also giving selective depository libraries the substitution permission, if you will, for digitized content in partnership with us.

So please, again, anyone at GPO can lead you to Suzanne, but really, we encourage you to consider having formal partnerships with us for your digitized content.

So I'm coming back to what is, of course, my favorite and my last slide, past hist prologue, we began this session with a slide that

summarize where we are on it.

possible.

As you've heard throughout the week from the preliminary responses, we are looking at what you have told us and we are taking that and comparing it to what we already had in process, for what is very doable for us, and you've heard a lot about that operationally this afternoon from Jane, for what is possible for us to do, and I want to take a moment and step back and just put some reality checks on what is

shows our process and now I'd like to kind of

government is appropriated for fiscal years.

As you heard from Acting Public Printer Davita

Vance-Cooks on Monday, we are currently under a

continuing resolution for our FY13

appropriations. And that continuing

And that has to do with the way the

The items and contracts that are covered in the monies we can expend in this fiscal year were actually developed about a year and a half ago, and even though it is October

resolution will expire at the end of March.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

18th, 2012, we have already begun the process of preparing our budget request for FY2014.

So I just wanted to provide this as sort of a reality check, that as we look at the possible, we also have to be realistic as to where our funding is and where our current year funding has already been committed, and that doesn't mean we can't be flexible in terms of hearing your messages, and as Jane said, how did you put it, Jane, sort of, changing a course correction, but certainly for materials for which we have to get approval for expenditure, over \$50,000, form the Joint Committee on Printing, it's a little bit harder to do a quick course correction.

And I also wanted to remind you, so we're beginning the process of preparing, LSCM is preparing, our FY12 budget submission and we'll be doing that from now through the end of this calendar year so that we can get it to OMB and it will be published as part of the President's budget request.

It will be published in FY2013, so

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I just want you all to understand that we in LSCM are already looking on the next fiscal year and what we can do. So that's just a little, what is possible, and sort of, sometimes we have the reality checks of our budget.

And as I mentioned, we're also moving towards that strategic plan and looking at what you want from us and what is going to require a legal change. And as I mentioned, that will be in the very first white paper that we will have out to you at either the end of March or early-April.

We talked a lot throughout the week again and thanked you and again for individual participating in the library forecast, and the state forecast, and in the state-focused action plan, and I regret that due to the need for us to pursue towards our preliminary analysis, we had the cutoff dates that we did of June 30th for both the individual library and state forecasts, and August 31st, although I believe Robin mentioned we let that slip a little bit, for the state-focused action plans.

So following a very excellent, I think, discussion earlier this morning during the depository library council's session and a request for us to give a firm deadline for those who haven't had the time or the ability to complete any one of those three components of phase 1, we huddled together before lunch and we would like to extend that deadline, for those of you who still want to get your information in, or thought that you had, but for whatever reason, your submission was incomplete, to Friday November 30th of 2012.

So that gives you a little more time to go back to your states. Somebody mentioned that they're having their state GODORT meeting in the next week or two and this would be a perfect opportunity.

To date, through iCohere, wonderful staff, and LSCM, have held, I think, more than 30 virtual sessions with state groups to, sort of, be there to help guide you through the process of developing the state forecast. And

we're very happy to do that between now and the November 30th deadline.

So if any of you would like to call upon our staff to help you if you have a state meeting coming up and you would like us either to do a short presentation at the beginning of that meeting or simply be there to monitor any questions that come up, I ask that you please contact either Cindy Etkin over in that dark corner, who has done such a wonderful job all week during these forecasting iCohere sessions.

And I really want to thank Cindy for that and I think she needs a round of applause. We have many unsung heroes in LSCM, especially in cataloging and classification, but Cindy has given so much of her time this week and has just done a great job.

And I want to also thank our virtual attendees. So many of you who took the time to send Cindy a note and tell her, and she's then communicated that to Jane and me, how valuable they've found these sessions to be.

So anyway, we'll be happy for any of

your state groups, if you want to contact Cindy
Etkin or Cherie Givens, and we can set this up
for you. As I've mentioned, we've done about 30
sessions so far with state groups, so we kind of
have the process down. It would not take us much

time to set this up in advance.

How are you going to be able to continue to learn more about our process going forward; the doable, the possible, the publication of our white papers? So one of our communications forms that we're all very proud of, and LSCM staff deserve tremendous recognition for, is the FDLP Connection.

The next issue, I believe, Kelly said the deadline was about November 19th, thereabouts? Yes, she gave me a high-five. Good. The deadline is November 19th for anyone who would like to submit an article, and we invite you all to do so, but it's in that issue that we will be providing summaries of what we have discussed today during these four forecast sessions, and this is a mechanism for us to keep up the communication with you.

Other communication tools are, of course, in addition to iCohere, the FDLP Listserv as well. We have talked this week, and you see up here, I believe in the upper right, and I think Cherie, and Kelly, and Kristina Bobe talked about focus groups, so we will be organizing those. We will be coming to for ideas on how best, and we will be coming to council too, to help us develop, how do you validate what we believe are the issues coming out of your responses to us for these focus groups that are coming up?

And we clearly want to make sure that anyone who wants to be a part of these conversations knows about them in advance and will participate, so we're going to make every effort to promote them very well.

Moving forward, as you've heard some of the doable and I remind you of the areas form the middle top box, preliminary analysis, this week's meeting, all the way down to our LSCM and FDLP strategic plans, so we're already moving in that direction and we'll, beginning Monday

morning, to sort of speed that up.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I guess last, but not least, I really this to thank community. want Your participation in this ambitious research project that we undertook, and remember, when you asked for the individual library forecast, you just sort of multiplied by X times what, not only you had to do for your part, but the data that we had, but you provided a wealth of information and we are working through it using our research methodology so that anyone who wants to go into the data that you have given us, this wonderful, rich data, will be able to do that.

I wanted to mention somebody, I can't recall, I'm sorry, whether it was a member of the depository library council, or I believe it was somebody at an earlier session in the forecasting, perhaps on Tuesday when Robin Haun-Mohamed was leaving the discussion on the state-focused action plans, I believe the question came up, will you make these available so we can all share in those wonderful

initiatives and action plans?

And we listened, we heard, and that again, will be on our agenda for a Monday morning meeting to work with Robin's team and to work with our wonderful web content team led by Karen Sieger, so that we can get these posted as quickly as we can. So I just wanted to mention that as a last point.

Cherie, thank you. You've been an excellent time keeper throughout all these sessions, and indeed, the conference, so any questions in case you don't know how to contact either Jane or myself, please, we are always there to listen. We want to hear from you and get your ideas, and never be shy.

I don't think this community has necessarily ever been shy about anything, but we encourage you to communicate with us and with the rest of our staff. So thank you again for coming to this fourth and final day of the forecast session. We appreciate everything you've done to make this research process a success and we will continue our due diligence work so that we

can culminate it in strategic plans and a new national plan, which is why we're all here. So thank you very much.

MS. LASTER: Thank you, Mary Alice, and thank you, Jane. This is Shari Laster from the University of Akron and I am now opening the floor for questions and comments. We have about 20 minutes or so for Q&A, and then we'll have a quick wrap-up of the session.

MS. MCANINCH: Sandy McAninch, University of Kentucky. So I'm still a little confused about where we go next, especially seeing Mary Alice's favorite slide, but it has arrows going down to the strategic plans, but it also works its way all through the other stuff. So I was wondering if you could sort of flush out how you're jumping right down to those strategic plans and where the white papers fit in to all of that.

MS. BAISH: Could you back up a slide, Shari? Okay. So thank you for that question. As we mentioned in going through and developing the themes, and I know, Sandy, you've

been here for each of the three preceding sessions, you heard our staff talk about how they developed themes, both for marketing, for promotion, for the digitization, as well, from

5 David Walls.

And so we're taking those themes and we're doing what we can, as Jane described, in terms of the operational issues for an LSCM strategic plan, and we're taking some of those themes as well so we can begin an FDLP strategic plan.

Several years ago, and Cindy would have a better memory of this, Susan, you would have a better memory, because I believe it occurred the year that you were Chair of the Depository Library Council, you had worked with staff on the development of an FDLP strategic plan, but that, actually, did not move forward. Suzanne, you might be able to address that issue a little bit.

I think we need to go back to that.

I know council, at the time, agreed to the vision, agreed to the mission, as well, so I

think we will take a look at that and see what

we can pull from that. We're listening to what

you are telling us about what you want to hear

from the program, Sandy.

We are seeing in the strategic plan,
I think, not just the doable and the possible,
but we want to, as well, incorporate what you are
telling us about what you want in terms of
changes and flexibilities that may be permitted
under current law that we might be able to meet
those requests through changes to our
regulations where there is authority under the
Superintendent of Documents Office.

So I guess the point I'm trying to make is, we're taking what we can do in the now, and the doable, and the possible, and we're working on those to incorporate them, and we will be sharing, as I said, by the end of March and early-April, what we view from the data that you have given us, what we are able to map, to the legal requirements in the law and in regulations, and then document where it doesn't map to current law, and identify the changes that

1 need to be made.

And we will be working on this, not just internally. I was so pleased to see throughout these daily sessions, we have had representatives from the American Library Association Washington office, from the Association of Research Libraries, from the Special Libraries Association, and from the American Association of Law Libraries.

And Acting Public Printer Davita
Vance-Cooks and I had the wonderful opportunity,
it was just a week ago, to actually meet with,
during the AOL fall meeting, many directors;
many of your deans and directors.

So we're going to, obviously, bring the library community, the library associations, into this discussion. We had an informal meeting last night over dinner with the leaders of the government documents roundtable, which is another important constituency for us.

So does that help answer your question?

MS. MCANINCH: So you're just going

MS. SMITH:

Lori Smith,

to go ahead and put those kinds of things into strategic plans for the FDLP and LSCM now and then work on some of the other stuff through your other paths?

MS. BAISH: As we can. Absolutely. And I think the doable and the possible, the doable are certainly, you know, this year's strategic plan, clearly, we're either doing it or we've heard from you that, and as Jane has said, we can change our course, so that would be, you know, for the current year, you know, looking to where you want this program to be.

And in 2017, I'm not sure any of us can make this prediction, but I think it's unknown exactly whether there will be tangible materials in the program and if so, what they will be. So I think the direction we need to be looking at is, really, when everything is available, and that was the vision of the former Public Printer, Bruce James, all the past, present, and future government information available in digital form.

Southeastern Louisiana University. Going back to the bibliographic control issue about getting holdings into OCLC to facilitate ILL. either the person who put that or one of the people who put that in my, you know, ideal program, but that was not a goal for GPO. a goal for the depositories because, as I understand, it's probably still true, most of government documents holdings don't show up in OCLC, because we did retrospective conversion and we loaded a big batch of records, and ended up with records for things we don't really own. cataloging people have been So cases.

reluctant to upload those to OCLC because it does not accurately reflect our holdings in many cases. So I would hope that, you know, as we're downsizing our collections in many cases that, for those things that we're keeping, eventually, we will get those into OCLC so that if somebody needs to borrow a copy, they'll have an easier way to know that we have it than going to our individual library catalogs.

MS. SANCHEZ: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island. I have a comment and kind of a suggestion, a slight suggestion, one of the things a year ago that was so exciting to me about this research project as it's unfolded was the opportunity to engage the entire community, and I think the fact that

700-plus libraries have, you know, participated

in this is just great.

It's also really encouraging to see day in and day out, as it's been reported, how this isn't just a research project to plan for strategic plans, but the input is being used immediately, and for course corrections, or whatever you want to call them, but immediate action is being taken informed by the community, and that's very encouraging.

So while we did dump a ton of work on GPO, primarily, and also ourselves, by making that suggestion, it's great to see that it's bringing fruition. The slight suggestion has to do with the longer term issues and that last bullet point there in terms of what requires

legal change.

I, like lots of other folks, am very, very anxious for the necessary changes in the law so that a new version of the FDLP can take hold. So my suggestion is that, as you go through and you've already described how you're identifying, and tagging things, and coding them, and you will be distilling that stuff for white papers, but not to wait of the white papers, not to wait for you to have to, sort of, put it all into nice neat categories and present finished products.

So that, where it's practicable, release that information to the community because, like the administration of the program and the implementation of the program, the responsibility for changing the law isn't just with GPO, it's with the community as well.

And we can do lots with that information in terms of informing our strategic tactics along the way as well. So, you know, share that stuff early and often. And one final, sort of, side comment or observation, I

б

guess, you know, we're here acknowledging the 50th anniversary of the '62 Depository Act, and that was, as we all know, the last time any really significant structural change to the program occurred.

If you go back and look at the legislative history of the '62 Act, you know, it probably won't surprise any of us that that didn't just spring forth on the eve of 1962. There were lots and lots of years leading up to that and one of the things that led up to that was, coincidently, a major survey of libraries.

And if you go back and actually read through the hearing record leading up to that Act, lots of the comments, especially by members of Congress, spoke to the survey results; the stuff that the libraries had been telling them. And, you know, while many of us may have thought, yet another survey. Why do we have to do this?

It does crystallize, I think it has proven, many of the things, yes, we did know, but maybe some things we didn't know, and irregardless, it gives us some substantive basis

to point to to move forward. So thank you for your efforts in all this.

MS. BAISH: Well, Dan, I want to thank you as well and for providing those insights. I think last October after we finished the four-day meeting and conference, Dan spent a couple days over at the National Archives actually doing his legislative research, right, Dan, am I right, on the 1962 Act.

And unfortunately, he hasn't shared his volume history of the Act with me yet, but I'm delighted to hear, actually, that and what touched and moved members of Congress into actually doing something to reform the program by creating the system of both regional and selective depository libraries, that that was as a result of a survey based on data.

And I think even though what we've been doing throughout this FDLP research project may have slowed it down for those who want an immediate change in the law, I think you just pointed out a very fine rationale of the

importance of a couple things.

The first one is having data to back up what we want Congress to do as they look at amendments to the law. And I think secondly, and, Dan, you spoke last year at this session that we had on creating our shared vision, and you also noted that it takes many years for changes to come forward, to be agreed upon, and I remember well that you also said there will never be a 100 percent consensus.

What I do think that we've seen, really, as a result of the quantitative, and especially the qualitative responses to our question, I think there is great consensus with the community. I think there is a 100 percent consensus that we want everything that exists in the collections of our oldest regional library are the most comprehensive collection to be available in digital form.

I think there is absolute consensus on that. And that's where we as a community need to work together to determine how that can happen. And again, gets back to the need for

partnerships with the community.

I think, very much, we have always all been in this together. The depository library community, the U.S. Government Printing Office, our wonderful leadership from the National Library Associations, and I really see us coming together in a very positive way with this study, and I know you want the last word, so go ahead, Dan.

MR. O'MAHONY: I don't want the last word. Dan O'Mahony, Brown University. But I guess I would just also remind myself, if no one else, that as anxious as I and others are to check-off that last bullet item in terms of making the necessary changes to the law, I temper my own enthusiasm for that with some practical realities.

And, you know, one of those, obviously, is, we're three weeks away from an election, you know, a brand new Congress coming in, sequestration and all the other priorities that, you know, Congressional and other attentions will be directed at, but, you know,

that should only, sort of, be a parallel out there because it's going to take us, you know, a lot of work and some time to get ready to the point where, you know, we could be there, so the road continues ahead. Thank you.

MS. BAISH: Thank you, Dan. And our Acting Public Printer reminded us, and we were very fortunate this week to have some wonderful guests in throughout our discussions, throughout the forecast sessions, to and including from the Joint Committee on Printing, which, during this 112th Congress, has been chaired by Representative Greg Harper, a member of the House Committee on Administration.

And so as Davita mentioned on Monday, with the new 113th Congress coming in in early-January of 2013, the leadership of the Joint Committee on Printing goes back to the Senate side, and I raise this because not everybody in our audience may be aware of that.

So the leadership of the Joint Committee on Printing comes back to the Senate Rules and Administration Committee. That

_

Committee currently is led by Senator Chuck Schumer of New York, and we look forward to working with him closely, with him and his staff, in the new Congress, so thank you.

MS. FELTREN: Emily Feltren,
American Association of Law Libraries. I just
wanted to take a moment to commend GPO leadership
as well as LSCM's staff for really taking the
Obama administration's commitment to open
government, transparency, and participation and
really running with that.

I think GPO has been a model for other agencies and I think it's worth noting, just throughout the process in the last year, but also throughout the four days here, particularly today, in some of Cherie's and other GPO staff comments and summaries, and I just wanted to express appreciation for the leadership and commitment to openness that you've shown throughout this process.

MS. BAISH: Thank you very much, Emily. And, you know, it's easy to share the Obama administration's open government and

transparency issue when you have a Public
Printer, and we certainly had that in William
Boarman, and we certainly do have that in Acting
Public Printer Davita Vance-Cooks, who is all
about openness and transparency, and making sure
that, as you saw with our new strategic plan,

it's all about our customers.

And I know that in the past, some of the community don't like to be called customers because, in reality, you're our partners, you're our collaborators, but when we look at the services we provide through LSCM, in so many cases you are indeed our customers and we need to tailor what we do to fit your needs.

So anyway, that's so important to the Acting Public Printer. And so, I just wanted to express my gratitude to her for the strong support she's had for this project because that makes it all happen, so thank you.

MS. LASTER: So I have a question from one of our online participants, Maryann Mason of the University of Iowa. For libraries whose forecasts were not valid been notified and

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

were they told that they weren't counted, and did they have an opportunity to fix their surveys?

MS. BAISH: Great question, Maryann. And it's a point that I overlooked as I was dealing with the last slide. Another issue that came up this morning during the council meeting and we've extended the deadline now until November 30th. In terms of the individual library forecast, our staff will be working with the regional librarians so that we will be able to provide you with names of the libraries.

Unfortunately, some of the libraries began to complete the survey and then, for whatever reason, didn't get back, okay? And we weren't able to count that, but we're working, as we discussed earlier, with the council. So we're going to work with the regional librarians to inform them of what libraries are yet, I don't want to say missing, but we're not able to get in their complete survey response, because I know so many of your libraries want to complete their segment and have their voices heard, so I

hope that answers your question.

MS. LASTER: And then another question came in from online, Stewart Chun at the Hawaii State Library, can you elaborate on the timeline for the formation of the focus groups?

MS. BAISH: I might punt that to Cherie Givens because she's the one who presses all of us to that. And, Cherie, why don't you just kind of sum up the purpose of the focus groups, the audience of the focus groups, and what that timeline is going to be? And thank you for your question.

MS. GIVENS: Cherie Givens, GPO. So the focus groups are going to begin in April, which means that we're going to be ready to go in April. We will have contacted people so that they'll know and be able to participate. And we plan to actually start them in April.

What we're doing is looking at what we see in the library forecasts, the state forecasts, and the state-focused action plans as either comments that were open to more than one interpretation to get clarification on that.

We're also looking at areas that we want to pursue, like different areas, particularly with education, and possible training, and stuff like that, so where people have identified a need that they want from us, that we can fulfill, we're looking at trying to customize that, and so we want to have focus groups that we can work with in order to flesh out the details of those sorts of things.

But it's beginning in April and it will run through August, and then we'll be transcribing the focus group interviews and also the targeted interviews, and then sharing that with the community, and folding that back into our analysis so that we have a better understanding of some of the issues that we have identified that needed further investigation. Thank you.

MS. BAISH: And, Cherie, please correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe, in addition to the focus group, there are certain things in some of the responses where we want clarification and I believe we might be able to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

do that in a very short Survey Monkey questionnaire. Did we not also say that?

MS. GIVENS: Yes, Mary Alice. Thank you for bringing that up. Yes, one of the things that I had talked about, I think, either Monday or Tuesday, some time this week, is that one of the other ways that we're going to reach out is that, when we have identified areas that we think need further investigation, one of the means that we'll be reaching out to the community in order to see who might want to participate in focus groups is by sending out a very short, likely, three to five question length Survey Monkey surveys, just to get a feel for a better understanding of the issue and whether or not you would be willing to participate, so we can get that setup. Thank you.

MS. LASTER: Okay. We're just about out of time. Do you want to go real fast? Thanks, Catherine.

MS. MORSE: Catherine Morse,
University of Michigan. I just wanted to ask,
following up on a question about contacting the

regionals to contact the libraries with incomplete surveys. For the states without regionals, are you going to contact the libraries directly?

MS. BAISH: I think that's a great suggestion, Catherine. Thank you.

MS. LASTER: Okay. And with that, I'd like to turn things over to Blane Dessy for today's meeting summary.

MR. DESSY: Cindy, do you have that
-- there it is. Earlier this week I told you
that I just love to live in "The Blur" because
it gives me lots of room to maneuver. And so I
was thinking about what I wanted to say to close
up this great four-day program. And I thought,
well, maybe I'll bring it back to that blur and
sort of reiterate that idea.

And I just want you to pay attention to the first two lines, which is, "The Blur is the convergence of speed, connectivity, and intangibles." And I was thinking about those three things in terms of what we've been talking about over the past four days.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The first is speed. It's amazing to me that, from last conference to this conference, the surveys were developed, completed by 80 percent of the regionals, 64 percent of the selectives, and have already been preliminarily analyzed.

That's a great deal of activity to happen in 12 months, especially when staff are juggling other things, as are the staff of the depository libraries. So I wanted to mention how quickly this is moving along, even though we all feel sometimes it's not moving as quickly as it should.

Connectivity, GPO, the FDLP libraries, federal members, the non-FDLP agencies, the private sector, some of whom are represented out in the foyer of this meeting who supportive of FDLP. are States and institutions of higher education. This is a broad constituency that brings to this group many different view points, many different opinions, but somehow it's all being worked through.

And I think you saw that when you saw the results that Mary Alice and Jane were talking about earlier today. And the intangibles, maybe my favorite. Let's think about the history of this program for just a minute.

It's been in existence for decades. And as I like to say, we all stand on the shoulders of giants. There are people who are no longer here who have been working to make this program better every year and here we are with the chance to make it even better.

So let's think about how rich the history of this program has been, what we need to keep in the program, and what we need to change. The present, this has been an extraordinarily productive four days. And I hope you took a moment to just sort of maybe step back and appreciate the vibe of the meeting.

I know that's a sort of gushy term, but I saw lots of people willing to come together and really talk about some difficult issues, and to be sort of guided by the data. And I think there was a wonderful sense comradery and

collaboration to this particular meeting.

And the future, not to mention the collaboration, just the scores of ideas that have come out as a result of this meeting. So if those are the things that define The Blur, the speed, the connectivity, and the intangibles, then I think some wonderful things are going to happen.

There are going to be the new opportunities that everyone wants to see occur and that everyone wants to be a part of, right? You're in this a 100 percent. There's going to be a sustained velocity. We've heard that already, how things are moving along. So this is picking up a lot of speed and I can feel it moving already.

So there will be some sustained velocity to this. And there are going to be many, many positive outcomes. So changes are being implemented now. We've heard about how many are already being implemented in LSCM just as a result of that preliminary analysis. That's really cool, that an agency will do the

preliminary analysis and just step out there and make changes.

So LSCM, Mary Alice, congratulations on that. New partnerships are being formed and current partnerships are moving right along. The data is going to be further analyzed. You know, this is the age of data mining, data integration, data analysis, and we need more visualization, Cherie. We just can't get enough visualization.

And the white papers are coming, which really surprised me because I thought that was phase 3, and here we are talking about -- and especially the first white paper, which I think is going to be huge, and which is something that people really are looking forward to.

So I'm really excited. I hope you're excited. It's been a tremendous four days thanks to Mary Alice and Jane, and the incredible efforts of all the LSCM staff who have been working tirelessly. I get a chance to talk to them periodically since we all work in Washington, they've been working like dogs, and

б

I mean that in a good way, and I want to thank DLC, Cherie, especially, and the rest of the council who worked so hard on everything here.

So if it's my job to wrap-up, I think you should give yourself a round of applause. I think you should leave here feeling really, really excited about this program and your role in it, because really, the best is yet to come, so have a good day.

MS. LASTER: Thank you, Blane, and we'll reconvene in about 11-1/2 minutes for a council wrap-up session.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 3:49 p.m. and went back on the record at 4:02 p.m.)

MS. LASTER: All right. We're going to go ahead and get started on our wrap-up session because some of what we're covering, I think, will not be anything surprising to the folks who are here, but because this session is on the record, it's a chance for us to summarize what's happened at the meeting over the past four days and also to get some public feedback and

comment on the recommendations that we're considering.

So before I start on this, for the -- let's see. I just lost my paper. Okay. I know it doesn't look like it right now. We have, what, maybe half a dozen folks in the audience, but we actually had 286 people in attendance throughout the course of this week, including 69 people who are first-time attendees, we had 30 regionals register, we had a total of 35 no-shows, which isn't a big number, except, of course, for everyone who had to, Lance, order all the cookies for the people who didn't come.

But 286 in attendance, that's just a fabulous number and I'm really glad that we had so many folks throughout the bulk of the plenary sessions. Also, as another piece of business, I would like to remind those of you who are left to please fill out your evaluations and let the LSCM staff know what you thought of each session you attended.

Council does review these forms after they've all been submitted and compiled,

and we use them to help determine our programming for future conferences, so please fill that out.

I would also like to profusely thank my fellow members of council for all their hard work in getting ready for the conference this week. I know that everyone spent a lot of time working on the sessions and we will spend lots of time in the coming weeks discussing our recommendations, and so thank you in advance for all that hard work.

For those of you who are not present at our working meeting on Wednesday evening, I am thrilled to announce that we have elected Arlene Weible from the State Library of Oregon to be our chair-elect, so thank you, Arlene. Arlene will serve as chair-elect through May 31st, 2013 and on June 1st, she will take on the role of Chair of Depository Library Council for a year.

We've also elected Chris Brown from the University of Denver to be our Secretary. So thank you, Chris, and I think we owe an especially big round of applause to Helen Burke from Hennepin County Library who served as

Secretary for two years. Okay. Awesome.

Thank you, Helen.

So what we'd like to do is give the audience and remind ourselves, briefly, of the council sessions that took place over this week. So I will go over the introductory remarks and the LSCM update, and following that, we'll have a representative from each one of the working groups briefly discuss their session and what was discussed within their session.

and broad terms, describe the recommendations that we will be considering over the coming weeks. These recommendations are not yet ready to be wordsmithed. These are at the conceptual level. Over the coming weeks, we will develop them as actual real, live language that we will then submit to GPO.

So the Acting Public Printer, Ms. Davita Vance-Cooks, opened our session with the observation that the theme of this conference has been celebrating the past, building the

future together, and she talked about how GPO
continues to transform itself into a digital
information platform and a provider of secure
credentials.

GPO is focusing on its customers and its partners, and of course, the participants of the Federal Depository Library Program are partners to GPO and this is a relationship that they will be focusing on throughout the coming years.

The strategic mission of GPO to keeping America informed continues to be to produce, protect, preserve, and distribute the official publications and information products of the Federal Government. The strategic vision of GPO is to continue to transform itself into a digital information platform and a provider of secure credentials.

So following that, the Superintendent of Documents, Mary Alice Baish, talked about the continued strategic dialog concerning the future of the FDLP in the digital age. Seven-hundred and seventy-five libraries

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

participated in the library forecast survey. There were, additionally, at least 40 state forecasts and 33 state-focused action plans that were submitted to GPO.

The results from the first phase of this project have been shared at this meeting and we just, in fact, finished a wrap-up session to discuss those results and the actions that are being taken as a result of the survey.

The second phase continues identify issues and investigate them further using focus groups and other tools to better understand the results of the survey. And the third phase will result in the production of white papers along with the LSCM strategic plan, the FDLP strategic plan, and an FDLP national plan.

At the LSCM update, we welcomed Jane Sanchez as the head of library services and content management. The key programs for LSCM include the cataloging and indexing program, the international exchange service, the by-law program, and us, the FDLP.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The recent reorganization and realignment within LSCM focused on moving to a streamlined format neutral workflow. We learned about the national bibliographic records inventory, which is a project I'm very excited about, in part, because it reflects some of the expressed needs and interests of the Depository Library Council.

And this inventory is a compilation of both ongoing and new initiatives that are going to help build a full inventory of bibliographic records for materials in the Federal Depository Library Program.

I was also really excited to hear about the initiative to transcribe brief records from monographs from the 1895 and 1989 MoCat. Jane, if you're wondering why I could prompt you on the years, that was because I was excited. The enhancements and ongoing development for DSIMS are also going to be very welcomed as are the cleanup project for PURLs, archiving for historical publications.

The acquisition of the iCohere

e-Learning platform has been a major step for GPO and we've been grateful to be able to use that on a number of sessions, both for council purposes and for training purposes.

The increase in FDsys training is something that we all welcome and we're looking forward to seeing what tips, tricks, and tools will be developed in the coming months to help all of us better use FDsys and provide better information services to our users.

I'm a big fan of the library's spotlights and the FDLP Connections, in small part, because my library got spot lit, and I think that these opportunities to showcase members of the community are a great opportunity for libraries to take advantage of and if you know that your neighbor is doing something great, please let LSCM know because it's always great to have some recognition for the hard work you do every day.

GPO continues to increase its cooperation with other federal agencies to provide both training and content, and I don't

want to go through the whole list now, but it's a very impressive list and I hope that it will

continue to grow.

Finally, the new FDLP promotion plan will be released soon. There's a draft version that's been released and I know that they are looking for comments and feedback. We're all looking forward to the chance to get to use that and to improve our abilities to promote library resources from the Federal Depository Library Program.

So the collaboration working group, do you want to give your summary?

MS. WEIBLE: I wanted to come up front so I wasn't, kind of cockeyed there on the end. Our collaboration workgroup heard from two specific collaborations and really, our intent for our program was to really inspire, to really show how collaboration is a way that you can solve common problems that you're facing in your area, but also, how it can inspire you on to other things and can blossom into other things you don't expect.

So we heard from the folks in Missouri, Marie and Barbara, talking about what their -- they introduced a new term for us, subregional, and talked about what that meant for the area of St. Louis. I was really excited to hear that concept and Marie also got to promote it again at the regionals meeting, so I think that's definitely one of those things that -- something that's being tried at the local level that really can be looked to as a model to replicate in other kinds of environments throughout the country.

So again, you know, on the collaboration, that can inspire us to think about other ways of organizing, and also, doesn't require Title 44 change, so that's always a good thing.

Our other collaboration we highlighted was the great folks who run the six-state virtual conference on training for government information. And I think what I really appreciated from hearing about their experience is, they gave really good tips on how

a virtual conference is different than a physical conference.

And, you know, those tricks and tips that will really help folks who look into doing virtual training, you know, just those technical aspects that are really important to consider in this new environment, and hopefully, made it seem more accessible for those of us who may be in the position of planning those kinds of trainings.

And then the other thing, I think, that was really wonderful about that presentation is, we got to actually do some virtual participation because we had Peggy Jobe and Jennie Gerke from the University of Colorado sitting at their desks, in Colorado, talking to us about their collaboration.

And I think that was really exciting and I hope we continue to do that more and more in these conferences. So we were really excited to hear about these collaborations and I hope they were as inspirational to you as they were to me. Thanks.

I'm sorry. I did a really bad thing
and did not acknowledge the people that are in
the collaboration workgroup on council, and I
didn't do that on Tuesday, so I want to make sure
I do it now, it's Stephanie Braunstein, Steve

Hayes, and Larry Romans, and myself.

MS. BURKE: Helen Burke, Hennepin County Library. Our education working group, consisting of Debbie Rabina as the chair, she had to return and left early today, but Sue Lyons, Blane Dessy, and myself, we were lucky to put together a session on Facing Training Needs: Building a Training Registry.

Thanks.

Training is a perpetual need, whether it was the 19th century, the 20th century, the 21st century, it will continue to be a need, so trying to address that with two speakers that we had, who are current content providers in great training sessions, to building upon what Arlene said, we tried to inspire the community with current training efforts.

And Debbie Rabina started the

б

session out with an overview of the need for, perhaps, a training resource, something that would be a collection, a place where we could go, a centralized place where the community to go to reliably find training resources.

And after that introduction by Debbie, we had Councilmember Steve Beleu, who is from the Oklahoma Department of Libraries, speak about his efforts to go out and do training sessions. His training is legendary and very-well appreciated throughout the community. And he was able to speak to his efforts to go out and reach data professionals and introduce that topic for us.

And then Jesse Silva, of the University of North Texas, who was also the co-chair of ALA GODORT's education committee, spoke about ALA GODORT's current efforts. They, of course, had put together the Handout Exchange, which was started by my colleague, Larry Romans, and talked about where the status of that and that that's moving towards -- they've got their first webinar that they offered and

they plan to offer several in the future.

And then we raised the questions for the community that we wanted to engage the community and raise those questions, and we had some discussion after the session about the kind of three aspects of a training resource that the community may want to consider these three questions as it thinks of a training resource; the audience, the intended audience for it.

Should it be government information librarians? Should it be general librarians? Should it be the public at large? Should it be library information students; whatever?

The second question would be, what model for a resource would be best? And we described the clearing house model, the repository, or a registry, or something brand new. As part of the model, we also raised the question of partnership. GPO partnering with the community, with specific institutions in the community, to make the resource a reality.

And the third question we raised was about a possible name for the resource. And I

think it was Lucia Orlando of UC Santa Cruz who
gave us our first name, which was GLUE. I know
the G was government, and it went on from there,

4 but GLUE is something for us to react to, or

endorse, or build upon, but that's where we left

6 it. Thank you.

MS. CONCANNON: I'm Marie Concannon, University of Missouri, on the sustainability committee, along with Steve Beleu from Oklahoma, and Peggy Jarrett, who is not here right now, was our chair. And we chose to do a session title, How to Succeed with Little or Nothing: Ideas for Federal Depository Libraries.

We wanted to do a session that would give people a boost in their morale, a feeling that they had options and ideas when, you know, in this time of economic decline and during this period of time before Title 44 has that change, which brings us into, you know, the modern digital age, we all need a little boost.

We need to get some ideas, some hopes, some optimism, and carry that home with

us. And so we thought that would be the best service that we could do for you. So what we did was, we invited three panelists to come and answer specific questions that we gave them in advance.

We had a librarian from a 95 percent selective academic library. We had a librarian who is with a public library. And we had a librarian who is a regional, who is a law librarian, and who has been the acting state librarian, so she had a lot of perspectives.

It was hard for me to hold up the little sign saying, stop, your three minutes are up because she had some really very interesting things to say. We gave them questions that had to do with staffing, how much has your staff decreased? How has that affected you?

We asked them about their collections and space. Have they been asked to decrease the amount of space that they have for their docs collection? We asked them how reference has changed for them in recent years. My personal favorite category was advocating to

administrators, which, to me, I consider that fundamental, and my favorite question in that favorite category was, what's your elevator speech?

So if you find yourself getting on the elevator with your top-level library administrator and they say, oh, how's it going in documents? And you have just a few seconds to say, we posed that question to these panelists to say, you know, what would you say? I was very interested and Cass from Washington, who's the other academic library, she said, I would say, official, digital, secure.

Well, I think that would leave them rather speechless and stunned. It's like, wow. And then the final set of questions we asked them was, how you see the future. You know, for you library type, for you, how do you see the future of the FDLP?

And so we really had a lot of interesting visioning in that session. As far as a recommendation -- oh, no, I'm going to explain why we don't have one. Is that okay?

а

1 I'm going to explain why we don't have normally, or at least in the past, these council 2 working sessions would result 3 in

5 We don't have one because, and it has 6 to do with what the sustainability subcommittee 7 is all about, and it was something that I had to actually learn myself, because I, myself, had a 8

misperception about it.

recommendation.

The sustainability subcommittee on the DLC is not a unit which is supposed to help revision the program or reinvent it at all, because all the recommendations we make have to be actionable by GPO at the present time, otherwise, they can't do anything, you know, they can't do anything with it.

So everything that we say would have to be actionable now, so all of our suggestions would have to be in alignment with the current The way we designed this session was Title 44. to help boost your ideas, boost your morale, to get through this present time, okay?

So what we're going to be doing is,

23

4

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Okay?

Thank you.

over the next few weeks, we're going to be thinking if we have something that we can submit that we feel it would be representative of all your thoughts and ideas, so that's about it.

MR. BROWN: Chris Brown, University of Denver. The technology team consists of Mark Phillips and Rosemary LaSala, and myself, and we had a little presentation this morning, web archiving and how it fits into the FDLP.

So we had four mini-presentations, Abbie Grotke from the Library of Congress, and then David Walls, Fang Gao, and Dory Bower from GPO. And just to summarize all of their presentations together, well, what is web archiving? Well, it's creating an archival, or preservation, copy of a web site, including the look, feel, and navigation.

It's not just, you know, doing a right-click, save page as, it's actually, you know, replicating the entire site to the extent possible. So it involves selecting web sites, you know, the scope of the search, what are you

going to collect? Scoping the crawl time and frequency, and then processing all of this data, storing it, and looking at the retrieved materials.

And I was stunned by the amount of terabyte-age that is involved in this project. When we're talking about, I don't have the numbers in front of me, but 100's of terabytes. It's just quite stunning, the infrastructure that goes into this. In fact, it's so much, that often it's outsourced to places like the Internet Archive.

So there's technology challenges. So we can perfectly capture old-style web sites, you know, from maybe 10, 15 years ago, but challenges come into play with newer-style web sites when we have technologies such as multimedia, Java, Flickr, crawlers have trouble keeping up with these things.

So as new technologies come about, crawlers have to be tweaked and redesigned to be able to handle these, and so that's a challenge. There are also legal challenges. The Copyright

Act, Section 108, provides for library exceptions in terms of copyright, but nowhere does the Act address archiving and digital

preservation.

So there's a lot of challenges that are encountered. So those of you following along at home, try this. I did it while the talk was going on, go to the CGP, go to expert search, and put WCAT=web archiving. You will see eight records there. That's pretty cool. You can see archived sites that have been captured by GPO.

And you can see the same sites, or the eight sites, in archive-it.org, that's www.archive-it.org, and in that main search box type GPO, and then you'll also see eight sites there. So that's something you can do right now.

GPO has a pilot program and they're looking to harvest some difficult web sites and the challenge that they're taking is the Y 3 classification, you know, the Congressional Commissions. So it's small, definable sites,

but sites that have been very difficult to capture, so that's kind of the scope of the pilot project.

Metadata issues, well, there's the DC, Dublin Core, to MARC metadata mapping, and they're also in the process implementing RDA, since that's in our future. To summarize the whole thing, the importance of best practices is what came across in this whole thing.

MS. LASTER: All right. Thank you all for giving those great summaries of our sessions. I would like to have each working group that has a proposed recommendation, introduce it briefly. The reason I wanted to do the recommendations very last is that, we don't have any text for them.

You'll see, we're not committed to anything in writing, and I wanted to bring them up last so that they'll be fresh on everyone's mind when we open the floor for discussion. So with that, the collaboration working group.

MR. ROMANS: This is a considerably more specific version of our recommendation and

1 it has not been approved by the other members of the group, but I wanted to throw it out, and that 2 is Depository Library Council 3 that the 4 recommends that GPO, first, investigate the public domain distribution tool created by 5 6 ASERL; to identify challenges to adoption and 7 possible solution; three, decide whether to endorse the tool for use by regional librarians; 8 and four, provide updates to the Depository 9 10 Library Council.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. LASTER: The education group.

MS. BURKE: Helen Burke, Hennepin County Library. For the education group, just a draft version of our recommendation. Council would like to see a centralized platform for education and training resources that is similar in structure to the digitization registry in that it provides annotations and metadata, and links to educational resources, that are already available from both GPO and the community.

Ideally, we would like to see a release before the October 2013 FDLC meeting.

MS. LASTER: Okay. And I know we

don't have one from sustainability, but we have a surprise new recommendation from technology.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. PHILLIPS: We ate lunch and we did -- no, Mark Phillips, University of North Over lunch, we had some discussions and Texas. one of the things that we had actually come into the DLC talking about, and then it just bubbled and, kind of, we forgot about it, and then recommendation remembered. was а encouraging GPO to work with platform providers the various discovery tools that academic public libraries and some purchasing.

And in order to not only incorporate data and metadata from the CGP into their platforms, but also to see if there's a way to include the full text of documents from FDsys into those platforms. And that's really the long and short of it.

MS. LASTER: Okay. Thank you,
Mark. Comments from council before we open up
the floor for discussion? All right.
Questions, comments, from the audience? We

1 have a lot of time.

MR. STEVENSON: John Stevenson,
University of Delaware. When you're talking
about discovery platforms, are you including
ones that may be confused with catalogs, like
WorldCat Local?

MR. PHILLIPS: I think at this point we haven't defined them, but as broadly as possible without being, it's on the web and you can crawl it, and be Google. But I think, you know, identifying several of the major players in the field. And I know that other large collections of federal information agencies have been contacted by these companies and have had their content integrated into it, so there's some prior art in this area, and it's just to, kind of, go down the path of seeing what could be done.

So I don't think we're ruling anything out at this point, so I think we'd try to cast the net broadly and see what comes out.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you.

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Stephanie

1	Braunstein, LSU. I am probably displaying an
2	incredible ignorance about this, but I believe
3	I was told by the people at my library who have
4	oversight over our EBSCO discovery service that,
5	depending upon how we decide to code things, they
6	will show up automatically in a search by a label
7	that says government document or some related
8	way of identifying documents. Does anybody
9	know what I'm talking about?
10	MR. BROWN: Yes, I know exactly what
11	you're talking about, but not all the systems,
12	necessarily, have ingested FDsys or other
13	content. So to the extent that it's ingested,
14	that's correct.
15	MS. LASTER: That was Chris Brown.
16	I have been totally breaking this rule in this
17	last session, so it's no big deal.
18	MR. BROWN: Chris Brown that was,
19	University of Denver.
20	MS. LASTER: Thank you.
21	Kathy.
22	MS. HALE: Kathy Hale, State

Library of Pennsylvania. Technology subgroup,

1 just remember that, even though there are many academic libraries that have those kinds of 2 platforms, there are many public libraries that 3 4 do not have that access, do not have that platform, and we are here for all of the public, 6 not just academic.

> MR. BROWN: Chris Brown, University of Denver. Absolutely. It's just that, right now, the government content is explicitly omitted from those sites and there's no reason why it should be omitted. So, absolutely, it's not a prejudicial thing. It's just that I don't see any reason why it couldn't be folded into a product of that nature.

> I would just add, MS. LASTER: particularly, if it can be done with, virtually, zero resource expenditure. More questions, comments from the floor? Did everybody have fun this week? Thank you. Great.

> MS. MCANINCH: Sandy McAninch, University of Kentucky. Are we only asking and commenting on your recommendations?

> > MS. LASTER: No.

23

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	MS. MCANINCH: Okay.
2	MS. LASTER: The floor is open.
3	MS. MCANINCH: Okay. I was very
4	surprised to hear that GPO was cataloging
5	pamphlets but not distributing them, so where do
6	the go? Do you digitize them? And if they're
7	part of an active item, why wouldn't you
8	distribute them?
9	MS. EBANUES: Suzanne Ebanues, GPO.
10	Things that aren't distributed to the depository
11	program are still part of the cataloging and
12	indexing program, so we are required to catalog
13	them, so you'll find records for pamphlets, and
14	maybe a notice for a program that some agency is
15	having that you don't want to get in your box.
16	After we catalog it, that material
17	is sent to NARA as part of our records group.
18	MS. MCANINCH: But these are things
19	that are part of active items, item selections
20	we've made, right?
21	MS. SANCHEZ: Can we get back to you
22	on that?
22	MC MCANINCH: That is fine

1	MS. SANCHEZ: I'm sorry. Laurie
2	Hall isn't here. I just heard her tell someone
3	this morning. These are totally ephemeral
4	things. She said they're things that the
5	libraries do not want.
6	MS. MCANINCH: Well, to quote a very
7	venerable documents librarian, Fran Buckley,
8	one man's trash is another man's treasure and
9	MS. SANCHEZ: Okay. I'll get your
10	name and Laurie Hall will get back to you next
11	week, okay?
12	MS. MCANINCH: That's fine.
13	MS. SANCHEZ: Thank you.
14	MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin
15	Haun-Mohamed, GPO. I'm going to jump in here.
16	Sandy, sometimes they come directly from the
17	agency, in which case, we try to send them back
18	to the agency if we have bulk stock. The other
19	thing that we've done consistently is go through
20	the boxes to identify where, maybe, we're
21	getting material under a deal direct. I know

That is, the agency has a regular

you've heard that term before.

22

standing print run and they'll throw all kinds of things under that print run. So you'll get a serial title and then you'll get a bookmark, and so we try to weed out those bookmarks before they actually go out to you.

If there's no information content on the bookmarks, then we're pulling them if we can. That said, occasionally, just as you said, sometimes those are really cool little things, and some of them go out. Laurie, though, is, on a regular basis, going through the boxes and looking through the physical publications that we're receiving, and trying to do the follow back on the other end to get them stopped if they truly are ephemeral.

MS. SANCHEZ: Also, to be a little more clear, what Laurie was describing today was, sometimes we get one copy. When we get that one copy and we don't have the ability to buy more, we are cataloging them, but we only have one copy. But again, I apologize for any confusion. We'll have her get back.

MS. CLARK: Kristen Clark,

University of Minnesota. Much of the time of this conference has been spent around the forecast study, but as I was sitting here I was kind of thinking, we really haven't heard anything about what council's role in that study has been, and so I think, could you address this since, even though I know you guys are an advisory group appointed by GPO, you still do represent us as well, and so I'm just interested in your role as this moves forward.

MS. LASTER: Sure, Kristen. This is Shari Laster, University of Akron. So up to now, the primary role that we've had, we did help GPO in reviewing the questions for the survey before they were released. We provided some informal advice about the distribution of the surveys.

We were involved in the discussion to move the deadline for the action plans to the end of August because some folks on council had heard about how difficult it was to do the state forecast and the state-focused action plan all at once as opposed to sequentially.

So moving forward, we will be in discussion with GPO about their findings as they are made available to us. We don't specifically have a timeline beyond what we've heard today, or what we've heard this week. I expect that we will see things like white papers.

I'm hopeful, and I will be talking to GPO about this, that we will have some input in what types of focus groups are consulted, what kinds of -- we'll have some information on what GPO is going to be asking about in the focus groups. As they said, what they'll be looking for will be clarifications so that they, ideally, will be able to have as neutral as possible interpretation of the words used in the survey.

I think there's still a lot open in terms of what the role can be. I would not think that there will be much that we will see that you guys won't eventually see, or hopefully won't see shortly after we see. I might have mixed up my negatives on that. Does anyone on council have anything to add?

MS. WEIBLE: Arlene Weible from the Oregon State Library. I do think that if there are specific concerns in the community about how the process moves forward and you're looking for advocates, council is a really good place to direct those ideas and concerns because, in our role as advisor, we can be a voice for those kinds of concerns in a more direct way, maybe, and so if there are some specific concerns, I would says, specifically, about the process, particularly, or timelines, or that kind of thing.

I personally would love to hear about them so I can make sure I am doing my job of representing the community.

MS. LASTER: And of course, you can contact us individually and there's also a form on fdlp.gov, somewhere, to contact us. Does anyone from GPO want to add anything about that process? I realize most of the forecast folks have had to leave for the day. Did everything I say sound reasonable? Okay. Kristen, did that answer your question?

1 MS. CLARK: Thank you.

MR. STEVENSON: John Stevenson,
University of Delaware. I wondered if council
was going to be using the FDLP community site to
continue discussions in a public way?

MS. LASTER: Great question, John. Shari Laster, University of Akron. Yes, we will. We, up until now -- well, I'll speak for my own experience. My experience is that there has not been a great deal of response to queries that are put out there and I think we want to use as many communications channels as makes it easy for folks to give us feedback.

So, for example, what we might do is, if we would like to get some information from the community, we might put a post on the forum, but then also setup a form for some other easy submission so folks can just send us a quick answer and maybe post that form in a public place like, govdoc-1.

I do know that there are plans, eventually, to revise that entire site, but the fdlp.gov events guide take precedence.

	MR	STEVENSON:	Thank	V011
	IVII/\ •	215/51/2011.	IIIaIII	you.

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. If I recall correctly, last year, we were told that the conference was going to start moving around the country and wouldn't be in Washington every year, but I noticed on the evaluation form it asked if we were coming back to Crystal City next year, so can we assume that we're going to be in D.C. for the foreseeable future?

MS. LASTER: Lance just said yes. I don't know if that yes was on the record of not though.

MR. CUMMINS: Lance Cummins, GPO. Yes, unfortunately, with the travel issues going forward, it makes more sense for us to be able to staff it appropriately, and to bring the people that you need to talk to, and that need to talk to you, that we have you coming here for a while.

And when things lessen back up and we get the opportunity, we will look into it yet again if it makes sense to move around or stay,

1 but at this point, it's just more economical that way, and it provides us the chance to send as many 2 people as we can to interact with you all, which 3 4 I think is very important for both sides. 5 MS. LASTER: Mary Alice, since you 6 just walked back into the room, I'm sorry to --7 I don't think I'll catch you flat-footed. That's extremely hard to do. We had a question 8 a few minutes ago about what the role of the 9 10 Depository Library Council will be in terms of the process going forward for understanding the 11 data from the forecast survey and the products 12 13 that will come out of that. And I was wondering if you wouldn't 14 mind just talking about what you see council 15 16 doing and hopefully none of it conflicts with what I just said. 17 MS. BAISH: Well, not knowing what 18 19 you just said, Shari --20 MS. LASTER: That's great. It's a

MS. BAISH: And I apologize for not being here, but our chief communications

blind test.

21

22

offi	cer,	Andy	She	rman,	са	.me	to	the	very	end	of
the	last	sess	ion	and	so	we	ne	edec	l to	have	а
disc	nussic	n so	о Т .	do ar	2010	nais	z.e				

I think when council came in March and had the meeting with our Acting Public Printer, she laid out, actually, what her expectations were of council members. I think we will be continuing to communicate and give council -- well, what we've tried to do in the past is give them, if you will, advanced notice on some of the things that we have been finding.

I think, now that we have our preliminary information, now that we are going to be going through our data and identifying, on our own part, what we believe are issues for the focus groups, or for the surveys, we'll be looking for even more assistance from you in helping us with our decision making.

I think you will continue to serve an important role between the agency, staff, and the community, and, Shari, what else did I miss?

MS. LASTER: That pretty much sounded like everything.

1	MS. BAISH: Okay. Thank you.
2	MS. LASTER: Other questions or
3	comments? We did agree that we all had fun while
4	you were out. That was a topic of discussion.
5	We had fun.
6	MS. BAISH: I'm not going to make a
7	comment because it might go in the transcript,
8	but after the meeting, I will comment on that.
9	Thank you.
10	MS. LASTER: Okay. This is the
11	last call for comments, or feedback, or
11 12	last call for comments, or feedback, or questions from the audience. Anything else
12	questions from the audience. Anything else
12	questions from the audience. Anything else from council? Are we all good? All right.
12 13 14	questions from the audience. Anything else from council? Are we all good? All right. Well, thank you all. Have a safe trip back to
12 13 14 15	questions from the audience. Anything else from council? Are we all good? All right. Well, thank you all. Have a safe trip back to your homes and we will see you online for further