Collection Management:
An FDLP Forecast Study Working Paper[1]

OCTOBER 17, 2013

The U.S. Government Printing Office's (GPO's) Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) Library and State Forecast Study Questionnaires requested responses related to the following themes: Affiliations & Community Marketing, Collection Management, Education, Future Roles & Opportunities, Library Services and Content Management Projects, and Preservation.

This series of Working Papers presents an analysis of each theme and includes major findings and conclusions from the related qualitative and quantitative data.

This report also includes analyses of responses from questions 30–33 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire and questions 17-20 of the State Forecast Questionnaire. These questions focused on future roles and opportunities for the FDLP and its libraries. A wide range of topics were included in these responses and those related to collection management have been analyzed and reported in this paper.

Each Working Paper includes the following sections:

- *INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND*
- *QUESTIONS*
    - *Library Forecast Questionnaire*
    - *State Forecast Questionnaire*
- *SUMMARY OF FINDINGS*
- *DETAILED FINDINGS - LIBRARY FORECAST*
    - *Collection Management-Related Comments From Other Library Forecast Questions*
- *DETAILED FINDINGS - STATE FORECAST*
    - *Collection Management-Related Comments From Other State Forecast Questions*
- *GPO ACTIONS AND NEXT STEPS*
    - *Actions Already Taken*
- *CONCLUSIONS*
- *APPENDICES TO SUPPORT THE WORKING PAPER*
    - *LIBRARY FORECAST DATA REPORTS*
    - *STATE FORECAST DATA REPORTS*

---

[1] *FDLP Forecast Study Working Papers have not undergone the review and editorial process generally accorded official GPO publications. These working papers are intended to make results and analysis of Forecast Study data available to others and to encourage discussion on a variety of topics.*

In response to the Library and State Questionnaires, specific recommendations for each theme will be included in the FDLP Forecast Study Final Report.

PLEASE NOTE: TOTALS MAY NOT ALWAYS EQUAL 100% DUE TO ROUNDING, AND RANKINGS ARE BASED ON FREQUENCIES, NOT PERCENTAGES.

INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

GPO's Library Services and Content Management (LSCM) unit recognizes the key role it plays in supporting collection management work in FDLP libraries and the legal requirements related to acquiring and disseminating U.S. Government publications.

Collection Management is framed by the scope of the resources included in the FDLP by law. The scope of the FDLP is defined as Government information products, except those determined by their issuing agency to be required for official use only or for strictly administrative or operational purposes which have no public interest or educational value, and information classified for reasons of national security.

FDLP Government information products include tangible resources within the scope of the FDLP, electronic resources on FDsys, other titles in the FDLP Basic Collection, resources made available through official FDLP content partnerships, and all online publications cataloged and available through the Catalog of U.S. Government Publications (CGP).

Federal depository libraries select tangible, electronic, and tangible electronic (e.g, CDs) Federal depository resources through item selection. Regional depository libraries acquire all available tangible resources in at least one tangible format.

Depository libraries are not required to select online-only publications by item numbers or house them, although they may do so. Libraries provide access to all online publications within the FDLP.

This Working Paper addresses aspects of Collection Management from the Library and State FDLP Forecast Questionnaires. Most Forecast questions under the "Collection Management" heading were intended to assess the current status, standing, and challenges of managing government information collections (an environmental scan). Other questions ask about future plans, within the parameters of the program, to change the shape of collections.

Open-ended responses about Collection Management addressed collection management at libraries, related GPO processes, and improvements or changes to information lifecycle management processes. Responses also addressed specific topics covering GPO's resources for depository collection management (e.g., the *List of Classes of United States Government Publications Available for Selection by Depository Libraries*), GPO and library technical services processes for all formats of publications, selection and patron use of different formats, and depository housing and retention of tangible publications.

For the purpose of this Working Paper, collection management refers to activities within the Federal Depository Library Program that relate to developing and managing either tangible, tangible electronic, or electronic collections at libraries and GPO. Activities include discovery, selection, GPO distribution to libraries, bibliographic control, and access as it relates to any of the above. There were five collection management questions in the Library Forecast Questionnaire (Questions 7-12). There were no parallel collection management questions in the State Forecast Questionnaire.

QUESTIONS

Library Forecast Questionnaire:
- **Question 7:** *If your library stores FDLP materials remotely (in-house or offsite), does the time needed to retrieve the item negatively affect the demand for their use by the general public?*
- **Question 8:** *In your library, are resources made available by the FDLP an important source of both tangible and digital authenticated government information?*
- **Question 9:** *Do patrons use commercial resources (Examples include Westlaw and Lexis/Nexis.) to access Federal government information in your library?*
- **Question 10:** *The tangible FDLP collection is: (Please mark all that apply.)*
- **Question 11:** *If your library does not view the tangible FDLP collection positively, please explain.*
- **Question 12:** *In your library, is digital government information available through FDsys an important source for federal digital government information?*

<u>SUMMARY OF FINDINGS</u>

Responses to the individual library and state questionnaires reinforced the important focus libraries place on collection management, and confirmed how essential collection management is to libraries and the FDLP. Unless otherwise stated, the information below refers to the 802 respondents to the Library Questionnaire.

- 92% of libraries said FDLP resources are an important source of both tangible and digital authenticated government information.
    - Elaborations from 439 libraries indicated that specific types of content are important, all formats of materials are important, and that different patrons prefer and use certain formats. (Library Q8)
- 79% of libraries indicated that their patrons use commercial or non-depository resources to find Federal Government information in their libraries. (Library Q9)
- Although there are distinct user groups who prefer one format over others, there are also patrons who use any available format. (Library Q5 and Q6)

Tangible and tangible electronic resources:

- When asked to describe the "tangible FDLP collection" in their own words, 78% (626 of the 802 libraries) indicated that the tangible FDLP collection is a "valuable information asset." 83% (669 of the 802 libraries) responded that their tangible FDLP collection is "supportive of their library's mission." (Library Q10)
- However, 273 respondents expressed concerns about the "tangible FDLP collection." The top three elaborations of those concerns were in ranked order: 1) storage or space issues; 2) preference for electronic; and 3) reduction in use or low usage. (Library Q11)
- 69% of libraries do not store depository materials remotely or offsite. Among those libraries that store materials remotely or offsite, only 4% indicated that retrieval times negatively affects their patrons' demand for the resources. (Library Q7)

Digital resources:

- 88% of libraries said that Government information available through GPO's Federal Digital System (FDsys) is an important source of Federal digital government information. (Library Q12)
- 52% of Library respondents (Library Q16) and 87% of 45 State Questionnaire respondents (State Q5) said that they anticipate barriers to access digital-only government information in the next five years.

Collaboration and support:

- Libraries are very interested in LSCM project areas related to collection management. The majority of respondents rated LSCM projects in this area extremely or moderately beneficial to their individual libraries, in both the Library and State responses. (Library Q17A, 17B, 17C and State Q6A, 6B, and 6C) Suggestions for additional project emphasis include cataloging, especially of pre-1976 publications, and improving collection management tools and processes. (Library Q18 and State Q7)

- Some libraries indicated interest in additional training on collection management topics, such as management techniques and guidance (e.g., weeding, retention, and storage) and collection development guidance and tools. (Library Q19)
- The majority of Library respondents indicated that they would not be willing to commit to the development of specific subject-focused collections (Library Q29). However, of 45 State respondents, 80% reported willingness to commit to subject-based collection development, and to provide service beyond their local communities. (State Q14)
- Collaboration between libraries often involves collection management activities:
  - Library respondents said that a majority of libraries do not have or do not plan to have relationships with other libraries. For example, only 12% of libraries (96 of 802 respondents) currently have formal selective housing arrangements. Furthermore, 64% (517 of the 802 libraries) are not interested in establishing that kind of arrangement within any geographic area. (Library Q27)
  - State respondents were asked about existing or planned collaboration between depository and non-depository libraries. 87% indicated that they have relationships (State Q9), both formal and informal, with non-depository libraries. 67% indicated that they plan to enter into relationships with other depository libraries. (State Q13)

DETAILED FINDINGS - LIBRARY FORECAST

Question 7: *If your library stores FDLP materials remotely (in-house or offsite), does the time needed to retrieve the item negatively affect the demand for their use by the general public?*

Question 7 required a no, yes or a third response option, "My library does not store materials remotely."

Of 802 respondents to Question 7, 551 (69%) responded that their library does not store materials remotely, 218 (27%) responded "no," and 33 (4%) responded "yes."

This question did not contain an option for open-ended responses.

Question 8: *In your library, are resources made available by the FDLP an important source of both tangible and digital authenticated government information?*

Question 8 required a standard yes/no response and provided an option for open-ended responses where respondents could elaborate on their response.

Of 802 respondents to Question 8, 736 (92%) agreed that FDLP resources are an important source of both tangible and digital authenticated government information. 66 respondents (8%) indicated that they are not.

Respondents from 439 libraries provided further elaboration via the open-ended responses. There was no limit to the number of elaborations that they could provide.

The elaborations on whether or not resources made available by the FDLP are an important source of tangible and digital authenticated government information were grouped into 16 different topics, resulting in 774 observations.[2]

Of 16 topics identified from the elaborations in the initial review, none received more than 19% of responses. Top-ranked responses are (in ranking order):[3]

Figure 1: Library Forecast Question 8 Most Frequent Responses

Rank	Topics	Frequency	%
1	Specific content important	145	19%
2	Yes, important	139	18%
3	All formats important	87	11%
4	Specific users prefer	79	10%
5	Authentication important	57	7%

The second step in analyzing responses was a process of analytical compression that grouped the 16 individual topics into 12 overarching themes, resulting in 766 unique observations.[4] The results show that many respondents entered a wide variety of remarks. The 12 overarching compressed themes are (in ranking order):

[2] The term "observations" refers to each unique "library-topic" combination. A library's response could include numerous topics, each characterized here as "observations."
[3] Responses irrelevant to the question asked were removed in this ranking.
[4] A more detailed explanation of the analytical compression process is provided in the FDLP Forecast Study methodology documentation.

Figure 2: Library Forecast Question 8 Compressed Themes

Rank	Compressed Themes	Frequency	%
1	Other	153	20%
2	Specific content important	145	19%
3	Yes, important	139	18%
4	All formats important	87	11%
5	Specific users prefer	79	10%
6	Authentication important	57	7%
7	Digital preferred	32	4%
8	Authentication not important	26	3%
9	Non-FDLP Sources Preferred	17	2%
10	Not important	14	2%
11	Tangible preferred	12	2%
12	Tangible not preferred	5	1%
	Totals	766	100%

The following table further illustrates the breakdown of observations associated with respondents' yes or no responses to Question 8.

Figure 3: Library Forecast Question 8 Compressed Categories

Compressed Categories	Yes		No		Total Frequency	Total %
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%		
Specific content important	144	19%	1	0%	145	19%
Other	139	19%	14	2%	153	20%
Yes, important	138	18%	1	0%	139	18%
All formats important	86	11%	1	0%	87	11%
Specific users prefer	78	10%	1	0%	79	10%
Authentication important	56	7%	1	0%	57	7%
Digital preferred	23	3%	9	1%	32	4%
Authentication not important	16	2%	10	1%	26	3%
Tangible preferred	11	1%	1	0%	12	2%
Non-FDLP Sources Preferred	8	1%	9	1%	17	2%
Not important	3	0%	11	1%	14	2%
Tangible not preferred	2	0%	3	0%	5	1%
Totals	**704**	**92%**	**62**	**8%**	**766**	**100%**

Question 9: *Do patrons use commercial resources (Examples include Westlaw and Lexis/Nexis.) to access Federal government information in your library?*

Question 9 required a standard yes/no response and provided an option for open-ended responses where respondents could identify the sources.

Of 802 respondents to Question 9, 636 (79%) indicated that their patrons use commercial resources to access Federal government information in the library, and 166 (21%) indicated that their patrons do not.

Respondents from 636 libraries elaborated further via the open-ended responses. There was no limit to the number of resources that they could identify.

Responses to this question were not categorized by themes. Responses listed vendor/commercial sources. The following are the most frequently mentioned resources.

- Bernan
- Bloomberg
- BNA
- Cambridge University Press
- CCH
- Columbia University Press
- Congressional Information Service (CIS) (formerly)
- Congressional Quarterly (CQ)
- Department of Energy, Hanford
- EBSCO or EBSCOhost
- ExLibris
- Fastcase
- Gale
- Geographic Research, Inc.
- Geolytics
- Google / Yahoo / Bing, etc.
- GPO
- Hein or HeinOnline
- Infogroup, Inc
- LexisNexis
- LLMC
- MARCIVE
- Newsbank
- NTIS
- OCLC
- Oxford University Press
- Paratext
- ProQuest / LexisNexis1
- Readex
- Ross Publishing
- Thomson Reuters RIA
- Various resource publishers
- Vendor or source unspecified
- West or Westlaw
- Wolt

Respondents initially identified 312 individual topics or resource names, resulting in 1,940 observations.

Of the 312 individual topics or vendor names identified in the initial review, top-ranked responses are (in ranking order):

Figure 4: Library Forecast Question 9 Most Frequent Responses

Rank	Resources	Frequency	%
1	LexisNexis	445	23%
2	ProQuest / LexisNexis	382	20%
3	West or WestLaw	266	14%
4	Hein or HeinOnline	182	9%
5	Readex	85	4%
6	Congressional Quarterly (CQ)	75	4%
7	EBSCO or EBSCOhost	56	3%
8	Gale	33	2%
9	Congressional Information Service (CIS)	29	2%

Through analysis and compression, the responses were regrouped into five overarching themes, with 1,455 unique observations. Compressed themes typically represent the publisher or vendor and include data for individual product titles when the publisher or vendor was identified or unique. It was necessary to group less-frequently mentioned sources under "other." The five overarching compressed themes are (in ranking order):

Figure 5: Library Forecast Question 9 Compressed Themes

Rank	Compressed Themes	Frequency	%
1	LexisNexis	444	31%
2	Other	302	21%
3	ProQuest / LexisNexis[5]	280	19%
4	West or Westlaw	261	18%
5	Hein or HeinOnline	168	12%
	Totals	**1,455**	**100%**

---

[5] Observations frequently mentioned that ProQuest now owns some resources that were previously from LexisNexis.

Question 10: *The tangible FDLP collection is: (please mark all that apply.)*

Question 10 allowed respondents to choose one, multiple or all response options. Response options were: a valuable information asset, supportive of the library's mission, viewed as cost and/or space intensive, other (please elaborate). The response "Other" provided an option for open-ended responses where respondents could elaborate.

Of the 802 library responses to Question 10, there were a total of 1,827 observations (options selected, since responses were not limited by the number of options that they could select). Of the total observations, 626 (34%) categorized the tangible FDLP collection to be "A valuable information asset," 669 (37%) were "Supportive of the library's mission," 366 (20%) were "Viewed as cost and/or space intensive," and 166 responses (9%) were categorized as "Other."

Respondents from 166 libraries that selected "Other" also provided further elaboration about tangible collections via the open-ended responses. There was no limit to the number of observations that they could provide.

These observations about tangible formats were grouped into 22 different topics, resulting in 286 observations. The majority of responses (81%) were received from academic libraries.

Of 22 topics identified about the tangible FDLP collection in the initial review, none received more than 13% of total responses. Top-ranked responses are (in ranking order):

Figure 6: Library Forecast Question 10 Most Frequent Responses

Rank	Topics	Frequency	%
1	Valued- is valuable asset, content/information or used	37	13%
2	Storage or space issues	28	10%
3	Usage issue - reduction of use, low usage or uncertain of usage	27	10%
4	Valued- historically, archival, official, authoritative or only format available	25	9%
5	Preference of or transitioning to electronic	23	8%
5	Other	23	8%

The second step in analyzing responses was a process of analytical compression that grouped the 22 individual topics into 6 overarching themes, resulting in 255 unique observations. The six overarching compressed themes are (in ranking order):

Figure 7: Library Forecast Question 10 Compressed Themes

Rank	Compressed Themes	Frequency	%
1	Positive Value	79	31%
2	Collection Management	59	23%
3	Library Operation Issues	36	14%
4	Other	32	13%
5	Usage Issues	28	11%
6	Negative Value	21	8%
	Totals	**255**	**100%**

Question 11: *If your library does not view the tangible FDLP collection positively, please explain.*

Question 11 did not have a yes/no (quantitative) component. Responses were entirely open-ended (qualitative), and respondents were not required to respond to this question.

For question 11, 273 respondents elaborated why the tangible FDLP collection was not viewed positively. Respondents were not limited to the number of responses that they could provide. The majority of responses (79%) came from academic libraries.

Responses were grouped into 19 themes, resulting in 585 observations. Of the 585 observations, 123 (21%) did not address the question asked and were removed from any further analysis. From the remaining 462 responses, none received more than 24% of the total responses.

Of the remaining 18 themes identified in the initial review, top-ranked responses are (in ranking order):

Figure 8: Library Forecast Question 11 Most Frequent Responses

Rank	Topics	Frequency	%
1	Storage or Space issues	110	24%
2	Electronic Preference or transitioning in some part to electronic	69	15%
3	Usage Issue - reduction in use, low usage or uncertain of usage	56	12%
4	Operational support or resource issues (time, labor, staff)	47	10%
5	FDLP Procedural, policy or Issues with the program	30	6%

The second step in analyzing the 462 responses was a process of analytical compression that grouped the 19 individual topics into six overarching themes, resulting in 399 unique observations. The six overarching compressed themes are (in ranking order):

Figure 9: Library Forecast Question 11 Compressed Themes

Rank	Compressed Themes	Frequency	%
1	Library Support	143	36%
2	Collection Management	102	26%
3	Usage	66	17%
4	Negative Value	38	10%
5	Procedural	30	8%
6	Other	20	5%
	Totals	**399**	**100%**

Question 12: *In your library, is digital government information available through FDsys an important source for federal digital government information?*

Question 12 required a standard yes/no response and provided for open-ended responses, in which respondents could elaborate on their response. The elaboration could expand upon the "yes" or no" response.

Of 802 respondents to Question 12, 709 (88%) agreed that digital government information available through FDsys is an important source for Federal digital government information. 93 (12%) did not agree.

Respondents from 471 libraries provided further elaboration through the open-ended responses.

There was no limit to the number of elaborations that they could provide.

The elaborations on whether digital government information available through FDsys is an important source for Federal government information were grouped into 40 different topics, resulting in 879 observations.

Of 40 topics identified in the initial review, none received more than 8% of the responses. Top-ranked response topics are (in ranking order):

Figure 10: Library Forecast Question 12 Most Frequent Responses

Rank	Topics	Frequency	%
1	Used for special collections	66	8%
2	Valuable (important/essential) information	63	7%
3	Worse than / less used than similar resources	55	6%
4	Authenticated / digitally signed, authoritative content	54	6%
5	Taught / promoted / used in classes	47	5%
6	OPAC and / or Catalog links to FDsys	44	5%
7	Library or topic web page links to FDsys	41	5%
7	Broader distribution than tangible through remote access	41	5%

The second step in analyzing responses was a process of analytical compression that grouped the 40 individual topics into four overarching themes, resulting in 688 unique observations. The four overarching compressed themes are (in ranking order):

Figure 11: Library Forecast Question 12 Compressed Themes

Rank	Compressed Themes	Frequency	%
1	Access	224	33%
2	Other	217	32%
3	Authentication	131	19%
4	Limitations	116	17%
	Totals	**688**	**100%**

Collection Management-Related Comments from Other Library Forecast Questions

Several additional Library Forecast questions related to the general topic of collection management. Some were directly related to the topic of collection management, and some related to topics that may have an impact on collection management within libraries. FDLP collection management processes apply to all formats of publications, and selection involves consideration of patron use of and preference for various formats.

Question 3: *Have changes in funding affected the following areas of your parent library or institution over the last five years (2007-2011)?*

While this question did not directly focus on FDLP collection management, it does reflect funding effects on collection management generally. Of 802 responses to Question 3, the majority of respondents reported funding changes had caused decreased staffing, but had not affected services and public use of the collection.

- *Staffing* – Changes in funding have caused a decrease in staffing for most FDLP libraries over the last five years according to the majority of respondents (61%).
- *Services* – Changes in funding have not affected services for most FDLP libraries over the last five years according to the majority of respondents (57%).
- *Public Use of the Collection*– Changes in funding have primarily not affected public use of the collection in most FDLP libraries over the last five years according to the majority of respondents (65%).

Question 4: *How does your library anticipate the following areas of your library being affected over the next five years (2012-2016)?*

This question did not directly ask how libraries anticipate FDLP collection management will be affected during the next five years (2012-2016). However, responses have an impact on the libraries generally. Of 802 respondents to Question 4, the majority of responses projected levels of staffing, services, and public use of the collection to remain the same.

- *Staffing* – The majority of respondents anticipated staffing would remain the same or not be affected over the next five years (63%).
- *Services* - The majority of respondents anticipated services would remain the same or not be affected over the next five years (54%).
- *Public Use of the Collection* – The majority of respondents anticipated public use of the collection would either remain the same or not be affected (62%).

Question 5: *Is there a distinct user group(s) in your library that prefers digital government information? (Examples include but should not be limited to: Users of the Congressional Record, Historians, Professors, and Small-business owners.)*

Question 6: *Is there a distinct user group(s) in your library that prefers tangible (this includes paper, microfiche, maps, compact discs and audio visual materials) government information? (Examples include but should not be limited to: Historians, Users of the Congressional Record, Professors, and Small-business owners.)*

The majority of respondents for both Question 5 (66%) and Question 6 (56%) indicated that there are distinct patron groups in their libraries that prefer digital or tangible government information. However, the types of patrons groups reported to prefer digital or tangible government formats generally were the same patron groups. Most frequently, the patron groups identified were students/alumni and faculty/staff.

Question 16: *As government information is increasingly produced and distributed in digital-only formats, what barriers to access, if any, do you anticipate in the next five years?*[6]

Of 802 respondents to Question 16, 52% (419) of respondents anticipated barriers to access and 1,049 observations identified specific barriers. Of those observations, 372 related to issues or problems accessing collections, and included comments about anticipated collection management-related barriers to access. The collection management-related comments were primarily related to cataloging and discoverability of collections, and the need for certain publications in tangible formats. These comments coincide with comments received from the collection management questions.

Question 17A: *Please rate the following current LSCM projects areas according to how users of Federal government information in your library might benefit: Projects to provide greater access to government information such as: Simultaneous searching of FDsys and the Catalog of Government Publications; increasing access to United States Courts' opinions provided in partnership with the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts available on FDsys.*[7]

---

[6] Parallels information requested in Question 5 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.
[7] Parallels information requested in Question 6A of the State Forecast Questionnaire.

Of 802 respondents to Question 17A, 486 (61%) rated these types of LSCM projects as "extremely beneficial," 289 (36%) rated the projects as "moderately beneficial, and 27 (3%) rated the projects as "not beneficial."

Question 17B: *Please rate the following current LSCM projects areas according to how users of Federal government information in your library might benefit: Projects to increase cataloging services such as: The Cataloging Record Distribution Project; Shelflist Transcription & Bibliographic Record Clean Up; Cooperative Cataloging Partnerships; enhancements to MetaLib.*[8]

Of 802 respondents to Question 17B, 372 (46%) rated these types of LSCM projects as "extremely beneficial," 369 (46%) rated the projects "moderately beneficial, and 61 (8%) rated the projects as "not beneficial."

Question 17C: *Please rate the following current LSCM projects areas according to how users of Federal government information in your library might benefit: Projects focusing on collection development and management tools such as: The National Bibliographic Inventory; Library Information System Transformation (LIST), PURL Referral Reports.*[9]

Of 802 respondents to Question 17C, 271 (34%) rated these types of LSCM projects as "extremely beneficial," 469 (58%) rated the projects as "moderately beneficial, and 62 (8%) rated the projects as "not beneficial."

Question 18: *Is there another area of service that you would like LSCM to offer? (Please describe.)*[10]

Of 802 respondents to Question 18, 217 responded "yes" and chose to elaborate with an individual open-ended response. Those responses totaled 351 observations. Of the 351 observations, 85 observations were related to collection management.

Comments related to collection management were focused on retrospective or pre-1976 publication cataloging and improvements to item selection and disposal processes. These comments coincide with responses from other questions.

Question 19: *Would you participate in GPO-facilitated virtual meetings or seminars on topics of interest to the FDLP community?*[11]

Of 691 respondents that answered yes to this question, 1,370 individual training topics were specified. Seventy-two responses related to collection management and development training, and four were collection sharing training topics. Of 76 collection management-related comments, the focus was on collection management techniques and guidance (e.g. weeding, retention, storage) and training in collection development guidance and tools (e.g. item selection, formats, electronic

---

[8] Parallels information requested in Question 6B of the State Forecast Questionnaire.
[9] Parallels information requested in Question 6C of the State Forecast Questionnaire.
[10] Parallels information requested in Question 7 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.
[11] Parallels information requested in Question 8 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.

collections). Collection management-related training topics correspond with comments received from collection management question responses.

Collaborative Collection Management-Related Comments from Other Library Forecast Questions

Several other Library Forecast questions requested information on collaborative collection management. Those questions follow, along with a summary of responses pertaining to collection management.

Question 21: *Does your library have formal or informal relationships with local non-FDLP libraries to provide Federal government information?*[12]

Question 25: *Is your library planning to enter into new or additional relationships with local non-FDLP libraries to provide Federal government information?*[13]

Question 26: *Is your library planning to enter into new or additional relationships with other FDLP libraries to provide government information?*[14]

These questions were focused on identifying collaborative relationships or gauging library interest in collaborative relationships; however some individual responses described collection management-related relationships.

Responses to these questions indicated that a majority of libraries did not have, do not have, or do not plan to have relationships with local non-FDLP or FDLP libraries to provide Federal government information. Those libraries that did indicate that they have or plan to have relationships with local non-FDLP or FDLP libraries to provide Federal government information had the opportunity to describe those relationships. Some of the relationships described were relevant to the topic of collection management. Comments related to collection management primarily described interlibrary loan, shared catalog, collaborative collection development, and cooperative repository or shared housing relationships.[15]

Collection Management-Related Comments from Future Roles and Opportunities Library Forecast Questions

Question 27: *Within the next five years, is your library interested in participating in shared housing agreements to distribute parts of your library's FDLP collection throughout your state, depository region, or multistate region? (Please mark all that apply.)*

---

[12] Parallels information requested in Question 9 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.

[13] Parallels information requested in Question 12 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.

[14] Parallels information requested in Question 13 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.

[15] Supporting data is available through the FDLP Forecast Study Data Reports: Library Forecast Questions 21, 25, and 26.

Shared housing for the distribution of parts of the FDLP collection directly impacts the organization and maintenance of a library's FDLP collection. The majority of responses, 517 (51%), indicated that respondents were not interested in participating in shared housing agreements in the next five years, either throughout the state, depository region, or multistate region. Only 96 (9%) responses indicated that respondents were already participating in such agreements. Those respondents interested in participating were most interested in shared housing agreements throughout a depository region (195, 19%) or a multi-state region (124, 12%).

Question 29: *Within the next five years, would your library be willing to commit to the development of a specific subject area collection and be willing to serve users beyond your local community?*[16]

The development of a specific subject area collection is a collection management activity. Of 802 respondents to Question 29, the majority indicated that they would not be willing to commit to the development of a specific subject area collection, or be willing to serve users beyond their local community. Of the 304 respondents that indicated a willingness to commit to the development of a specific subject area collection, they primarily described subject areas related to: health and safety, a specific agency or publication, and politics, law, or government. In addition, 76 observations indicated that their libraries were already developing specific subject areas or collections.

Question 30: *What leadership opportunities and roles do you foresee for your depository library in the next five years?*[17]

Of the 802 respondents to Question 30, individual open-ended responses totaled 989 observations. Of the total 989 observations, approximately 27% (271 observations) related to collection management. Collection Management-related observations were identified under themes for both the Collection Management and Discovery and Access categories for Question 30. Most often, respondents expressed interest in maintaining collections to support users and increasing electronic content within their collections. A few libraries also indicated interest in collaborating and sharing collections or serving as a resource for other libraries.

Question 31: *What would an ideal FDLP look like that met all of your current and anticipated needs for Federal government information?*[18]

Of 802 responses, there were 1,699 open-ended observations describing an ideal FDLP that met their current and anticipated needs for Federal government information. Approximately 55% (932 observations), identified under themes for both the Collection Management and Discovery and Access categories for Question 31, related to collection management. The majority of these collection management-related observations were focused on Discovery and Access (321), Digital Collections (222), Cataloging and Metadata (117), and Item Selection and Distribution (98) themes. Of the 321 Discovery and Access observations, comments focused on easy access, open online access to all government information, providing information discoverability tools, and increased

---

[16] Parallels information requested in Question 16 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.
[17] Parallels information requested in Question 17 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.
[18] Parallels information requested in Question 18 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.

access of digital content. Of 222 Digital Collections observations, a large number focused on the program permanently providing a comprehensive FDLP collection in digital format. Other comments included improving collection searchability, providing discoverability tools, and access to the collection through a single search portal. Of 117 Cataloging and Metadata observations, the focus was on comprehensive collection cataloging (including all formats of all government publications, historical and current), permanent direct links to all electronic documents within the CGP, and increased and more timely cataloging. Cataloging was also discussed as an LSCM project and additional observations about LSCM's role can be found in the LSCM Projects Working Paper. Of the 98 Item Selection and Distribution observations, comments were focused on item selection flexibility, such as the ability to select only those items the library wants, one-to-one item number to item/document correlation, simplified processes for editing a selection profile, customized shipping lists, and tools to assist in processing items within the library.

Question 32: *Thinking about the next five years, what specific things would you like GPO to do to help you and your library improve public access to Federal government information?*[19]

Of 802 respondents to Question 32, 1,308 individual open-ended responses identified specific initiatives that libraries would like GPO to undertake to improve public access to Federal government information. Of the 1,308 observations, approximately 46% (598 observations) related to collection management. Collection Management-related observations were identified under themes for both the Collection Management and Discovery and Access categories for Question 32. Content-related collection management issues were mentioned in nearly half of the responses to this question. Observations related to collection management were focused on Digital Collections (170), Discovery and Access (143), and Cataloging and Metadata (88) themes. Of the 170 Digital Collections observations, most indicated the need for GPO to digitize or increase digital access to government information. Of the 143 Discovery and Access observations, comments primarily pertained to increasing and improving online accessibility and discoverability of all government information. Of the 88 Cataloging and Metadata observations, the focus was on increasing cataloging of historical and current records, and more timely cataloging. Cataloging was also discussed as an LSCM Project, and more observations about LSCM's role can be found in the LSCM Projects Working Paper.

Question 33: *Is there anything else that you would like to tell us about the current and future vision of the FDLP?*[20]

Of 802 respondents to Question 33, 238 responded "yes" and chose to provide an open-ended response. Those responses totaled 400 observations. Of the 400 observations, about 36% (144 observations) were related to collection management. Collection Management-related observations were identified under the themes for both the Collection Management and Discovery and Access categories for Question 33. The majority of those observations related to increasing online access to government information; open, permanent, public access to government

---

[19] Parallels information requested in Question 19 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.
[20] Parallels information requested in Question 20 of the State Forecast Questionnaire.

information; item selection flexibility; and the continued importance of tangible documents to patrons.

MAJOR FINDINGS - STATE FORECAST

The State Forecast Questionnaire did not contain specific collection management questions; however, it did contain some questions that are relevant, either directly or indirectly, to collection management.

Collection Management-Related Comments from Other State Questions

Question 5: *As Government information is increasingly produced and distributed in digital-only formats, what barriers to access, if any, do libraries in your state anticipate in the next five years?*[21]

Of 45 responses to Question 5, 39 (87%) anticipated barriers to access, while only 6 (13%) did not. Respondents that anticipated barriers to access could elaborate on what those barriers might be through the open-ended response. Those responses totaled 300 observations. Observations related to issues or problems in accessing collections included comments about anticipated collection management-related barriers to access. Comments on collection management focused on free access, unavailability or disappearance of government information in digital format, incomplete cataloging of government information, and discoverability of government information.

Question 6A: *Please rate the following current LSCM projects areas according to how users of Federal government information in libraries within your state might benefit: Projects to provide greater access to Government information such as: Simultaneous searching of FDsys and the Catalog of Government Publications; increase access to United States Courts' opinions provided in partnership with the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts available on FDsys.*[22]

Of 45 responses to Question 6A, 38 (84%) rated these LSCM projects as "extremely beneficial," and 7 (16%) rated the projects as "moderately beneficial. There were no responses that rated these LSCM projects as "not beneficial."

Question 6B: *Please rate the following current LSCM projects areas according to how users of Federal government information in libraries within your state might benefit: Projects to increase cataloging services such as: The Cataloging Record Distribution Project; Shelflist Transcription & Bibliographic Record Clean Up; Cooperative Cataloging Partnerships; enhancements to MetaLib.*[23]

Of 45 responses to Question 6B, 28 (62%) rated these LSCM projects as "extremely beneficial," and 17 (38%) rated them as "moderately beneficial. There were no responses that rated these LSCM projects as "not beneficial."

---

[21] Parallels information requested in Question 16 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.
[22] Parallels information requested in Question 17A of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.
[23] Parallels information requested in Question 17B of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.

Question 6C: *Please rate the following current LSCM projects areas according to how users of Federal government information in libraries within your state might benefit: Projects focusing on collection development and management tools such as: The National Bibliographic Inventory; Library Information System Transformation (LIST), PURL Referral Reports.*[24]

Of 802 responses to Question 6C, 11 (24%) rated these LSCM projects as "extremely beneficial," and 32 (71%) rated the projects as "moderately beneficial. Only 2 responses (5%) rated the projects as "not beneficial."

Question 7: *Is there another area of service that FDLP libraries within your state would like LSCM to offer in the next five years? (Please describe.)*[25]

Of 45 respondents to Question 7, 33 responded "yes" and had the opportunity to describe those services in an open-ended response. Individual responses totaled 103 observations. Of the 117 observations, a number of comments, about 35 observations (30%)were related to collection management.

There various comments related to collection management projects with many focused on increasing cataloging and improving access tools, item selection, and disposal processes.

Question 8: *Would FDLP libraries in your state participate in GPO-facilitated virtual meetings or seminars on topics of interest to the FDLP community?*[26]

Of the 45 respondents that answered yes to this question, 288 individual training topics were specified. Of the 288 individual topics, there were 17 collection management and development training topics, and 1 collection sharing training topic. The focus of most topics related to collection management techniques and guidance, and collection development guidance and tools training.

Collaborative Collection Management-Related Comments from Other State Forecast Questions

Several other State Forecast questions contained comments related to collaborative collection management. The questions and a summary of the findings, as they pertain to collection management, from these questions are provided below.

Question 9: *Do FDLP libraries in your state have formal or informal relationships/agreements with local non-FDLP libraries to provide Federal Government information?*[27]

---

[24] Parallels information requested in Question 17C of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.
[25] Parallels information requested in Question 18 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.
[26] Parallels information requested in Question 19 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.
[27] Parallels information requested in Question 21 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.

Question 12: *Within the next five years, are FDLP libraries in your state planning to enter into new or additional relationships/agreements with non-FDLP libraries to provide Federal Government information?*[28]

Question 13: *Are FDLP libraries in your state planning to enter into new or additional relationships/agreements with other FDLP libraries to provide Government information?*[29]

While these questions were focused on identifying collaborative relationships or gauging state interest in collaborative relationships, several responses were related to collection management.

Responses to these questions indicated a majority of libraries in the state did have informal or formal relationships with local non-FDLP libraries (87%) and 67% plan to enter into new or additional relationships with other FDLP libraries. However, a majority (53%) do not plan to enter into any new or additional relationships with local non-FDLP libraries to provide Federal government information. Those libraries that did indicate that they have or plan to have relationships with local non-FDLP or FDLP libraries had the opportunity to describe those relationships. Some relationships were relevant to the topic of collection management. Comments related to collection management primarily described shared catalog, shared or selective housing, interlibrary loan, or consortia relationships. It is important to note that while the majority of library question responses indicated no relationships, state responses identified that libraries did in fact have relationships or planned to have some relationships.

Collection Management-Related Comments from Future Roles and Opportunities State Forecast Questions

Question 16: *Within the next five years, would FDLP libraries in your state be willing to commit to the development of a specific collection area(s) and be willing to serve users beyond their local communities? (Your response to this question is not binding.)*[30]

The development of specific subject area collections is a collection management activity. Of 45 respondents to Question 16, 36 (80%), indicated that they would be willing to develop a specific subject area collection, and serve users beyond their local community. Of the 36 respondents indicating willingness to develop specific subject area collections, 118 individual subject areas were reported. The majority described the following subject areas: science, specific geographical areas, and politics, law, or government. In addition, some respondents indicated that libraries within their state were already developing specific subject areas or collections. 14 observations indicated that they are already doing so.

Question 17: *What leadership opportunities and roles do FDLP libraries in your state foresee for themselves in the next five years?*[31]

---

[28] Parallels information requested in Question 25 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.
[29] Parallels information requested in Question 26 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.
[30] Parallels information requested in Question 29 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.
[31] Parallels information requested in Question 30 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.

Of 45 respondents to Question 17, individual open-ended responses totaled 171 observations. After removing one observation that did not apply to the question, 36% (61 of the 170 observations) were related to collection management. Collection Management-related observations were identified under themes for both the Collection Management and Discovery and Access categories for Question 17. Most often, observations related to collection management identified leadership opportunities and roles related to maintaining and preserving the tangible government collections within the state. They also indicated that they wanted to further develop electronic collections, including digitization projects, and improving or providing greater access to government information.

Question 18: *What would an ideal FDLP look like that met all of your current and anticipated needs for Federal government information?*[32]

Of 45 respondents, there were 326 open-ended observations describing an ideal FDLP that met current and anticipated needs for Federal government information. About 41% (134 observations) were related to collection management. Collection Management-related observations were identified under themes for both the Collection Management and Discovery and Access categories for Question 18. The majority of these collection management-related observations were focused on Discovery and Access (35), Digital Collections (26), Cataloging and Metadata (23), and Tangible Collection (20) themes.

Of the 35 Discovery and Access observations, comments focused on improving access and access tools: free, permanent, online access to all government information (old and new), increased electronic access to content, and a single point of access for all government material. Of the 26 Digital Collections observations, most responses related to providing access to a comprehensive collection in digital format and digitization of historical content. Of the 23 Cataloging and Metadata observations, the majority related to comprehensive collection cataloging and distribution of cataloging records. Cataloging was also discussed as an LSCM Project and Service, and more observations about LSCM's role are discussed in the LSCM Projects and Services Working Paper. Of 20 Tangible Collection observations, comments were focused on preserving tangible publications, and ensuring tangible formats remain accessible and available for some publications, or for libraries that prefer tangible information.

Question 19: *Thinking about the next five years, what specific things would you like GPO to do to help FDLP libraries in your state improve public access to Federal government information?*[33]

Of 45 respondents to Question 19, 333 individual open-ended responses about the specific things libraries would like GPO to do to help libraries improve public access to Federal government information were identified. Of the 333 observations, 41% (137 observations) were related to collection management. Collection Management-related observations were identified under themes for both the Collection Management and Discovery and Access categories for Question 19.

---

[32] Parallels information requested in Question 31 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.
[33] Parallels information requested in Question 32 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.

Observations related to collection management were focused on Digital Collections (28), Discovery and Access (28), Cataloging and Metadata (24) themes. Cataloging was also discussed as an LSCM Project and Service, and more observations about LSCM's role are discussed in the LSCM Projects and Services Working Paper. Of the 28 Digital Collections observations, most indicated the need for GPO to digitize or increase digital access to government information. Of the 28 Discovery and Access observations, comments primarily suggested improving searching or discoverability tools and services, and improving the capture of or availability of all government information. Of the 24 Cataloging and Metadata observations, the focus was on continuing or increasing cataloging of historical and current records.

Question 20: *Is there anything else that you would like to tell us about the current and future vision of the FDLP?*[34]

Of 45 respondents to Question 20, 29 (64%) responded "yes" and provided open-ended responses. Those responses totaled 136 observations. Of the 136 observations, about 27% (38 observations) were related to collection management. Collection Management-related observations were identified under the themes for both the Collection Management and Discovery and Access categories for Question 20. The majority of comments related to expanding access to and building comprehensive collections to government information online; ensuring free permanent public access to government information; and the importance of tangible format.

GPO ACTIONS AND NEXT STEPS

GPO continues to acquire and provide access to publications for the Federal Depository Library Program and Cataloging and Indexing Program.

Actions Already Taken

Cataloging

Several current and ongoing projects in LSCM focus on the National Bibliographic Records Inventory with the goal of making catalog records available to depository libraries, including:

- The Cataloging Record Distribution Program (CRDP) allows records to be pushed to participating libraries at no cost.
- Records may also be obtained at no cost to depository libraries through Z39.50, downloaded from the CGP, and copy cataloged from OCLC.
- The historic shelflist has been digitized.
- Pre-1976 materials continue to be cataloged.
- Cooperative cataloging partnerships allow even more historical documents to be cataloged.
- GPO Cataloging Guidelines are being updated to reflect new changes with Resource Description and Access (RDA).

---

[34] Parallels information requested in Question 33 of the Library Forecast Questionnaire.

Serials Management

LSCM has developed a serials management strategy to create a streamlined serials processing workflow to provide better intellectual control of Federal Government serials in all publishing formats, and to provide improved electronic tools for locating and accessing serial publications in the CGP. Issues of new serials are attached to CGP bibliographic records, and serial issues from the historic shelflist and from other serial manual files are being retrospectively added to the CGP.

Acquisitions for the FDLP

- Because LSCM is committed to ensuring all documents within the purview of the FDLP are made available to depository libraries, a program for reporting fugitive documents, the "Lost Docs Reporting Form," is available on fdlp.gov.
- LSCM continues to harvest selected government agency Web sites within the scope of the FDLP to capture the content of the site and render as much of the original functionality as is technically possible. The harvested sites may be accessed through the Catalog of Government Publications or by directly searching the Internet Archive site for GPO.

PURL Referrals

Keeping accurate statistics is vital to depository libraries. Accordingly, LSCM has released an update to its automated PURL Referral tool in 2010. This tool is available to depository libraries through fdlp.gov.

FDsys

LSCM has collaborated with several Federal agencies to ingest content into FDsys, thereby ensuring free public access and enhancing discovery of these agency's resources. The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and GPO collaborated to authenticate, preserve, and provide public access via FDsys to Federal court opinions. The U.S. Department of Treasury and GPO collaborated to authenticate, preserve, and provide public access via FDsys to historic content digitized by the Treasury Library.

Depository collection management

LSCM provides direction with Program regulations and guidance on library management and ongoing staff consultation about library collection management. FDLP training programs also regularly focus on these topics.

Systems modernization

The Depository Selection Information Management System (DSIMS), a new resource for depository library use, was launched in 2012 with enhanced depository library capabilities to better manage item selection profiles. GPO upgraded a legacy mainframe system that had managed the List of Classes data, library item selections, and distribution information. In that upgrade, GPO made improvements to provide libraries with more timely access to and additional capabilities for item selection.

CONCLUSIONS

The responses to collection management related questions in the Library and State Forecast Questionnaires reinforced that collection management is an important part of the FDLP.

- 69% of libraries do not store depository materials remotely or offsite, while 31% do. Among those that store FDLP materials remotely or offsite, only 4% indicated that the housing situation negatively affected patron demand for the resources (Library Q7).

These statistics indicate that information provided by the FDLP is valuable, and that most libraries view FDLP materials as a valuable information asset, and supportive of their library's mission.

However, although most open-ended observations about the tangible collections are positive, some see the tangible collection as cost and/or space intensive. Others observe that their collection is largely unused. Still others express a preference for digital materials.

This indicates that LSCM and the FDLP community need to plan for the future of tangible materials in view of current and future realities.

- 79% of libraries indicate that their patrons use commercial or non-depository resources to find Federal Government information in their libraries (Library Q9).

Commercial resources are commonly used to access Federal government information. Nearly eight in ten libraries acknowledge that their patrons use commercial or non-depository resources to find government information. An examination of the value these resources provide to libraries could help LSCM plan for future library needs*.*

- 92% of libraries agreed that FDLP resources are an important source of both tangible and digital authenticated government information (Library Q8).
- When asked to describe the "tangible FDLP collection" in their own words, 34% indicated that it is a "valuable information asset" and 37% responded it is "supportive of their library's mission" (Library Q10).
- 88% of libraries agreed that Government information available through the Federal Digital System (FDsys) is an important source of Federal digital government information (Library Q12).

These responses confirm the importance of FDLP resources in all formats. Most libraries recognize that there are patron groups that prefer government information in tangible format, and other patron groups that prefer information in digital format. However, there are some perceived barriers to accessing digital information, including the need for good catalog records and discovery tools. It was also noted that many respondents anticipate barriers to accessing digital information. It is important to understand what those barriers are and to anticipate and counter them as GPO's digital resources are further developed and expanded.