## Depository Selection Mechanisms: Proposed New Models

Judith C. Russell

**Superintendent of Documents** 

**Depository Library Council Meeting** 

Seattle, Washington April 5, 2006



#### **Overview**

#### **Timeline:**

Oct. 2004 Review of item numbers and

discussion of alternatives began

Sept. 2005 First briefing papers released

Oct. 2005 Comments received

Feb. 2006 Revised briefing papers released

**Apr. 2006** Discussion at DLC meeting



#### **Overview**

### **Factors in Decision Making:**

- Distribution and selection tied together
- Need to move off legacy systems by end of 2007
- Finite number of item numbers in current system; online titles accelerated their use
- Different requirements for distribution of tangibles and provision of access to online titles led to proposal of different models for tangible and online titles



- 1. Do you agree that the requirements for distribution of tangible publications are different enough from the requirements for online dissemination to merit separate mechanisms for selection and distribution?
- 2. Do you agree that the item number system needs to be revised to reflect the increasing number of online publications?
- 3. Do you agree that the system needs to be revised to allow more flexibility for tangible selection?



### **Objectives:**

- Reflect the importance of online publications
- Free selection of online publications from constraints of a system designed to distributed tangible publications
- Increase the flexibility of depository coordinators to select only those publications that best meet the needs of their users



- Two selection mechanisms:
  - Select using collection development tools
  - Select using agency-based item numbers
- Use the mechanism that best suits your needs or a combination of the two
- GPO will continue to create unique SuDoc numbers for online publications



### **Collection Development Tools:**

- Develop ILS services to allow for selection by subject, issuing agency, and geography
  - Provide brief bibliographic information and a PURL
  - Enable examination of a publication before inclusion in a depository collection



#### Collection Development Tools, continued:

- Expand New Titles page to retrieve new cataloging records by pre-determined date range (in testing)
- Issue bibliographies on specific topic areas (under development)
- Allow saved searches (profiles) that execute searches at regular intervals (under development)



### **Agency-Based Item Numbers:**

- Provide one item number for <u>all</u> online publications issued by a single agency
  - Include all agencies and bureaus listed in the List of Classes
  - Example: 25 separate item numbers for online publications from the Department of Agriculture and its subordinate agencies



#### **Agency-Based Item Numbers,** continued:

- Assist regionals and depositories that collect comprehensively from certain agencies
- Indicate availability through the FDLP and inclusion in the National Bibliography



### **Agency-Based Item Numbers,** continued:

- Differentiate titles in multiple formats
  - Tangible version distributed under existing item number
  - Online version aggregated under the online item number for the issuing agency
- ◆ Add online item numbers to profile *twice a year* during the update cycle; drop item numbers at any time



- 4. What type of collection development tools would assist you the most in selecting online publications?
- 5. If the proposed model is implemented, which option will you consider using to select online publications?
- 6. Do you or your users use the "Locate Libraries" feature of the CGP for online publications?



- 7. Currently, GPO uses item numbers to record the online publications for which a depository library agrees to provide access. Do you agree that this function should be maintained in any new model for online selection?
- 8. If the proposed model were adopted, how much time would be needed to review the new collection development tools before implementing the proposed changes to item numbers?



### **Objectives:**

- Give libraries greater control over selection and receipt of tangible materials
- Reduce distribution of unwanted titles
- Enable GPO to offer depository libraries flexible services, more comparable to book dealer best practices
- Improve feedback mechanism



### **Categories for Selection:**

- High profile titles distributed to all depository libraries
  - 9/11 Commission Report
  - Katrina Reports
- Libraries designate other items as "selected," "review," or "non-selected" based on local needs



#### Categories for Selection, continued:

- Selected items
  - Same as items <u>selected</u> in the current system
  - Similar to standing orders
- Review items
  - New criteria for selection
  - Review an electronic copy
  - Request tangible if desired after review of electronic copy



#### Categories for Selection, continued:

- Non-selected items
  - Similar to items <u>not selected</u> in current system
  - Copies remaining after libraries that designated the item as "selected" or "review" would be made available on a first come, first serve basis
- Feedback mechanism would enable GPO to make better decisions over time



#### **Other Factors:**

- Five-year retention rule continues to apply to *all* tangible publications received
- Add tangible item numbers to profile <u>twice a</u> <u>year</u> during the update cycle; drop item numbers at any time
- Titles with limited distribution continue to be limited
  - Serial Set and Bound Congressional Record



- 9. If the proposed model for selection of tangible publications were adopted, depository libraries will have a specified time period to review and select titles with items they have designated as "review." What is a reasonable time period for review and selection of these items?
- 10. If your library is not a regional, how would you use the review items?



- 11. Would you consider the additional workload of having to review some titles before receipt an acceptable tradeoff to allow more specificity in selection of tangible items and reduce unwanted items held for 5 years?
- 12. What is an appropriate claims period for selected items (similar to standing orders)?
- 13. What is an appropriate claims period for review items (similar to review copies)?



# Depository Selection Mechanisms Next Steps

- Inclusion of tangible FDLP selection and distribution in RFP for Sales Program
- Use questionnaire responses to determine if proposed models are on track with depository needs
- Analyze impact of the proposed models on GPO operations



# Depository Selection Mechanisms Next Steps

#### **Timeline:**

Apr. 2006 Release of Sales Program RFP,

with optional FDLP selection and

distribution component

**Apr. 2006** Questionnaires sent to depository

community

May 2006 Sales Program RFP proposals due

May 2006 Review of questionnaires



#### **Timeline:**

Sum. 2006 Analysis of proposed models and impact on GPO operations; Release of white paper for

comment

Aug. 2006 Sales Program contract award



### **Depository Selection Mechanisms**

Additional questions or comments?

Item Selection Briefing Papers available at: www.access.gpo.gov/su\_docs/fdlp/selection/



Please return the completed questionnaire as you leave the room.

If you need more time, return it to the registration desk or fax it to (202) 512-2300.



### **Depository Selection Mechanisms**

Thank you for your input.

Your comments will be helpful as we move forward in this process.

