

SOAR Discussion Document

October 6, 2003

Charge

The Subcommittee On Attrition and Retention (SOAR) will continue its work by developing communication services and mechanisms focused on matters of retention.

SOAR shall achieve this charge by:

- Working with the Government Printing Office to develop services to encourage all types of depository libraries to remain in the Federal Depository Library Program;
- Working with the Government Printing Office to develop, enhance and evaluate training for depository libraries;
- Monitoring new services offered by the Government Printing Office or being developed in the depository community regarding collection development and authentication;
- Encouraging the development of and reviewing the work of the Government Printing Office Pilot Projects;
- Articulating the standard(s) for withdrawal of selective depository libraries from the program in consultation with the Regionals; and
- Developing guidelines for Regional Depository libraries contemplating withdrawing from the Federal Depository Library Program.

Working Groups

Retention: Barbara Ford, Luke Griffin, Aric Ahrens, and Robin Haun-Mohamed

Training: Paul Arrigo, John Graham, and John Kavalunuas

New services: Greta Marlatt, Laura Saur, and Barbie Selby

Pilot Projects: Duncan Aldrich, Valerie Glenn, Claire Huffman

Withdrawal of Selectives: Ann Marie Sanders, John Phillips along with Robin Haun-Mohamed

Withdrawals of Regionals: Mary Prophet, Chuck Eckman, and Michele McKnelly

Contents

Retention	2
Preliminary Findings –Characteristics of FDLP Libraries Relinquishing Status. Report from Luke Griffin and Aric Ahrens.....	2
Current GPO Outreach from Robin Haun-Mohamed	8
Training	10
Training Subcommittee Conference Call: Paul Arrigo, John Graham, and John Kavalunuas.....	10
Education Committee Report for the DLC Soar Committee from Paul Arrigo.....	11
New Services Offered By GPO Or Being Developed submitted by Laura Saur, Barbie Selby and Greta Marlatt.....	12
Collection Development: Current Services	12
Collection Development: Future/Proposed Services GPO Proposals	12
Depository Community Proposals	13
Authentication Current Services	13
Authentication Future/Proposed Services.....	13
Pilot Projects	13
Ideas from Duncan Aldrich	13
Managed Depository a missive from Michele McKnelly	14
Withdrawal of Selectives , from Ann Marie Sanders, John Phillips and Robin Haun-Mohamed	15
Withdrawals of Regionals : from Chuck Eckman, Michele McKnelly and Mary Prophet	16
More information and ideas	20
Spec Kit	20
Survey on Flexibility	20
Retention of Regional Status from: Tim Byrne	21
OCLC holdings for Government Information from Barbie Selby	23
Three Tiered Approach—Judy Russell.....	23
How about Four Tiers?	24
Appendices	26
Appendix I Pilot Project Proposal, Federal Depository Library Program Field Consultant, Based at the University of South Carolina's Thomas Cooper Library.....	26
Appendix II Depository Termination Guidelines For Kansas Selectives	41
Appendix III	43
Termination Guidelines For Michigan Selective Depository Libraries	43
Guidelines For Disposal Of U.S. Government Depository Publications	46

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Retention

Preliminary Findings –*Characteristics of FDLP Libraries Relinquishing Status.* Report from [Luke Griffin](#) and [Aric Ahrens](#)

To Subcommittee on Attrition and Retention

10/1/2003

Overview of Research

The research that we have been conducting has been geared toward determining the characteristics of libraries that have dropped their status, particularly those that have dropped since they responded to the 1999 Biennial Survey. In order to accomplish this, variables from the Survey were coupled with basic information from the online directory of depositories and analyzed using the statistical software package SPSS 11.5.

Our methodology changed slightly when SPSS 11.5 became available to us very recently. Until then, using SPSS 11.0, we were limited to analyzing 100 or fewer variables at a time. As there were 114 variables we wished to analyze, this presented a problem for us. Since the most important goal of the analysis was to be able to determine the characteristics of dropping libraries, we decided to reduce the number of variables by determining their correlations to the control “Drop” variable. This could be done in two chunks of 100 variables or fewer, while our preferred method of data reduction, factor analysis, could not accomplish this. Having reduced the number of variables to less than 100, a factor analysis was then performed on the lesser group of variables, with the goal of grouping the variables. By grouping the variables using factor analysis, redundant variables are grouped together, which keeps dependent variables from having too much weight. Also, the variables are grouped under a “factor” which reduces the number of items to allow for better interpretation. More on the topic of factor analysis follows.

When SPSS 11.5 was made available to us, and we were able to perform the factor analysis with the whole group of 114 variables, we jumped at the chance. This was due to the fact that we were concerned about the legitimacy of our methodology in the first analysis, and because we wanted to ensure that any variable that had some bearing on the dropping depositories would be included. We were worried that although the variables we eliminated had no significant correlation with dropping libraries on their own, there may have been some combination of those eliminated variables that could have some bearing, which couldn't be measured directly through correlations.

This new analysis was recently performed. Also, the data covers the span of 10/1/99 through 8/31/03. This represents a span of 3 fiscal years and 11 fiscal months for GPO, just under 4 fiscal years. Since the decision was made to perform the analysis again, and it is so close to that even 4 fiscal years, we are holding off on performing the final analysis until the September '03 issue of Administrative Notes Technical Supplement is released, so that a full 4 fiscal year analysis can be completed.

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

This delay, coupled with the recent decision to recalculate the factor analysis, led us to generalize the results of the factor analysis in this report. The actual final results may be slightly different, as far as factor loadings and possibly even the number of factors are concerned. However, we don't anticipate any significant changes; indeed, the two factor analyses performed under the different variable combinations ended up yielding similar results. The analysis presented here represents the factor analysis of the full 114 variables across the 1335 libraries that responded to the 1999 Biennial Survey, during the 47 month span starting 10/1/99. Should no depositories relinquish their status during the month of September 2003, this analysis would remain valid. Should some libraries drop during September, a new analysis will be performed as soon as Administrative Notes Technical Supplement is released. The final analysis will be included in the article that we intend to submit for publication later this year.

Methodology: Factor Analysis

For those unfamiliar with Factor Analysis as a statistical method, a good quick introductory resource is available at <http://www.statsoftinc.com/textbook/stfacan.html>

Basically, factor analysis reduces data, and groups data with dependent variables all falling under the same "factor". This helps to avoid "measuring something twice". For instance, if a researcher is analyzing people, and three variables in the analysis are "Value of their Automobile", "Value of their Home" and "Income", one would expect these 3 variables to be highly correlated. In a factor analysis, these three variables would likely end up grouped under the same factor, which a researcher would have the responsibility of naming. By looking at the variables that loaded on the factor, a good choice for a factor name in this example would be "Wealth".

That is what we have done in our analysis. We reduced the 114 variables to 36 factors, and then named the factors based on the variables that loaded heavily on the factors. An option available to researchers using factor analysis is to have separate variables created for each factor, with the values of the variable for each case called a "factor score". We had SPSS create factor scores, which we then correlated with the control "Drop" variable. This was done to identify the factors that had significant correlations to dropping, which allowed us to reduce the number of factors from 36 total to just 8 that correlated with dropping.

So, 9 groups of variables, or factors,

Interpretation:

This factor is an indicator of the crux of the problem. In our presentation in Reno (<http://www.jsu.edu/depart/library/government/depositories/>), Luke & I communicated the fact that surveyed libraries indicated the availability of resources on the Internet as the top reason they decided to leave FDLP. This factor addresses this issue as well. Depositories that are substituting online resources for tangible were more likely to relinquish status FY '00-'03. Basically, the more successful FDLP becomes in getting depositories to substitute online resources, the more likely those depositories are to relinquish their status. This factor more than any illuminates the need of GPO and FDLP to provide unique resources to depositories. Academic Law Libraries were less likely both to have relinquished status FY '00-03 and to

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

substitute online resources for tangible. It is possible that academic law libraries cannot substitute as much of their important resources, and therefore depository status has remained appealing to them.

Factor Twenty-Two: Record keeping & Preservation

Correlation with Dropping:

Negative

Variables:

Depository has piece level records for all items (+)

Depository materials included in library's preservation and binding efforts (+)

Interpretation:

Depositories included in preservation and binding efforts, as well as those keeping piece level records were less likely to have relinquished their status FY '00-'03

Factor Twenty-Eight: Special Libraries

Correlation with Dropping: correlated with libraries relinquishing their status. By looking at these factors, it is hoped that two things could be accomplished. First, they could be used to identify "at-risk" depositories. Secondly, in some cases they may provide insight as to what things could be addressed to prevent depositories from dropping. We believe that both of these goals were accomplished with this analysis.

Below are the 8 factors, in order of their level of significance. Some correlated negatively, meaning that libraries with high factor scores were less likely to relinquish status, and some correlated positively, meaning that libraries with high factor scores were more likely to relinquish status. Also, under each factor are the variables that loaded heavily on the factor, and whether the variable loaded positively (+) or negatively (-). Keep in mind that the particular variables loading on each factor can have positive or loadings, while the factor then has a positive or negative correlations to the "Drop" control variable. This is important in interpreting the results.

Example:

Factor One has been named "Size", and correlates negatively with the Drop control variable. This means that a particular library that scored highly on the Size factors is both a library with the characteristics of a large library, and it is also less likely to have Dropped during FY '00 through '03. When looking at the variables that loaded on the Size factor, one notices the variable "Selection Percentage 25% or Under", which has a negative loading on the Size Factor. Since this variable loads negatively on the Size Factor, which correlates negatively with dropping, the variable actually correlates positively with dropping, because the two negatives make a positive. This is important when interpreting the variables grouped under each factor. In this case, it means that having a selection percentage of 25% or under correlates positively with

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

dropping, and that libraries that met this criteria were had an increased likelihood of relinquishing their status from FY '00 through '03

An Interpretation of each of the Factors is also provided.

Factor Analysis Results – Factors Correlating Significantly with Dropping Libraries

Factor One: Size

Correlation with Dropping: Negative

Variables:

Depository Selection Percentage (0-100%) (+)

Library Collection Size (+);

Depository Selection Percentage 25% or Under (-)

Depository Designation Date 1962 or Later (-)

Depository Selection Percentage less than half National Average (-)

Interpretation:

Larger libraries, those with larger collections and higher selection percentages, were less likely to relinquish status from FY '00 onwards. Particularly, those established before 1961 were less likely to relinquish status. Prior to 1961, only one representative designated depository was allowed per district; since then two are allowed. Depositories designated since the number of slots was increased tend to be both smaller libraries, and libraries that were more likely to relinquish their status from FY '00 through '03.

Factor Two: Small Scale Travel Budget

Correlation with Dropping:

Negative

Variables:

Library has Budget for Support Staff to Attend Local Meetings (+)

Library *does not* have Budget for Support Staff Travel to Attend Meetings, etc. (-)

Library has Budget for Professional Staff to Attend Local Meetings (+)

Library *does not* have Budget for Professional Staff Travel to Attend Meetings, etc. (-)

Library has Budget for Professional Staff Travel to Attend State Meetings, etc. (+)

Library has Budget for Support Staff Travel to Attend State Meetings, etc. (+)

Interpretation:

Libraries that had budgets to allow professional and support staff to travel to Local and State level meetings and conferences were less likely to have relinquished their status FY '00 through '03. Libraries that had no budget for any travel to meetings and conferences were more likely to have relinquished status FY '00-'03. .

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Factor Thirteen: Hours

Correlation with Dropping:

Negative

Variables:

Library Type: State Library (-)

Library Hours (+)

Hours there is Professional Service at Reference Desk Serving Depository Collection (+)

Library Type: Four-Year Academic Library (+)

Interpretation:

Libraries with longer hours and greater reference assistance were less likely to have relinquished status FY '00-'03. Four-Year Academic Libraries tended to be among these libraries; State Libraries tend not to be among these libraries.

Factor Fifteen: Selection Rate Below Peers

Correlation with Dropping:

Positive

Variables:

Depository Selection Rate Below Size/Type Average (+)

Depository Selection Rate Below Half Size/Type Average (+)

Interpretation:

Pretty straightforward. Depositories that are selecting fewer items than their peers in the library type/size grouping are more likely to have relinquished their status FY '00-03. This backs FDLP's use of selection percentage as an indication of depository health.

Factor Sixteen: Non-Public Library

Correlation with Dropping:

Negative

Variables:

Library Type: Public (-)

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Interpretation:

Libraries that aren't Public Libraries were less likely to have relinquished their status FY '00-'03.

Factor Twenty: Online Substitution

Correlation with Dropping:

Positive

Variables:

Depository Substitutes Online Resources for Tangible (+)
Library Type: Academic Law (-)

Positive

Variables:

Library Type: Special Library (+)

Interpretation:

Special Libraries were more likely to relinquish status FY '00-'03.

Factor Thirty-Two: CD-ROM Catalog

Correlation with Dropping

Positive

Variables:

Library's catalog on CD-ROM

Interpretation:

Libraries with their catalog on CD-ROM were more likely to relinquish status FY '00-'03. This may be an indication of libraries with limited resources.

Factor Analysis Results – Factors Failing to Correlate Significantly with Dropping Libraries

Factor Three: Use of Online FDLP Resources

Factor Four: Library Staff Awareness & Depository Staff Promotion of FDLP Resources

Factor Five: Depository Independence from other Library Departments

Factor Six: Library Internet Capability

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Factor Seven: Document Cataloging and Integrated Shelflist
Factor Eight: Depository has Written Policies
Factor Nine: Use of Online Non-FDLP Resources
Factor Ten: Depository Affiliation with Library Departments
Factor Eleven: Large Scale Travel Budget
Factor Twelve: Five Years Growth Room
Factor Fourteen: Library Charges for Services
Factor Seventeen: Older or In Transition OPACs
Factor Eighteen: Networked CD-ROMs
Factor Nineteen: Use of Online Processing Tools
Factor Twenty-One: Stand Alone CD-ROMs
Factor Twenty-Three: Documents Original or Copy Cataloged
Factor Twenty-Four: Two-Year Academic Libraries
Factor Twenty-Five: Library ADA Friendly
Factor Twenty-Six: Depository Affiliated with Special Collections
Factor Twenty-Seven: Federal Court Libraries
Factor Twenty-Nine: Shelflist on PC
Factor Thirty: Other Type of Shelflist
Factor Thirty-One: Up to Date Collection Development
Factor Thirty-Three: Depository Affiliated with Unusual Library Department
Factor Thirty-Four: Service Academy Libraries
Factor Thirty-Five: Construction in Library Since Last Inspection
Factor Thirty-Six: Library has a COM Catalog
Strategies For Identifying At-Risk Libraries

The factor analysis performed to determine the characteristics of dropping libraries also allows us to identify at-risk libraries. This can be done with the aforementioned factor scores, or with another statistical analysis called Cluster Analysis. The factor scores would actually provide a sort of ranking of at-risk libraries, where a particular library could be labeled “most at-risk”, using factor score magnitudes. Cluster Analysis would use the factor scores to group libraries, and at-risk groups could then be identified, without singling out libraries with an “at-risk” score.

In our final article, we are planning to exclude such an analysis, as we don’t want to single out depositories. We are worried that the labeling could actually encourage depositories to drop, or endanger their relationship with their library administration. However, such an analysis may be useful as an internal tool for SOAR and/or FDLP. We would like direction from SOAR and FDLP as to whether this type of analysis would be appropriate and useful. It would be little trouble to create such a tool.

Current GPO Outreach from Robin Haun-Mohamed

Judy Russell, and I have been reaching out to libraries in a number of ways to hear what their needs and concerns are, and to try to be more visible to the library administrators.

- We have held conference calls with Law Librarians, Regional Librarians, and some State Librarians.

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

- We also have scheduled meetings at AALL to hear what library directors and depository coordinators think about developing a pilot for an electronic law library.
- We sent in a request to PLA for program dealing with Federal information--what it is and how to find it, but the proposal was turned down. I subsequently sent in a proposal for a talk table, and Gail Snider (former depository library inspector and depository library coordinator) of Santa Cruz Public will be doing this with me at the Seattle PLA conference in February 2004.
- We have also reached out to the Urban Library Council and PLA to try to schedule conference calls with Public Library Administration staff to find out their interests and concerns, especially as related to the FDLP and access to Federal government information. We had an interesting discussion with PLA. The Urban Library Council was very interested and as a result, we did have a conversation with several library directors.
- Also, while in Seattle for AALL, Judy and I visited a number of libraries, including Seattle Public, King County Library System, Highline Community College, the Suzzalo Library at the University of Washington Library, Seattle University Law School, and the Washington State Library. Before going to Seattle, we stopped in Portland Oregon for a session with depository librarians in the Portland area held at Multnomah County Library, visited the Oregon State Library, and Portland State University.
 - The questions we asked were general--what do you need for the depository that GPO doesn't do now, but could do in the future.
 - The single most popular answer--catalog records for depository resources pushed out to the libraries, especially for online only titles.
 - Other needs--revision of the rules allowing libraries to select less (or more) material, allowance for libraries to choose what titles they continue to receive in paper, and allowance for more material to be weeded and electronic items to be selected in place of the tangibles.
 - We also heard a great deal about the need for training and education, especially to help regional libraries meet this need. GPO Training is also needed for non-depository libraries such as branch staff.
- Steps taken by GPO to help libraries feeling like they need support to stay in the program: development of the [Stay With the Program](#) page, which includes many resources, including the presentations at the Spring 2003 meeting, listing of reasons to continue in the program as provided by SOAR, and links to other helpful resources and papers.
 - When a library calls about dropping from the program, an inspector will work with that library to investigate other options, including discussing the change to a mostly electronic collection.
 - Outreach is done to libraries discussing these issues as GPO is notified by the regional coordinator or other libraries.
 - On the Council/Conference agenda, this fall is the inclusion of breakout sessions by type of library similar to the discussions in Reno. Council members will be acting as facilitators in these sessions. Summaries of the different sessions will be compiled by these council members and the information made available to conference attendees before the Tuesday morning discussion session with the Public Printer.

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

- Other projects that we are working with that touch on these issues include the kiosks project-- where we are going to upgrade screens in three public libraries to include information on Government documents and these kiosks will be placed in public areas to see the response.
- Continued outreach to the different communities in the FDLP--a conference call to Medical Libraries had to be post-poned, but it is still on the agenda.
- Discussions with some of the libraries in the Northwest included the idea of setting up public access information centers--libraries that have had some training for reference staff in govdocs, thus enabling them to meet a basic level of government info needs, but also with the knowledge of when and where to make referrals as appropriate. Along with the idea of possibly "certifying" or somehow otherwise making the centers visible, possibly some way to provide a very small set of basic resources, such as stat-abstract, Government Manual, and a few other titles would also be provided to these libraries. And it is still our hope to be able to push out cataloging records when we have an ILS in place.

Training

Training Subcommittee Conference Call: Paul Arrigo, John Graham, and John Kavaliunas

A 3-way conference call on September 5th.

We discussed training issues for SOAR and depository libraries in general.

Paul suggested a way to consolidate training efforts and eliminate duplication. It would be helpful to bring together all stakeholders such as GPO, ALA GODORT, AALL, library schools, and others to learn of current practices and to coordinate efforts in the future. Conceivably, Council could serve in an umbrella capacity to enhance coordination. We know GODORT has a toolbox website with training information, and there is a survey in works on library school documents classes. Ideally, we would like a comprehensive assessment or census of what resources/services are available.

We discussed the needs of training new depository librarians. A survey from Mary Ann Mason (University of Iowa?) showed many of these people prefer web-based training, which would fit in their schedules easily.

Training for GPO Access by GPO staff came up. GPO Access training is evidently still available by request for remote sites around the country.

We would like to see some form of core competencies for new documents librarians, along the lines of core competencies for electronic skills. This suite of competencies would potentially identify core skills every documents librarian, especially every new one, should know. This would be helpful for developing training programs and possibly leading to some form of certification of depository librarians. While we realized this could be helpful, it could also be a barrier to some smaller, understaffed libraries.

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

We liked the idea of placing the GPO inspectors in regionals around the country as expert consultants who could also conduct training for new staff & continuing education for others. Related to this, we discussed the possibility of super-regionals, how, where, when, etc.

We discussed training offer by the Patent & Trademark Depository system. We realize GPO is a much larger, and much more poorly funded, system. However, we see its annual training seminar as something beneficial. It differs from interagency seminar in including all depository librarians and covering essential materials each year. Offering such a seminar even on a scaled down version outside of the DC area would be helpful. We realize many librarians have little time off or budget to travel for training.

John G. brought up automation issues, which would probably be covered by vendors or libraries of the same type using the same system.

Education Committee Report for the DLC Soar Committee from Paul Arrigo

Liaison report from the Federal Documents Task Force:

- David Griffith is conducting a survey to determine who is teaching government documents courses in the library schools and what they are teaching.

Results of the new documents librarian's focus group conducted at Reno. Marianne Mason

- Most of the librarians want something they could access quickly especially in web format.
- They wanted it to be Internet based where they could have ready access to the materials they need.
- Tips on what are the National and Local professional associations they should join or contact should they need any information.
- They thought that the FDLP resources are not very organized or easy to access
- They want connections or lists of professional journals they could consult.
- They needed reference tips.
- Someone they could contact either nationally or locally. Similar to a mentor.
- They need training and Continuing education in a web format.
- What do they mean by training?
 - An analysis of Godort-I will be done to see what were the frequently asked basic questions. From that an FAQ will be written.
- They need a list of local discussion lists they could join.

I told the education committee about the Depository Library Council's interest in education and training and especially in eliminating any duplication of effort. The education committee decided to proceed with their project and keep a close eye on what the DLC and GPO does. This

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

focus group was initially done to help provide services to new librarians in an attempt to hopefully get them to join GODORT in the future.

- A representative from the @ your library came to discuss their formal PR campaign and how it could help attract more members to GODORT. GPO would be wise to adopt something similar to what this program does for the American Libraries Association.

New Services Offered By GPO Or Being Developed submitted by Laura Saur, Barbie Selby and Greta Marlatt

August 26, 2003

Collection Development: Current Services

- Web claim service
- Documents DataMiner & improvements to DDM
- Online Item Selections
- Re-examination of items and formats in the "FDLP Basic Collection" (http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/coll-dev/basic-01.html)
- Electronic notification, via GPO listservs, of Federal Register TOC, defence publications, health care publications, new laws, etc.

Collection Development: Future/Proposed Services GPO Proposals

- GPO to build a "National Library" of last resort containing paper, fiche, and electronic materials. Provide permanent access to this government information - in all formats
- Advising agencies on the best ways to reach their customers (citizens needing government information). Including electronic publishing, automatic translation programs, publishing in several languages. (Based on comments of Mr. James in Reno)
- Obtain more court materials for FDLP (based on Mr. James comments in Reno).
- Provide a more comprehensive "national bibliography" including cataloging records provided by other federal agencies
- Acquire more publications. Acquire "fugitive" publications through recent agreement with OMB
- Fiche Digitizing projects – GPO intends to investigate digitizing materials rather than microfiching them
- "Super-regional" libraries which would act as backups for current regional collections
- Source files – GPO may acquire source files from agencies rather than depend on agencies to archive their electronic materials
- On-Demand printing for depository libraries

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Depository Community Proposals

- Libraries need ownership of digital content in case GPO goes away – proposal by depository libraries for ownership of digital content
- Scanning older materials to provide electronic access to historical information
- Pre-1976 cataloging - GPO might work together with depository libraries to provide cataloging for pre-1976 materials, possibly in conjunction with a digitization project

Authentication Current Services

- Presence of information on GPOAccess offers some degree of confidence in the information

Authentication Future/Proposed Services

- GPO should become the authenticator of federal information. A digital GPO watermark on a digital document should guarantee its authenticity. GPO should work with the courts and Congress to agree on a standard (based on comments of Mr. James at Reno)

Pilot Projects

SOAR awaits a listing of pilot projects from LPS.

See: Appendix I

Pilot Project Proposal Federal Depository Library Program Field Consultant

Based at the University of South Carolina's Thomas Cooper Library

Ideas from Duncan Aldrich

1) The idea of a distributed GovOnline chat organized by depository librarians and operated by them is something that could be funded through GPO - some sort of a payback to institutions contributing "chatters." I would like to see someone draw up a proposal (format/style similar to Bill Sudduth's) [[see Appendix 1](#)] that describes the human resources, software, and training that would be required. I know from the recently distributed annual report that GPO plans to have chat on GPO Access. This would be much broader and would be a way that fdlp librarians would be providing the service rather than having it centralized in GPO (I say this as in the past GPO has had a tendency to want to centralize/control things). This would have the usual accoutrements of a knowledge-base, FAQs, etc.

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

2) Another possible grant opportunity would be a proposal for the pilot design of outcome measures. This could possibly be done by a partnership of depository librarians (a couple), a library school faculty person interested in outcome measurements, and perhaps a private sector consultant.

3) What's a super-regional? Let's ask for grant proposals to establish a super regional (or two or three...) and see how people describe them, then select the most interesting proposal(s). Support would surely be needed from GPO for this - I am fuzzy as to whether some library administrators might see some positive value in doing this on their own dime. Tim Byrne (Colorado) routed some message (regional-I think) outlining some budget possibilities. [\[See Retention of Regional Status from: Tim Byrne p. 21\]](#)

4) Versions of publications. I could see a grant solicitation for someone to draw up a schema to resolve this issue - would probably be tied to authentication (different stamps for current vs older versions?). Perhaps private sector consultants could be involved in this.

5) Web pages/templates for each library that link to passworded federal databases and allow access by IP, and possibly which list serials (I'm not sure what all these would entail from reading the notes). This could be a grant directed toward Web savvy librarians or private sector Web designers.

6) A neat one would be to provide funds to develop several Web delivered (or otherwise I suppose) video-conference training sessions. These could range from relatively basic govt info use to very specialized areas. Wearing my data services cap, I'd love to see a training session on integrating various agency data products in a data mining like environment.

7) Not in the grant area here, but just to mention I thought the idea of council (or some subset thereof) meeting with agency publishers was intriguing, perhaps a workshop hosted by GPO but more or less run by Council...?

8) Two items that seem to be moving well are LOCKSS and Authentication (PKI).

Managed Depository a missive from Michele McKnelly

One size could fit many.

FLDP could create a sub-program that is passive on the part of a library.

- It would be based on profiles developed, by the community to address different size and types.

This could do away with two labor-intensive processes for libraries

- Selection and;
- Discard procedures, based on the idea that the materials distributed would never be unique
- Materials could arrive “shelf ready”
- Catalog records could be push catalog records out with the materials

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Currently designated libraries would be offered the choice of staying with the old self-managed program or moving to a managed program. New destinations could be automatically placed in the managed program.

Advantages:

- Would permit focus on providing service, rather than compliance with rules.
- Would make it easy to be part of the program.
- Could use the Print on Demand proposal to sculpt materials for local needs.
- Attractive to under funded, understaffed libraries.
- Reduce the cost of being in the program for libraries.

Drawbacks:

- This would require running two systems, the full fdl and the m-fdl.
- The cost of this might be too great.
- The m-fdl would never be able to address the concerns of the library community and scholars.

[See: Three Tiered Approach—Judy Russell p. 23]

Withdrawal of Selectives, from Ann Marie Sanders, John Phillips and Robin Haun-Mohamed

Withdrawal of Selectives

Ann Marie Sanders, Robin Haun-Mohamed and John Phillips were given the work assignment within SOAR to articulate the standards for withdrawal of selective depository libraries from the Federal Depository Library Program in consultation with the Regionals.

Under the current guidelines of the program a selective that wishes to withdraw from the FDLP is required to contact the Superintendent of Documents. In most cases the Regional Library that oversees this selective is not aware of this letter until the Regional receives word from Washington, D.C. This has been a concern of many of the Regional libraries and has been discussed at meetings of the Regionals during both the fall and spring Depository Library Council sessions. Unfortunately there has not been enough time to deal with this matter. The subject was discussed in greater detail at the Regional Meeting that preceded the 2002 Federal Depository Library Conference. (The minutes of this meeting are available on the Regional's website at the Library of Michigan.) A number of suggestions were made that would slow down the process for dropping depository status. Some of these suggestions were:

Depositories are required to send a letter of intent to drop depository status to the Superintendent of Documents before a final decision is made.

Depositories have to notify their congressional representatives or staff members of their

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

intent to drop depository status.

Depositories should seek advice from other depositories in its congressional district.

Time lines should be established to allow regionals to work with the depository interested in dropping its status and regionals are required to provide advice and assistance during this process.

Standardize procedures used by regionals in this process.

All of these suggestions and more were discussed in greater detail at various working sessions of the Depository Library Council during its Oct. 2002 meeting. These concerns were also discussed further during the April 2003 meeting and at a meeting SOAR held during ALA Toronto.

No formal document articulating standards for withdrawal has been written by staff of the Federal Depository Library Program. However, Ken Lohrentz at the University of Kansas wrote guidelines for his selectives in Kansas and they are posted on the website of the Kansas Library Association. These [Guidelines Depository Termination Guidelines for Kansas Selectives](#) can be read in Appendix II. These guidelines will be basis of further discussion at the fall 2003 meeting of the Regional libraries. The guidelines are attached below. This report will be posted on the Regional list and will be available for distribution at the fall meeting.

Withdrawals of Regionals: from Chuck Eckman, Michele McKnelly and Mary Prophet

Charge:

Developing guidelines for Regional Depository libraries contemplating withdrawing from the Federal Depository Library Program.

1. The principal responsibility of a regional depository library is to ensure the comprehensiveness and integrity of the State's or region's Federal depository resources. (Instructions to depository Libraries, Chapter 9, Section B. revised 2000)

The working group considers this portion of the regional depositories duties to be the most important. Major provisions of our discussion surrounding guidelines for Regional Depository Libraries contemplating withdrawal from the FDLP – or changed status within the program-- revolve around the integrity of the State or region's Federal depository resources.

2. The loss of a regional means that under [Title 44, United States Code, §1911](#) none of the selective depositories previously served by that regional will be able to weed collections of documents unless they appear on the [superseded list](#). The loss of this ability could result in the loss of many selective depositories from the program.

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Other issues to consider:

- What can GPO do to make it easier for regionals to stay in?
- Can GPO ease regional requirements to allow a group of selectives to serve some the functions of the regional? What about the idea of temporary regionals?
- Currently another SOAR group is working to establish uniform guidelines for selectives to withdraw from the program. Preliminary discussions assume that the regional is vital to this process.
- Regionals are suppose to have an active role in the inspection process a new mechanism would need to be set up to provide support for selectives undergoing inspection if they felt the need.
- Mechanisms would have to be set up for retention of files currently retained by the regionals on the selective libraries.
- Could GPO offer any of the following possible benefits to regionals
 - Travel budgets
 - Equipment
 - Special Training
 - Special Access to databases
 - Administrative support
 - Recognition from GPO/Congress/Etc for services rendered
 - Consultants
 - Print copies of materials distributed to selectives only in E-formats
- Could a library be adopted by another regional if their regional leaves the program?
- In light of the current one size does not fitting all thinking – can the requirements of Title 44 be addressed by a structure other than the current regional patter.
- What about large historical collections in other depository libraries? Can such collections be considered when assessing the needs of a state or region?
- Should GPO pursue a virtual reference service, to support regionalist states?
- Is the interlibrary loan service of the regional still a valid need?

Some critical situations to consider:

If a regional surrenders its regional status but remains in the FDLP and there is no other regional serving the area, then neither the ex-regional nor the selectives within the state/region will be able to discard any documents beyond those identified by the Superintendent of Documents as superseded or replaced in bound form .

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

If a regional surrenders regional status but remains in the FDLP as a selective and there is another regional in the state/region, then does the ex-regional become just another selective and operate under the provisions governing selective depositories served by a regional.

If a regional withdraws from the program, then how can the integrity of the state or region's depository resources be best protected and how can the services previously supplied by the regional be made available to the selectives in the state/region.

If a large number of Regionals were to propose withdraw or changed status within the program upon publication of guidelines, the issues raised could not be confined to the state or region. In this situation, the question could quickly become maintaining the integrity of the nation's Federal depository resources.

Can a selective not served by a regional surrender its status?

A few proposals

The withdrawal of a regional from the FDLP and the legal requirements for the retention of Federal Publications can result in a significant risk to the historical and cultural heritage of the nation. For this reason, Regional Libraries wishing to withdraw from or change their status to a Selective FDLP should be required to:

1. Formally, notify GPO of the intention to withdraw from the FDLP a minimum of 2 years prior to the effective date of withdrawal. Additional notification to selective libraries within the state or service area the state library authority and congressional delegation are also required. In the case of a Regional that serves more than one state or designated with another library, this notification process must include all interested parties.
2. Establish with GPO a collection review team composed of experienced documents librarians from all types and sizes of depositories from within the state or region.
3. Pay a reasonable consultants fee and expenses to the librarians on this team.
4. Carry out the recommendations of the review team for the disposition of the collection, before depository status is relinquished.
5. Pay for the cost for the transfer of any depository materials to a new location.

Review team members will:

1. Determine the interest of other libraries in the state or region in assuming regional status.
 - a. If a library can be found to assume regional status, a representative of the new regional should be on the review team.
 - b. The new regional has first refusal on items from the depository collection of the regional surrendering depository status.
2. Survey the collection for rare and/or culturally or historically significant materials.

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

3. Establish a procedure, utilizing existing depository networks, online catalogs, etc. to assure that materials that might be considered for discard are represented elsewhere within the state or region.
4. In collaboration with GPO select materials for the national collection at GPO, if there is one.
5. In Cooperation with the selective depositories previously served by the regional, investigate other housing options for important materials available nowhere else in the state or region.
6. Where available suggest materials which could be sent to state/regional storage facilities and recommend processing procedures which will assure accessibility for these materials.

Number of Regionals

State	Number of Regionals	service area
AL	2	
AK		Served by Washington State Library
AS		Served by the University of Hawaii
AZ	1	
AR	1	
CA	1	
CO	2	
CT	1	
DE		Served by the University of Maryland
DC		Served by the University of Maryland
FM		Served by the University of Hawaii
FL	1	
GA	1	
GU		Served by the University of Hawaii
HI	1	
ID	1	
IL	1	
IN	1	
IA	1	
KS	1	
KY	1	
LA	2	
ME	1	
MD	1	
MA	1	
MI	2	
MN	1	
MS	1	
MO	1	
MT	1	
NE	1	
NV	1	
NH		Served by the University of Maine
NJ	1	
NM	2	
NY	1	
NC	1	
ND	2	Shared
OH	1	

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

OK	2	
OR	1	
PA	1	
PR		Served by University of Florida
RI		Served by the Connecticut State Library
SC	2	Shared
SD		Served by the University of Minnesota
TN	1	
TX	2	
UT	1	
VT		Served by the University of Maine
VI		Served by the University of Florida
VA	1	
WA	1	
WV	1	
WI	2	
WY		WY contracts with the University of Colorado, Boulder for regional services
	53	

More information and ideas

Spec Kit

Ridley Kessler, Beth Rowe and and Bill Suddeth have conducted a survey of ARL libraries. They have received a first round of data (100 libraries, including 46 of 53 regionals) and are analyzing the data. As of mid-September, the survey is still open.

Bill knows that we are interested in this data and will keep us posted.

Survey on Flexibility

I unilaterally decided to halt any survey concerning what libraries meant by wanting “more flexibility.” We discussed this during the meeting in Toronto. LPS was pursuing the essential titles survey and ARL was surveying its members, it seem clear that there would be confusion and survey fatigue.

Other information needs include:

- what is needed to change to keep libraries in the program
- satisfaction survey
- What is meant by “we need more education or training”
- What sort of performance measures can be used by LPS and depository libraries to measure the utility of materials and services offered

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Retention of Regional Status from: Tim Byrne

At 02:26 PM 7/18/03 -0600, you wrote:

To: Regional-L

From: Tim Byrne

Re: Retention of Regional Status

I basically wrote most of these comments when this topic originally came up just before ALA Annual. Unfortunately, due to changes with email servers here at CU, Regional-L did not recognize me as a subscriber and declined to distribute the message. So I have taken what I wrote before and added a few more comments and now offer it to Regional-L.

I had a short talk with Judy Russell in Reno on the topic of libraries dropping regional status. The vehemence of her response convinced me she is extremely concerned about this. I suggested that one thing that might help would be for Judy to visit each regional for the purpose of meeting with the Library Director. This would be a chance for GPO to emphasize to the director how important regionals are to the Depository Library Program and to listen to whatever the director wants to say. Judy thought that this was a great idea and that she would start trying to do it. She has talked to my director at a couple of national meetings and he has invited her to come visit. While I certainly don't think this will solve everything, it may help some.

However, I strongly feel that what we really need are tangible (\$\$\$) benefits for being regionals. The prestige is not going to make it. The service to the state, to the depository community, or to the greater good doesn't carry much weight in these economic times. The thing that carries weight now is money.

The idea of a GPO consultant based in a regional may be heading in the right direction. We need to look long and hard at what we really need to continue as regionals. A free trip to the regionals Meeting is very nice but really no where near enough to convince a library to continue as a regional. Judy Russell is sending the message that she is willing to consider options that GPO has been unwilling to talk about in the past. I think that the time is right to ask for what we need. Below are several ideas that came to me that I put out for discussion purposes.

Discard lists: For many selective depositories, the most important thing a regional does is give them permission to discard. From the comments made in Reno, it is clear that checking discard lists varies greatly among regionals. Many just do not have the staff to really handle it. What if GPO was able to supply funds for partial support of a position in each regional to process the discard lists? The number of selectives for which each regional is responsible would determine how funds would be allocated.

Visits to Selectives: Few of us can claim to visit our selectives as often as we would like. The cost of travel falls on our institutions. What if GPO gave each regional a travel budget to visit our selectives? We could each submit budget proposals with travel and lodging expenses. Then we would only get the funds if we actually did the traveling.

Workshops and Training: Might it be possible for GPO to give us some sort of financial support for regionals to put on workshops and training? These could be statewide workshops for

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

depository librarians or local workshops for depository staff in several depositories. Again, we could submit budget requests and would be compensated for whatever we actually do.

State Support for Regionals: The University of Colorado is paid by the State of Wyoming to be Wyoming's regional. (The State of Colorado doesn't give us anything.) The Wyoming State Library is willing to put funds in their budget so Wyoming selectives can discard. How can we get this type of support in all our state budgets?

GPO Consultants: Some of the suggestions above are also things that could be done by a GPO consultant. I do, however, have a concern about this concept in light of the discussion on retention of regional status. Suppose, for example, I proposed having a consultant, based at the University of Colorado, who would serve the states of Colorado, Wyoming, Kansas, Utah and New Mexico. While I might be able to convince my dean of benefits CU would receive by having a GPO consultant based with us, what about Kansas, Utah and New Mexico? Yes, the states will benefit from the having the GPO consultant, but the regionals in those states will not really be getting a tangible benefit. In fact, the director's at these regionals may decide that if the consultant is based at CU, then perhaps they should just drop regional status and let the University of Colorado be the regional for their state. As I have said, Wyoming pays CU to be their regional, so why not other states? Certainly, CU would have to receive payment to take on another state.

Replacing a Regional: So what happens in those states with only one regional if that library decides to drop regional status? Good luck finding another library in the state to take it on. It may be that the only way to allow selectives to continue discarding is to contract with a regional in another state. So, in the example above, if Kansas, Utah and New Mexico decide to contract with the University of Colorado for regional service, where are we heading? It certainly is beginning to look like a super regional.

Super Regionals: What would it take to convince a library to become a super regional? The answer to that is pretty simple: \$\$\$\$. The problem, of course, is where the money would come from. I would think each state would have to appropriate funds for this purpose. That may be easier to achieve in some states and nearly impossible in others. The other option would be for GPO to pay the library to become the super regional. Not too long ago I would have said that this would never happen, but I am not so sure now. So let's assume for discussion purposes that this is the direction we are heading. Some of us are going to drop regional status. Some of us are going to assume responsibility for other states. How much money might we be talking about? Wyoming pays CU \$8715 per year. CU would not take on another state for anything less. So let's say that we would want \$9000 each from Utah and New Mexico because they have about the same number of depositories as Wyoming and \$18,000 for Kansas which has about twice the depositories as the other states. The total for the four states would be close to \$45,000. This would cover the salary and benefits for a Library Technician II to be added to my staff. That would certainly catch my director's attention.

Please be assured that the scenario I described above is purely an example for discussion purposes and I have no designs on taking over Kansas, Utah and New Mexico.

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Our Directors/Deans: What do we say to our Directors/Deans when asked why we should remain a regional? As some of you are finding out, this is not an easy question to answer. I think we need to admit that there might not be many reasons for retention of regional status today, but give us some time. We are starting to work with GPO on this and in the next couple of years we should be able provide tangible benefits for being a regional.

These are just a few thoughts that I have thrown together. Hopefully these are the sort of thing we can discuss further in October.

Tim Byrne
Government Publications Library
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80309-0184
303-492-4375
Tim.Byrne@Colorado.edu

OCLC holdings for Government Information from Barbie Selby

I do think that the whole idea of GPO working some sort of deal with OCLC to automatically post holdings to OCLC for depository libraries, or at least for Regionals, is one that bears more thought and study. It seems as though it would be a real incentive to libraries to remain in the depository system so it might be one that SOAR could look into more closely.

Three Tiered Approach—Judy Russell

Date: Fri, 3 Oct 2003 16:42:42 -0400
From: "Russell, Judith C." <jrussell@gpo.gov>

In Reno we talked about moving toward a three tier system, with govt information access centers in many libraries -- whether libraries not currently depositories or depositories wishing to have a less burdensome status. Further discussion on this topic has elicited the idea of a small number of paper titles sent to these libraries - govt manual, stat abstracts, and perhaps a few other volumes as the truly minimal (vs. core) collection. It would be interesting to discuss this concept and Michele's concept together.

Right now we have libraries that file by SuDocs, by LC and by Dewey. Would we have to offer three options or send items processed for only one system? If only one, which one?

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

While we can't eliminate all processing because libraries will need to bar code or add anti-theft markers or take other steps unique to their collections, we could make it a lot easier than it presently is. Once we refine the idea, could look for a vendor who would participate with us in a pilot disseminating a few ready to shelve titles to a few libraries as a test of the issues, costs, etc.

Let's keep talking and see where Michele's "delusion" leads us. She is definitely challenging us to think outside of the box and it is very helpful.

From Laura Saur

... The example was to put a pre-set package of materials in an economically disadvantaged area. The material would be the sort of things that would be useful there - economic development stuff, health etc., and the depository wouldn't have all the strictures of a regular depository. It shouldn't be too expensive, since GPO would not have the expense of processing the managed depositories' selections, or creating lighted bins for them. Possibly they wouldn't be inspected either. Whoever brought this up didn't mention cataloging, but that shouldn't be much of an added expense since GPO catalogs all the stuff anyway. They could put the records on floppies or on an FTP site.

How about Four Tiers?

Tier 1

Government Information Access Centers: Not part of the FDL system, with its attendant rules and regulations, but still located in places where the public can access basic federal government information. Provide a basic print collection and online access.

Primary service areas: No FLD or geographical dispersed FDL's e.g., Alaska, Montana North Dakota, western Kansas, Pacific Islands.

- The rule for public access these materials would need to stand.
 - Would libraries want in? Given many public libraries experiences with the IRS if they might not sign on.
 - Does this concept include non- libraries? If so how?
- This has huge training implications.
- Should this be done through library systems, not individual libraries?
- Why not just give FDLs 800 numbers or have GPO set up an answer center and fax on demand?

Tier 2

m-fdl concept is beyond an access center, but less than a selective.

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Does this concept work within the limits of the law of the current law? (Any title 44 revision could create new types of access, but we should look at something that can be done now to keep libraries that are in the program now onboard.)

Tier 3 Selective FDL s

Full selective with the right-to-profile

Tier 4 Regionals

or a group of regionals

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Appendices

Appendix I

Pilot Project Proposal, Federal Depository Library Program Field Consultant, Based at the University of South Carolina's Thomas Cooper Library

The University of South Carolina, Clemson University, the University of Georgia, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill propose a pilot project in conjunction with the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO) to study the efficacy and outcomes of placing a Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) Field Consultant within the tri-state region of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia.

The Field Consultant (FC) working from the University of South Carolina's Thomas Cooper Library, a shared-regional library, would establish contact and provide a variety of services for the Federal Depository Libraries (FDLs) in the three states. The Field Consultant would assist depository libraries through site visits, training, and consultations with regional and selective depository staff.

The goals of the project would be to improve GPO Library Program Service (LPS) and regional depository services to selective depository libraries and extend depository services to non-depository libraries, communities, and the general public.

1. The Field Consultant would visit Federal Depository Libraries to assist staff with program and operational issues that affect services in the library and the community.
2. The Field Consultant, in conjunction with the Regional Depository Coordinator, will work to coordinate and strengthen regional/selective services within the state.
3. The Field Consultant will conduct training sessions for depository staff related to program resources and databases.
4. The Field Consultant will conduct training sessions for Regional Depository staff on conducting site visits and support for selective depository libraries in the state. The purpose of this goal will be train depository library staff to continue the work of the field consultant after the pilot project has ended.
5. The Field Consultant will conduct training sessions on databases and resources available through the FDLP for depository and other library staff. Training sessions will be scheduled by local depository staff and held in conjunction with site visits. These sessions should be held in communities where there is a single FDL with focus on extending the reach and resources within the depository library's service area.
6. The field consultant will conduct training sessions on databases and resources available through the FDLP for the general community. These sessions will be arranged through and with the

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

assistance of the local depository library staff. The sessions will focus on local groups (small business, education, students) that would benefit from additional access to government information resources. Area of emphasis would be on resources for economic development or small business. Other topics could be covered depending on local interest. The field consultant will be accompanied and assisted by the local depository staff. The goal will be to train local depository staff to increase public awareness and outreach for the program.

7. Field consultant will attend state depository conferences in North Carolina, Georgia, and South Carolina and any state meetings scheduled by the Regional Librarians.

NC – state conference September; Documents section May

SC – state conference October; Regional’s meeting May; SCLA GODORT (varies each year)

GA – state conference October (Council of Media Organizations); Regional’s meeting (December)

8. The Field Consultant will attend the Fall Depository Library Conference and Spring Depository Library Council meetings.

Project evaluation

The project will be evaluated using the following tools/methods:

1. A preliminary survey conducted by the GPO and the Regional Librarians of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia will be completed by all depository libraries in the three states. Questions will focus on the perceived effectiveness of having consultation services within the region rather than based in Washington, DC. A follow-up survey will be conducted and will focus of the effectiveness of the Field Consultant’s training and on-site visits, and will identify areas and depository services that improved during the pilot project.
2. A follow-up survey of the Regional Depository library staffs will be conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the Field Consultant’s assistance in helping staff to better perform regional services.
3. Interviews will be conducted with the Regional Depository staffs to determine whether the regional Library can continue the program established by the Field Consultant for site-visits, training, consultations, and periodic inspections. An estimate of costs for continuing the program would be included in this evaluation.
4. A cost analysis would be conducted by GPO and the participating regional depository libraries to determine if the Field Consultant concept is a more efficient and economic way for GPO to support selective and Regional Depository library services.
5. A case study analysis will be done for each at-risk library. At-risk depository libraries will be identified jointly by the GPO, the Regional staff, and Field Consultant. Initial site-visits/inspections will be conducted followed by the Field Consultant and Regional staff

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

providing assistance to the depository staff to improve in any category noted as deficient or non-compliant. Follow-up site-visits to these depositories will be done by Regional staff and will continue until a resolution is achieved.

Responsibilities of the Regional Depository Libraries:

The four Regional Depository Libraries agree to act as local support for the Field Consultant, assist in any travel plans, and agree to accompany the field consultant on any site visit. The Regional Librarians in each state will assist the Field Consultant in scheduling workshops and training sessions at either their home library or a library convenient to the selectives or group of selectives (cluster) receiving the training. Regional Librarians will assist the Field Consultant in making contacts with state library organizations, library science programs in the region, and individuals that can assist in non-depository library outreach.

Resources provided by the Regional Libraries:

The University of South Carolina at Columbia

The University of South Carolina – Thomas Cooper Library is willing to commit the following resources to the project.

Time of Bill Sudduth, Head of the Documents and Microforms Department and Regional Librarian for South Carolina to coordinate the establishment, operation, and evaluation of the project. – 20 hours per month; 5 hours per month support from department's professional staff; 5 hours per month support from department paraprofessional staff; and 10 hours per month support of a department student assistant.

One work area for the Field Consultant – containing desk, chair, telephone; telephone line; access to USC network including network connection including e-mail account; access to fax line currently provided to Documents staff; telephone line with re-imburement for long-distance calls provided by GPO; parking in adjacent parking facility on campus (paid by consultant or reimbursed by GPO; 6 months paid in advance; access to the circulating and electronic resources of the libraries;

GPO will provide the Field Consultant's salary; re-imburement for travel expenses; travel vouchers will be submitted directly to GPO.

Clemson University

Clemson University will contribute the time of Jan Comfort, Regional Librarian, to assist with planning workshop, travel, and general scheduling within South Carolina. Clemson will also provide travel funds for Jan Comfort to attend meetings between the Regional Librarians. Clemson will also provide travel funds for Jan Comfort to accompany the Field Consultant on site visits and training session within South Carolina

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Davis Library has agreed to provide office space for the Field Consultant's use during extended stays in the Research Triangle (Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill) area.

The University of Georgia

The University of Georgia has agreed to provide office space for the Field Consultant's during extended stays in Georgia; access to appropriate UGA network connections (ie, e-mail account); access to a FAX line; access to a telephone line; and other necessary services and equipment needed. Parking on campus is available in the North Parking Deck for a fee of \$8.00 per day.

In addition, UGA will allow Susan Field (Regional Librarian) to attend meetings with the Regional Librarians and the Field Consultant or other GPO staff connected with this project; to spend time assisting the Field Consultant while in Georgia; to travel with the Field Consultant on scheduled visits to federal depository libraries in Georgia; and to attend meetings scheduled by the Field Consultant for depository staff in Georgia.

Identification of At-Risk Depository Libraries

All of the Regional Librarians hesitate to name specific depository libraries that they consider at-risk. However, each Regional Librarian did provide an estimate of the possible number of libraries that may be in this category. Of the three states, South Carolina has the most libraries with lower selection rates. The regionals (Bill Sudduth and Jan Comfort) estimate that as many as 8-14 depository libraries could be considered at-risk at this time. Ridley Kessler (NC), estimates that at least eight depositories could be considered at-risk or in need assistance. On average, selectives in North Carolina receive a higher percentage of materials than most libraries. Susan Field (GA) stated that she can identify at least three depositories currently at risk. All of the regionals believe that a large majority of the depositories in each state would benefit from increased visits by GPO and Regional staff and that additional training and programming opportunities would help more than just the at risk depositories.

Pilot Project Schedule (1 year project):

The projects proponents all agree that a one-year pilot project would not be effective.

Problems with the 12 month pilot project –

Time due to vacations – (estimated 3-5 weeks)

November (1 week); December (1-2 weeks); summer (1-2 weeks)

Time due to conferences – (estimated 5 weeks)

September (NC state conference);

October (SC & GA state conferences)

October (Depository Library Conference)

January (ALA-Midwinters)

April (Depository Library Council)

June (ALA annual conference)

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Time spent state Documents organizations – (1 week)
May (NC, SC)

Problem months – August (academics busy; visit public libraries)
October (Depository Library Conference & state conferences)
November (Thanksgiving holiday)
December (Christmas holidays)
January (ALA-Midwinter Meetings)
April (Depository Library Council)
May (state documents meeting)

A longer pilot project timeline would give more time for at-risk libraries to make progress on initial recommendations, provide for more visits to groups or clusters of selective depository libraries, provide for more training and community outreach activities and provide more in-depth training to Regional Library staff. The proposal provides timelines for 12-, 18-, and 24- month pilot projects.

**Below is an example of a one-year pilot project schedule.
Schedule based on federal fiscal year (October-September)**

Month 1 (October)– Orientation to New Workplace; Contact Regional Librarians; Meeting with four Regional Librarians in Columbia, SC: Approve schedule of visits; workshops and other activities; Identify at-risk depository libraries; Make site-visit to each regional library.

Month 2 (November) – Two day-site visits to UGA and UGA-Law School and UNC-CH and UNC Law School. Visits should be scheduled so that only one overnight would happen each week.

Month 3 (December) – Complete first visits to at-risk depository libraries (follow-up visits in Months 8-9). See list of at-risk libraries.

Month 4 (January) - Site visits to NC at-risk depositories and visit to at least one of following NC clusters: Research Triangle Park (9 libraries) or Triad Libraries (7 libraries); ALA Midwinter Meetings

Month 5 (February) – Site visits/training sessions to cluster areas: Atlanta (Month 5); Research Triangle Park (Month 6); Triad (either Month 5 or 6)

Month 6 (March) – Mid-term meeting of Regional Librarians in Chapel Hill, NC.

Month 7 (April) – Small cluster meetings (Charlotte, Columbia, Charleston); Depository Library Council Meeting

Month 8 (May) – Follow-up visit to at-risk depository libraries. Community based training sessions

Month 9 (June) – Follow-up visit to at-risk depository libraries. Community based training sessions

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Month 10-11 (July/August) – Additional cluster meetings (West/North Georgia; Rocky-Mount/Greenville, SC; Wilmington/Fayetteville area; western North Carolina)

Month 12 (September) – Wrap-up meeting with Regional Librarians (in Athens, GA). Agreement of plan of continued regional support. Pilot evaluation.

Pilot Project Schedule (18 month project): Schedule based on federal fiscal year (October-September)

Month 1 (October) – Orientation to USC Library and campus; Meet Regional Librarians in Columbia, SC; Schedule site visits to Regionals; Identify and schedule site visits to at-risk depositories; SCLA Annual Conference; GA Conference of Media Organizations (COMO); Fall Depository Library Conference

Month 2 (November) - Site visits to Regional Depository Libraries: UNC-CH; UGA; Clemson; Thanksgiving holiday

Month 3 (December) - Visits to at-risk libraries; Christmas Holidays

Month 4 (January) - Visits to at-risk libraries; ALA Midwinter Meetings

Month 5 (February) - Complete visits to at-risk libraries; cluster visits

Month 6 (March) – Six-month meeting with Regionals Librarians in Chapel Hill to review at-risk visits; Training for Regional staff; cluster visits to either RTP (9 libraries) or Triad (7 libraries)

Month 7 (April) - Depository Library Council; Cluster visits to Charleston (4 libraries); Columbia (4 libraries); Greenville/ Spartanburg (4 libraries)

Month 8 (May) - SC Depository Meeting; NC Documents Meeting; 1 week vacation

Month 9 (June) - ALA Annual Conference; ; Cluster meetings – North & West Georgia; western NC; community based programming

Month 10 (July) - Cluster meetings – Rocky Mount/ Greenville, NC & Wilmington/ Fayetteville, NC; community based programming

Month 11 (August) - 1 weeks vacation; Plan training schedule and return visits to at-risk depositories; Community based programming; Cluster visits

Month 12 (September) - NCLA State Conference; Meeting with Regional Librarians in Athens, GA to plan training schedule; Return visits to at-risk libraries and mid-project evaluation

Month 13 (October) - SCLA Annual Conference; GA Conference of Media Organizations (COMO); Training sessions at SCLA and COMO; Fall Depository Library Conference

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Month 14 (November) - Follow-up visits to at-risk libraries; Cluster visit; Thanksgiving holiday

Month 15 (December) - Follow-up visits to at-risk libraries; Christmas Holidays

Month 16 (January) - Follow-up visits to at-risk libraries; Cluster visit; ALA Midwinter Meetings

Month 17 (February) - Cluster visits

Month 18 (March) - Cluster visits; Final meeting of Regional Librarians in Columbia, SC

Month 19 (April) - Program evaluation meetings at GPO; Depository Library Council

Pilot Project Schedule (24 month project): Schedule based on federal fiscal year (October-September)

Month 1 (October) – Orientation to USC Library, USC-School of Library & Information Science and campus; Meet with Regional Librarians in Columbia, SC; Identify and schedule site visits for at-risk libraries; SCLA Annual Conference; GA Conference of Media Organizations (COMO); Fall Depository Library Conference

Month 2 (November) – Site visits to Regional Depository Libraries: UNC-CH; UGA; Clemson; Thanksgiving holiday

Month 3 (December) – Visits to at-risk libraries; Christmas Holidays

Month 4 (January) – Visits to at-risk libraries; ALA Midwinter Meetings

Month 5 (February) – Complete visits to at-risk libraries; Cluster visits

Month 6 (March) – Six-month meeting with Regional Librarians in Chapel Hill, NC to review at-risk visits; Training for Regional staff; Cluster visits to either RTP (9 libraries) or Triad (7 libraries)

Month 7 (April) – Depository Library Council; Cluster visits to Charleston (4 libraries); Columbia (4 libraries); Greenville/ Spartanburg (4 libraries)

Month 8 (May) – SC Depository Meeting; NC Documents Meeting; 1 week vacation

Month 9 (June) – ALA Annual Conference; Cluster meetings – North & West Georgia; western NC

Month 10 (July) – Cluster meeting – Rocky Mount/ Greenville, NC & Wilmington/ Fayetteville, NC

Month 11 (August) – 1 week vacation; Plan training schedule and return visits to at-risk libraries

Month 12 (September) – NCLA State Conference (training session); Meet with Regional Librarians in Athens, GA to plan training schedule; Return visits to at-risk libraries and mid-project evaluation

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Month 13 (October) – SCLA Annual Conference; GA Conference of Media Organizations (COMO); Training sessions at SCLA and COMA; Fall Depository Library Conference

Month 14 (November) – Follow-up visits to at-risk libraries; Cluster visit; Thanksgiving holiday

Month 15 (December) – Follow-up visits to at-risk libraries; Christmas Holidays

Month 16 (January) – Follow-up visits to at-risk libraries; Cluster visit; ALA Midwinter Meetings

Month 17 (February) – Community based programming sessions; Cluster visits

Month 18 (March) – Meeting with Regional Librarians in Clemson, SC; Plan regionals follow-up training sessions; Cluster visit

Month 19 (April) – Depository Library Council; Community based programming sessions; Regional training sessions Clemson, SC

Month 20 (May) – SC Depository Meeting; NC Documents Meeting; Regional training sessions at UNC-CH; Cluster visit

Month 21 (June) – Community based programming sessions; ALA Annual Conference

Month 22 (July) – Community based programming sessions; Regional training sessions GA; Cluster visit

Month 23 (August) – Community based programming sessions; Cluster visit

Month 24 (September) – NCLA State Conference; cluster visit; Final meeting of Regional Librarians in Columbia, SC

Month 25 (October) – Program evaluation meetings at GPO; Fall Depository Library Conference

The following table allows comparison between the 12-, 18-, and 24-month pilot projects. All projects are assumed to start on October 1 of the fiscal year. There maybe more auspicious months to start the project and that can be determined later; however the following schedules will illustrate some of the recurring schedule issues and problems.

Month	12 month project	18 month project	24 month project
1-October	Orientation to New Workplace; Contact Regional Librarians; Meeting with four Regional Librarians in Columbia, SC:	Orientation to USC Library and campus; Meet Regional Librarians in Columbia, SC; Schedule site visits	Orientation to USC Library, USC-School of Library & Information Science and campus; Meet with Regional

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

	Approve schedule of visits; workshops and other activities; Identify at-risk depository libraries; Make site-visit to each regional library.	to Regionals; Identify and schedule site visits to at-risk depositories; SCLA Annual Conference; GA Conference of Media Organizations (COMO); Fall Depository Library Conference	Librarians in Columbia, SC; Identify and schedule site visits for at-risk libraries; SCLA Annual Conference; GA Conference of Media Organizations (COMO); Fall Depository Library Conference
2-November	Site visits to Regional Depository Libraries: UNC-CH; UGA; Clemson; Thanksgiving holiday	Site visits to Regional Depository Libraries: UNC-CH; UGA; Clemson; Thanksgiving holiday	Site visits to Regional Depository Libraries: UNC-CH; UGA; Clemson; Thanksgiving holiday
3-December	Visits to at-risk depositories in SC. Christmas Holidays	Visits to at-risk libraries; Christmas Holidays	Visits to at-risk libraries; Christmas Holidays
4-January	Site visits to NC at-risk depositories and visit to atleast one of following NC clusters: Reasearch Triangle Park (9 libraries)or Triad Libraries (7 libraries); ALA Midwinter Meetings	Visits to at-risk libraries; ALA Midwinter Meetings	Visits to at-risk libraries; ALA Midwinter Meetings
5-February	Site visits to GA at-risk depositories and Atlanta cluster (11 libraries)	Complete visits to at-risk libraries; Cluster visits	Complete visits to at-risk libraries; Cluster visits
6-March	Mid-project with Regional Librarians in Chapel Hill, NC and visit to either RTP or Triad cluster; Spring vacation	6 month meeting with Regional Librarians in Chapel Hill, NC to review at-risk visits; staff training for Regional staff; Cluster visits to either RTP (9	6 month meeting with Regionals Librarians in Chapel Hill, NC to review at-risk visits; Training for Regional staff; Cluster visits to either RTP (9

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

		libraries) or Triad (7 libraries)	libraries) or Triad (7 libraries)
7-April	Visits to small clusters – Charlotte, Columbia, Charleston; Depository Library Council	Depository Library Council; Cluster visits to Charleston (4 libraries); Columbia (4 libraries); Greenville/Spartanburg (4 libraries)	Depository Library Council; Cluster visits to Charleston (4 libraries); Columbia (4 libraries); Greenville/Spartanburg (4 libraries)
8-May	Follow-up to SC at-risk visits and community-based training sessions; SC Depository Meeting; NC Documents Meeting	SC Depository Meeting; NC Documents Meeting; 1 week vacation	SC Depository Meeting; NC Documents Meeting; 1 week vacation
9-June	Follow-up to NC and GA at-risk visits; Community based training sessions; ALA Annual Conference	ALA Annual Conference; ; Cluster meetings – North & West Georgia; western NC; Community based programming	ALA Annual Conference; Cluster meetings – North & West Georgia; western NC
10-July	Cluster meetings – West & North GA	Cluster meeting – Rocky Mount/Greenville, NC & Wilmington/Fayetteville, NC; Community based programming	Cluster meeting – Rocky Mount/Greenville, NC & Wilmington/Fayetteville, NC
11-August	Cluster meetings – Rocky Mount/Greenville, NC; Wilmington/Fayetteville, NC; western NC	1 weeks vacation; Plan training schedule and return visits; Community based programming; Cluster visits	1 week vacation; Plan training schedule and return visits to at-risk libraries
12-September	Final meeting with Regional Librarians at Athens, GA; Plan of continuing regional follow-up; Evaluation of pilot; NCLA State	NCLA State Conference; Meeting with Regional Librarians in Athens, GA to plan training schedule; Return	NCLA State Conference (training session); Meeting with Regional Librarians in Athens, GA to plan training schedule;

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

	Conference	visits to at-risks libraries and mid-project evaluation	Return visits to at-risks libraries and mid-project evaluation
13-October		SCLA Annual Conference; GA Conference of Media Organizations (COMO); Training sessions at SCLA and COMA; Fall Depository Library Conference	SCLA Annual Conference; GA Conference of Media Organizations (COMO); Training sessions at SCLA and COMA; Fall Depository Library Conference
14-November		Follow-up visits to at-risk libraries; Cluster visit; Thanksgiving holiday	Follow-up visits to at-risk libraries; Cluster visit; Thanksgiving holiday
15-December		Follow-up visits to at-risk libraries; Christmas Holidays	Follow-up visits to at-risk libraries; Christmas Holidays
16-January		Follow-up visits to at-risk libraries; Cluster visit; ALA Midwinter Meetings	Follow-up visits to at-risk libraries; Cluster visit; ALA Midwinter Meetings
17-February		Cluster visits;	Community based programming sessions; Cluster visits
18-March		Cluster visits; Final meeting with Regional Librarians in Columbia, SC	Meeting with Regional Librarians in Clemson, SC; Plan Regional's follow-up training sessions; Cluster visit
19-April		Program evaluation meetings at GPO; Depository Library Council;	Depository Library Council; Community based programming sessions; Regional training sessions Clemson, SC

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

20-May			SC Depository Meeting; NC Documents Meeting; Regional training sessions NC; Cluster visit
21-June			Community based programming sessions; ALA Annual Conference
22-July			Community based programming sessions; Regional training sessions GA; Cluster visit
23-August			Community based programming sessions; Cluster visit
24-September			NCLA State Conference; Cluster visit; Final meeting of Regional Librarians in Columbia, SC
25 -October			Program evaluation meetings at GPO; Fall Depository Library Conference

Addenda

Service Area: Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina

Number of Federal Depository Libraries: 77

Sample Distances from Columbia, South Carolina and number of Federal Depository Libraries

Georgia

Columbus, GA	357 miles	2
Atlanta, GA	213 miles	11
Macon, GA	192 miles	3
Athens, GA	165 miles	2

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

- Connects with I-85 in Atlanta for access to west Georgia
- Interstate I-77
 - Direct route to Charlotte, NC
 - Connects with I-85, access to central and western NC
 - Connects to I-40 for access to Triad (Greensboro/Winston-Salem) and Triangle (Raleigh/Durham/Chapel Hill) areas of NC
- Interstate I-26
 - Connects Charleston, SC to south; Asheville and western NC to the north
 - Connects to I-85, access to north Georgia
- ◆ University of South Carolina
 - School of Library and Information Studies
 - Distance education program
 - Over 200 degree programs
 - National leader in distance education programs

Draft schedule for one-day site visits for At-Risk Depository Libraries

- | | |
|--|------------|
| 1. Meet with Documents Coordinator & staff | 1 hour |
| 2. Tour of Documents Collection | 30 minutes |
| 3. Demonstration of Documents Processing | 30 minutes |
| 4. Demonstration of Documents Services (public services, electronic/web services, training/outreach) | 1 hour |
| 5. Meeting with Library Directory | 30 minutes |
| 6. Break/Lunch | 1 hour |
| 7. Action Plan Meeting | 90 minutes |
| 8. Scheduling of re-visit and up-coming training/professional development opportunities | 30 minutes |

Total time on-site – 6.5 hours

Draft schedule for site visits for not-at-risk Depository Libraries

- | | |
|--|------------|
| 1. Meeting with Documents Coordinator | 30 minutes |
| 2. Meeting with Documents staff | 30 minutes |
| 3. Tour of Collection, Documents processing, demonstration of services | 1 hour |
| 4. Meeting with Dean/Library Director | 30 minutes |
| 5. Follow-up with Documents Coordinator | 30 minutes |

Total time on-site – 3.0 hours

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Draft schedule for site visits for not-at-risk Depository Libraries with Training session or product demonstration

Training session would be scheduled for before or after but would be no more than 3 hours with at least one 15 minute break

Meeting with Documents Coordinator – 30 minutes

Meeting with Documents staff – 30 minutes

Lunch Break – 1 hour

Tour of Collection, Documents processing, demonstration of services – 1 hour

Meeting with Dean/Library Director – 30 minutes

Follow-up with Documents Coordinator – 30 minutes

Total time on-site – 7.0 hours

Draft schedule for site-visits to potential depository libraries (done with Regional Librarian)

1. Meeting with library directory and potential depository staff	1 hour
2. Tour of the facilities	45 minutes
3. Break	15 minutes
4. Presentation of the process of becoming a FDL including questions	1.25 hours
5. Schedule follow-up visit	15 minutes

Total time on site – 3.5 hours

Draft schedule for cluster visits - A

Day 1 – At risk visit

Day 2 - Non-risk ½ day visit; presentation/product demo to multilibraries

Day 3 – Non-risk (AM); Non-risk (PM)

Day 4 – At-risk visit

Day 5 – Meeting with regional

5 day cycle – 2 at-risk visits; 3 low-risk visit; presentation; follow-up with regional

Draft schedule for cluster visits - B

Day 1 – Non-risk visit (AM); Non-risk visit (PM)

Day 2 - Non-risk visit (AM); presentation/product demo to multilibraries

Day 3 – travel; Non-risk (PM)

Day 4 – Non-risk (AM); Non-risk (PM)

Day 5 – Workshop/presentation/demo to multi libraries and non-FDLs

5 day cycle – 6 site-visits; ½ day workshop; 1 full-day-workshop

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Draft schedule for cluster visits - C

Day 1 – At risk visit

Day 2 - At risk visit

Day 3 – At risk visit

Day 4 – Presentation/workshop/demo

Day 5 – Meeting with regional

5 day cycle – 3 at-risk visits; 1 full-day workshop; follow-up with regional

Appendix II Depository Termination Guidelines For Kansas Selectives

A. Authorization

- Authorization for withdrawal of depository libraries from the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) is based on 1) Instructions to Depository Libraries, Chapter 1, Section C, and 2) Administrative Notes, vol. 23, no. 15 (December 15, 2002), pp. 6-7.
 - As stated in the Instructions, an FDLP participating library “has the right to voluntarily relinquish its depository privilege if the library finds that it cannot meet the legal obligations set forth in the Instructions and other administrative directives.”
- The Depository Library Council has requested (AN, 12-15-02) the Government Printing Office to review and develop expanded guidelines to assist regional libraries in their attempts to deal with depository libraries that may be considering withdrawal from the FDLP. Such guidelines will be added to this document as they become available.

B. Review of Depository Library Benefits and Consequences of Withdrawal

- Communication with the Regional Librarian at the earliest possible time prior to the finalization of a decision to withdraw is crucial to review FDLP benefits and to consider possible consequences of withdrawal.
- A meeting should be held with the Regional Librarian and leadership of the library considering withdrawal to emphasize the benefits of continuation in the FDLP and to articulate the consequences of withdrawal.
 - Implications for the terminating library with regard to the loss of any or all of its federal documents collection as stated in Section D

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

below (Disposal Requirements) will be emphasized at this interview.

- Immediately upon receipt of a termination letter from a member library, GPO systematically discontinues all standing orders for serial titles received as part of the library's depository status. Consequently, arrangements for continued receipt of GPO standing order titles must be made with a commercial library vendor prior to sending the termination letter to avoid possible gaps in receipt.
- Prior to the finalization of a selective library's decision to withdraw, and provided that the library holds a congressional designation, the Regional Librarian will communicate with the library's congressional delegation to indicate the possibility of withdrawal.
- Notes from a panel discussion held at the 9th Annual Federal Depository Library Conference (Oct. 22-25, 2000), entitled "Questions for 'Reconsidering Depository Status,'" are available on the FDLP Desktop at http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/proceedings/00pro29.html and should be consulted as background information if and when a decision to withdraw from the program is being considered.

C. Announcement of Decision to Withdraw

- The withdrawing library will be expected to notify the Government Printing Office and the Regional Librarian of its intent to withdraw no less than six months before the intended date of withdrawal. The withdrawal letter should be addressed to the Superintendent of Documents at the following address, and should be faxed to GPO at 202-512-1434 and 202-512-1432:

Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office (SD)
Washington, DC 20402

- A copy of the withdrawal letter should be sent to the Regional Librarian at the address below, and a copy should also be faxed to 785-864-5705:

Regional Documents Librarian
320 Anschutz Library
University of Kansas Libraries
Lawrence, KS 66045-7537

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

- When the decision to withdraw is announced, the terminating library must inform other depository libraries within the same Congressional district of its intent to withdraw.
- Upon receiving notification of a library's intent to withdraw, the Regional Librarian will communicate once again with the withdrawing library's Congressional delegation, informing the delegation of the library's intent and informing the delegation of their right to appoint another library if the withdrawal creates a vacancy in the FDLP program.

D. Disposal Requirements

- The Regional Librarian and the terminating library will negotiate the issue of whether the library will be permitted to retain any materials in its documents collection. Potentially, all documents held by the library are eligible for claiming by documents libraries remaining in the program.
- Requirements for listing of the library's holdings for the benefit of other libraries in the program will be finalized at this time. A time frame will be established for the withdrawing library's preparation of offers lists that will be made available to other documents libraries in the state.
- The terminating library should expect onsite visits from other documents librarians in the state as part of the review and claiming of items from their collection.

Prepared by
Kenneth P. Lohrentz
Regional Documents Librarian
Reference Librarian & Bibliographer
320 Anschutz Library
University of Kansas Libraries
Lawrence, KS 66045-7537
rev. 6/18/03

Appendix III

Termination Guidelines For Michigan Selective Depository Libraries

Approved by the Michigan Council of Federal Depository Libraries, September, 2003

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Authorization for withdrawal of depository libraries from the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) is based on *Instructions to Depository Libraries*, Chapter 1, Section C.

Prior to the Decision to Withdraw

The depository coordinator will contact the library's primary Regional Librarian at the earliest possible point in the discussion of possible withdrawal.

A meeting between the depository library's primary Regional Librarian and leadership of the library considering withdrawal will be held to emphasize the benefits of continuation in the FDLP and to articulate the consequences of withdrawal.

Implications for the terminating library with regard to the loss of any or all of its federal documents collection as stated in Section C below (Disposal Requirements) will be emphasized.

Arrangements for continued receipt of GPO standing order titles must be made with a commercial library vendor prior to sending the termination letter to avoid possible gaps in receipt.

If the library considering withdrawal holds a congressional designation, the appropriate Regional Librarian will contact the library's congressional delegation to indicate the possibility of withdrawal. If the selective library decides to remain in the depository program at the conclusion of its deliberations, the Regional Librarian will inform the congressional delegation.

If a decision to withdraw from the program is under consideration, background information is available on the FDLP Desktop at http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/staywiththeprogram.html.

Decision to Withdraw

The withdrawing library will notify the Government Printing Office and both Regional Librarians of its intent to withdraw no less than six months before the planned date of withdrawal. The withdrawal letter must be addressed to the Superintendent of Documents at the following address, and also faxed to GPO at 202-512-1434 and 202-512-1432:

Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office (SD)
Washington, DC 20402

A copy of the withdrawal letter must be sent to the Regional Librarians at the addresses below, and a copy also faxed to 517-373-9438 and 313-833-1442:

Regional Documents Librarian
Library of Michigan
Michigan Dept. of History, Arts & Libraries
702 W. Kalamazoo St.
P.O. Box 30007

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Lansing, MI 48909-7507

Regional Documents Librarian
Detroit Public Library
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit, MI 48202

The terminating library must inform other depository libraries within the same Congressional district of its intent to withdraw.

The depository library's primary Regional Librarian will communicate once again with the withdrawing library's Congressional delegation, informing the delegation of the library's decision and their right to appoint another library if the withdrawal creates a vacancy in the FDLP program.

Disposal Requirements

The terminating library will contact the regional depository libraries to determine if missing or wanted documents lists are available.

The terminating library must list all of the documents it does not wish to retain in accordance with Appendix E of the state plan, "Guidelines for the Disposal of U.S. Government Depository Publications", latest edition. Terminating libraries are exempt from the requirement that material must have been received in the library five or more years prior to the date of the disposal request. All of the other provisions of Appendix E must be met. Terminating libraries must also inquire of all other depository libraries in the Congressional District if they would like to review the lists.

Upon completion of the weeding of the depository material, the terminating library must prepare a final list of the federal property in its possession that the library would like to keep. This list will be submitted to both regional depository libraries and copies made available to the other selective depositories in the Congressional District. The Regional Librarians will determine if any of the material on this list would better serve the state in another depository library's collection. After the final approval of the list, the appropriate Regional Librarian will inform the terminating library by letter (copied to the Library Programs Service at the Government Printing Office) that their involvement with the FDLP is at end.

The terminating library should expect onsite visits from other documents librarians in the state as part of the review and claiming of depository items from their collection.

Revised by the Michigan Council of Federal Depository Libraries - August 2002; editorial rev. 2003

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

Guidelines For Disposal Of U.S. Government Depository Publications

A selective depository library desiring to dispose of depository material must obtain permission from both regional libraries. If permission is not granted, the selective must keep the material, but may apply at a later date for approval to dispose of the items.

Lists that do not conform to these guidelines will not be processed.

Procedure to be followed in disposal

1. Review the collection:
 - a. Material for disposal must have been received in the depository library five or more years prior to the date of the disposal request.
 - b. Libraries are not required to list superseded materials, but are encouraged to offer significant materials. Significant materials include those listed in the Superseded List (http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/suplist/index.html) marked for regional retention, or those with a Great Lakes focus. Superseded materials that are being offered shall be integrated into the appropriate scheduled monthly list.
 - c. Depository holdings replaced by the purchase or gift of the same or other format, e.g., microform, acid-free paper, Internet access or CD-ROM, cannot be sold, bartered or exchanged and must be offered to the regional library if the purchasing library wishes to dispose of the unwanted original copy. Under these circumstances, the disposing library does not need to adhere to the five-year retention period but may offer the depository holdings at the time of replacement, as outlined in the Instructions to Depository Libraries.
2. Compile a list arranged by Superintendent of Documents classification number.
 - a. Each page of the list should indicate the following: Library name Depository library number List date in the form Month/Year, for example Sept. 2000 Page (#) of (Total) Pages, for example Page 1 of 15, Page 2 of 15, etc. For each entry, the following information is to be supplied:
 - b. Superintendent of Documents classification number;
 - c. For non-serial publications, complete title and date of publication. In addition, date received must be indicated in brackets. If either date is unknown, indicate with nd next to the title. For example, 1983 [1984], or nd [1984], or 1983 [nd], or nd [nd].
 - d. For serial publications: Series title and holdings for disposal - numbers, volume, years, whatever is appropriate to identify the publications exactly, indicating missing issues; House and Senate hearings, although now issued as S. hrg. number or H. hrg. number, should be listed title by title;

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

- e. Specify bound volumes - /bd;
 - f. Format other than paper - microfiche -/mfc, microfilm -/mfm, diskette -/floppy, video -/video, CD-ROM -/cd, Braille -/Braille, digital video disc - /dvd, map - /map, poster -/poster, other -/other;
 - g. Specify non-depository if less than five years from date of publication -/non-dep;
 - h. Specify replaced by the same or other format if less than five years from date of publication -/r;
 - i. Specify superseded material - /s;
 - j. Lists should be no more than 15 typed pages (8-1/2" x 11"). (Please do not reduce. Font size must be 10 point type or larger.) The disposing library should retain a copy of the list. A example of a disposal list is displayed on pages 35-36;
 - k. Libraries whose annual disposal lists are 10 pages or less may submit those lists as a single unit once a year. Such lists should be identified as an Annual Disposal List with the month and the year listed. All other requirements of section 2 apply.
 - l. Libraries requesting exceptions to these guidelines must prepare and submit a Request for Exemption from Disposal Guidelines (see Appendix G).
3. To facilitate processing time for the regional libraries and to encourage selective depository libraries to establish a routine schedule for weeding collections, discard lists will be sent in the following calendar/ Superintendent of Documents number order:

Depository Disposal Schedule

January

A

February

D

March

C

April

E, F, G

May

H

June

L, M, N

July

Y, Z

August

I, J

October

O, P, R, S

December

T, V, W, X

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

September and November have been omitted. They will be considered "bye" months and no lists should be submitted. Lists must be sent to the regional libraries in time for receipt by the end of the scheduled month. The lists will then be processed and a response sent by the end of the second month, e.g., H is received by the regional libraries no later than May 31. Response by the regionals will be returned to the selective no later than July 31.

4. Lists must be received by both regional libraries and be identical in order to be processed. The list may be sent, to each of the regional libraries, addressed as follows:

Documents Disposal Lists
Technical Services
Library of Michigan
P.O. Box 30007
Lansing, MI 48909-7507

Manager, Government Documents
Detroit Public Library
5201 Woodward Avenue
Detroit, MI 48202-4007

Disposal lists may also be transmitted by fax. All telefax lists must include a cover sheet addressed to Documents Disposal Lists. The telefax numbers for the regional libraries are as follows:

Library of Michigan 517-373-9438
Detroit Public Library 313-833-9709

All documents must be held until both regional libraries have responded to the disposing selective depository. If both regionals request the same document, that document should be sent to the disposing library's primary regional (see Appendix A). No documents may be discarded or distributed prior to response by both regional libraries.

5. Regionals receive publications at no charge. Other libraries receiving items from the list will be responsible for transportation charges, unless other arrangements are made. The disposing library will indicate the method of reimbursement, i.e., postage stamps, petty cash, invoice, at the time of response to the request.
6. After both regionals have responded, it is strongly encouraged that selective depository libraries utilize available electronic mail or online lists to advertise the availability of discarded titles. The national Needs and Offers list is a recommended venue for such postings and can be accessed via the FDLP Desktop at http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/tools/needs_of/index.html. This method should be used particularly when disposing of major sets or long runs.

SOAR Discussion Document

10/07/03

7. After all reasonable efforts have been made to transfer the publications to other libraries, the depository library is authorized to dispose of the remaining items by means of any of the following:
 - a. Offer to other educational institutions;
 - b. Offer to private citizens;
 - c. Donate as paper to recyclers or paper drives;
 - d. Sell, either as secondhand book or waste paper. All depository publications remain the property of the U.S. Government. Therefore, the proceeds from the sale of any items, accompanied by a letter of explanation, should be sent to the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402;
 - e. Destroy.

It should be noted that no library is required to discard any depository library materials.