# FALL FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL MEETING AND CONFERENCE TRANSCRIPTS ARLINGTON, VA | OCTOBER 17 - 20, 2011





## U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

+ + + + +

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE & FALL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL MEETING

MONDAY OCTOBER 17, 2011

+ + + + +

The Council met in Salons A and B of the Crystal Ballroom of the DoubleTree by Hilton Hotel Washington DC-Crystal City, 300 Army Navy Drive, Arlington, Virginia, at 10:30 a.m., James R. Jacobs, Chair, presiding.

## PRESENT

JAMES R. JACOBS, Stanford University, Chair STEPHANIE BRAUNSTEIN, Louisiana State University

HELEN BURKE, Minneapolis Central Library STEPHEN M. HAYES, University of Notre Dame PEGGY ROEBUCK JARRETT, University of Washington

SHARALYN J. LASTER, The University of Akron DONNA LAUFFER, Johnson County Library SUSAN LYONS, University of Rutgers-Newark School of Law

JILL A. MORIEARTY, University of Utah DANIEL P. O'MAHONY, Brown University MARK PHILLIPS, University of North Texas DEBBIE RABINA, Pratt Institute ANN MARIE SANDERS, Library of Michigan CAMILLA TUBBS, Yale Law School ARLENE WEIBLE, Oregon State Library

# ALSO PRESENT

- WILLIAM J. BOARMAN, Public Printer of the United States, U.S. Government Printing Office
- MARY ALICE BAISH, Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
- GEORGE D. BARNUM, Agency Historian, Congressional Relations Specialist, U.S. Government Printing Office
- HUI HUA CHUA, Michigan State University
- CAROL DROST, Willamette University
- ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED, U.S. Government Printing Office
- BRUCE SARJEANT, Northern Michigan University CINDY ETKIN, U.S. Government Printing Office LAURIE BEYER HALL, U.S. Government Printing
- TED PRIEBE, U.S. Government Printing Office KAREN SIEGER, U.S. Government Printing Office

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

DLC Meeting Kick-off with Public Printer and Superintendent of Documents

Council Session: Regionals in Transition: What Can Selective Do?

Stephanie Braunstein, Hui Hua Chua, Carol Drost, Kathy Edwards, Robin Haun-Mohamed, Ann Marie Sanders, Bruce Sarjeant, Arlene Weible 68

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

10:31 a.m.

CHAIR JACOBS: Good morning, everyone.

ALL: Good morning.

CHAIR JACOBS: Colleagues, friends, future friends. I'm James Jacobs. I'm from Stanford University. I'm the Chair of the Depository Library Council for this year and I would like to welcome you to the first annual Depository Library Conference.

I say first annual because this is the first year that we are only going to have one physical conference in the fall and we hope to have a virtual conference but this is the first year where we will only have one conference rather than the customary fall and spring conferences.

I hope for an inspiring collegial filled conference with discussions and strategizing about the the FDLP and preservation of and government access to information.

This year Council has instituted a

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

set of five working groups centered around some of the main issues or main themes of importance to the community so quickly I would just like to run through them so that the community knows and can put a name or several names to the different working groups.

The working groups are as follows:
The Regional Selective Issues. We have
Stephanie Braunstein, Arlene Weible, and Ann
Sanders on that group.

Public Libraries with Helen Burke,
Donna Lauffer, and Steve Hayes.

Education and Training with Debbie Rabina, Camilla Tubbs, and Peggy Jarrett.

Collections and Metadata with myself, Jim Moriearty -- Jill Moriearty, not Jim. Jill Moriearty and Dan O'Mahony.

And GPO Infrastructure and Technology with Shari Laster, Sue Lyons, and Mark Phillips.

The working groups are a way to lead the Council discussion. We'll have Council sessions today and tomorrow and those working groups will lead those discussions and

focus our work around those issues.

You can find a description of the talks in the schedule and a list of panelists as well in the conference schedule. Through these working groups we hope to focus and collect the community's feedback and gauge the community pulse in order to advise GPO in a better and more timely fashion.

Please track us down during morning coffee with Council sessions and throughout the conference as well as online in whatever way you want so we can talk more about these and other issues of importance to the FDLP.

Please, though, be considerate of Council and do not try and chorale us right after the conclusion of our Council session as we are heading for a bio break. That is still important for us to do that. Coming out of the bathroom, no problem.

I have a couple of reminders and housekeeping issues to remind everyone of before we get to the main speakers of the session -- of this plenary session.

First, turn off your cell phone

ringers. Do I see anybody moving to do that? Good. Second, turn in your surveys. The FDLP biennial survey is two weeks. The due date is in two weeks so we need your submission for the biennial survey.

Second -- third, sorry, tune in.

There is a live blog set up for the conference at freegovinfo.info. That live blog will collect the Twitter hashtags. Are there people tweeting in the crowd?

Please raise your hands if you're tweeting. Excellent. I want more than three.

There better be more than three. There's four. All right. Thanks, Mark. Oh, good, five. Excellent.

The Twitter hashtag. There are several hashtags that will feed into the live blog so if you mix it up a little bit, don't worry, it will still feed in. The hashtag is dlc11 for Depository Library Conference 2011.

There is also dlc11f which is sort of in the past we had used f and s to differentiate between fall and spring but since we only have fall, it you want to use f,

you can still use f. Also, fdlp will get into the livestream as well as gpo, hashtag gpo, hashtag fdlp.

Please tweet to your heart's content as they will all feed into the live blog and will help people who aren't here in this room to sort of keep track and follow along with the proceedings.

A couple of other housekeeping announcements. At the end of each Council session we'll do announcements. For example, where the regional selectives are going to meet for lunch or other things like that.

I'll do a couple of announcements in a second. You can get them to me, Chair of Council, or you can give them to Lance or Bridget at the registration table and they will get them to me so I can announce them at the end of each session.

There is also a message board outside if you want. I noticed there are some flyers out there that some people have put on there. If you have flyers for an interesting projects or something that you are doing, feel

free to put them out there for the rest of the community.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I guess I should give you those announcements that I have. Oh, the first big is that do have internet announcement we access. We have wifi access. The network name is PSAV-DTCC. I'm not sure what that for but that's fine. stands conference code is gpo so feel free. wireless network should work in all conference rooms and in the lobby.

The network name is PSAV-DTCC and the log-in or conference code should be gpo. That will not work in your rooms so you will need to pay for internet access through your rooms. Lowercase gpo.

I have a couple of other quick announcements which I'll do in the beginning but I'll do at the end. The Law Librarians and Friend's Dinner, Larry would like you to sign up on the message board outside, 6:15 p.m. on Tuesday, dinner at 6:00.

Why is it 6:15? Oh, there's a colon there. Sorry. I couldn't read your

writing, Larry. I believe that is dinner at 6:15. If it's different, Larry will give it to me and I'll announce it again.

Librarians from Florida and Puerto Rico will meet for lunch today, I assume, at noon in the hotel cafe which is around the corner here.

Last but not least -- well, let's see. Oh, one other housekeeping item. During question and answer sessions, or sections, of Council when you go up to the mic please state your name and your institution clearly.

We do have a court reporter in front here and he would really like it if you state your name and your institution as well, as well as Council. We don't know everybody. We know a lot of you but not everyone so please do that for us.

We have Council calisthenics that we normally do. I just want to ask a couple of questions, get everyone in the crowd standing up and down jumping around. I won't ask you to do jumping jacks or anything like that.

First I want to know, and Council would like to know, sort of a geography section -- question. How many of you are local to the D.C. area? Please stand up.

How local is local? Within 10 miles of the Beltway. How's that? Or 15 if Towson is a little bit farther outside the Beltway. Great. That's a lot of locals. So if anyone has restaurant questions, go to see those people. How many of you are east of the Mississippi? I guess that includes the locals. Wow. That's excellent.

Steve, you're counting them all, right? Okay. Good.

How many of you are west of the Mississippi? Whoo. Thank you for coming all that way. How many regional coordinators do we have here? Okay. Thank you. And all you new folks look to those regional coordinators because they are your friends and your lifelines.

How many public libraries? Thank you. How many academic libraries? No claps for the academics? Boo, academics. How many

law libraries? Great. Good crowd. Thank you.

Let's see. How many of you started in documents within the last five years? So quite a few new. How many of you have been in documents for over 15 years. Good. You two groups look for each other so you can help each other.

Lastly, how many of you would like to have more staff? Aw, I assumed I would get everybody to stand up. That's amazing. Some of you have enough staff. Good. Good.

I guess everyone is warmed up. Now I'll move on to the next section. It's my pleasure to introduce William J. (Bill) Boarman, the Public Printer of the United States.

For four decades Bill has been a key participant in the partic -- sorry. I'm reading his bio but it's also online at GPO.gov so I'm not going to read the whole thing. You know so you don't need to hear it again.

For four decades Bill has been a

key participant in a partnership between labor and management in the American printing and publishing industry where he gained extensive experience in fund management and turning organizations with deficit problems into profitable organizations.

Bill has been a trusted advisor to several public printers spanning the administrations of Presidents Jimmy Carter through George W. Bush and, as a result -- and I assume we could add Barack Obama to that list as well. As a result of the bipartisan relationships with members of Congress over the year, he's been a spokesman for the role of the GPO plays in our democracy.

Bill has been employed by GPO as a printer for more than 35 years. He returned to the GPO January 3, 2011 at the request of President Barack Obama and serves now as the 26th Public Printer of the United States.

Please join me in welcoming Bill Boarman.

So before Bill does his comments, we have a short video to show you so please

sit back and enjoy.

(Whereupon, the video was shown.)

MR. BOARMAN: Thank you very much for that warm welcome and I hope you enjoyed seeing some of the accomplishments that we have been able to get through in the last 10 months. I'm going to talk a little bit more about that this morning. First let me thank the Council for inviting me to come. We had a wonderful evening last night.

Thanks, James, for putting that together. It was just good quality time at a nice local restaurant and I think it's become a tradition and it's one that I hope I can continue. I must tell you, James, I like that idea about a bio break. Maybe about halfway through my speech I can do one of those.

Hopefully you noticed in the video we get a lot of use out of this backdrop. I think it was in most of them. Mary Ellen and I were talking about that last night. I think we're going to have to get a new backdrop for next year.

Anyhow, welcome and good morning to

everyone. Welcome to Washington, or Washington. Just across the river. And to the largest annual gathering of Federal Depository Library professionals. As I understand it, this is the 79th meeting of the Depository Library Council and the 20th Federal Depository Library Conference.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It's a pleasure to be here with you this morning, and I mean that sincerely. I have always loved this program over the years and working with the librarians. It's just a real pleasure for me to be here.

I would like to begin by thanking the Council for their hard work during these challenging times. To all of you here in this room, and to those of you who are following us on Twitter, I want to thank you as well for your dedication and for your service to the American people in helping them with their Government information needs.

The FDLP would not be the success it is without your deep commitment to service and passion for the free public access to the information products of the Government. Every

day you help to keep America informed and the access you provide facilitates informed civic engagement, innovation, and an improved quality of life for the American people.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It's also nice to be here in the D.C. area where more GPO employees can be in attendance and you can see the dedicated men and women who serve you and support your operations and you can put a name with a face.

It is also an excellent opportunity for you to network with each other. It was great to see so many of you at this morning's "Meet and Greet" with the LSCM staff and I'd like all of them to stand up and be recognized, all the folks from LSCM's GPO staff.

# (Applause.)

MR. BOARMAN: I also would like to introduce to you my executive management team that has been in place since I took office and these are the five individuals that I meet with almost daily that help me shape, you know, our vision and where we are heading in the future. I have to tell you these are some

(Applause.)

of the hardest working Government officials that you will ever want to know.

First I'm proud to introduce the Assistant Public Printer for Operations who is the person who's responsible for the complete plan operation which includes both passports and all of our other printing, Assistant Public Printer Jim Bradley.

(Applause.)

MR. BOARMAN: A real superstar and the Chief of Staff of the United States Government Printing Office and the person that makes sure that trains run on time every day, Davita Vance-Cooks.

(Applause.)

MR. BOARMAN: When I took over we had an Acting General Counsel and it was Drew Spalding. For the life of me I couldn't understand why he wasn't General Counsel. I worked with Drew for many, many years. As soon as I took over I offered him the job as General Counsel and he took it and I'm so happy that he did. Drew Spalding.

MR. BOARMAN: And Andy Sherman who has a new title as Chief Communications Officer, but actually what Andy does is he's our day-to-day contact with Congress. He's probably got one of the busiest BlackBerrys in Washington. He does work very, very hard in making sure that we communicate the right message back to our customers on Capitol Hill. Andy Sherman.

(Applause.)

MR. BOARMAN: And, of course, last but not least, the person who is leading us here in this wonderful conference, Mary Alice Baish who I had promoted to an Assistant Public Printer but the official title, of course, for Mary Alice which is in the statute is Superintendent of Documents.

She has been a great partner for me in this whole process helping me to understand the library side of these issues. As you all know, I came out of the plant side. I was in production so I need a lot of help on these things. I can't think of a better person.

We worked together before I came

back to GPO and I was so thrilled when she accepted my offer to become the Superintendent of documents. I'm telling you this woman is working hard for you each and every day. Mary Alice Baish.

(Applause.)

MR. BOARMAN: Now, we've all been very busy since we last meet as the Depository Library Council when we were in San Antonio back in April. At that meeting in San Antonio I told you a bit about my professional background so you know that 35 years ago I worked at GPO -- if you didn't know that, you know it after seeing the video -- as a printer.

This morning I'm going to share with you what it was like and the challenges I faced when I returned to GPO as the Public Printer of the United States. I will also speak to the changes that we're making to address those challenges.

I described my arrival at GPO on Capitol Hill this way a number of times, as the Charles Dickens beginning of A Tale of Two

Cities, "It was the best of times and it was the worst of times..."

I found a work force dedicated and highly trained and committed to GPO's mission.

And I must say that I am so proud to be able to lead them each day as they accomplish amazing things for the Congress, for Federal Depository Libraries, for agencies, the courts, and their many other customers.

At the same time, I found an agency in the midst of a dramatically changed fiscal reality confronted by the need, like every other federal agency, to reduce spending. We've responded to that challenge aggressively.

Soon after I took office, we cut our appropriations request for FY 2012 by more than \$5 million from what had originally been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget last year. We cut GPO's annual spending plan, which we are required to send to the Hill, as previously submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing by \$15 million.

We also reduced the number of

senior-level managers by attrition and implemented controls on hiring, travel, and related discretionary accounts to stem the flow of spending in these overhead areas to include a massive amount of over-hire that was being worked and unchecked.

All of this was threatening our ability to stay in business. We created a task force to recover outstanding payments from federal agencies. We called it a Charge-Back Task Force.

Essentially there was about \$28 million of unpaid bills to the Government Printing Office that had been run up over the years because agencies were taking their money back after we had charged them and nothing was done about it.

Well, I'm happy to say that in the short time that this task force has been together they're retired about \$17 million of the \$28 million. Some of it we figured out was double charges.

But they have actually collected in excess of \$11 million in cash for GPO in this

short period of time. They are working on the overall problem of reducing the charge-backs.

What a great success this has been.

We created a Strategic Investment Committee to define needs and investments for Business Units and integrate them into a cohesive GPO strategy for our annual capital investments, looking ahead to where GPO will be positioned in 2020.

As we enter FY 12 we are operating under a continuing resolution that expires on November 18th. GPO fares better under the Senate version of the appropriations bill that is pending which was marked up last month and increased our funding for FY 2012 by \$8.7 million above what was approved by the House in July.

Nevertheless, this represents a decrease of 12.4 percent from FY 11 enacted levels. Though we do not yet know what the final appropriations will be for GPO, it will clearly be a reduction from last year and less than our budget request.

In this we are no different from

any other agency of the legislative branch of the Government overall, as anyone who has been watching the appropriations process this year can tell you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

spending reduction Our and recovery efforts are helping us compensate for the appropriations cuts we're facing. additional revenue pursuing opportunities including the expansion of secure credentialing for federal agencies and leasing space in the GPO headquarters building to other federal agencies.

They actually mandated the Public Printer in a House report that I have to find tenants for this space and create opportunities for income they as cut our budget. So we are working on that and I think there are some exciting opportunities for us as the meetings that we've had on this have shown.

We're also proposing expanding our printing procurement capability, and this should be of great interest to you, for federal agencies to improve savings on

Government printing for the taxpayers. If it gets into our program, the taxpayer is going to get the best price execution because of the way we run our procurement program.

We are anxious to do that. We estimate there's about \$800 million more work out there that is done by agencies and does not come through the GPO. Moving more of that work to GPO for procurement will reduce the taxpayer's cost, as I mentioned, for printing and expand job opportunities in the private sector where we already create about 70,000 jobs a year.

And they will also support the FDLP by reducing the incidence of fugitive documents in those cases where that continues to be a problem for creating comprehensive print collections. Like other federal agencies we are having to do more with less. So far the approach we are taking is showing results and our finances are holding steady.

You know that by law and regulation GPO provides the House and Senate offices and committees printed copies of the Congressional

Record and the Congressional Record Index.

And on behalf of the Office of the Federal

Register we also provide them with copies of

the Federal Register, Federal Register Index,

and the Code of Federal Regulations.

With these titles available on GPO's Federal Digital System, or FDsys, and recognizing the changing printing needs of Congress, we decided it was time to determine the necessity for the printed versions of these publications.

In May, GPO developed and conducted the first-ever online survey of congressional offices and committees to determine those needs.

There was about a 50 percent response rate, with many, but not all, offices and committees requesting a reduction in or opting out of receiving these publications leading to a reduction of several hundred copies of the Record printed daily.

Reductions have also been made in other print documents received by congressional offices.

This unprecedented effort by us,
proactive going out asking people do you need
these documents has been praised by the House
Appropriations Committee in its report to GPO
and we have been assisted in this by Dear
Colleagues letters from the Chairman of House
Administration and the Ranking Member, and

It sends a strong signal that we share fully in Congress' efforts to help control its printing costs and improve its information service availability.

also from the Senate Rules and Administration

committees.

One hundred and fifty years ago GPO set type by hand. Today we use hand-held devices to download and read documents. The latest development in GPO's digital information services tracing directly to the passage of the GPO Access Act in 1993 which many of you in this room made possible.

With investments in new technologies GPO is increasing digital services to Congress by meeting the House's requirement for posting more electronic

records; working with the library of Congress to digitize historical copies of the Statutes at Large and Congressional Record for ingest into the Federal Digital System; and piloting the online distribution of court documents.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We've also signaled our strong support for legislation that is now pending providing for online access to Federal agency reports required to be filed with Congress. All of these efforts mean access information for of Government members the public who your institutions serve.

Last month while American's everywhere solemnly observed the 9/11 attacks on our homeland, GPO made available for the first time an official edition of the 9/11 Commission Report in eBook format. By making this historic report available in format, GPO is providing the public with greater access to the content of the report and the details of one of the most tragic days in our Nation's history.

The 9/11 Commission Report is just one of more than 200 eBooks that GPO makes

available for purchase. GPO is using latest technology in its role as the digital information provider for the Federal variety of Government to make а titles available that appeal to the public.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Other eBook titles include Wings in Orbit (a legacy of the space shuttle program) and The Financial Crisis Inquiry Report, as well as the Public Papers of President Obama which I personally told the President about when I visited the Oval Office in March.

growing eBook GPO's market is another example of how the agency has itself to remain transformed relevant and viable in today's digital age.

At the same time, we recognize that many people continue to need printed products and, therefore, each of these important titles was distributed to Federal depository libraries in print.

The same is true in Congress. As our survey has shown, print is still a valuable format in the legislative process, a fact noted by the Clerk of the House in

testimony on congressional information this past summer.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We are working with our oversight committee to enhance and manage the transition from print to electronic for congressional and other Government information. This has resulted in a significant reduction in printing.

For example, when the Congressional Record was first put online on GPO Access in 1994, we were printing about 20,000 copies per night that the Congress was in session. Now we print only about 3,200 overall, a reduction of more than 80 percent and the number continues to drop as the result of our survey, achieving ongoing savings.

In the meantime, the transition has been orderly and no one has been deprived of the information products they need for their in Congress, the agencies, the believe libraries. Ι that this orderly transition is the path we should continue to I've testified about this on numerous follow. occasions on Capitol Hill.

I've made the point over and over again on the Hill that I think it resonates with those who make use of the work we produce, regardless of the legislative calls we seen in this Congress and elsewhere to stop printing legislative bills.

As the Government's digital information platform we fully recognize that we have actively been promoting the value of digital technology for Government publications.

But we've also pointed out the continued utility of print documents that there is a false economy if the digital alternative is used to download and print out copies of publications in offices throughout Congress and across the Government.

Office printer systems produce copies at about 7 cents per page, compared with GPO's high-speed technology that we have available to print with where we can do the same amount for about 5 cents per page down to about a penny a page depending on what kind of press we're on. That's not an expense that the

Congress can afford and we want to make sure that they don't make that mistake.

I recently attended, and you saw a little clip about this in the video, a celebration at Towson University's Cook Library and had the honor of welcoming them into the Federal Depository Library Program. It was a most wonderful experience.

I have to tell you, I've told a few people this this morning, of all the really neat and great things I've done as Public Printer, this was one that I really enjoyed participating in. I was treated so well by the folks at Towson. It was a day that I will remember for a long time.

I was impressed with the number of computers that surrounded us and the intensity of the students who were there taking advantage of all that the internet offers. The important role that depository libraries lay in provided free public access to Federal Government information since the founding of our Nation was very evident.

Representative John Sarbanes, who

designated Towson as a Federal Depository
Library, remarked, and I quote, "The Federal
Depository Library Program provides a critical
link between government and the citizenry
through free and unrestricted access to
government documents and information."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Any time we make Government information available it strengthens democracy. to have been able to For me welcome Towson's Cook Library into the FDLP Ι the documents where know Government collection will be available to everyone, was an extra special moment for me.

I would like to recognize and thank Deborah Nolan, Dean of University Libraries at Towson University and, in a moment, we will share with you a video of that wonderful experience.

Dean Nolan, would you stand up?

In closing, I want to leave you with this. I can't say enough about the women and men of GPO and they continue to make the technology strides in world of and business, remain committed and to the

foundation on which we were built of "Keeping America Informed."

We are very proud of our successful partnership and collaboration with the Federal depository libraries, and especially all of you in this room.

I would like to close by thanking each of you this morning for your invaluable contributions in assisting the American public locate and use the Government information they need, both current and historic, and in both tangible and digital forms.

I hope you have a productive and beneficial conference. And I look forward to welcoming you this evening at the reception and tour of the GPO 150th Anniversary Exhibit. Thank you very much.

There is a short video on the Towson presentation. I hope you enjoy it as much I enjoyed being here.

(Whereupon, the video was shown.)

MS. BAISH: Thank you. Gary Somerset, would you please stand and be recognized?

Gary is the voice behind all of these wonderful interviews.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Good morning. Let add me mу gratitude to all of you for joining us here this week. I would like to welcome DLC Chair James Jacobs, all the members of the Depository Library Council, especially five new members. I've enjoyed working with the Council since the meeting in San Antonio last April, and I really thank you for your support and all of your commitment to the program.

Public Printer Boarman has described how exciting the event last month at Towson University was for him and it was, indeed, a wonderful celebration.

What we also celebrated that day, as you saw from the video, was a strong connection between the Federal Depository Library Program and members of Congress. Rep. John Sarbanes and his father, Senator Paul Sarbanes, eloquently expressed their commitment to the purpose and foundation of the FDLP.

That is, the importance of the free flow of information in a democratic society and the necessity for the public to be informed about its government and its workings to allow effective participation in the democratic process.

Depository libraries are a public good, a form of social capital, that support civic engagement, active public participation, dialogue, and problem solving, virtues that foster a better quality of life in our communities.

I would like to also personally thank Debbie Nolan, Dean of Towson University Libraries, for recognizing this civic responsibility and for her commitment to the FDLP.

I would also like to thank Ashley Dahlen, one of our wonderful outreach librarians, who is sitting somewhere in the audience, for working with Cook Library staff over the summer. And also for her assistance in coordinating the wonderful event that we saw in the video.

In this time of shrinking budgets, when we are all doing more with less, I know it is often difficult to be away from your library. So to all of who have made the trek to Arlington to participate in this meeting and conference, thank you! For those of you who could not be here, but are following us on Twitter, I appreciate the time you are taking out of your busy schedule to follow us virtually.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

sacrifices These personal are indicative of your dedication and commitment to furthering the mission of the FDLP. recognizes that the success of the Program is due in no small part to the access library provides, to both print and digital content, and the excellent level of services each of you provides, on a daily basis, to contribute to GPO's mission of "Keeping American Informed."

I would like to introduce and than the Library Services and Content Management directors who serve as my senior management team: Laurie Hall, Robin Haun-Mohamed, and Ted

Priebe.

It is with very mixed feelings that I announce that Ted, who became LSCM's Director of Library Planning and Development in 2006, has accepted a new position to fill a vacancy at GPO as one of the Directors within our Customer Services business unit.

I would like to recognize and thank

Ted for his fine leadership of our division

and especially for the strong support he has

given me since he became LSCM Acting Director

last March. GPO needs Ted's talents

and experience in our Customer Services until

and this is a great opportunity for him,

although he will be sorely missed by us all.

Lance Cummins and his Education and Outreach staff have worked hard, once again, to provide the perfect venue, agenda, and programming for this meeting and conference and I thank all of you.

It was great to see so many of you this morning at our LSCM Meet and Greet. I am pleased that our D.C. location allows more of our dedicated staff to participate in this

meeting, including several who joined us during the past year.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

You'll see that we are all easily identifiable by our "GPO Staff" badge, so please take advantage of the opportunity to network with us throughout the conference.

I am also very pleased that my colleague, Herbert Jackson, GPO's Publications and Information Sales Director, is able to join us this week, along with several of his staff who have a table out in the exhibit area. Welcome, Herb.

## (Applause.)

I would also like to especially express my gratitude to all of you who submitted such wonderful program proposals or are participating in giving presentations throughout the conference.

We have great of а array educational programs and it is your active participation that will help this make conference a success. Peer to peer education and training is such an important part of our collaboration with you so thank you all.

Let me now provide you with a quick update on our FY 2012 Appropriations since I know that is of great interest to you. As the Public Printer mentioned, GPO, like the rest of the federal Government, is operating under a continuing resolution that allows agencies to operate at fiscal year 2011 levels.

The House passed its version of the FY 2012 legislative branch bill in July and the Senate marked it up in September. For those of you unfamiliar with the GPO budget, there are three components: Congressional Printing and Binding, the Revolving Fund, and the Superintendent of Documents Salaries and Expenses.

It's the Salaries and Expenses portion of the appropriation that funds our cataloging and indexing programs; the Federal Depository Library Program; the International Exchange Program with the Library of Congress; and the by-law distribution to Members of Congress and other Government agencies. In addition, it funds annual operational costs for the Federal Digital System.

Both the House and the Senate initially recommended \$35 million for S&E for FY 2012. We also received authority to apply to this amount an additional \$2.7 million left over from unused funds from FY 2006, making an effective total of \$37.7 million for the coming year. This is a cut of about percent.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A House floor amendment reduced their amount by \$1.5 million but we hope the higher level will prevail during the conference.

In view of other funding reductions at GPO, which Mr. Boarman mentioned earlier, and elsewhere in the legislative branch, we believe the prospective cut to Salaries and Expenses will be manageable and we have already begun to prioritize projects.

I will continue to keep you informed of our budget situation through our new monthly e-newsletter, the FDLP Connection.

We follow the discussions on GOVDOC-L and other listservs, and are well aware of the messages many of you have posted

about the importance of contacting Members of Congress in support of GPO's funding request.

Thank you for your willingness to participate in the legislative processes in support of the FDLP.

Now for an update on several new collections in FDsys. Many of you may recall a year ago GPO received a letter from the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, Senator Chuck Schumer, authorizing us to work in collaboration with the Library of Congress to provide online public access to documents that are of the utmost importance to Congress and to the public.

Specifically, they are the historical volumes of the United States Statutes at Large and the bound Congressional Record, and the Constitution of the United States: Analysis and Interpretation, or CONAN.

I would like to update you on the progress we have made.

First, the United States Statutes at Large digitized versions from 1951 to 2002 including volumes 65 through 116 are now all

available as a new collection on FDsys.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Second, the bound Congressional Record upon completion of this project the online collection of the bound Congressional Record will include volumes dating from 1873, when it began publication, through 1997.

The 1998 through 2002 volumes are already available online through FDsys.

The historical digital files will have the same search functions, content management capabilities, and authentication as the volumes already available online. This is an extremely important partnership with GPO and the Library of Congress.

As with the Statutes at Large project, the Library will digitize the volumes and GPO will create the metadata and ingest into our bound Congressional collection. At this time, the Library has begun the digitization and we are working with them to development requirements metadata.

We were also directed by Senator Schumer to work with the Congressional

Research Service to create a new authoritative and dynamic online version of the Constitution Annotated of the United States: Analysis and Interpretation.

We plan its launch on FDsys to accompany the publication of the print Centennial Edition in January 2013. As you know, CRS publishes supplements to CONAN every two years.

We are very excited about developing this new online version because it will provide members of Congress, interested parties, and certainly the general public three to five updates every year, improved navigability and enhanced search functions.

Since GPO's Federal Digital System became the system of record in December 2010, we have also been collaborating with other Federal agencies to bring important new content into FDsys.

GPO is delighted to be working with the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to bring a new collection into FDsys, the United States Courts Opinions. The collection contains electronic opinions from the Federal appellate, district, and bankruptcy courts. We initially are testing with three courts:

The United States Court of Appeals for the Eight Circuit; the United States District Court District of Rhode Island; and the United States Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of Florida.

After testing the number of courts participating in the pilot will expand to twelve and then to more than thirty. The pilot recently moved into our public beta testing, and Tuesday morning, during the 10:30 to noon time slot, you will have the opportunity to see a demonstration of this new collection.

We are very interested in your feedback and hope you will provide us with your comments and suggestions. For those of you following us on Twitter, we want to hear from you as well. Please send any comments about the new Courts collection to askGPO where there is a category under FDsys for New

Collections/US Courts Opinions.

Moving to other areas, GPO is a trusted steward of authentic online Federal government information and maintains control over the content life cycle in a preservation system.

GPO's authentication policies and technologies are developed around a user-centric approach to content authentication, where we provide a suite of tools to help users make determinations about the authenticity of a particular piece of content.

As the field of content authenticity develops, technology changes, and user requirements are identified, GPO's policies and technologies will continue to evolve.

To this end, GPO demonstrated its leadership in this arena by partnering with the Library of Congress in creating the Content Authentication Working Group to bring agencies together to define common guidelines, methods, and best practices to authenticate digital content.

Several of us from GPO, the Library of Congress, and the Congressional Research Service, have come together as an informal steering committee and we realized quickly that among our first tasks would be to create a glossary so that we all have a common understanding of some basic vocabulary such as words authentic, do the integrity, verification, chain of custody, and really mean.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The agencies participating in this Working Group share the belief that common authentication guidelines and best practices will enhance the exchange of research results and developments, will encourage collaborative authentication practices for projects among federal agencies and institutions, and provide the public with an enhanced level of trust in the authenticity of Federal information products.

Many of you expressed the need for more training so I am going to talk a little bit about how we have enhanced our training efforts. I am proud to say, as I mentioned

earlier, that we have more educational programs on the agenda for this conference than we have ever had in the past. One of my goals as Superintendent of Documents is to expand and enhance our in-person and virtual training efforts as much as possible.

As a first step, an LSCM team has just completed a comprehensive curriculum on the use of FDsys with 33 training modules ranging from basic, advanced, and citation searching to tracking, legislation and regulations, and helpful tips and tricks for performing specific searches.

They have written detailed scripts and developed materials that include step-by-step instructions that will be recorded by Gary Somerset and made available on the FDsys website.

In addition, beginning in November we will offer staff from GPO and federal agencies free monthly training courses on the use of FDsys through the GPO Institute at our North Capital location. Also next month LSCM staff will begin to offer training to

Congressional staff and committees.

Another important training program we are developing in collaboration with the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and the American Association of Law Libraries is to teach members of the public how to become proficient in using PACER, the fee-based Public Access to Court Electronic Records tool that provides information from the federal courts.

The program will be open initially to Federal Depository Libraries and subsequently to public libraries and to Public Law Libraries. Federal depository libraries that participate in the PACER: Access and Education Program will be exempt from the first \$50 of quarterly usage fees.

Building on activities already performed in libraries, Program participants will develop training materials and conduct training sessions. We would like to thank the San Bernardino County Law Library and the Law Library of Congress for beta testing procedures and developing training materials.

We are now opening up the program to fifty more depository libraries. I invite you to attend the program Tuesday from 8:30 to 10:00 where we will be demonstrating this new wonderful training program. Be sure to bring your laptop or netbook to the session and turn it into a "hands-on" event.

Just very briefly, I would like to mention that I am pleased to announce that LSCM is ramping up the harvesting of Federal online content. A Web Harvesting Task Force was appointed this summer and is being lead by preservation librarian David Walls.

The Task Force has been planning an automated harvesting pilot that will be outsourced to Internet Archive's Archive-It Web harvesting service.

The one-year contract with the Internet Archive is for 1,500 URLs, or 3.2 terabytes of content. While files initially will be hosted on Internet Archive servers, GPO will retain ownership and they will be migrated into FDsys.

We've also discussed the need as we

move into automated harvesting of agency websites to continue to harvest single PDF publications when that is the only relevant in-scope content on an agency website using Heritrix.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

As we look at redesigning the LSCM workflow, we are committed to cataloging all harvested content and creating a record for that content in the Catalog of Government Publications.

If you're interested in learning more about our harvesting activities, David will be speaking about this project during the LTIS Update Tuesday morning at 10:30.

Now, for just some quick last minute reminders:

James has already reminded about the Biennial Survey and I want to thank so many of you who have already completed and It provides us with submitted your survey. information concerning important the conditions individual οf both depository libraries and the Depository Library program as a whole.

Please post any questions you have to the Community Forum where they will be promptly answered by our staff.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Second, don't forget to subscribe to our new monthly electronic newsletter. IN August we launched the first issue of the FDLP Connection which highlights projects and activities and achievements at GPO and throughout the FDLP community.

Each issue features columns myself and the Chair of the Depository Library Council; information from LSCM staff about our organization; and, most importantly, insights and news articles that all of you and your colleagues are providing for us. We also the FDLPConnection to focus use on our partnerships in a monthly Spotlights on FDLP of the month.

Please know that you can subscribe to the FDLP Connection from the Desktop.

Third, in order to solicit your ideas or questions throughout the conference, you will find at the registration desk a very colorful purple box along with suggestion

cards. Please feel free to submit any questions or comments through that opportunity. If you put your name on your card, our staff will try to get back to you during this week.

Last but not least, I hope you will all join us for this evening's Open House at GPO from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. where you will visit our wonderful exhibit and our beautiful newly redesigned bookstore.

The reception is going to be held in the Visitors' Center and also in the Bookstore where you will receive a 50 percent discount off any purchases you take home with you. Please be sure to refer to the flyer in your packet.

Now I have the great privilege of introducing a very familiar face, George Barnum, GPO's Agency Historian/Congressional Relations Specialist. George did a remarkable job as chair of our 150th Anniversary Committee and he contributed greatly to making our yearlong celebration such an overwhelming success.

Please join me in welcoming George Barnum. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BARNUM: Thank you, Mary Alice. It's a pleasure, as always, and a privilege to stand up in front of you yet again and tell you a little bit about what we've been doing to observe this 150th anniversary of ours.

You've heard me talk about our planning now for a couple of years almost and it was very exciting to see it finally roll into action. We planned events throughout this year and it's been very exciting and very gratifying to see the response that we've gotten to all of our projects.

The first of the events was really targeted to the GPO family, the GPO employees.

That was on the anniversary itself on March 4th. Mr. Boarman very kindly offered up the use of his office suite for an open house for the entire staff on all three shifts.

It was an opportunity that interestingly a lot of people had never had before to see the office where he works and

the lovely conference room that is attached, and to get a chance to see a lovely new display of historic GPO photographs that we selected and reframed and hung for the occasion so it was a very festive day.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

That got us rolling. In June then we opened the 150th anniversary exhibit, Keeping American Informed. We opened it twice. We opened it on June 15th for the GPO staff. Kept it open for a week for them. Then opened it to the public on the 21st.

At the same time we published our official history Keeping American new Informed, which you have received in your depository shipment. Ιf I had a piece of advice to offer anybody doing this kind of thing, again I would say don't do this. Don't publish a book and open a major exhibition on the same day.

To give you an example of what that felt like, a couple of days before the exhibit opened I was walking very fast with several wall panels that are six-and-a-half or seven feet tall on a cart through the bindery and

one of the bindery supervisors said, "Have you got a minute?" I said, "Okay, yeah. I guess so. What?"

Away we went and he took me to see the book on the bindery line being bound. It's not very many authors who get the privilege of not only seeing it on press, which I got to do a few weeks before, but seeing it on the bindery line.

They handed me the first couple of copies that I got to touch and they were still hot up the spine. That was great thrill. Then I had to get back to delivering those panels and working.

The opening of the exhibit was especially exciting for us because everything about the exhibit was done by GPO staff. We did hire a very fine exhibit design firm, and I see Linda McNamara, our designer, here. We were very grateful for the gorgeous design that they gave us.

But from there on everything was done by members of the GPO family. When you see it this afternoon please keep that in mind

that it's a labor of love on the part of a lot of very dedicated GPO employees.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We've taken about 700 people through the exhibit. That is above all the GPO staff who have seen it and all of people who attended the two receptions. That's just people in the 8:00 to 4:00 every day that we've counted noses.

We've also been very fortunate that the exhibit has been reviewed in Government Information Quarterly in the current issue. If you haven't seen that yet, go look it up. August Imholtz wrote a very lovely review that we are very proud of.

We have a couple more events coming up that will highlight the exhibit and its impact in the coming months. We are doing a project with some old GPO display type and that's in cooperation with the Corcoran School of Art. That will be coming up in November. We are staging a mini symposium as well later on this year.

The exhibit will close at the end of December and we are already working --

already? We are working on the next what will appear in the space next.

Last, but certainly not least, I need to recognize the absolutely invaluable help that we received from several of you in the community in lending us material that you'll see on display this afternoon. I'm going to call names of folks who are here and I would like you to stand up and be recognized by the whole community.

Mary Prophet from Denison
University in Ohio. Lou Malcomb from Indiana
University Bloomington. Lori Smith from
Southeaster Louisiana University. Claudia
Fitch from the Louisville Free Public Library.
Bill Sleeman who was, at the time, at the
University of Maryland Law Library. He's now
at the Supreme Court Library. I saw Bill
earlier. There he is.

And the person who has continued to work with us on this loan is Pamela Blue. Staff Hoffman from the University of North Texas. Doreen Hockenberry from Ohio University.

John Phillips from Oklahoma State
University. Although I know she's not here, I
want to thank Leona Faust from the Senate
Library. I think Manon is here, Manon
Theroux, who works for Leona at the Senate
Library.

Then there are several people who are not here; Kathy Carolson from the Wyoming State Law Library and Nadia El Anani from the Jackson District Library in Michigan. All these people sent us objects to display and we are very, very grateful. We could not have done it without you.

Looking forward to welcoming you --

(Applause.)

MR. BARNUM: We are looking forward to welcoming you this afternoon showing you through and having you look around and ask us lots of impertinent questions. Thanks very much.

CHAIR JACOBS: Thanks. We just have a few more minutes until this session is done. I want to make a couple of

announcements again for lunches. The first day of conference is traditionally the lunch when the regionals and selectives get together.

Hopefully the regionals have reached out to their selectives and made those plans. Just as a reminder, libraries from Florida and Puerto Rico will meet for lunch in the hotel cafe at noon. I assume it will be a couple of minutes after noon because we end at noon.

I have not seen Libby File from the California State Library. She has taken over responsibilities for Regional Operations from David Cismowski. If Libby is not here, then I would -- she's not here? Okay. I would be happy to meet with other California libraries.

## (Laughter.)

CHAIR JACOBS: I'll be at the registration table shortly after noon. One last announcement. For everyone who is going over to the open house this evening at GPO probably the easiest way to get there is by a

Metro. Capitol City Metro Station is about a 10-minute walk. Crystal City, sorry.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

There are several different ones. Pentagon City, Crystal City, Pentagon. However far you want to walk you can get to a station. You can go to Union Station which I believe is one the red line. You can get to Union Station. It's only a couple minutes. couple minutes from the Union GPO is а Station, the Union Station station. be redundant.

The last thing I would like to do is just introduce your Council members for this year. Maybe I'll have each of you introduce yourselves. Just turn on the mic and announce who you are and where you're coming from. I'll start at the end there.

Susan.

MEMBER LYONS: Sue Lyons from Rutgers Law Library in Newark.

MEMBER RABINA: Debbie Rabina,
Pratt Institute.

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony from Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island.

1	MEMBER BURKE: Helen Burke from
2	Hennepin County Library in Minneapolis.
3	MEMBER WEIBLE: Arlene Weible from
4	the Oregon State Library.
5	MEMBER LAUFFER: Donna Lauffer from
6	Johnson County Public Library in Overland
7	Park, Kansas.
8	MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Stephanie
9	Braunstein from LSU Library in Baton Rouge,
10	Louisiana.
11	CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs,
12	Stanford University.
13	MEMBER PHILLIPS: Mark Phillips,
14	University of North Texas.
15	MEMBER MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty,
16	University of Utah, Salt Lake City.
17	MEMBER SANDERS: Ann Sanders,
18	Library of Michigan.
19	MEMBER HAYES: Steve Hayes,
20	University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana.
21	MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
22	University of Washington Law Library, Seattle.
23	MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster,
24	University of Akron, Akron, Ohio.

1 MEMBER TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale 2 Law Library, New Haven, Connecticut. 3 CHAIR JACOBS: Thank you everyone for participating. 4 5 Okay. And with that, if I don't 6 hear any other announcements, we'll regroup 7 again at 2:00 p.m. so have a good lunch 8 everyone. Thank you. (Whereupon, at 11:53 a.m. off the 9 10 record for lunch to reconvene at 2:00 p.m.) A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N 11 12 2:01 p.m. 13 CHAIR JACOBS: Hi everyone. Let's take our seats and we'll get our 2:00 session 14 15 started. Our first session today is 16 Regional Selective Issues. We have a panel of 17 speakers and I believe Stephanie Braunstein is going to moderate this session so I'll pass it 18 19 over to Stephanie. 20 Take it away. 21 BRAUNSTEIN: Thank MEMBER you, 22 James.

Does everyone hear me adequately?

23

24

Excellent. Okay.

The little back story behind this particular presentation is that, as James mentioned earlier, we have been -- those of us on Council have been put into little subgroups or committees specializing in various topics. The committee that I happen to be on is the Regional Selective Issues.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

When we decided what we wanted to present today, we figured a pretty good topic would be the idea of how regionals and their selectives communicate, particularly in a time of some stress on regionals and some regionals have made the change from regional selective so we wanted to get some of the perspectives of the selectives involved and have them share that with you all.

Before I introduce Robin Haun-Mohamed to give you some information on how one goes about relinquishing regional status, I want to throw out a few statistics at you. We are always getting statistics so here are a few more. Some of these you may already be very familiar with.

As of October 2011 the number of

regional depository libraries that completely dropped out of the system happens to be only one. That was the State Historical Society of Wisconsin and it happened back in 2002.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

However, regional depository libraries that have changed status from regional to selective the number is now up to 11.

We started way back in 1970 with the State Library of Massachusetts; 1985 was the Nebraska Library Commission; '87 was the University of Arizona; 1990 was Wyoming State Library; 2006 Detroit Public; 2008 Portland State University; 2008 New Mexico State Library; 2009 Denver Public; 2010 Clemson; 2011 University of Nevada Reno and State Library of Michigan. That, again, adds up to 11 total.

Now, in most of these instances the state still had a functioning regional at that time. However, we now have three states which are not served by any regional which happens to be Wyoming, Nevada, and Michigan.

So essentially we only have --

apparently there are only one, two, three, four, five states left with two regionals, one of which is my state Louisiana. Alabama has two regionals. North Dakota, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wisconsin all have two regionals at this point.

What I'm going to do now is bring Robin Haun-Mohamed up and she's going to talk about what the process is that is required of regionals to drop their status to selective.

Robin.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: It's a full room, too. Hi. Good afternoon. Regionals changing designation from a regional to a selective, of course we don't like to hear that happening. We've had, as you just heard, increasing numbers that have done that.

What we ask folks to do is at the earliest possible moment to, of course, give GPO notice. There are guidelines for regional libraries withdrawing to selective status, publication guidance, that went out in AdNotes.

We are endeavoring to find where

it's located right at the Desktop. I know Karen Sieger and I have had some communications about this. If you still have your AdNotes, Favorite Ad Notes is still in there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The first thing to do is let GPO know we recommend a year because it does take time for that profile to be changed and for decisions to be made. There are some materials that the regionals gets libraries at selectives don't get. The bound congressional record, the bound serial and a few other miscellaneous pieces.

We ask that the -- there are two regionals in the state that they, of course, notify their counterpart in the state and let them know what's happening. We require that all selective libraries be notified in advance of this change in status that they are considering withdrawing.

We require that the regional coordinator and/or library director contact the congressional representative's offices. Senators, because they are the only ones that

have the authority to designate a regional and, of course, some of the libraries also have strong ties with their representatives so you need to let them know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The decision to withdraw at least six months notice. We would like a year but at least six-months notice to GPO and then again letting your congressional delegation know the decision has, indeed, been made to change status.

So for disposal requirements these are negotiated between all the parties. If there's two regionals in the state, definitely the main regional has first pick over material in that other collection if material is going to be offered up.

Probably going to need to establish a disposal procedure within a specific time frame so that things move along at a pace that everyone understands. The regional that is dropping status and material that needs to go to another library under the agreement, that requirement going to be the of the disposing library, regional the that is

dropping status to selective to pay for that material.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Then some of that material should offered. The material that also be the regional wants to keep, of course, if staying within state, that seems a reasonable thing to do. You are still serving your state constituency, but if you're thinking discarding it, it needs to go through the selectives in your state before it broader than that.

What happens if a library decides to leave the program after regional has decided they no longer want to serve in that role as in our three states; Wyoming, Nevada, and now Michigan.

What happens in that case since there is no regional to say, "Yeah, you can keep that or you can get rid of that. This is the process you're going to follow." That we believe has to be worked with GPO on a case-by-case basis.

We did have one library that left the program after Wyoming was shifting from

their agreement to pay Colorado into a nonregional status and we worked with that library and the former regional coordinator to ensure coverage for the state.

Is it a pleasant process? I think all involved will say it's a difficult process. It's a difficult decision to make. It's not a decision made lightly because, as we said, the materials if disposed of are offered up and someone says, "Yeah, I want that material," that library has got to pack them up and ship them on out.

I wish in the best of worlds that we had two regionals in every state so that we wouldn't face this prospect, but we do believe that there are some other regionals that have been sitting on the fence, so to speak, trying to decide if continuing in the program is in their best interest.

We do want to have the conversation with any library as early as possible. I will say in Colorado when Denver that was a bit of a shock. Because there was another regional and, in fact, a pretty active regional, we've

been able to weather that. The Michigan and the Nevada, those are going to be areas of learning for both GPO and for the folks in the states. We ask that you exercise a lot of patience and speak clearly when you talk to me over the phone about it because we want to make sure we get it right. We want to hear it right.

MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Thanks, Robin, for giving that overview.

What we are going to do next is different people are going to come up to the mic and talk about their experiences.

What we are going to do first, however, we are going to start with Arlene Weible from Oregon who is going to come up and say a few words about their kind of unusual situation with their regionals. She will introduce also Carol Drost from Willamette who is in that area and they will talk to you for just a moment now.

MEMBER WEIBLE: Hi. I also wanted to mention that we are going to try to do all our presentations and then we'll open it up

for questions. We assume we'll have many questions.

I'm just going to talk a little bit about the organizational structure we have for the regional services in the state or Oregon and give you a little bit of background.

As Stephanie mentioned, Portland State University. Basically what happened there is the community in Oregon had increasing difficulty communicating with the regional. We were not getting phone calls returned and that kind of thing.

Because we were concerned about the situation, we knew there had been a staffing change at the institution, we were concerned about what was going on in terms of their commitment to continuing to provide regional service.

A group of librarians through our local state documents group called DIGOR actually set up a meeting with the library director at Portland State. We talked about the situation.

What was really heartening for

those of us who did go to that meeting, we saw
that there was clearly a commitment to
continuing to be part of the depository
program but a real uncertainty about their
ability to continue to provide the level of
service that is really required of regionals
both in terms of keeping collections but also
in providing the outreach and services that
are required.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Basically what we found library director who was turning to help and we were, you know, "Wow, great." Now we've got to come up with something. This was happening in 2006, 2007. Some of you will remember that this is also the time that Kansas and Nebraska were floating a proposal for having а shared regional.

In the discussions -- I had been attending the conferences and hearing what was going on with that -- it didn't sound like that was going to go too well in terms of having two states involved in sharing a regional status.

Having that knowledge I brought that into the conversations that we were having about our options in Oregon and decided we wouldn't look to another state but see what we could do internally.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We were really fortunate. We have Oregon State Library where I work. The state library has a very strong tradition of providing outreach services to the state. We do it in a lot of different ways. We did have a basis for looking at maybe providing some of that service. What we didn't have was a regional level collection nor the capacity to take on a regional level collection.

However, the universities in Oregon had traditionally been doing some very comprehensive collection, although they had been doing it in areas for which there were their main constituencies.

For example, Oregon State University, which is land our grant institution in the state, had always had a collection agricultural strong of materials and was very committed to continuing to do that.

The University of Oregon in Eugene had always been the strongest collection in the state for congressional materials and was very committed to continuing to provide a very comprehensive collection for that. What we realized is that we had institutions that were committed to building comprehensive collections for the regional but didn't want to take on the whole thing.

What we did is we charted out an option that is available to all depository libraries which is called the Selective Housing Agreement. We realized that we could use that tool to basically divide the regional collection across the institutions that were willing to participate.

In order to make this happen, though, we did have to decide who was going to actually be designated the regional. Again, because of our commitment at the state library to doing outreach and services.

And also because we got signed agreements from the other universities that

they were going to work with us in doing selective housing agreements the state library did agree to take on the regional designation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It took some time for us to work congressional office and with our GPO actually get designated to regional for the State of Oregon. At the same time Portland State went through the process of what Robin described as stepping down. They also are participating in our regional agreement, regional collection but they in are selective status now.

Ιt really worked well for the universities, I think, because they also, as of you know that most are in larger universities, there's a lot of pressure for space in our collections. This option really worked well for them because they could continue to build in the areas that wanted to have strong collections but didn't have keep the other kinds to collection.

For example, University of Oregon can continue to build their already strong

congressional collection but, at the same time, maybe think about maybe I don't need to collection as many NASA materials or Defense Department, that kind of thing, and allow the other regional partners to take on those responsibilities.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We have these meetings where we went through the SuDoc classification scheme and divided it all up. We had a few agencies nobody wanted because, you know, there's always going to be a few. The state library was fortunate enough that we can make almost anything fit our mission so we kind of took on some of those. We divided up the list.

the designation became Once official, then executed these housing we we have it in official agreements so agreements that say that the regional collection is housed at the various institutions and were specific by the SuDoc class.

At the same time, what we worked out for the disposal process is the method of sharing the responsibility when it comes to

reviewing disposal lists. When a library does decide to do a list, they have to organize it by SuDoc classification and they have to send it to the appropriate institution that holds the regional collection for that SuDoc class.

That was another way we kind of spread the workload of the regional amongst the institutions and lessening the load for everyone. The state library and I as the coordinator I'm the one who calls people to make sure they get their biennial surveys and coordinates training and meetings as much as I can but I always work with my partners in the other institutions.

What we wanted to do was have the perspective of someone who is a selective in the state and is now working under this new model say a few words. Carol Drost from Willamette University in Oregon is going to come up.

I just want to say that this is Carol's very first depository meeting and she is a first-time attendee and she's getting up in front of a bunch of people to talk. Give

her a hand.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. DROST: I'm also not a documents librarian but I love documents librarians. I work with documents obviously a lot. That was not really part of my job when I started at Willamette 27 years ago.

We are а small undergraduate institution primarily. have 2,000 We undergraduates and three graduate programs with about 800 students in those programs. select about a shade under 29 percent of U.S. federal publications. We have been a Federal Depository Library since 1969 so we've been in the program a long time and sort of saw what Arlene explained where the communication was starting to break down in our state. Our state is sort of interesting because we are a large state but with a relatively small population. When communication starts breaking down, people notice.

It was really interesting to see this come together, this program that Arlene and her colleagues at the state universities came up with.

I think we all are grateful to them for doing this because it has, I think, brought in the smaller selective libraries into the communication and the program a lot more actively than I think we were in the past.

The communication just seems a lot more up front. I think we feel a lot more involved and our voices, I think, get heard a lot more clearly.

I don't have a whole lot to add. I mean, Arlene has basically told you everything but I do think it has been a positive thing. I personally haven't heard anything negative from my fellow smaller selective libraries in the FDLP.

I just think it's something that it worked for Oregon. I some ways we had some of that cooperation already, the groundwork already laid by some of the academic library consortial arrangements that were already in existence in other areas. We had sort of already this foundation of working together and cooperation which was really helpful.

I would be happy to answer any questions afterwards but that is about the extent of my comments. Thanks.

MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you, Carol.

At this point we are going to talk to people from Michigan. That's a very recent change from being a regional to being a selective. Essentially we are going to be talking to Selective Coordinators Bruce Sarjeant from Northern Michigan University and Hui Hua Chua from Michigan State University.

They are going to talk about their experience again as selectives in a state which has lost its regional. Hopefully I won't butcher too many more people's name. There are city names here so bear with me.

Bruce and Hui Hua, you're on.

MS. CHUA: Okay. Can you hear me? Okay. Our presentation falls really into two parts, a timeline for those of you who have not been actively following events in Michigan since July 2009. We'll begin a timeline of events, how we got there to here.

Bruce will discuss the results of a very informal survey we did of other Michigan selectives as to the result.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. SARJEANT: It worked fine in practice.

MS. CHUA: Okay. In July 2009 an executive order from Michigan Governor Jennifer Granholm abolished the Department of History Arts and Libraries and transferred the Library of Michigan to Department Education. The executive order included eliminating or transferring to other suitable institutions to federal documents depository.

In August the same year in an executive directive the governor specified that collections at the Library of Michigan encouraged collection remain open but transfers, specifically the depository and others as well.

September of the same year the Governor authorized Michigan Center for Innovation and Reinvention Board to examine repurposing the Library of Michigan of which houses, of course, the depository collection.

In 2010 we had something positive.

The Library of Michigan celebrated the 150th

anniversary as a Federal Depository Library so

4 there is a timeline and booklet available

5 outside.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

In February 2010, though, there was an announcement that the collections would be downsized at the Library of Michigan but services would continue. However, the Library of Michigan was effectively eliminated as a regional in the future.

In May 2010 there were four state regional focus groups with GPO, Michigan, Michigan Depository Library of directors and coordinators identify to alternative stewardship for the regional federal depository collection and possibly the state-level coordination oversight performed by the Regional Federal Depository Library, i.e., regional services.

In June 2010 the board met and recorded and it was really recommended that the Michigan Library and Historical Center remain what it was created to be, the people's

building but it made no real mention of Regional Federal Depository Library services.

In July 2010 the state librarian Nancy Robertson asked selectives to indicate if they were willing to house any part of the regional collection. In October 2010 she announced that only five libraries were willing to take on the equivalent of 10 percent of the regional historical collection.

At that point the Library of Michigan decided to pursue discussions with two other regional depositories around in the Great Lakes area interested in providing regional services to Michigan.

Months later it was announced that the University of Michigan -- sorry, the University of Minnesota and the Library of Michigan were in discussion for Minnesota to serve as Michigan's regional.

January 2010 volunteers from selectives were requested to work on a task force to determine what services Michigan selectives wanted and how selectives would contribute to any new regional group.

January 2011 the group was given agenda and discussion points for the February 4th meeting at the Library of Michigan to see how we could prioritize what we wanted and also how we could contribute to any kind of greater regional group.

There was a meeting on February 2011 which included Kirsten Clark, the University of Minnesota regional librarian and she presented on the kind of services that they would offer to Michigan selectives.

March 2010 at the request of GPO Nancy Robertson solicited workable in-state alternatives to the Minnesota proposal.

In May 2010 -- 2011, I'm sorry, there was an online poll for which selectives were given two options; that the Library of Michigan become a selective depository and Minnesota's regional serves Michigan, or that the Library of Michigan become a selective depository with no regional federal depository service available for the foreseeable future.

In July 2011 it was announced that regional operations at the Library of Michigan

would cease and that work towards the
University of Minnesota becoming Michigan
regional was in progress. September

15th of this year GPO rejected the proposal
for the University of Minnesota to become the
Michigan regional.

This, of course, has been followed by a series of letters from the state library, the University of Minnesota, a multi-regional state letter, and also, of course, the recent ARL statement culminating, of course, October 1 where the Library of Michigan ceased to be a Regional Federal Depository Library and Michigan no longer has a regional.

The next part of the presentation, as I said, is going to be a summary of comments that we receive from other selective coordinators about this process and the end result. As it was an informal survey, the results are often contradictory.

MR. SARJEANT: At the request of Arlene we submitted or sent out our in-state listserv questions about the Michigan and Minnesota proposal opinions and they ran the

gambit from, "This is a wonderful idea" to "This is crap."

(Laughter.)

MR. SARJEANT: There's no other way to put it. Some people were happy and some people weren't. They were concerned about the loss of -- the impact on Michigan's citizens.

For the longest time the Michigan plan before I got to -- moved to Michigan I had heard of the Michigan plan for government documents, librarians, and the national -- something of a flagship plan for other states. That's kind of gone by the wayside, in Michigan anyway.

We believe that keeping the regional helps a stronger networks of selectives within the state and the knowledge of collections and what happens when regionals supporting multiple states want to get out of the program or change their status.

This morning's talk by James Jacobs talked about sustaining something after it had finished somewhere else. I think this kind of

falls into it. How do you keep sustaining a program like this?

Some people are in favor of this.

They prefer an in-state given the budget situation in Michigan. People are concerned about weeding. They are grateful to the University of Minnesota taking on this role.

Comments on the process. Should have been a done deal by now say some people. Frustration how long it took. Others thought the end result was pretermined. Never felt a shared regional was within -- an option from the start.

We got an email from the library on Friday who indicated that a shared plan was never really looked into seriously. She thought it was kind of dismissed from the start.

Additional comments. Lacking of particular points in the process. After the decision to pursue an agreement with the University of Michigan GPO rejected the agreement.

There has been some communication

issues with this. Our state librarian shared her response to Mary Alice's letter and she wouldn't share the letter from Mary Alice to her which I thought was kind of strange but there it was on the ACRL website further circumventing the whole thing. Okay, here we are. She said she didn't feel comfortable sharing this letter with other folks.

The GPO came up with guidelines to help selectives set the possibilities of developing shared regionals, especially if they are going to turn down interstate regionals. I think you covered a little bit of that a few moments ago.

Ample opportunity to provide input. The process did go on for a year and a half, maybe even longer. Before it was a budget issue it was space issue at the Library of Michigan and put out the call for other libraries to hold some of the collection.

Our library was interested in doing that and we were still interested in a shared regional. My director, bless her heart, is the former documents librarian at Northern so

she was -- I can only say this in a crowd like this -- she has already been corrupted. She likes documents. She understands it. Again, before it was a budget issue it was a space issue at the Library of Michigan.

Advice for you guys. Speak up early and often. Be engaged in the process. Stay informed. Advocate for investigating all possible options. Let your comments be known loudly. The listservs are very good for that.

Review your collections with nearby selectives to see what their collection strengths are as Oregon did. Keep up with weeding. Since we don't have our regional anymore we can't weed.

We'll be taking questions shortly apparently. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Well, thank you, Bruce. That was very interesting and we appreciate your honesty.

As most of us are aware, the main reasons behind most of the discussion we're having has to do with economics. We just

aren't getting funding anymore in the ways that we were in the public sector. Various public universities and state libraries and so forth are having problems committing themselves to doing more than just the minimum that they have to do.

I say that because the librarian who is the documents coordinator at the Nevada State Library in Carson City, Kathy Edwards, could not be here today to give you her point of view on the recent loss of her regional because she has no funding to travel.

I spoke with her. I will try to just briefly make remarks based on the conversation I had with her. I hope and pray that I put out her feelings in an appropriate way that doesn't conflict with anything that she would like me to say.

Her main -- let me just get my notes here. Excuse me. Her observations were that there were two main problems losing the regional. One, of course, that there would no longer be any training opportunities for libraries in Nevada because prior to the loss

of the regional UNR had been actively training and putting on programs for the selectives in that state. Those went by the wayside obviously. That's the service aspect of being a regional that they missed.

As to procedural aspects Patrick, the regional librarian, had given the selectives three to four months of lead time indicating that they had a set deadline for putting out authors list before they no longer would be able to offer.

This was mentioned by Bruce that probably if you have any inkling that you may be losing the only regional in your state that you want to be up to the minute on reading. I think that is probably really wise so that you're not stuck with space issues based on the fact that you cannot read technically.

So he had given them the deadline for authors list to be sent out. This is, again, their main problem now, even after this deadline. Of course, they met the deadline as well as they possibly could. They are now in a situation where they cannot send out

discharge lists. They have no regional to give them permission to discard.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So this could be the most debilitating problem for them at this point. It's a small state with very few depository libraries. It's medium size in terms of geography but very small in terms of population.

I believe they only had seven depository -- seven to nine libraries there all together anyway. But this is, again, leaving them without any methodology to control their collections. I am, again, just trying to give the best report from what Kathy had told me in our phone conversation.

Now, at this point I'm going to wrap this up in the sense of the discussion that comes from me and let you all have what you -- say what you would like to say. There are two microphones.

We would like to hear your questions. Ask any one of the people that have spoken a question. If you ask me something about Nevada, you have pretty much

heard it all so I don't have anymore to add to that.

We will go ahead and open up the floor for Q&A. Again, there are two microphones available for you so please do stand up and say whatever comes to your mind about this issue and please let's get going.

MS. ROWE: Beth Rowe. Is it on?

I'm so loud normally I had to make sure.

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Arlene, this is a question for you. How transferable as a model do you feel your experience in Oregon has been? Was it just everything was in the right place? The gods were smiling and it could happen, or is this really something that you see could happen in other states if the need arose?

I do think that every state is going to have a different set of issues. You know, libraries are organized in different ways. There's a different mix of depository libraries. One thing we didn't mention about Oregon is we have 20 depositories, 19 of which are academic libraries.

This notion of having -- we also, as Carol mentioned, we have a collaborative consortium of those academic libraries that already has a proven record of working together. Those kinds of things made it much more likely that we were going to be able to work collaboratively in our state because we had kind of an infrastructure to build on, or at least a spirit of cooperation.

We also had institutions, the universities. You know, they weren't interested in, you know, reading their collections massively, at least at this point, although we are starting to hear a little bit about that at the universities.

In terms of everything aligned and all that kind of stuff, it is true that the one thing that I think really made a difference with our agreement is we had directors supporting us, directors at academic libraries and the state librarian as well working together.

I mean, I had a state librarian who understood that if for some reason one of our

selective housing agreements were to be terminated, we would be responsible for taking all of those materials into our collection and he understood that, but he also had confidence that if that situation were to happen, that we could, in fact, work out an agreement.

In fact, our MOU and our housing agreement indicate that we have to have at least a year's notice before the agreements are terminated and we are very hopeful that if that does actually happen some day that we'll be able to work out alternatives.

I do -- I am a big believer that this can work in other states. I mean, I don't -- it does take institutions stepping up and making a commitment to figuring out how they can contribute to a regional collection without taking on all the responsibility. I think that is where we really succeeded is we managed to share the burden in an equitable enough way that made everybody happy.

Now, we only were working with three or four institutions total. Michigan has a lot more institutions to work with and it

becomes more complex as you bring in lots of institutions. Those kinds of situations are going to be trickier.

It did concern me to hear that Michigan while it did appear that they had the option of looking at an arrangement that was similar that was in Oregon, it was not seriously pursued, or at least the perception was it wasn't seriously pursued.

Directors have to make decisions on the feedback that they get and if they did a survey that said, you know, we could only cover 10 percent of the collection, I mean, they have to believe that.

You know, I would love to hear what other states think about could that model work in their state.

MS. FREILICH: Mary Freilich, University of Memphis. I just want to comment that Tennessee has used this model for the past 20 years successfully. We have seven libraries that are using -- are doing shared regional holdings and it has worked out just fine.

97

1 MS. WALSH: Mary Jane 2 Colgate University, update New York. 3 questions. One, and this is from me down on the floor as well as Arlene. Do you have any 4 5 kind of delivery system to get materials 6 around or do you depend on FedEx, USP, U.S. Postal Service? 7 MEMBER WEIBLE: Well, in Oregon we 8 of fortunate enough this 9 are as part 10

member weight: well, in Oregon we are fortunate enough as part of this consortium agreement we also have most of the libraries in the state, including the public libraries, as part of a courier service that helps us deliver materials around the state.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

That really facilitates a lot of the work that we do to move material back and forth in terms of discard lists, but also for interlibrary loan and that kind of thing. We are fortunate in that regard we have that system.

MS. WALSH: And what is the kind of turnaround time on that delivery courier service?

MEMBER WEIBLE: Yeah. I mean, it's stated 48 hours and I have to say in my

experience that's usually true. Folks you live in remoter parts of the state may not experience that but certainly in the main Willamette Valley I think that is generally true.

MS. WALSH: My other question has to do with the elephant in the room. Since I'm not an ARL library I was not tracking Michigan and Minnesota closely but I'm curious what was behind the decision not to allow multi-regional -- multi-state regionals since it's happened, it sounds like, at least twice. Not that I'm in danger of losing my regional but inquiring minds would like to know.

MEMBER WEIBLE: Maybe GPO wants to field that question.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: I'll hold the whole thing. Okay. The Michigan proposal was a series of letters between Mary Alice Baish as Superintendent of Documents and Nancy Robertson as the state librarian.

There was a series of discussions prior to Mary Alice coming to GPO. The decision had to do with equity of access.

Questions about sustainability as regarding turning and processes. It also had to deal with the issue of law where the assertion was made that a senator in one state could designate a regional in another to serve that state and vice versa and it can't be done according to law.

I would say that there was open communication back and forth between parties. It became clear that additional details that were requested weren't forthcoming. Why the letter wasn't posted I'm not exactly sure but GPS is not in the position of taking on letters and posting them between. We have big packets of letters so that was interesting.

It had to do with the contiguous border also, the concern that material would be leading the state, going to another state which is serving as a regional when there were deep fears or concerns. I'll put it both ways. Both those things were expressed to GPO in several of our emails and a couple of letters.

Mary Alice, anything else you want

to add to that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Matter of law. Matter of law is up to the authority that has that decision-making capability which is generally not conveyed to another party either by petition or by assumption and it is one of the issues that continue to rise over these cross-state-boundary borders.

I'm glad somebody asked So question. Really I am. I can smile at everybody again and say, "You know, your view comes out of your concern and professional opinion. The view that you hear expressed in the letter to Nancy Robertson, the party authorized to have who was on behalf of discussion the libraries Michigan, was the authority for the Federal Depository Library Program.

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster. Oh, hi. Okay. Shari Laster, University of Akron. Robin, would you be able to perhaps restate the last part of your answer about the illegal authority?

I'm having a little difficulty

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

following it and I was wondering if you could just say the same thing again maybe in slightly different words so I make sure I'm understanding and following what you're saying.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: The decision about what is allowable under law is regulated 44 USC under the under and rules regulations forth as put bу the party responsible for the program. The designation process outlined in Section 1912 is in plain language a state-based system.

Senators are only authorized to designate regional depositories within the areas served by them, i.e., their states. A senator in one state cannot make a designation in another state for library services.

MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: There is a question from the audience again.

MS. KNIGHT: Hi. My name is Rebecca Knight. I'm from the University of Delaware and I was wondering if you foresee any impact -- the legal decision, I mean -- any impact on the states that already have

multi-state regional responsibilities?

MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: And who is that question actually directed towards? Is it towards GPO?

MS. KNIGHT: Yes.

MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. I'm sorry I didn't say it before.

There are several multi-state regionals and we have received a letter of strong concern about those arrangements. It is not GPO's intention to go back and make those changes. However, in a CRS opinion given to JCP their request cross-state boundaries are not allowable.

It was not the intent of the law and, therefore, we are not approving any new ones. We don't intend to go back and yank the rug out from the folks that are being served that way. There is a significant amount of service being provided to those states including Delaware. Maryland serves Delaware, D.C., and, of course, their own.

1 | MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you.

MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley,
University of New Mexico. I'm not a lawyer
but I did stay at the Holiday Inn last night.

(Laughter.)

MR. BARKLEY: I'm really concerned about this whole legal issue because I think that, number one, on the legal opinion that was issued that Robin just talked about, that was the 2000 opinion from the CRS that was shrouded in the whole argument about administrative abilities from the immigration case that came out in 2007.

That was a Supreme Court decision so I know that's been kind of used as a means by which to rule against Michigan and Minnesota authority. Robin will correct me if I'm wrong here. As well as allowing the current multi-state agreements that were in place that were done in the '60s and early '70s.

Was GPO -- did GPO go to legal counsel to ask for a current opinion on why they denied the agreement between Minnesota

1	and Michigan or they just using previous legal
2	opinions that have been sought in other case
3	matters?
4	MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Sorry, Robin,
5	but you seem to be getting most of these.
6	MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-
7	Mohamed, GPO.
8	Dan, we did not go back and ask
9	another opinion. We did rely on the
10	information that was conveyed to us by the
11	Joint Committee on Printing, i.e., the
12	decision excuse me, the opinion of CRS
13	based on what the legal status was for cost
14	state boundary regionals.
15	MR. BARKLEY: May I ask a follow-up
16	please?
17	MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Yes, you may.
18	Get to the microphone. Hang on just a second.
19	MR. BARKLEY: Why not?
20	(Laughter.)
21	MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Because it was
22	already
23	MR. BARKLEY: I'm not being
24	flippant here. If I could interject for just

a second, that decision was made in 2000 based on a specific case. You can find another lawyer today in 20 minutes that will give you a different opinion that may actually allow you to do what some of the people in this room want you to do so I'm kind of curious as to why there wasn't any more thought given for opinion sought.

Particularly from the new legal counsel in terms of being able to kind of expand the flexibility that many of us are actually looking for and that's one of the reasons we're here.

MR. O'MAHONY: Robin, I don't want to speak for you. You can certainly answer the question. Dan O'Mahony, Brown University.

Just a quick clarification, Dan, on the timeline there.

Robin and others can correct me if I'm wrong but I think that the CRS opinion that was relied upon was actually issued in 2008 so it's quite recent and it was in response to the Kansas and Nebraska proposal which prompted sort of the first instance in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

which the Joint Committee on Printing actually had ever looked at this formally.

Even though, as many have pointed out, all the way back to 1966 the University of Maine has been a regional for three states, but all of those in Rhode Island and Connecticut are one of those multi-state agreements. I have a definite vested invested in all of this but I think it's been quite recent actually that sort of definitive direction came from the oversight committee.

MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: I believe there is another question on this side of the room.

MR. WOODS: Steve Woods, Penn State.

So correct me in terms of the timeline. When did GPO tell you folks that this Minnesota thing couldn't work? Was it in the process -- did you hear this after the Minnesota agreement had been worked on?

Because it sounded like from the timeline you guys had spent a great deal of time and energy coming up with this proposal and it appears to be that the White Knight

came running in at the end and said this can't 1 be done before the decision was made. 2 3 telling you how it sounded. MR. SARJEANT: The letter from GPO 4 5 to Nancy Robertson was the 15th of September and that's when the word came down that no. 6 7 It was a few days after that that we got her response to that letter. It proceeded along 8 like it was going to happen. 9 10 MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Can you restate that at the microphone? I don't think anyone 11 12 was able to hear you. MR. WOODS: So why did GPO wait so 13 long in stating that before they had done a 14 15 lot of work to try and create an agreement 16 with Minnesota? MR. SARJEANT: 17 GPO? 18 (Laughter.) 19 MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: I'm looking for 20 another job. 21 (Laughter.) HAUN-MOHAMED: Actually, 22 MS. 23 information about the request being approved

was not whole-heartedly endorsed from February

24

4th phone call right on through July asking for additional information on the plan asking for additional details. It was not assured

and it was not a decision taken lightly.

If I could have made another decision, don't you think I would have? This is so important to everyone in this room. I appreciate the fact that we are having this discussion now out in the open and face to face rather than petition of surveys versus whatever survey GPO might have ran.

I mean, it's a difficult situation so thank you for expressing your concerns. But I do want to say pretty clearly that details were asked and, in fact, a request was put to Nancy Robertson who did do this, asked the selectives if anybody else was willing to step forward and extended a deadline for additional information.

Some of the problem was that people were saying back in their institution that they would like to do this but didn't feel comfortable saying it within the state where everybody could hear. That appeared to be the

۷.

case because we continued to have letters and emails of concern into June about this issue.

MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Just before I ask you to speak, Mary, can I just point out that we all do know that this is a rather touchy, contentious issue. So far people have been pretty civil but I just want to remind everybody we still do need to keep that civility in the discourse.

That said -- and please, when you do ask a question, if it's not obvious to whom the question is being directed, would you say, "I am asking this question of GPO" or "I'm asking this question of one of the speakers." Thank you.

Okay, Mary. Go ahead.

MS. MALLORY: Mary Mallory,
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
Please note that was just before I went up to
ask a question.

(Laughter.)

MS. MALLORY: I actually have three questions. I'll try to just ask two. You showed us some of the comments that people in

1	Michigan made in response to informal surveys
2	and I wonder if you could tell us just kind of
3	off the cuff was it a 50/50 split between the
4	selectives? Did 50 agree that it might go to
5	Minnesota or did 50 want it to stay in
6	Michigan? I would be interested in that if
7	you could just give us a ballpark estimate.
8	MS. CHUA: I would like to say it
9	was an informal survey so it was a selective
10	group that answered. I would say there are 43
11	selectives. I believe we received seven to
12	eight responses.
13	MS. MALLORY: And did these
14	responses come from depository librarians or
15	library administrators?
16	MS. CHUA: They were all depository
17	coordinators.
18	MS. MALLORY: Okay. Thank you.
19	So my next question is why does
20	Minnesota want to become the regional for
21	Michigan?
22	(Laughter.)

MALLORY: How does Minnesota

have the resources to support that? I guess I

23

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

-

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

would just like to hear some response about that because being in the midwest I know they are not contiguous.

(Laughter.)

MS. MALLORY: I would be very curious because this may at some point set a precedent. Not to put Kirsten on the spot or anything.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: I think the person that's being put on the spot is up there right now.

MS. CLARK: Kirsten Clark, University of Minnesota. I guess what I just want to point out to you is many of those questions were answered by the letter that Wendy Loger wrote in response to -- hold on -state GPO's letter t.o t.he librarian Michigan. I just want to reiterate -- I mean, it's posted on the ARL website. I suggest people read it.

What I want to just reiterate is

-- I've said this to several people. I've had

more conversations with Wendy in the last six

months than most depository librarians have with the director in their entire lifetime.

This is not something that is being taken lightly on the point of the University of Minnesota. We are already serving South Dakota. This is not something new to us.

Wendy has put forward additional resources. That was one of the things that was mentioned. We are putting in for additional staff. She has given me the money to catalog our entire collection, our entire regional collection.

(Applause.)

MS. CLARK: So this is not something that we are taking lightly. We are wanting to work within the program, or wanting to be part of the program. It's something we're already doing. Michigan approached us.

This wasn't Minnesota going out saying, "Hey, we want to be your regional."

It was Michigan approaching us about this and we answered that call. There's not a lot more I can say in terms of we have the support of the institution.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We have the support of the provost.

Those of you at academic institutions can relate with me on this. This has gone all the way up to the University of Minnesota provost level. There is support all the way down.

MS. MALLORY: If no one minds, I'll ask mу third question because it's That is with Arlene's conversation related. in what happened in Oregon, for example, and also with Minnesota and Michigan, I about how these will be sustained because I think so many of the people involved are very dedicated and committed t.o access to government information and preserving those collections.

Even though these situations are in writing, their agreements, what happens when those people leave, when the economy becomes worse, and so on? I hope that's something we can talk about throughout the next few days. Thank you.

MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Can we move to
-- I know you've been waiting a long time but
I think we might want to move to the other

side of the room for just a second.

MS. HODUSKI: Bernadine Abbott Hoduski, retired professional staffer, the Joint Committee on Printing. I, of course, am not speaking for the Joint Committee on Printing. I'm speaking for myself but I would like to give some historical perspective.

I was the point staffer for 21 years on the Depository Library Program. JCP was quite aware of the various cooperative agreements across state lines. JCP chose not to step into it legally because on so many issues JCP realized that the law sometimes could be vague or interpreted in different ways and did not wish to do a legal opinion.

We never did a legal opinion on the JCP because we knew that, for example, Puerto Rico, Guam, and some others definitely needed help and we didn't see that in the law. I was involved in at least 20 efforts to revise Title 44 starting in the early 1970s.

We have know forever that the regional situation is a problem in our community. JCP knows that but often times the reason you

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

don't ask for a legal opinion, I never would have asked for one when I was there. Neither would anyone else who worked with me because you open up Pandora's box. Even though those programs are supposedly going to grandfathered in, that doesn't mean that somebody couldn't legally dispute them. hope they don't do that. I would say that we all recognize that there are problems with economics and people protecting collections, preserving the collections, but I have other concerns.

When documents cross state lines in large amounts, and you have 43 libraries in the State of Michigan, what happens to those publications? If a large part of that collection that was Detroit Public Library's regional which went to the State Library of Michigan or went to other libraries in the state of Michigan, that is transferred to another state and is considered a duplicate.

Then it is digitized and I know many of you in this room are digitizing certain parts of the collection. I think

that's great as long as the stuff 1 is 2 destroyed. It my understanding that in some 3 digital situations the original is destroyed 4 and not returned to the library that contributed it. I think that's an important 5 6 consideration as any. What will happen to

these collections?

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I look at it this is the people's property. It's not the property of the people in this room except as you are citizens. It's not my property. It belongs to the taxpayers of this country.

Hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars, as you know, tax dollars, have gone into producing, distributing, cataloging, protecting. Each one of us had a series of people before us when I was at Central Missouri State.

Thank God we did not have a regional. Central Missouri State University had a grand collection that was never weeded, had additions from one to six and so on. I had a wonderful collection that I got when I went there.

Now, part of that collection that I bound is at the University of Missouri and hopefully being well taken care of. We have to be considered about the future preservation of collections.

I know the University of Minnesota and others are doing this, protecting their collections. But what about other collections that come in to be digitized? We all have this fine goal.

I spent my entire life since '65 promoting electronic conversation of government publications and I also want to preserve that. Every technical person I've talked to at the Library of Congress, National Library of Medicine, National Agriculture Library, the Linda Hall Library, and many, many others are preserving their documents because digital is very fragile.

Unless these agreements are written in such a way that the people's interest are protected, not only that the documents will be preserved somewhere, even if GPO is taken to Pueblo, they can take those collections, GPO

has not done its part either in protecting the collections.

They could put them in a warehouse until we find a time that those are needed. Also that these special arrangements which only include so many institutions do not provide the tax supported publications to every citizen of the United States, every person in the United States.

Unless the agreements do that, I don't think we should be supporting those agreements even if there are just 40 libraries involved. It's a matter of who owns this information and who is going to protect it.

We, the library community, have been protecting government documents since the founding of our republic and I think that we need to think that way about the entire program and are we really protecting the interest of the American people.

MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you, Bernadine.

Barbie.

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby,

University of Virginia. This is a question 1 2 for GPO and maybe Robin and maybe Mary Alice. 3 So when I reread the COS decision it seemed lot of it had to do with 4 а collections being split between the two states 5 6 which this is not exactly -- the University of 7 Minnesota and Michigan plan, as I understood it, wasn't exactly the same as what was ruled 8 on in the CRS decision.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I guess my question is a question in regional in some ways. My question is does this most recent decision by GPO basically is there any chance at the GPO level or to go up to JCP if that is, indeed, who needs to make the decision that any intra or multi-state plan would be considered?

think that many of us Τ potentially down the road need to be looking at that and I just wonder if this is something that within the current law or possibly with some support possibly changing the current law. Thank you.

MS. BAISH: Ι want to thank everybody, including Council, for convening this open discussion. The situation in evaluating the proposal for Minnesota to become the regional for Michigan is a long and complex one.

Kirsten, I think you are among -- I think every regional librarian should deserve applause actually at this point in time, as well as the directors of their libraries.

The CIS memo actually, which was requested as a result of the proposal for Nebraska and Kansas, left us in a bit of a conundrum. On Thursday I'm hoping to convene and open and full meeting. I hope all of you are going to be able to join us.

We have talked for more than 20 years and I've been part of those discussions about the fact that sections of Title 44 regarding the FDLP are very much wedded to the print distribution model that is now the reality of the program for the best solution in terms of meeting the general public's immediate needs for current information. That is all available online.

When Mr. Boarman offered me this

position, I thought hard about it and I think
the goal that I have is to work with all of
you no matter what type of library you are
working in, no matter what organizations you
belong to that we can come together as a
community. We have always done it before in

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the past.

We can speak honestly. We can have honest disagreements but at the end of the day, I took this position in the hopes that I could lead all of us into civil discourse collection of a kind of information that we don't yet have about what the states and regions are going to be able to do in the next five to seven years.

going begin that We are to is a serious discussion on Thursday. Ιt commitment on my part, on Mr. Boarman's part and a lot of GPO staff. I think we recognize that the current law based on print distribution model is outdated and needs to be changed.

We have talked for 20 years about supervisionals. We've talked about in the

Nebraska/Kansas context sharing collections across state lines.

I also view the fact that in an electronic environment perhaps we have a much more proactive responsibility for assisting small public libraries, for assisting more community college libraries, for assisting school media librarians in how to access and help their own user communities locate the government information they need.

I'm hoping for the support of every one in this room and everybody is following us on Twitter. We will be following the Thursday day-long session with discussion on the Community site on the Desktop.

We need to collect, I believe, new types of data within the states on where they see themselves, what they see their capabilities being in five to seven years.

I will be looking for skilled analysts to take all of the data that we collected from all the studies that we've done in the last 10 years.

Hopefully if we can all work

together and cooperate, that data analysis will be able to be mapped against the current Title 44, particularly Section 1912 regarding the regional libraries and their responsibilities, and mapped as well to government regulations.

At the end of the day all of us want to improve equal and equitable public access to government information for every member of the public.

I really want to thank Debbie Nolan who is still here with us today, as well as our Maryland former Senator Paul Sarbanes and Representative John Sarbanes for reminding us of what the root and the foundation of this program is all about.

It is GPO's intention to help led the discussion. I have a fairly short time frame in mind for getting this done and I really ask all of you to assist this effort because I do worry, as do many of you, about the future of this program unless we can come together and agree upon changes that need to be made.

1	Then hopefully with a consensus
2	amongst us we can rely on you and take some
3	proposals up to the Hill. That is my plan. I
4	have communicated and had many discussions
5	with members of the Depository Library Council
6	about this.
7	Jay Miller asked three to four to
8	five months and, James, I think Council is
9	supportive of this effort and I think at the
10	end of the day our hope is that we'll have a
11	much more vigorous and robust FDLP of the 21st
12	century that is going to be built on digital
13	access and collections, as well as the print
14	collections which are needed for historical
15	research. I hope this answers your questions.
16	James, you may want to weigh in on
17	this. Thank you.
18	MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you, Mary
19	Alice.
20	Bill and then Larry.
21	MR. SUDDUTH: Bill Sudduth,

Mary Alice, first I want to thank you for what you just said. I'm glad we are

University of South Carolina.

22

23

kind of having these discussions again.

There's a lot of people in this room who have worked many years, as you said yourself, so there has been a desire to have a program which still works for the future which needs flexibility and which we need to have more conversation about.

Part of flexibility is also trying new things. If you have an opportunity to continue services in one area of the country, it's pretty hard for some people to say, "Yes, we want flexibility but, no, you can't do this."

Somebody like myself when the discussion gets very complicated, I go to very simple things like the publication that you all put out, that GPO put out in June. When I looked through that, I don't see the word "state."

Kind of what Bernadine was referring to earlier is that the law had some flexibility built into it in the first place.

If you look on page 3, whether it's the shortened version or not, the words "area" and

"region" are used and not the word "state."

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I would like to say I think we have a point of discussion. We have a lot of information that we have gathered. We need to continue to gather information. We are in a period within our libraries and in the society that changes quicker and we've been trying for almost 20 years to make some positive changes.

I think there are people out there who are doing that. Not trying to push the envelope but trying to maintain or improve depository services and access to collections through different projects in this country.

Yes, I hope we can continue to have the conversation, but when somebody like me who is real simple and gets confused and I pick up the publication and it doesn't use the word "state" and then I come here and somebody says, "It means state," I'm sorry. literal sometimes but thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. BAISH: Thank you, Bill. Ι think -- I don't know. I look around and I see faces up on Council, Steve Hayes being

one. Forgive me if I've missed anybody else.

My first Depository Library Council meeting

was in October of 1991, exactly 20 years ago.

Bill, I'm sure you recall Steve was there, Dan Barkley was there, and I think we were talking about some of the same things. Weren't we? Right? So when we look at how we have progressed the discussion, GPO is in the position we coordinate the program.

We have statutes and regulations but I want to move on beyond that for now. I want to look at some of the innovative things that have been done which in our view need some tweaks to be in compliance with our statute.

I also want -- please, community, let us look forward and let us put the interests of the American public, which I know you do, at the very heart of how we move on to these discussions.

As I mentioned, I just want to reiterate I am committed to working with the community in a very open, transparent, and collaborative way in which the voice of all

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

our documents community and the voice of every Depository Library initially and then I would like to move it out beyond the Depository Library community, the voices of libraries that are not served.

Let us come to some conclusions about what we want this program to look like, again going back the needs of civic to responsibility that Debbie mentioned so nicely and as we heard articulated by Senator and Representative Sarbanes this morning.

I want to thank Council for this opportunity to air some of the discussions that we've just had in the last hour. Again, I look forward to input and comments from all of you during the next couple days, especially on Thursday. Thank you.

MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: We've got about 10 minutes so I think we can probably get one more question in there.

You've been very patient.

Actually, Stephanie, MEYER: is not even going to be a question. San Bernardino Meyer, County

Library. I guess this would come under the 1 2 subject of point of personal privilege. 3 As a native Minnesotan and as geography teacher, 4 former I have heard 5 couple times this afternoon, I've seen it in the email discussions back and forth, claims 6 that Minnesota and Michigan are not adjacent 7 states. Look at Lake Superior. 8 PARTICIPANT: Got a boat? 9 10 (Laughter.) MR. They actually stole 11 MEYER: Isle Royale from Minnesota. 12 13 (Applause.) 14 MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: That was a bit of levity we needed. 15 16 there anyone else who has 17 question in our last eight minutes or are we ready to wrap it up? Okay. I guess we are 18 19 about ready to go on our break. 20 Wait. Oh, sorry. I thought No? going in a completely different 21 you were

MS. WILLIAMS: I'll go do my bio break after this. Rhianna Williams, Michigan

direction. Excuse me. Go ahead.

22

23

24

Technological University, Michigan.

(Laughter.)

MS. WILLIAMS: I suppose in all of this the question is what about the selectives. We cannot read anymore. Let me just say that is not acceptable. What about all of these selectives that are left without leadership? How are we to move forward? What will the GPO do to support our needs during this time of limbo?

(Applause.)

MEMBER SANDERS: Ann Sanders,
Library of Michigan, not speaking for the
Library of Michigan. You have to lead
yourselves.

MS. McKNELLY: Michele McKnelly, University of Wisconsin, River Falls, the state in the middle.

(Laughter.)

MS. McKNELLY: I would like to say
I am from a small selective in a state that
really did have a regional crisis whatever
year it was. It was in the Michigan timeline.
Thank you for that.

But I want to go to a different point and not actually talk about -- I don't have a question. I have a comment. In looking at this I see that Oregon came up with a solution internally from the bottom up, from these libraries up.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

What it appears to me -- and I'm out of this. I have no dog in this fight -- is that in Michigan there was a solution brought from library directors or from the now non-regional down instead of the libraries within going and swirling themselves up and coming with a way to cope. Is that incorrect for the people from Michigan?

MR. SARJEANT: I asked on the listsery a couple of times, "Oregon did this. Can do this?" Northern Michigan we University is ready to take on -- we're a small school but we're willing to take on part of this collection and the silence deafening.

MS. McKNELLY: I mean --

MR. SARJEANT: Without the large libraries it just can't happen.

MS. McKNELLY: Okay. Yes, that's right because without the big boys we don't get to play. I'm a small institution and when we had our issue in Wisconsin a number of years ago, I weeded like a maniac because we

7 said if one goes, the other goes.

Now, I want to say our friends at UW Madison stepped up to the plate for us and really helped us out and we all very much appreciate that, but we have to sort of step aside now and talk about this -- you know, you're talking about this collegiality.

did have two regionals but the second regional

I've been having an email argument with my really good friend Larry Romans for about a week about all of this -- all the stuff on ARL. The way that we can do that is because we can voice our opinion and really go at it.

But, in the end, it all washes off because we are not -- neither one of us have this. I hope that when we go into our other discussions that we can sort of have that kind of conversation but things are not personal.

You can have contradictory opinions about this situation.

I have contradictory opinions and I hold them both very, very closely, but I see one thing in the law and I see another thing in the way it has to be done. I'm very hopeful that this will continue on this way but that's my observation.

MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: One more question.

MS. MORSE: Hi. This is Catherine Morse from the University of Michigan. I was just going to say that from my perspective being in Michigan and being in a big library in Michigan is I felt like the proposal, the intra-state proposal, was brought up frequently.

Certainly Bruce brought it up frequently and I felt like it was kind of -- we had time to talk about it. We had time to bring it up and there was silence on that issue.

Certainly my institution we were silent because my institution has no real

desire to promise to keep print in perpetuity so it just was not something that would ever go anywhere for the University of Michigan, at I know that the other libraries in Michigan kind of look to the bigger libraries like, "Aren't you going to step up and do this?" It just wasn't something that we could do.

MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Okay. We are wrapping it up now. We are getting ready to take a break and I'll turn the mic over to James.

CHAIR JACOBS: Thanks everyone. I just have one quick announcement. There is an error on the agenda. The break is stated for 3:30 to 3:45. It's actually 3:30 until 4:00 so we are giving you an extra 15 minutes because we're so nice.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR JACOBS: So please come back at 4:00 for the next session. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 3:29 p.m. off the record until 4:07 p.m.)

CHAIR JACOBS: I'm sorry, folks,

that I'm not putting the recommendations from spring 2011 which is our next session, I'm not putting them up on the projector because my computer is being a little bit picky right now

but you should all have them in your packets.

The way this is going to work is we're going to announce the recommendations that we had for spring and then GPO staff will tell us what they are responding. Then we'll have a change to ask questions and discuss that.

Okay? Sound good to everyone? So, unless anybody else on Council would like to read recommendations, I will go ahead and do that. I thought Barry White was going to do that.

## (Laughter.)

CHAIR JACOBS: So Recommendation No. 1. This is recommendations from DLC to GPO after the spring meeting in San Antonio.

Recommendation No. 1: More integration between the FDLP community and the FDLP Desktop websites. In order to improve and enhance community access to Government

Printing Office websites and online tools GPO should explore the integration of FDLP Desktop and FDLP community websites which would linkages include more overt between these integrated websites, log-in using OpenID, alerts and subscriptions for new activity on both websites, and moving askGPO community platform in order to create publicly accessible knowledge base for community.

## And GPO's response?

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. I'm going to start with the second part of that and then see if I can ask Ms. Sieger to talk a bit on the Desktop. She's going to be going over tomorrow a lot of details and seeking some final input on our design piece.

In terms of askGPO it certainly would be feasible to have a system like that integrated into the Community site. One of the challenges that we look at in that big picture across the agency is it's currently used as an enterprise tool.

An example I would give you is if

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

ordering

you are a depository and you are

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

communicating with that part of our business unit, or you have a question to our public relations group, or you have a question to the library services business unit, we all leverage that same system so the records of request that are made sometimes are related

specifically to LSCM, but other times there

are other business units that use that.

items off of the bookstore site and you are

If we were to in considering this stand up a dedicated system strictly for our community, it would create risk of potentially having more than one system or trying to get the buy-in because we have the greatest widget that every business unit in GPO would leverage and then bluow we potentially administer that on their behalf.

It's something to ponder certainly.

I just wanted to share with you a little perspective of how the tool is implemented now. It doesn't preclude us from considering other options in the future.

In terms of the Desktop and

Community site and the integration log-in,

Karen really supported us with a pretty

detailed response there.

Do you want to take a quick highlevel on that functionality that we've got planned in terms of the Desktop and then what will come next?

MS. SIEGER: Hi. Karen Sieger,
Government Printing Office. Yes, tomorrow I
have a presentation called Choose Your Own
Adventure. At that time we'll be showing the
redesign of the FDLP Desktop and what has been
done so far for Ben's Guide.

One of the other things we want to talk about is the future of the FDLP Community site. There are re-designs planned for all three of the website. Two are underway now with the fixed number of staff that we have and the number of projects that we have at the moment we can't take all three on at the same time.

We are trying to finish the FDLP Desktop first, finish up Ben's Guide, and then we'll move on to the Community site. We are

looking for more linkages between the sites.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

One thing, for example, would be as a member of the FDLP Community site you would not need to have a separate log-in to get into, the registry. You would say, an account automatically have so we could start doing more of those. As Council's recommendation stated, OpenID is one suggested solution for that.

We at LSCM are looking into that right now. That is one of the solutions that we've looked at and we are looking at others to see if we can create more of those overt linkages between the two sites, create a system where we go to a more robust dynamic loq-in for both depositories and for individuals so that the passwords are maintained by the user rather than by GPO.

The FDLP Community site right now is set so that the password is controlled by the user and we are looking to do the same thing for the Desktop. We are just trying to work out some logistics for that now. off of tomorrow's session we are going to sit down and figure out a priority schedule for the suggested feedback that we get. "Here are some features that we want enabled on these websites." We are going to go back and have everybody put them in rank order.

From there we are going to start working on a set release schedule so we can turn around and say, "This is the functionality that is going to come on line in the next three months.

This functionality will come online three months after that," so we can get everybody on a consistent expectation level as we go ahead and try to enhance these services.

CHAIR JACOBS: Questions from Council?

MEMBER MORIEARTY: Hi. Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. That's going to be -- that timeline, the schedule is going to be released on the Connection.

MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. We'll either release it on the Desktop or the Community site. We do a lot of -- we've been trying to get more community feedback through

the forum so if you go onto the Community forum now, you'll see an FDLP web services forum thread there.

Underneath there we have one for the Desktop and one for Ben's Guide. There is an open dialogue that we have there for feedback and suggestions and we've been letting people know our progress as we go along.

We'll either figure out to put it on that forum site or release it as a news item off the Desktop, or whether or not it's set to go into one of the FDLP Connection releases. It just depends on the timing.

MEMBER MORIEARTY: Yeah. I just wanted to get it in the transcript so when everyone starts looking for it or have expectations as to how they are going to be informed about it, we've got it documented.

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster,
University of Akron.

Karen, this sounds fantastic. The GPO technology and infrastructure interest group would also love to chat with you as you

are working on developing the priorities. I don't think we'll be available at the session but we would be happy to talk to you some other time as well. Thank you.

CHAIR JACOBS: Any other comments or questions from Council?

Really appreciate your work on that, Karen. I think we're moving forward on that and hopefully we'll have a really robust web presence both for GPO and the community in the near future so thank you.

Recommendation No. 2 is -- this one's a hot one. Creation of a registry of Depository Library inventory and retrospective conversion projects. Council recommends that GPO encourage depository libraries to engage in local projects to catalog portions of their collections retrospectively.

Council further recommends that GPO establish a registry of Depository Library retrospective conversion projects as outlined in Council Recommendation No. 4. This retrospective conversion registry -- we haven't gotten to No. 4 so we'll get to that

1	later.
2	This retrospective conversion
3	registry would enable depository libraries to
4	(1) register their conversion projects in a
5	public accessible database;
6	(2) see which depositories are
7	engaged in converting specific ranges of SuDoc
8	classed publications;
9	(3) see which depositories have
10	completed conversion of specific SuDoc classed
11	publications;
12	And (4) know which depository
13	libraries have done a complete inventory of
14	certain portions of their collections.
15	By establishing this registry GPO
16	would help the community move forward and make
17	progress toward a complete inventory of FDLP
18	depository collections.
19	MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-
20	Mohamed, GPO. I think when you were saying
21	see Recommendation 4 you really meant

24

CHAIR JACOBS:

Recommendation 5 --

22

23

HAUN-MOHAMED: -- for PACER. MS.

Yes.

Do you really want me to read this response or do you want to take a minute-and-a-half and everybody read it?

CHAIR JACOBS: If you want to distill it down to --

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Okay.

CHAIR JACOBS: -- to what you responded.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Well, a couple of thoughts come to mind. The Digitization Projects Registry actually can do a lot of what you were suggesting already. What we don't intend to do because of staffing and funding is replicate in either the registry or in the CGP OCLC records where you can find a lot of this information.

If you are doing an inventory of your collection, we do want to hear from you. In fact, one of the projects that we are looking at is developing an inventory of national bibliographic records.

The reason we are focusing on records, first of all, is because we want to get a grasp of what's out there and then phase

2 of this whole project would be actually matching holdings against the records.

But right now we have a few problems here. We do not want to get a whole lot of information in yet another backlog so we are working with some students in a couple of institutions.

One was at the University of Washington this past spring. The one this fall is at San Diego Public. These students are investigating what's on the shelves that didn't come from GPO utilizing oftentimes the little x after the SuDoc's classification number.

Then we're investigating not just what's there but how to get it to GPO so we can input that information and combine it with our efforts at developing this national inventory.

We don't have the complete project plan yet but it is something that we know probably will be coming out of Council as a recommendation, in which case it bumps up in priority a bit.

Of course, with our current budget and staffing situation the 10 people that you go to, and I know everybody has this. You go to certain people because you know it's going to get done. Those 10 people already -- Lisa is nodding her head. Lisa's got two big ones right over here and I can see her going, "No, I don't want another one."

So we want to outline it, get some feedback, work with some institutions that are doing this effort, and see if we can develop that through process that will allow us to take the information from your library and add it to our bibliographic record project without forming yet another backlog.

I think the registry has already been covered. I think that takes care of it.

CHAIR JACOBS: Okay. Questions from Council? Oh, good. I had a question for Laurie so I'm glad she stood up.

MS. HALL: Tomorrow in the LTIS update we have a few slides about this national bibliographic inventory initiative or strategy that Robin already talked about. For

those of you who don't know, we kind of started this already before it actually became a name and an initiative so we are doing the shelf list conversion.

We're doing a big serials management project migrating a lot of our internal records that are in tangible format into the ILS so there's a lot of little pieces that we're already working on. We did a big project of identifying all the item numbers that were ever used in the depositories from those item cards into a database.

We're doing a lot of tiny little things that become part of this strategic initiative. We're going to talk about it a little bit tomorrow. Then Robin is talking about some gap projects with practicum students.

We're doing the Cataloging Cooperative Projects which also fills in pieces. We have been doing a lot of these little things and now I think we're putting it to a name. Is that helpful?

CHAIR JACOBS: Yes. That's very

helpful.

James Jacobs, Stanford University.

Laurie, don't go away from the mic. Maybe I
have another question for you. So are you
actively mining OCLC for bib records into CGP
or how does that process work?

MS. HALL: No, not really because we are still working on the shelf list so that is up to close to about 110,000 records that are in the CGP now. Remember we're not touching OCLC because we don't have the book in hand so we are just transcribing from the card. That's getting ready to come to an end in December.

Then, of course, there are a lot of things we didn't get to out of those cards and a lot of cleanup that is going to go on. Then we are working simultaneously on the Montana Cataloging Project bringing in those records merging records together, doing work on that. And the Florida Project.

Besides keeping up with current stuff, cataloging current stuff, that is about all we've been able to take on at this point.

Depending on the funding we hopefully have put in the budget some additional money to do some additional task orders or projects to maybe do some of that thing. It obviously depends on the budget. Did that answer your question?

CHAIR JACOBS: I think so, yes.

MS. HALL: Okay. Round about? I'm good at round about.

CHAIR JACOBS: Any other questions from Council? Questions from the floor? All right. Seeing no movement towards the microphones, we'll go on to No. 3.

Recommendation No. 3, GPO Budget. In order to improve the FDLP community's understanding of GPO's operation budget, Council recommends that GPO provide educational updates on the agency's annual appropriations request throughout the budget cycle.

In addition, Council recommends that GPO provide updates on pending congressional legislation that impact GPO activities and services to the FDLP.

think Mary Alice covered a little bit of that this morning.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. So I won't go back over some of the communications that Mary Alice gave in her update other than just to reaffirm that the FDLP Connection and her SuDoc column, as well as the calls and some of the conference exchanges that we will continue to conduct with Council.

Then for the major Library Association events and meetings we provide those kind of updates. I think we want to continue that open communique in terms of where we're at and we are hopeful for a final budget FY 12 that is as best as expected in this difficult time.

CHAIR JACOBS: Thanks Ted.

Comments from Council? Questions from Council?

MEMBER WEIBLE: Arlene Weible from Oregon State Library. Since I wasn't part of Council when this recommendation was created, I did have a question. Ted referred to

updates to Council on legislative updates.

I would assume that the intention of his recommendation is the entire community, not just Council. And I do know -- I mean, obviously, you know, FDLP connection is the venue for that but are you considering other venues other than that just to clarify?

CHAIR JACOBS: Good question.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. So at the public events like AALL events, ALA, so forth, we also use those as vehicles to communicate at that time.

It certain is a dicey road if we are sending out in terms of the budget process communications depending how they are worded that would be perceived perhaps that we are petitioning versus trying to share information so it's a delegate balance.

If the suggestion is perhaps a more consistent communication method via the Desktop or something like that, we can certainly take that as an advisement from Council if that's intended.

MEMBER WEIBLE: Well, I think what

I was trying to get at is that, you know, is there a difference in what you would update Council on versus what you would update the community on and advocate that there really shouldn't be a big difference, although I can understand in certain situations where that might be true if there is something moving fast or something like that. That is really 

what I was getting at.

CHAIR JACOBS: Thanks, Arlene.

Anyone else? Any questions or comments from the floor? Okay. Moving right along. Maybe I'll have to dance here for a little while. I don't know.

Recommendation No. 4, GPO Investigate Exclusive Benefit to FDLs for the new PACER platform. Council recommends that GPO work with the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts as it's new program of library access to PACER launches and is evaluated to investigate additional PACER benefits and incentives exclusively for participating FDLs.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Officer. Do you want me to distill

1 this one too? 2 CHAIR JACOBS: 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. ETKIN: Okay.

CHAIR JACOBS: Thank you.

MS. ETKIN: That's it. Okay.

Sure.

CHAIR JACOBS: This question is yes. Right?

Yeah. Yeah, actually. MS. ETKIN: I really wanted to write that but Robin wouldn't let me.

For those of you who are unfamiliar with this program, we are working with the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and AALL for a PACER Access and Education Program. This is all about increasing public access to and awareness of PACER and building on the education and training activities of libraries to undertake training about PACER.

Into this program we have built into an evaluation process. So that training session that is given will evaluated, we have identified success measures will be evaluating against success measures.

1 As we analyze the data, then we can 2 better see a picture where we might be able to 3 then justify or find some benefits that are exclusive to Federal Depository Libraries but 4 data first. 5 have to get that Any 6 questions? There is a session tomorrow about 7 8 this, tomorrow morning bright and early. MEMBER SANDERS: 9 That we can't go 10 to. MS. ETKIN: Well, darn. 11 12 MEMBER SANDERS: Sorry. 13 MS. ETKIN: you Do have questions since you can't be there tomorrow? 14 15 MEMBER JARRETT: Ι do. 16 Jarrett, University of Washington Law Library. When is the pilot going to be expanded to 17 those 50 libraries? It says October 18th so 18 19 are you going to --20 Announce it tomorrow. MS. ETKIN: 21 Right, and we MEMBER JARRETT: won't be there tomorrow so --22

MS.

ETKIN:

announcing that we are going to be expanding

Tomorrow

we

will be

23

to up to 50 more libraries. 1 2 MEMBER JARRETT: Okay. And you 3 will be sending sort of email some communication? 4 5 Yes, but we wanted to MS. ETKIN: 6 make the announcement tomorrow first. 7 MEMBER JARRETT: Thank you. CHAIR JACOBS: There's not that 8 many people here so you can make it now. 9 10 MEMBER JARRETT: Is the timeline to 11 then open it up to Public Law Libraries, 12 public libraries Depository or any other Library January of 2012 still on track since 13 this was printed? 14 15 MS. ETKIN: Yes. Still on track 16 for January. MEMBER JARRETT: Thank you. 17 MS. ETKIN: Any other questions? 18 19 MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Stephanie 20 Braunstein, LSU Libraries. What kind of additional benefits are we talking about? 21 think I'm a little uninformed possibly about 22 this but I'm wondering what other things you 23

are going to be able to offer.

MS. ETKIN: It's not real clear.

We can take a look at what kind of content in

PACER is used. That kind of data we can also

look at perhaps trying to justify a higher

dollar amount for the waiver for Depository

Libraries. We're just going to have to see

what kind of data we get and see what kind of

brainstorming we have.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The courts are actually doing more to provide more public access as well so this is going to be a delegate balance between exclusivity for Depository Libraries and what the courts are doing to make things more publicly available anyway because of their mission.

CHAIR JACOBS: Ι think another benefit -- James Jacobs, Stanford University. Another benefit that could happen that I haven't heard of anybody talking about, I've only been hearing about extra money to those quarterly accounts for for FDLP users libraries, but I'd be interested in exploring other kinds of opportunities.

For example, you know, I'm in

California. I might want to get metadata out 1 2 of there for the 9th Circuit or something to 3 that effect. Then I could give additional 4 to the court in my state or in my 5 region to my users so that could be another 6 avenue maybe to explore that I haven't heard 7 anyone mention. Cindy Etkin, 8 MS. ETKIN: That's a good idea, James. Actually, we have 9 10 been doing some metadata extraction from the opinions pilot so depending on what kind of 11 12 metadata you want, that could be 13 possibility as well. 14 CHAIR JACOBS: Okay. 15 MS. ETKIN: So if you have any 16 ideas, please let me know. 17 CHATR JACOBS: What kind of metadata do you want, Mark? 18 19 Mark is on the record as saying, "I want all of it." 20 21 MS. ETKIN: You want it all, you 22 want it now, you want it for free, and you

24 MEMBER MORIEARTY: The answer is

Okay.

want if forever?

1 yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. ETKIN: Anything else? Thank you. Again, if you do have ideas, let me know.

CHAIR JACOBS: Any comments from the floor? PACER is really hot. I know you all are interested in it.

Recommendation Okay. No. 5, Consolidation of GPO Tools and Infrastructure. Currently many GPO applications and databases operate independently of each other. leads to users having to search multiple find information and to to perform multiple functions in order to transact business with GPO.

Council recommends that GPO identify databases and systems that share common aspects, develop interfaces between these databases and systems, and achieve greater database and systems interoperability.

GPO response.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. So data interoperability. What we've talked about and what we've made substantial progress on is really a phased approach in terms of,

No. 1, the legacy systems that we've been leveraging for a number of years.

In terms of migrating those legacy systems we have a workflow that leverages them so we've been planning and we've certainly given updates over the past few Council meetings about that process and we are nearing towards the target of the first part of the second quarter of 2012 to being off a couple of our major, major legacy systems, DDIS and Access.

In terms of that integration, that is what we've -- I've used the term and others have of bridge stability. We have single point of support maintenance personnel, some of which are getting ready to retire so we have to first get off of those systems.

Then once we got there as we look at additional enhancements and integration, that's where we have to look at where's our budget in terms of what are the priorities in terms of how those systems interact.

When we look at tools like the Needs and Offers and we are getting ready to

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

-- we are still targeting, I think, early November on a smaller beta on that. We are using data from the CGP and it's right along the lines of what you're looking at here.

A lot of what Karen will be talking about tomorrow further extends that in terms of understanding better the requirements and the prioritization of our requirements. I think as Jill said, the answer is yes. Do we want interoperability?

Yes, but if we have fixed funds, if we have limited resources, how do we correctly prioritize those? So we hit the biggest pain solve point it and then do that and progressively with the community. think I that's the high level of some of the technical information and the response and the paperwork.

Questions or additional feedback?

CHAIR JACOBS: Yes, James Jacobs,

Stanford University. Karen, would you mind distilling your talk down to like a minute or two minutes just to let us know what's on the horizon since we won't be able to go to your

presentation tomorrow.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. You want me to distill down what I'm going to talk about tomorrow in an hour-and-a-half in about 30 seconds. Okay. It's a good thing I talk fast.

CHAIR JACOBS: Ready, go.

Okay. MS. SIEGER: So what I'm trying is really make to do sure everything, all the data that we have, entered once and then reused repeatedly so rekeying data in we're not We're calling on those systems to systems. grab that information once so it's keyed in once and called multiple times.

For example, one of the systems that we'll be bringing in shortly will be FDLP-L. That will be brought into the Desktop. We'll provide new functionality into it. GPO staff will have one system that we'll go ahead and enter this information and then it will go out to the community through that one system.

The Desktop will be able to put it

out in HTML, RSS, and then email alerts based on how people subscribe to receive the information. We can provide our users with that flexibility to decide how they want the

data, when they want to get it.

On our side we enter it once and then let the database then go ahead and serve out that information based on how users request it. Did that boil it down to about one minute?

CHAIR JACOBS: Awesome. Thank you so much.

MS. HALL: Laurie Hall, GPO. Karen is talking about things like the Community site and the Desktop. What Ted is talking more about is our -- we have legacy applications that have been around since 1982. The legacy system that handles your item selection profile.

We have a legacy application, an ILS that was home grown and home built. Those are the ones that he is also talking about that is also part of our priority where there is a lot of data that is stored that we have

to migrate to new platforms.

Also that includes the ILS and some of the migration of that internal processing data to the ILS. Between Karen and Linda Resler, who is not here today but will be tomorrow, there's lots of things going on, lots of discussions between those two folks to get together to start working on like the FDLP directory.

There are discussions underway of moving some of the applications and things. A lot of that is going on in brainstorming sessions now so there is that additional piece as well. Is that okay? Anything else?

CHAIR JACOBS: Thank you.

Arlene.

MEMBER WEIBLE: Arlene Weible from Oregon State Library. Can you talk a little bit more about what you were talking about with working on prioritizing? Because, you know, the item list is the infrastructure of what Depository Libraries do on a daily basis.

As a regional I am constantly asking questions -- asked questions about why

things aren't working correctly. I am very -I mean, I understand that some things are
easier to work on than others. I mean, I
totally get that but this is kind of like a
core infrastructure issue and, you know, it's
really frustrating to me.

I'm someone who has attended these meetings for a long time and I've heard about the migration of legacy systems for a very long time. Could you address how you are going to make those priority decisions because I think a lot of the community really wants to weigh in on some of those issues.

MS. HALL: Arlene, this is Laurie Hall, GPO. A lot of that is already underway with the 1982 legacy system. As Ted said, some people are retiring. We had to get funding -- approved funding for those.

Lisa is the project manager for that one so I'll let her talk but they are already underway. We've recognized for years that they were problems and issues but it also takes for something that big budget approval. Anything over 50 grand we have to go to Joint

Committee on Printing.

MS. RUSSELL: Lisa Russell, GPO. I have been working on what we are calling the LIST Project which stands for the Library Information Systems Transformation. We haven't named the system yet, although I found out somebody is lobbying for Lisa which I'm not in support of.

At any rate, we are going to be replacing DDIS which is a 30-year-old mainframe system programmed in Cobol which is the system that manages all that information with your items and the list of classes and all of that. That is all going to be moved into Oracle.

We are also going to be using the ISOR application within Oracle to allow you to have sort of a shopping cart kind of thing where you can go in and manage your item selection profile through that. Just getting off that old Cobol system should do a lot to take care of some of those problems you've seen in the past.

MEMBER WEIBLE: And what is your

166 timeline that you're working on with that? 1 2 MS. RUSSELL: We're looking at going live early 2012. 3 4 MEMBER WEIBLE: Thank you. JACOBS: 5 CHAIR You just made a 6 Councilor very happy. 7 MEMBER SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. Can I follow up with 8 what you said was a shopping cart application? 9 10 I'm sorry. I just flashed on an 8,000 item shopping cart and it wasn't a pretty mental 11 12 image. 13 MS. RUSSELL: It's a shopping cart 14 15 16

approach but there are going to be ways you can sort of slice and dice. You can just look at the EL items or just the paper items, the microfiche items. Ιt will actually what's in your profile. Then it's when you want to add something that you get more into that shopping cart part of it.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I'm sorry. Lisa Russell, GPO. forgot to identify myself earlier.

The other advantage of that is that you will also be able to see -- right now when you submit something you've got to wait and go back and see if your changes took. Right now you will be able to see them immediately in the system.

CHAIR JACOBS: Did you have something else? I saw you take the mic so I thought you wanted to say something else.

I think Council really appreciates the fact that you are working on these things under difficult budget situations and we'll continue to have other ideas, I'm sure, to help you along the way.

Any other comments on No. 5 Recommendation? Comments from the floor? All right. We're a little but short today.

Oh, yes. Okay.

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. I have a question for Laurie. I don't want it in the context of it's not doing enough to fulfill a recommendation because that's not where I'm coming from. This is an informational question.

You have some microfilm that plugs the gap in the historic shelf list. I'm just

wondering if you have had any opportunity to even think about how you might be able to deploy that?

MS. HALL: Laurie Hall, GPO. Actually, one of Ted's staff has done some -- we haven't been able to find a microfilm reader. We had to go out to Maryland -- to the University of Maryland to do the microfilm reader printer or whatever.

Actually, she's gone out for a couple of sessions and we've been looking at stuff she's been bringing back, bits and pieces, "Oh, this looks like something that we're going to use." So we started to do some investigation, opening different boxes and taking a look.

Oh, yeah. Robin is reminding me that there is a San Diego -- no, San Jose. San Diego? Yes, San Jose State student -- library school student living in San Diego who is working on a virtual practicum for us taking some of those things and checking her collections locally for us.

Robin, you want to tell us more

about that? This is the second one of these projects, virtual practicums, that are helping us.

MEMBER SANDERS: Thank you. I heard that earlier but I wasn't -- I didn't realize it was connected to that same film. Thanks.

CHAIR JACOBS: Anyone else? Going once, going twice. I think we may be getting out of here a little early today which is good because we're all going over to the GPO.

I did have one announcement to let you know about and I'll do this announcement again tomorrow when there's more folks in the room. Public library attendees invited to a lunch on Wednesday with the Public Library Interest Group and Mary Alice Baish, the Superintendent of Documents.

Please see Donna Lauffer, Helen Burke, or Steve Hayes if you want more. I believe they will place where they are going to go on the board outside. Pass that along to any of your public library friends who are not here right now. If anybody wants to tweet

that, that would be really good to get that into the flow.

Hearing no other comments or questions, I call this meeting to order for now. See you all at GPO. Thanks everyone.

Whereupon, at 4:45 p.m. the meeting adjourned

### U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

+ + + + +

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE & FALL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL MEETING

TUESDAY OCTOBER 18, 2011

+ + + + +

The Council met in Salons A and B of the Crystal Ballroom of the DoubleTree by Hilton Hotel Washington DC-Crystal City, 300 Army Navy Drive, Arlington, Virginia, at 8:30 a.m., James R. Jacobs, Chair, presiding.

## PRESENT

JAMES R. JACOBS, Stanford University, Chair STEPHANIE BRAUNSTEIN, Louisiana State University

HELEN BURKE, Minneapolis Central Library STEPHEN M. HAYES, University of Notre Dame PEGGY ROEBUCK JARRETT, University of Washington

SHARALYN J. LASTER, The University of Akron DONNA LAUFFER, Johnson County Library SUSAN LYONS, University of Rutgers-Newark School of Law

JILL A. MORIEARTY, University of Utah DANIEL P. O'MAHONY, Brown University MARK PHILLIPS, University of North Texas DEBBIE RABINA, Pratt Institute ANN MARIE SANDERS, Library of Michigan CAMILLA TUBBS, Yale Law School ARLENE WEIBLE, Oregon State Library

## ALSO PRESENT

CHRISTOPHER C. BROWN, University of Denver SUSAN KENDALL, San Jose State University MICHELE McKNELLY, University of Wisconsin River Falls

JOHN STEVENSON, University of Delaware WILLIAM CUTHBERTSON, University of Colorado Boulder

SARAH GLASSMEYER, Center for Computer Assisted Legal Instruction

KRISTINE UNSWORTH, Drexel University
KAREN SIEGER, U.S. Government Printing Office
CHERIE GIVENS, U.S. Government Printing Office

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

SESSION	1 -	GPO Infrastructure & Tech	. 4
SESSION	2 -	COMMUNITY WEBSITE	87
SESSION	3 -	TRAINING1	L58
SESSION	4 -	OPEN DISCUSSION 2	241

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

8:30 a.m.

SESSION 1 - GPO Infrastructure & Tech

CHAIR JACOBS: Welcome to Tuesday morning. Here comes Jill.

We've got a lot to talk about today, so I'm just going to have a couple of announcements and then I'll hand it over to Shari for our first session on GPO infrastructure and technology. We have a great panel today, so I'm looking forward to it.

The first thing I wanted to announce was that I've heard from one and all that I've talked to that last night's exhibit was, was really amazing, and I want to thank GPO staff again for putting that exhibit on and for doing that.

(Applause.)

CHAIR JACOBS: And one other quick announcement, just a reminder that when you come to the mic, say your name and your institution to help the court reporter to keep

track of who's saying what. Okay?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And with that, I'm going to hand it over to Sherry Lester.

MEMBER LASTER: Thank you all for coming this morning to our panel on electronic collection management. You my colleague Sue and him and Mark Phillips, I'm very, very happy to say that we did not do most of the work for this panel.

The idea and most of the organization for the panel came from Michele McKnelly, Kathy Bayer, and Mark Ames at GPO. And so we are very grateful to them for their hard work and their brilliance in coming up with this idea, which I think is a topic that we're all interested maybe in different ways. We have different tools her command, but it's something that we all need to consider an something that's changed a lot in the past several years.

So, with that, the order of operation here is that our panelists will each have about 10 minutes to discuss their

experiences and their perspectives at institutions. Related to this topic. have a freak few pre-composed questions that we will post to the panelists, time permitting. There will be a few minutes for questions from Council. Ιf there are questions from GPO forth the audience or for discussions, will have those as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And then we'll open it up for audience questions and discussions. I'm really hoping that will have a fantastic, fruitful discussion on both the philosophical issues at stake and the more practical technical aspects of managing an electronic connect collection.

So, with that, I would like to turn it over to Michele McNally.

And the panelists, you could just introduce yourself yourselves with your name and institution, that would be fantastic.

Okay, thank you.

MS. MALLORY: Well, good morning, and I want to thank the Council and the GPO

staff who work with us on this panel because I think it's a very interesting topic. I'm also kind of grateful that it's only 8:30 in the morning a lot of people are still asleep because I'm going to stand here and talk about everything that I have not been doing and don't do. It's kind of important for you to know that I'm coming up here and then burying my shame to the entire world, and so I'm kind of glad it's a small audience.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

This presentation of came out discussions with people at LPS and Outridge, and with Robin Haun-Mohamed, where I calling them up and saying, what are other people doing about e-collection management? How is it that they're dealing with this? Because I'm really hard time wrapping my head around the ways to deal with some of these issues. And the answer came back, we're not really hearing a lot about that. Nobody else is asking this question.

If you've been around me much, you know I always run out and have these weird

questions. But I ask them of myself, and I've been stewing over this for actually a number of years without a lot of success.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I will also say that I'm here with people with answers and I have only questions, and that's sort of intimidating. So you'll see in my slide that there are zombies in my OPAC, and I want to say that that slide came from a US government website. It's from the CDC's site.

talk about zombies, When I talking about our electronic records in our catalog that have been there for a number of years, but what we don't have is the ability actually two very well track their usage and the data. So there are some that are out there that have aged into kind of this on usability and clutter within our catalog. I want to back up your project the second and talk about how we got to this date.

Early in the 1990s, we started loading Marcive record with everyone else. We had gone completely un-cataloged collection to

loading in the Marcive records based on our print materials, and then electronic records started moving in. And we were so happy; this was great. And we just began adding them in. We added all the electronic records because we as a constrained in this collection by space. There was a certain amount of space we could fill. No more; no less.

The thing about electronic records was they were always on the shelf. They worked. They took up no real estate. They really required very little maintenance compared to what you had to do in the print world. You don't have to shelf-read. You don't have to re-shelve it when someone uses it, it goes right back there. And everyone was happy.

And we actually, at my institution, cut our electronic teeth with the government documents. We made many decisions based on those. But at that time, GPO had a firm one-record policy and so did we. Then things started to change. We now saw this as another

additional format to enhance the usability of government information. But then the changes started to take place, and one of the big changes that has happened is the development of search engines.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The search engines have become incredibly sophisticated, and we find that our users have a fair idea of how they work. do not have any idea how our catalog operates. You know, they know there are these searches that you put in, that there are titles and if you knew that, you would use that. But they don't know things. They've grown up using Google to do their discovery and being able to put in a lot of words that are spelled right and have it correct. And our catalog just don't do that.

Vendors and libraries have been struggling now for quite a while to make their materials really very acceptable, and to only a fair degree of success, I think. The observation I see in students seeking information, and other people too, is they go

to Google, then they'll go to databases.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The next thing that they do is they ask their friends, who may or may not know and, you know, there are several things on social networking here, and we see this coming through with like questions on Facebook about how to answer interlibrary-related questions. They don't ever come to us. They may go to the online catalog and then they consult with someone in the library dead last, so they're not really coming to us.

of For lot reasons, а institution, the usage of e-government never tracked. First of all, the early days of PURLS -- I don't know if anybody remembers those reports -- but you'd go in and they would just say, you have this many hits. I was in the top third, and then I stopped looking because there was nothing there for except to say people were using information. It really didn't inform our decisions as to how they would work.

The other thing about PURLS is you

have to follow the path to make the PURL data work. Your users have to come through your online catalog and click on the PURL. But that's not the behavior I observed. The behavior I observe is, once I have a known title, they go back to Google and type it in and they go straight to it and they skip a step. I know that things have changed in the way that the PURLs work and that the data is better, but for me, it wasn't worth the time to set that up.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

other thing I want to talk The about is -- I do more than one thing at my institution; I don't know if any of you do -and I manage a lot of things. I manage all the serials, all the databases, the cataloger's report to me. I do government I teach classes. information. And managing the commercial databases, what I know is serious is there а standard counter-compliant data and they've automated now with the work where this SUSHI it's harvested. I don't have to go out and seek

the data from my vendors anymore, and there's a standard that they operate on as to what constitutes a usage in the counter-data.

We also have other data that we can get from our open URL vendor, where they talk about clickthroughs, and I always have to look this ups, where someone is presented with a resource and then and there is a view. And that's when they actually go through, into the resource.

I see the PURL data as being really very much like that. It's the clickthrough you're getting through that. But once again, we have no idea about whether people are actually finding these useful or not. That is true with COUNTER also. You know when they go in. In the print world, we had a fair idea. We had circulations and it was all on an even platform and we didn't get that. So my FDLP toolbox is actually really kind of empty.

Now, back to the zombies, this is just to give you idea of the kind of materials that we hold in our collection. You can see

the online is 46,000. We're an overall collection of about 320,000. But we have this brand-new e-book set of 70,000 things that I have to load in pretty soon. So we're pumping up. You can bump up hugely with the electronic resources. The question is, how do you go in and take them back out? Because, it's easy in.

I will also say that a number of years ago, I made the determination that with our Marcive loads, that I was getting it all, but that wasn't necessarily a good thing. I started doing this very selective, adding of materials into the catalog, and I personally no longer add any GAO documents. I know that Chris Brown has data about GAO documents and the usage at the University of Denver. But we have another way to deal with that and so it turned out not to be a good thing. So we're adding in really rather selectively.

But 46,000 is a lot. You can see the print collection. The NCS noncirculating -- I think that basically rivals the print

collection, and it's pretty close to the fiche collection too.

So this is a zombie record, in my opinion. Here is one of the records that really, in our catalog, is no longer useful for us and the questions I have deal with, how do you go through and identify these? In the print world, we went through and we looked at the shelf and we looked at those materials. And even if there wasn't circulation data, we could tell if it had been used because it would be tattered and there would be things wrong with it.

And here's another one that I want to talk about. This is the research notes of the Pacific Northwest Forest Service. We had individual titles loaded into our catalog with this, but there are a variety of ways now that we can go back and we can present that data that actually is more useful to our users.

This is our open URL link resolver.

What this will do is lead a user from a resource, from a database, back into this

collection of materials through seriality instead of going through the monographic materials. So these are the questions I'm asking. It has to do with identification and how to remove things and best practices.

I have been handed a note that says "all done." But I have other questions to ask people, and I'll do that later.

(Applause.)

(Whereupon, there was a long pause on the record.)

MS. SIEGER: My name is Karen Sieger and I work at the US Government Printing Office. Today, I'm going to walk through the PURL referral reporting tool.

I am handing out to Council the paper equivalent of the slideshow. There are copies of this for attendees at the back of the room if you want to grab one. There is some detailed information that's in here, so if you can't see the screen all that well, you may want to grab one of these so you can see what data is being presented here.

help clarify some To questions about how to track statistics at institution for clickthroughs, I'm specifically going to talk about the referral reporting tool. I'll give people a moment to get their packets and sit down before I move on.

(Whereupon, there was a long pause on the record.)

MS. SIEGER: To start, what is the PURL referral reporting tool? The PURL referral reporting tool provides statistics for federal depository libraries of requests that are made to PURLs that had been created So, if your institution links to by GPO. PURLs, you can use this tool to see not only the aggregate number of clickthroughs from your institution to the GPO PURL server but, as Michele mentioned, we've gone ahead and made some enhancements to that system. you can actually see what people specifically are clicking on.

As we go through the demo, I'll

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

show you those screens where you can drill down further into the report and see the exact resources that a user has selected in the course of the time frame that you've selected from the tool.

The statistics on the site are generated daily. They are updated on the site as of midnight the previous night. That way, we get the log file for the day and then we go ahead and we generate the PURLs for the following day. So you can go ahead and get data for the past 12 months. Right now, if you go into the tool, it will tell you how many PURL referrals you have through last night.

The historical traffic right now is available for one year. What we said when we first changed from the OCLC PURL resolver software to the PURL-Z resolver software was that we would go ahead and offer the data for a minimum of one year.

Now, based off of server performance and how much data is actually

collected, we're going to go back and see if there's now a restriction on that. offer it for only 12 months? Can we go ahead and offer it now for five years? We're still determining that now. We just had one-year anniversary on the new resolver software and we launched the tool December, so we're coming up on the one-year mark for the PURL referrals, and we'll figure out from there how long that data will be available.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Once you have your data, you can go ahead and export out the reports in various levels in comma-separated value format, CSV format.

There are enhancements that can be made to this tool. However, it's going to based off of community demand as well as GPO funding and resources.

So, to get to the tool, you'll point your browser to PURLreferrals.FDLP.gov, and you'll log in with the same credentials that you use to log into the FDLP desktop, so

you'll log in with your library number and your GPO-issued internal password.

What you'll see now is -- once you go to the URL, this is the interface that you're going to see. So, from here, at the top of the screen, you can choose what month you want to pull back your referrals for. And so, in this particular example, September of 2011 is the month that was selected.

One of the other enhancements we were talking about was possibly making it so that you can choose exact dates, so you could say from March 15th through September 15th. But that is a future enhancement; is that something the community wants? And then what are the resource constraints of the server, GPO, to make that happen?

But there are other things we can do with this tool. It's just, this is what was provided as a way to get off the Legacy system onto the new, with some enhancements that were feasible at the time.

So we've chosen our time frame, and

afterward, you can put in the properties that you want to track. We have it set up so that you can search by hostname and/or IP address. You can also use wildcards to broaden your searches. So you can search by your subnet if you'd like. If you want to do something like 128.57.\*.\*, you'll find any requests that fall under that umbrella. One example I use all the time is \*.udel.edu. So, whatever host name it came from, as long as 'udel.edu' at the end, it'll be captured in that query.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So, if you want to find out how much is sent from a particular workstation, if you find out the IP address or hostname of that particular workstation, you can search for that here, and it'll pull back those specific numbers. It's up to you to decide, do you want to have a broader number based off of a more broad query of your entire network, or do you want to go more granular, based off of particular entity а organization within your system?

Once we go ahead and we put that information in, we're going to hit 'submit'. You can do up to 10 queries at a time; just put a comma in to separate the entries. And then you'll get back an initial report. This will look very much like old report that just had the aggregate numbers.

But from here, you see a list of all the properties, and to the right of the properties, you're going to find a number. That number is the total number of PURL hits that were received during that time frame. If you click on that number, you can now get a more detailed report. You can, from this page, see the aggregate total and you can also export in CSV format.

When we go down to the detailed report, what you're going to find is the first column has the PURL string. It is not linked so that you're not skewing your statistics at all. On the next one, you're going to find the target URL, and that is where the user would have gone once the PURL redirected to

the resource. The next will be the number of hits that that resource received. And finally, you're going to find a link to the CGP. You can actually get to the exact CGP record out of that particular PURL.

So from here, you can also export to this in CSV format. From here, showing how you go to PURL, it's going to do a search for that PURL in the CGP. In this particular instance, we have just one hit. On the next page, you'll see that we've clicked on the record view for the CGP and gotten the full record view for that resource. And you'll see the PURL listed in that resource.

I have been told I have three minutes. I will go a little faster. That's never been a problem for me.

The real meat of this is the referrals that come back, the data that you get, is only as good as the headers that you send to GPO. So the more complete the headers, the more accurate your statistics are going to be. This chart here will show you

what you really want to have in your headers that come to GPO if you want the most accurate stats.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

What you're going to find is, in an log, you're going to find certain Apache headers. The ones we're most interested in are the refer and the user agents. With this chart, you'll see that you'll get the best numbers if you give us a refer and user agent. If you give us a refer, you're going to get If you just give us a user good numbers. we'll able agent, be to provide statistics, but we're not going to be able to tell you the granularity of the resource from which the user clicked.

So, if you want to find out what webpage did they come from, I won't know that unless I have a refer. If I have a refer, I can tell you what webpage you came from, from your institution, to get to that PURL. But if I don't have a refer or a user agent, there's nothing I can do with that data. I can't tell you if a human made that request or if a

link-checker made that request. That's why I warn people that if you're just going to give me that type of header response, I'm not going to be able to provide you with any statistics. I'll go to that in another screen.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The next screen Ι have here basically will tell you the different types of traffic that in. come And you'll see highlighted in the blue, in the first one, you can see in the blue on the refer, I can see exactly what webpage people came from. For the user agent, I can see exactly what web browser they used, what version they used.

With number two, refer with no user agent, I can see the webpage that somebody came from to get that PURL.

On number three, I only have user agent, so I can only tell you what browser somebody used to make that request.

And the last one, I have nothing.

I don't have the webpage that came from; I

don't have the web browser that they came

from. All I know is they requested that

particular PURL.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So why don't I include all the traffic in the PURL referral reporting? Ι don't know who you are. In this particular example here, in this traffic, you'll see I have no refer and no user agent. If you look at the requests here, they come semi-secondly, so this looks to me like it's a robot, and this is a robot just checking links. this into the stats, then you're going to get an inflated number that doesn't really tell you about an actual user clicking on a link. So that's why I've said if you have no refer and no user agent, I'm not including those statistics.

So, some limitations of this tool

-- this is only useful if you use PURLs. If
you do not link to PURLs off of your websites
or in your catalogs, this tool is of no use to
you.

This is not the sole tool for examining patron usage either. At the moment, institutions that have a shared OPAC are

unable to, you know, find out statistics based off of their shared OPAC. I have a solution for that, but that again is if GPO has time, if there are resources, and if the community wants it.

And I would stress again, if you have no refer and no user agent, talk to your IT departments to see if you can get the headers in a fashion that we can actually report statistics.

I am being told I'm out of time and I have two slides left. Well, I have one real slide left, so can I finish my one slide? Okay.

So I just basically covered the first one. Please send me a refer. Talk to your IT departments about the hostnames and IP addresses used at your institutions. There could be some hidden out there that you don't know about. You may want to consider proxy servers for anybody who connects off campus so that you can make sure that people off campus who are connecting to your network are also

included in those statistics.

What you can also do is, if you have a machine that you know staff uses and you don't want that included in your PURL referrals, you can do one of two things to exclude them from the list. If you know they're only going to be going ahead and it's only for staff use and not patron use, you can either look for that specific hostname and then subtract that figure from your overall total, or you can send that information to GPO and we will send them to the robot layer, and they will not be included in the statistics.

And the last page on my slide is where to go for more information. You can always find me on the FDLP community site.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. STEVENSON: Good morning. I'm John Stevenson. I work at the University of Delaware. I'm the depository coordinator there. I'm going to talk about, in general, some of the topics and how they interrelate

with what my colleagues have already talked about.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

As Michelle pointed out, maintaining the records has mostly been an additive process since the mid-90s. Very few people end up withdrawing electronic resource records unless somebody lets them know about it. Copy cataloging is still a viable way of getting selected records in because it's accurate and it addresses the specific needs. But, you know, for example, if you realize that you have an area of interest, you might search the catalog of US government publications, locate a batch of records, and without much ado, generate a list and bring them in.

Like subject guides, copy cataloging is labor-intensive to create and maintain, and certainly, nobody could really build a very large collection using this method.

Loading batches with or without checking in titles is the common practice.

I'm going to talk a little bit about that because checking in the electronic collection identifies duplicate and superseded items.

You may locate errors and duplicates in the records.

While labor-intensive, basic checking and can be done by relatively low-skill workers. In my institution, we have used student assistants to identify records which have potential problems, or which may supersede or duplicate something, and then they pass these on to staff who have a higher skill level and may be able to figure out what the real issue is. We do find this to be expensive.

Loading without checking results in superseded titles remaining in the catalog beyond the first page of results -- another potential zombie, I suppose.

Setting holdings in OCLC's WorldCat is an issue for some people. Some ask why we should do this for freely available titles. I think the obvious answer is, for people who

use WorldCat or WorldCat Local, it's to aid in discovery. If you have holdings set in your catalog in WorldCat, the electronic collection provided by the FDLP will rise in the rankings because that's how the algorithm works. It makes the search for these vetted titles achieve more results.

I apologize. I'm not good with keeping up with my own slides.

Maintaining records locally can be costly, and among the issues is the perceived cost of checking the records. If one does not do a check-in identifying them title by title. Then, only the ones that are identified by a user reporting a problem or a staff member or reference librarian, somebody who knows what's going on and says 'this doesn't work' or 'this is a problem,' those are the ones which will be addressed and none of the others.

An issue with this is that superseded titles will tend to remain in the catalog until identified for withdrawal. Most catalogs tend to bump the newer titles up to

the top, so it really does become a cumulative burden, perhaps. Although, in the last year, in my unit, we took some statistics and what we found was that only somewhere between two and nine percent, depending on the month, of the titles that we searched where actionable in that they were bump another title out.

My sense is that the FDLP, to its credit, is cataloging many new titles which don't obviously supersede something else. So the amount of time that it takes to withdraw something that is superseded is very small and the number that we will tend to notice, even when we're looking closely, may be small.

Т going to was make few suggestions, just thinking of how can encourage collection maintenance. One thing that might be done better centrally than in 1,200-some disparate depositories would be to identify known superseded titles centrally, and the FDLP seems to be the people best placed to do this.

I'm not suggesting a new standalone

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

database, because we all know that there's plenty of those and they don't talk to one another or work together well. But databases of superseded titles and records would allow lists to be generated. Sources contributing to this database should include GPO catalogers who, when they are deriving for new editions, could pass records information along to someone for vetting. does this supersede it? it Most of the librarians that I've cumulative? talked to indicate that with paper editions at least, it's often been the case that the library keeps the latest addition.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Of course, we are a community and we have subject experts working in libraries who could also contribute recommendations to an FDLP database of superseded editions for collection and management purposes. I think that the FDLP's experiences with superseded list volunteers might be examined to develop best practices if this was a course that was of interest.

Karen has already addressed some of the issues with tracking the use of online titles. The published reports and the FDLP Pro referral tool are very good tools for counting the use of PURLs. The advantages to reports generated by the PURL referral tool, the customized reports that she was showing, are really great because, unlike what Michelle was talking about where you've got a blank model number and have no idea -- what does that mean?

It just means that a lot of people are clicking on something -- you can look at the top 50 referrals and that may give you a sense, oh, we are have people who are interested in this; I didn't have to do any programming to do it, but I can sort of just browse through and get a sense of what PURL referrals were relevant and infer, by looking at CGP records, you know, what are people actually going out and looking for.

Ask Karen said, the IP addresses of robots, whether they are human or automated,

are easily excluded using the custom tool. The detailed reports are easy to read, and I think that's probably one of the most useful tools for something that I couldn't keep tabs on myself Otherwise has been developed here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Accuracy of usage counts -- when we're using the tools, anything referring, using PURL referrals, we have to keep in mind that we're not really reflecting all the uses  $\mathtt{FDLP}$ materials. People use bookmarks. Somebody who gets up every day and wants to the Federal Register, they're going to have it bookmarked or they'll Google it. They will get to it, and it will not go through a PURL referral. So we cannot show these numbers exclusive number as an to our They have to understand that administrators. people are getting to these through other means.

I would point out that while many of my colleagues included PURLs in their library subject pages, newer technologies like LibGuides, they make it really easy to sort of

bookmark and derive the page instantly. That will not have a PURL in it. So an extra step is required if people are going to use that PURL and get it counted.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Accuracy is further affected by other factors, including whether PURL а displays where people will click on it first. I point out that in a library that loads records, depending on circumstances, their catalog may show the URL of record in an 856, with indicators for a blank or not, and they may also have issues if they're using WorldCat local, depending on just how broadly and generously the display has been tweaked to show URLs. So we may have some undercounts through that. You can also get an occasional bad overcount because of network slowness and things being counted multiple times.

In conclusion, I want to point to three things. One is that maintaining the local resources, including withdrawal, is very time-consuming and a very tough job. It may be a tough sell to administrators who would

say, you know, why not just dump the records?

Listing record numbers for superseded records to make a superseded 'let's withdraw these' list would make it much more efficient, particularly if this was a shared project, and I think this should be explored among FDLP libraries who load records and maintain OCLC holdings.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And finally, the PURL use can be measured -- I'm just reading my slide here -- but it may not reflect the actual numbers. So, with those caveats, I think that the FDLP has given us an excellent tool, and if we work together, I think that we will be able to maintain these collections better.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

Good morning. MS. KENDALL: Sue Kendall. I'm from San Jose State University, and I'm the head of collection development head of and government My talk today is a little bit publications. different. I'm examining how we've looked at

our referrals from our catalog.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I know I'm preaching to the choir, but is dramatically our e-resource usage increasing, I would say, this last year. phenomenal. Like other been many so libraries, we've increased the number of electronic resources, be they qov-pubs, databases, or electronic book packages.

With this increase in the number of electronic resources, we've seen an increase, fortunately, in the use of these electronic For example, in our electronic resources. government publications, in the 2009-10 academic year, we saw our electronic gov-pubs that were accessed via our catalog skyrocket to over 4,680 titles that were downloaded. joy and the joy of However, much to my reporting to my administrators, in 2010-11, it almost doubled to 7,295 full-text documents being downloaded. I just went on last night checked my statistics for the fall and semester, and we're right on target for a very robust semester at San Jose using electronic

government pubs.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But with this, I still love the print, and I thought, well, maybe with the increase in e-gov pubs, maybe there's an increase in the use of print documents. We have over 85,000 print documents, but I almost -- well, I did cry --

(Laughter.)

Last year, out of MS. KENDALL: 85,000, we circulated three print documents. Then I thought, well, many people are coming in and running down to the basement to our compact shelves to see our documents and they're just leaving them on the desk. So that was even more disappointing. In '09, we had over 1,300 were in-house shelved. And sadly, in 2010, we had a little over 1,200 were shelled of our print. There's quite a movement of my administration to get rid of these print, non-news documents.

And in very tiny print, I put up there, conversely, with our print collection, our book collection of 1.3 million, in '09, we

only circulated over 194,000 titles, and it's dropped to just a little over 150,000 titles this last year. So print isn't being used. Our electronic resources are really being used. Conversely, our e-book collection in '09, the downloads of chapters were 240,000; last year, 770,000. Our students and our faculty are just gravitating more and more to the electronic.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So I'm trying to figure out, why are they going to electronic, and at San Jose University, I'm the on curriculum committee for graduate studies and I'm seeing, going across my board, more and more hybrid that is, where they only come to courses; class on campus one or two times a semester and the rest is all online, or they're going to totally online. I got an email from the head of the Graduate Studies Committee. We got a go-ahead starting in August of next year for a totally online doctorate in nursing practice. And he said, be on the lookout, more are coming your way, Sue, to study for.

Another thing, I think, is the technology to read these e-gov pubs and other electronic formats has vastly increased into a more user-friendly environment. We just started loaning out iPads to our students and we can't keep enough of them in. They just love using tablets, especially the iPad.

Also, CSU, the California State University system, which I'm a part of, has been challenged by the Chancellor to offer affordable learning solutions. That is, offering free, authentic, reliable sources for our course packs. And of course, the first thing that comes to mind is, okay, let's put some e-gov pubs into this course packs.

Another is we're getting our generation of our students coming in are just, they're an electronic generation. You know, they love electronics.

And then finally, the convenience

-- we're basically a commuter campus, and from

our surveys, they love the idea that they can

get these electronic resources, especially gov

pubs, 24/7, that they don't have to worry about getting a parking space, getting to our downtown library.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

statistics Reviewing my last used in semester what being on was electronic government publications, I found happily that the major hit in our e-gov pubs where in programs that are strongest campus, our environmental science, computer science, and our health sciences. I thought, well, you know, that's very interesting, and then I did the same search for some of these titles in Google Scholar. I did find them, but it wasn't as apparent in Google Scholar as it was finding these in our catalog. So I'm a big champion of keeping our catalog, at least for the time being.

I also found that some of our e-gov pub-supported programs that we don't really fund very well -- we have an ROTC program on campus. They have classes. They get degrees, but we do not fund them. And yet, thankfully, through e-gov pubs, we had our military

science, military history, strategies, et cetera. So that was quite revealing about that. I talked to the faculty in the ROTC program and they said, oh, thank you, librarians, for supporting our program. I said, okay, yeah, we are. Little did he know, no. Well, we are, with our gov pubs.

Also, and as you all know, gov pubs another singular subject. Most of them are multidisciplinary. I found one gov pub that kept getting used over and over again. It was the Danvers Butchery fire, and that took place in the early 1900s in Danvers. It was not just about fire science but about the history of New England. Quite interesting.

Also, I found e-gov pubs offered us, we have a huge Hispanic population at San Jose State. It was great to see so many e-gov pubs in Spanish being used. And we found some areas not taught at San Jose that are being used, and saw a lot of horrifying dental things that are being used.

Our in-house usage statistics was

developed in-house. We downloaded about 37,000 records -- and thank you Marcive. They were so helpful to us, and also to GPO. Just wonderful people -- we developed it in house, and there on the GPO desktop you'll find an agenda of our actual program. We ran it in two weeks. Now our ongoing maintenance is about 30 minutes. Our machine time is about two hours -- on a bad day, maybe four hours, but -- mostly bad.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

conclusion, I'd like thank you for our e-gov pubs. It's been such a support to the San Jose community. say, we're two blocks from City Hall and I get lots of good input from City Hall about what we offer. Also, I believe our catalog is an important factor for access. In January, we're instituting the Encore Synergy program and I've been playing around with University of Colorado someone Colorado; thank you -- and gov pubs looks so beautiful on their catalog. So excited. I know that's going to even increase

our use and access to gov pubs more so.

Finally, it's interesting, I took our e-gov pubs and compared them to the subjects in our e-book collection and they almost were parallel. The sciences, health sciences, were the most in e-pubs, e-books, as they were e-gov pubs. So it sort of verifies what we're getting it in our, our collection.

And then last but not least, I think the advent of new readers such as the iPad tablet, the e-book readers, are providing and ease of use to our patrons that we couldn't imagine three to five years ago. As I said, we're investing in more iPads and we're also looking at bringing the Kindle Fire in to loan out to our students.

So I just want to say thank you once again to GPO and to Marcive for so helping us in getting our usage statistic program up and running.

And our next speaker, Chris Brown, he's been a real guiding light in usage statistics of gov pubs.

So, thanks everyone.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

(Applause.)

MR. BROWN: Hi, everyone. I'm Chris Brown, University of Denver. My title is reference technology integration librarian. I'm a government documents coordinator, so that means Ι get to play а lot technology.

I've given similar versions of this talk many times here, but this will be a little bit different. It's how to get some meaning from the numbers that we've been tracking.

I started tracking clickthroughs to government documents in 2003, so we're in our ninth year now. What we're interested in doing is, like Karen was saying, is we want to track PURLs, but we also want to track URLs. We want to track Readex records that we've loaded for the serial set. We want to track hearings that are not PURLs. We want to track everything coming through one source, that being our catalog.

Now I realize that many people use Google and other tools, but at least we have one normalized place from which to get the data, and its ever-increasing. Last year, we had a little statistically insignificant dip -- I don't know why -- a little bit down.

But here's how it works. There's a prepend, a little prefix before the URL, which you can barely see there, but you don't need to see it, that sends the user to a server, and the server then count the click through. And every night, or as often as I want to, I can go in, grab the data, and then I can spend a little time massaging it, finding out the SuDoc numbers and all that.

That sounds very frustrating to all of you; right? You can't do that. Well, by the end of this presentation, I'm going to give you a slide that you can print out, and the idea is you take this slide to your assistant librarian and say, here are the specs; please make this happen for me.

I used to do this differently.

used to give the code. I published an article several years ago and I said, here's the code that we used in ColdFusion. I learned that's not the right way to do it, because systems librarians are like -- well, I shouldn't say this -- they're like catalogers. You put any two of them in a room and they won't agree; right? So one systems person will want to do CHP and another person will want to do it in PHP, ColdFusion, PURL, they'll do it in whatever. So just give them the specs and they'll make it happen for you.

How do users get to our documents?

Three ways. We installed Summon recently.

That's one way to get our documents. Encore,

our integrated interface's next-generation

catalog, and our classic catalog. Actually,

truth be told, Summon is just a link to the

catalog. So, really, the catalog is the way

that people get into our government documents

from which we track the clickthroughs.

There is a fourth way that we also provide access, and I'm quite proud of this.

At the University of Denver, we have -- now GPO, hold your ears; you already knew this -all of our documents or off-site, but we're all not discriminating, because of materials are off-site. Our entire library is off-site. All of our books, all of our CDs, DVDs, the whole library is off-site during our renovation. that makes electronic So documents all the more important.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

To help get through that process, I have a "browse the documents stacks" tool, not that anybody needs to use it or not that anybody does use it, but just in case they wanted to browse the shelves just like they used to in the old days, you can see the SuDoc stems and click through by stem. It's like -- I call it the virtual Andriot -- and then you can click through and get to a live catalog search.

So this way, if somebody wants to breast-feed in this case, they can click through to the SuDoc A, go down and see the breakdown of the As and they click through to

the -- this will be not just online but also in print.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So here is the circ stats for print compared with online access, similar to what Sue was showing, and you can see over the years, from fiscal year 2004 (which is 2003-4 onward) that the trend has been slowly going down and online has been healthy and going up.

This is our item selection profile. for '70s, '80s, '90s, So, traditionally a 70-, 75-percent repository. then you see the big dip in Beginning in 2007, we started deselecting en masse, huge amounts, and we're down to four-percent selective right now. But we have 100 percent of the online, which is 97 So 100 percent of what GPO has percent. online, we get through Documents Without Shelves. So I'd like to think of ourselves as a virtual regional.

Well, it doesn't really help to say unless you know what people are actually getting to, and the whole point I want to get

across with my talk today is that we documents librarians -- I think I know what my users So I know we have an international want. studies department. I know that we have, you know, lots of political science, lots of business students, we have law school across the street but those students use our side of the street as well. So I think I know my a result of the clickthrough users. As project, I find out that I really don't know my users. But I'll get to that in just a minute.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

When you're going through this deselection process, the question really is, what items are you going to keep and what are you going to eliminate? That's why I came up several years ago with this project, which is the virtual item selection tool. And I've done this now for several states.

I did one for Colorado, and this past year, I did one for Missouri and the entire state of Illinois, where you can go online -- I don't have it here -- but you can

go online and check all of your 8500-some odd stems and see what other selectives in your state are doing and see if they select or not and then click through on an item number and see from the CGP live what would happen if I deselected this? What am I going to be missing? Or you can do it for ads, for that matter. So this was a tool to help us go from high selection to low selection and see what the implications are.

Now, my statistics reporting gives me a lot of granularity. You probably can't see this very well, but the Agricultural Department, I can see agency by agency what is being clicked through and what is being used.

Another surprise in the clickthrough project is that the more older stuff I add specifically -- you know, Readex, serial set, digital hearings -- the more it gets used. And so, beginning in fiscal 2004, I had very little old stuff; it was 93 percent new stuff. Well, as I started adding more and more new stuff, look at the growth of the

older in relation to the new. In other words, if you add it, they will come.

Here's where the surprise comes in. We don't have agriculture in the City of Denver. CSU, Colorado State University is the land-grant institution. Yet our users, to my surprise, want agricultural materials. will load those records because, by golly, they want them. Energy Department -- well, we have refused physics majors, PhDs, but they want the OSTI reports; admittedly, not through the depository program, but it's stuff they want. So I add those records and I track those records. And of course, because of the serial set online usage, those go through the ceiling, whereas the physical volumes might tend to gather more and more dust. So, there really is tremendous value in that.

Here are some takeaways. If you have docs records in your catalog, someone will discover them. Greater exposure leads to increased discovery.

If desired, you could use your

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

clickthroughs to track item numbers, including to improve your item selection. We don't do that because we decided to select everything, but you could.

Users often click on links to agencies that I would never have selected. So all the wisdom that we have in the world is defined by what users actually do.

As a result of all this clickthrough things, we decided just to go with Marcives without shelves, load everything, become a virtual regional. And online access sometimes patterns with print circulation; sometimes not.

Here is the sheet for you to print out and give to your systems librarian and say here, make this happen. These are the specs. I don't have to read them. It'll be on the slides posted later. But I encourage you to try this, and if I can be of any assistance, feel free to give my email address to your systems person.

That's all I have.

(Applause.)

MEMBER LASTER: I want to give a great big thank-you to all of our speakers. As you saw, they could have easily done a 45-minute presentation. Without much more effort, they could have each had a 90-minute presentation. So I just want to say the amount of information you have snuck into 10 minutes has been fantastic.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MEMBER LASTER: We have about 30,

(Laughter.)

MEMBER LASTER: -- minutes left for today's presentation, so what I'd like to do is discuss at least one or two of our pre-composed questions.

I'll pose the question, and if we could have one or two, maybe three of the panelists who would like to give their take on this question, that would be fantastic. After that, we'll move on to Council questions of

the moment if you will.

Our first question: Outside of the OPAC, how do you identify and provide access to the online publications that are the most important for your library's users? Do you have data about how these access points are used?

MS. Mcknelly: We have Metalib that we use to organize all of our resources into an agency list, and this is really quite outside the OPAC because it generates subject lists of materials. It's by database; it's not by individual title. I think that's very important.

The other thing that we're moving to -- Chris mentioned Summon -- and we're moving to resource discovery. We've got an RFP out on the streets right now. And what we'll have is are 13 UW campuses and all of our colleges integrated into one search. That actually isn't quite inside the OPAC, but that's a very interesting thing because this will magnify every problem that everybody has, to see. I

mean, this is one of the things that actually started me looking at this.

But we use resource discovery tools to present things in those ways. We also use LibGuides -- I think John was talking about that -- to present subject-based things because you cannot depend on civilians to understand the SuDoc, and it doesn't work because agriculture includes food safety. That's one of the hot things right now to work with.

## MEMBER LASTER: Anyone else?

MR. STEVENSON: I was going to say that the use of WorldCat Local, I think, is one of the 800-pound gorillas. My own institution, the University of Delaware is encouraging its use as the primary finding tool because you can get articles, as well as documents, as well as books. So everything is on the table, and it's not all using a PURL.

MEMBER LASTER: And let me just add, those of you who are playing along at home and the audience, I guess, if you've got

fantastic answers for these, please bring them up to the mic when we hit the Q&A session.

Sorry; yeah. We'll just be a minute.

Our next question: What are the key data points that you think institutions should focus on, given limitations of time and staff?

Besides usage statistics, what factors do you take into consideration when managing a collection of online only publications?

MS. KENDALL: I have a tale of woe.

I would like to have all of the records for our serial sets -- we get the serial set from Readex and they have marked records -- but our IT department refuses to load them because they think it will overwhelm our computer server. This is an ongoing battle I'm having right now with them about adding more and more electronic records and the size of the server. So it's something to consider, is your computer capacity.

MS. Mcknelly: Well, I also get archived documents without shelves, but I don't load everything. It's that title-level selection that you've always dreamed of and it turned out to be, of course, a nightmare because there's so much to work with. But by doing that, I have a greater idea of what's in the catalog because I'm looking title by title. Now some things like USGS materials, I know automatically that I will load those in.

But in the deselection, in removing titles, I also go through and give a broader subject consideration of everything that is within our catalog. And if the record, I think, is a potential zombie but it is the only thing that we have on that subject, it stays. And so there's a much greater subject selection to the catalog, but there's a lot of work involved in doing that.

When you don't have good data, you have to be dependent on, you know, being really stubborn to do some of these things.

MR. BROWN: These are all really

good points, and it brings up the fact that you have to consider what the size of your catalog is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Those of us that, like Sue and myself, are on innovative systems, you pay for numbers of records unless you want to bite the bullet like we just did or we did a number of years ago and by unlimited records. That was the best thing we ever did.

So we have 800,000 documents records, of which 600, approaching 700,000, are online. That number is because 333,000 are for the Readex serial set and there's a couple hundred thousand for the Lexus/Nexus, now ProQuest, digital hearings in CDRC. get the idea. OSTI is another 200,000. So these are huge amounts, and a public would not want to load 800,000 documents records when they have 200,000 books. But an academic research library may want to do that.

MEMBER LASTER: Some libraries provide access to government information resources through commercial and nonprofit

products alongside traditional FDLP channels.

Often, library users have access to the same information in an online format from several

providers.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

What impact do you see, if any, of the increase in content access redundancy?

MS. McKNELLY: I favor it.
(Laughter.)

MS. McKNELLY: One of the other things that I do is I manage our SFX, our open URL link resolver. And Ι have the so opportunity to not only do selection with government publications in OPAC but to add those materials into our SFX server. And so publications of the Northwest Forest Service was one of the ones I was showing you.

I, of course, will turn this on because our users really do use databases, and if you can resolve back to the government information, I'm really not particularly concerned with the path that they take. You know, PURLs at our path-specific and so is the SFX, but I want them to go back and get to the

information and how they get there doesn't really matter to me.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I'm also particularly not they understand interested if that it's government information because, coming through this databases, they really don't. This is research and, you know, if the web knowledge takes them back to a Forest Service publication, that's where they wanted to go.

The impact that I see is government information comes at a very low cost to add into our online catalogs and so we're not tracking the data in the same way as we did through commercial databases. In commercial databases and e-journal packages and all that comes by subject and we end up looking at cost per use. But the cost per use here is in the calculation that I'm actually looking at. I'm looking at how usable the information is, and where is the best place to focus them through to.

MS. KENDALL: One of the nice things at San Jose is we're a joint library

with not only an academic university, but we're a joint library with the San Jose public. And I like the value added that you get from the commercial providers. But also, I love having the free access to e-gov pubs through GPO, et cetera.

When our public uses are cataloged, if they go to our commercial provider, of course, they have to authenticate. And if they're not a student, they can't access it. But having a redundant record means they, yes, they can access it through GPO and the FDLP program. So that's one thing.

The second is, I gave a speech last year at an international education conference on what educators could get for free to import into their course packs. And of course, it was a shameless promotion of government publications.

After that talk, I had a professor from Julie, someone from Buenos Aires, and Queensland, and say, you don't know how we love government publications from your

country; it so helpless in teaching in our schools. So, you know, of course that made me feel really great. And I use that argument all the time with my Dean, that we're here not only to help research in San Jose our University community but we're serving the greater purpose in the community, in the San Jose area, and who knows where else. And then I go into my song and dance. If they're not crying by the end of it, you know, I haven't done my job.

(Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. STEVENSON: The University of serial solutions Delaware and loads uses records into its catalog, and I have been surprised, since we did not turn on the government publications part of their service, how much overlap there was within subjects with the records that we have for federal I think the redundancy is good, publications. but it does lead to some confusion when there are multiple records for the same title and several different flavors and extents

access provided.

But certainly, I think I agree with this apparent consensus that more is better because people are getting to the resources that they need, and some of the flavors are more digestible for certain uses than others.

MEMBER LASTER: I think that we're going to set this question aside for the moment and come back to it if there's time. But I'd like to move on because I really want to get to audience questions.

So, first, are there any further questions from Council for the panelists?

MEMBER SANDERS: Ann Sanders,
Library of Michigan. Just a point of
clarification for Sue.

When you were looking at your circulation statistics for print, your 285,000, I think you said, print items and you had a circulated three, are those print items fully catalogs?

MS. KENDALL: They are fully catalogued.

1 MEMBER SANDERS: Okay. 2 KENDALL: And all three MS. 3 happened to be -- I know this would be no shock to anyone -- they were be congressional 4 5 hearings. 6 MEMBER SANDERS: Okay. MS. KENDALL: Those were the three. 7 MEMBER SANDERS: Okay, thank you. 8 And Ι have another point 9 of 10 clarification for Chris. I know this wasn't the focus of 11 12 your providing the statistics, but I just want to -- I have a lot of experience lately with 13 dropping one's selection profile by a 14 lot because it went from 100 percent to 34 percent 15 16 last week. But if your selection profile has dropped four percent, surely you can't 17 print circulation 18 surprised if your 19 dropping because you're not getting as much; right? 20 MR. BROWN: Well, we're not getting 21

23 MEMBER SANDERS: Okay. I just

22

print but we still have our legacy collection.

wanted to make sure --1 2 MR. BROWN: Yes, well --3 MEMBER SANDERS: Ιt would be expected, if you were dropping your tangible 4 5 receipts by that much that you would not be --6 MR. BROWN: Well, but --7 (Whereupon, the parties engaged in simultaneous conversation.) 8 MEMBER SANDERS: -- you wouldn't 9 10 have an available pool to circulate. MR. 11 BROWN: But have we an 12 available pool. We didn't get rid of anything 13 when we --MEMBER SANDERS: Okay. All right. 14 15 MR. BROWN: -- into -- so, yeah. 16 Even though we're not getting the print versions of ongoing, we're getting, 17 we're keeping all of our 102 years 18 19 depository, all the tonnage. 20 Yeah, MEMBER SANDERS: Okay. just wanted to throw that out. Thank you. 21 22 MR. BROWN: Yes.

MEMBER SANDERS:

Thank you.

23

1 MEMBER LASTER: Any other questions 2 from Council? 3 CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. This is a question for 4 I'm not sure if I should ask this 5 Karen. 6 question or if I should just send you -- some 7 of them are suggestions for a better tool. really love the PURL referral 8 tool. I think it's going to be a great use 9 10 for the community. Was there a reason why you decided not to give annual statistics? Was it 11 12 because of too much data to export at one 13 time? Did you think about letting people select multiple months rather than just one 14 month at a time? 15 16 I'll just leave it at that. MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. 17 The reason that we did not offer 18 19 that functionality out of the box was because 20 we did not know what the server load was going to be. 21

MS. SIEGER: Prior to going to the

Okay.

CHAIR JACOBS:

22

PURL-Z resolver software, when we had the OCLC software, we were just being inundated with requests and we didn't do any kind of sophisticated traffic routing that we do now.

So it wasn't until we were able to go ahead and basically segment out the server into three, basically, containers and then route traffic based on headers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

wanted We to see how that performance would play out and then go ahead and offer added functionality down the road if the servers could handle it. And then we also have to figure out the budget constraints and So those are things that time and resources. we can now start to examine now that we've gotten the one year under our belt with the PURL referral reports. Now it's just a matter of, you know, is that something people want? Where do we put it in the priority list?

CHAIR JACOBS: Would you prefer an email or a recommendation from Council?

MS. SIEGER: I'll just be surprised. How's that?

(Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. KENDALL: Any more questions right now? Yes?

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobson,
Stanford University. This one's for John
Stevenson.

John, do you see any use for superseded titles? Do you think that researchers are interested in any of that historic connection between documents?

And how you do you evaluate whether or not a superseded document is still potentially useful to your users?

Well, I see it MR. STEVENSON: pretty much the way I think many of colleagues would, with the print. There are superseded titles, for instance, from Health and Human Services which say on the back previous editions may still be used. If it's informational, directed toward a health issue or something like that, I would want withdraw all but the from current And it's fine for me to be able collection.

to point people to GPO and say, well, they've got an archived copy, possibly, which might be of some interest for some researcher.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

That said, I would say that in many cases, there's been some funny issues with superseded titles over the years. You know, the military has been pretty good sometimes about stating on the cover of a publication that this supersedes previous editions, this title, this number. A lot of times, people look and they say, this was published in 1984; topic no longer treated by this government? You may look long and hard and hasn't; that find it is the most recent addition.

My sense is that with an electronic collection, the universe of what's in the FDLP, unless it is perhaps dangerous to use, like a health issue, I would want to have the correct and withdraw things from my collection if there were an easy, cost-effective way to do it.

One of the vendors that my library

uses, Serial Solutions, for example, supplies us with records on a regular basis, and on a monthly basis as our access changes and we get replacements, they also provide us with a list with relevant numbers, titles, ISBN, ISSN, whatever, of titles that we would want to take the record out. That's kind of what I was kind of alluding to.

I do think that superseded editions may be of great value if you're looking for a snapshot, but I think that a lot of people in their collection development policies look at the superseded list, look at the space that they've got, and realize that a user may want a range of statistics covering a long period of time.

Not all of the things that we have in our electronic collections are like what JCRS does where, if it is a statistical or annual type of publication, they actually put a little PDF pop-up that says this is part of a series; there may be more recent editions available. If you're doing something like

that, you don't want -- many of us have not stamped our books 'superseded', which is one of the suggestions that GPO has made in the past. But likewise, the PDF doesn't show the sign of wear that one would say, gosh, this is old. No. It's still looking very crisp. It's just 10 years out of date.

Thanks.

CHAIR JACOBS: I have one more.

MS. KENDALL: Okay.

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. This is, I guess, question for a question for all of the speakers.

Are any of you writing Q&As, posting on your blog, with links to bib records for, you know, when you get an interesting reference question, for example, and you want to write about it? Are any of you doing anything like that?

I guess it's pointed more towards the, what other ways of access are there, other than our OPACs? So it's couched within

that.

MR. BROWN: On our library front page, we have two blogs. One is good answers, where an answer that we've helped somebody within the past. I always do government documents, so I did one two weeks ago for a census in Denver, how to drill down to Census tracts and how to compare that with the traditional Denver neighborhoods. So, yes, and I sometimes went through to records, but I don't do it enough.

MS. KENDALL: On my LibGuide website, I have a tab for current topics. And so, if something's in the news, then I try to call certain gov pubs on my current topic and then I post it to our, we have a listserv for our reference librarians and we send about.

If I see something in something GOVDOC-L where somebody's pointed out really interesting, unusual gov pubs, I'll also send it out to my ref listserv. It sometimes will end up, also, on my LibGuide page under current topics.

(Whereupon, there was a long pause on the record.)

MEMBER LASTER: Let's move ahead to questions from the audience; questions, comments, what you've been doing.

We have about 10 minutes, eight minutes. Let's pretend we have nine minutes, and I'm sure there will be plenty of great conversations afterwards.

Thank you.

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia, and this goes to the, how do we get to things outside of our OPACs?

I think probably other libraries is similar to us. We have a Blacklight front and to our OPAC, so we have a CIRCE OPAC and then we have Blacklight, and we're just about to load the ProQuest digital hearings records not into the OPAC, but it will be a database that will be searched by Blacklight, so there may be opportunities. You know, it could search the CGP, I think, if we wanted to do it that way.

So, as Chris was saying, we don't have to have unlimited record capabilities in CIRCE, because to our users, it looks like this is in our OPAC. It is in our OPAC; it's just not in our CIRCE back end. It's searching multiple databases. So it's sort of a Serial Solutions Summon, but it's different from that to. And I think other institutions are moving to that ability as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. SMITH: Southeastern Louisiana University. I just want to brag on Louisiana for a minute. In Louisiana, we are getting usage statistics for clickthroughs level. consortium We have statewide а consortium of academic libraries called LOUIS, which used to mean something that spelled out Louis and now it's the Louisiana Library Network.

But the consortium office prepended the URL, like Chris is doing, to the URLs for PURLs in all of the depository library catalogs. And now we get a monthly report that tells us, I think, the time the click

happened, the URL that was clicked, and we get the title in our monthly report. So it is possible to get title in there as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So, be aware of the instructions that Chris has given you. If you have a consortium, it may be possible to do that for the entire consortium and not just for your library.

MEMBER LASTER: More questions from the audience? Or bragging? Bragging is great.

MS. WALSH: Mary Jane Walsh from Colgate University. This is for Karen.

Karen, is it technologically possible enhance, of to as one the enhancements to PURL reports, to not have to click to the CGP to get either the item number the SuDoc number to help in profile collecting? That's the gold standard for me.

MS. SIEGER: GPO. Since the information in the CGP is tagged, I would just have to figure out, as part of that data interoperability and portability, a question

that came up from Council yesterday.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

With the information in the database, I would just need to make a call to the database and then pull that information.

My biggest concern would be server load, and obviously, GPO priority, but that is possible.

One thing that would certainly help with the server load issue would be if you're running link-checkers against the PURLs, if you could find a way to exclude GPO from that, that would help. Most of our traffic and most of the server load is based off of the link trackers they come in.

In the past, with the old system, yes, we needed some help to find out which PURLs were broken. We don't have that problem So, if there's a way to exclude the anymore. link-checkers on our side, that would be nice. Or, if you going the are to run link-checkers, if you could have them obey robot TXT files, that would help immensely. That way, we can get the server load down and we can expand the capabilities of the tool.

Ι

1 MS. WALSH: Thanks. 2 So, a follow-up for Chris. Chris, does yours automatically go 3 out and call for either item number or SuDoc 4 number, or do you have to do that manually? 5 6 MR. BROWN: I do it manually. take the daily log and load it into an Access 7 database. And then at night, while 8 watching the news, I go through and do all 9 that. So it's not automatic, but I do get all 10 that. 11 12 MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Kate 13 Irwin-Smiler, Wake Forest University Professional Center Library, and this question 14 15 is for Chris. 16 I'm sorry; you just sat down. I was wondering, you mentioned several 17 18 ways that your users get to the data that 19 you're then tracking. Do you know how they go 20 in, like how many users you get going and

> MR. BROWN: I do not. I just see

through your classic catalog, your NextGen

catalog, your overlay?

21

22

23

1 the report that says what domain they came 2 from, but I don't have it. I suppose I could 3 have someone engineer at that way. I just don't know what page, whether they're coming 4 5 from the Encore catalog or classic millennium 6 catalog. I do not. 7 MS. WALSH: Thank you. MR. BROWN: I wish I did. 8 But actually, we do have Google 9 10 Analytics on our two accounts and so we can see the searches that were done in each of the 11 12 catalogs. see exactly Ι just can't 13 clickthroughs that were done. So I can see the relative use of each of the catalogs. 14 15 (Whereupon, there was a long pause 16 on the record.) LASTER: 17 MEMBER Are there more questions? 18 19 (No response.) 20

spend the last two minutes discussing 21 final prewritten question. 22

LASTER:

MEMBER

23

How might planning be affected by

If not,

we

can

increasing development of web-scale discovery services -- for example, Serial Solutions' Summon product -- that can potentially diminish the role of library OPACs?

MS. McKNELLY: Well, it may diminish the role of the library OPAC but, as Chris pointed out, that OPAC is the backbone for your bid bib data that's located in it.

What these systems do though is aggregate out of all those multiple sources, and I think that's where we're going to start seeing real confusion with redundancy issues. If you're harvesting out congressional materials from three different areas, they may not have a match point to go to. But our OPAC, I think, will actually become more usable.

What happens, though, is that magnifies all the issues. We've always had little issues in our catalogs. But then everyone can see what they are and it becomes very confusing. We did a poet project with Primo Central is something a year ago -- this

is where I saw it -- and we saw this with our e-book collections, too, like mad. No one can understand what to do because we were loading in 13 campuses and then they all had the same e-book. They had a record for the GOVDOCs too.

That was actually one of the things that started me down this path of looking to sort of remove some of these things because, in a scaled delivery system like this, if another campus has loaded this information, I don't need to. My users can get to it without us ever having to load that in.

MR. BROWN: Serial Solutions' Summon does present some challenges, one of which is, when we loaded our catalog records him, we often had URLs in print or a fiche record, and those are rendered properly in a Summon environment. They create challenges.

One of the ways I hope to get around this challenge is I've pleaded with Serial Solutions to load FDsys, and I've got to renew that because it's been a couple

1 months since I put that plea out there, but 2 that would help the redundancy problem, or it 3 would get it more redundant, but it would make the documents were discoverable, so I'm hoping 4 5 that someone can harvest on an ongoing basis 6 all of what's in FDsys. MEMBER LASTER: So I think that the 7 moral of the story today is that a clean, 8 shiny catalog is a happy catalog. 9 10 On that note, I would like to thank our panelists and thank everyone for attending 11 this session. 12 13 (Applause.) CHAIR 14 JACOBS: Ι have no 15 announcements, so we'll reconvene at 10:30. 16 Thank you. 17 (Whereupon, a recess was taken at 10:02 a.m.) 18 19 (Whereupon, the meeting reconvened 20 at 10:32 a.m.) SESSION 2 - COMMUNITY WEBSITE 21 This session 22 CHAIR JACOBS:

going to be on the community site and other

23

aspects, and so I'll just pass it on to Helen.

Good luck.

MEMBER BURKE: Thank you.

Good morning and welcome. My name is Helen Burke. I'm from the Hennepin County Library in Minneapolis, Minnesota, and I am one of three people on the Public Library Interest Group. Donna Lauffer from Johnson County Library in Overland, Kansas, and Steve Hayes from the University of Notre Dame, we're on the Public Library Interest Group. So this is our session.

As much as the title was what you see on the screen, "What's the Best Use of the Community Site? Consultation with fellow FDLs, discovery of GPO pilot products and training," we're going to leave training to the next session and two today. We're not going to address that.

But the lay of the land for this session is I'm just going to welcome you, and now that I've introduced the Public Library Group, I also want to mention that we're lucky

enough to have Karen Seiger start us off with an overview of the site. Then I'll talk more about the consultation with fellow FDLs and the discovery of the pilot projects.

So, Karen, there you go.

MS. SIEGER: Hi. My name is Karen Sieger. I work at the Government Printing Office and I'd like to walk you through the FDLP community site.

By show of hands, is anybody on the community site? Oh, all right. That's an impressive show of hands. I appreciate that.

This is a very beta version of the site right now. What you'll hear at two o'clock today in the "Choose Your Own Adventure" session is about how we're working on redesigning all three websites at the moment, the desktop, Ben's Guide, and the FDLP community site.

The FDLP community site is third on our list, so now is the prime opportunity to get your wish list in now so that you can help shape what this site will be in the future, so

we can take it out of beta and launch this into a tool that the FDL community will find useful for collaboration and social networking.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

This is the FDLP community site. It's available at a community.FDLP.gov. What we're talking about yesterday in the Council recommendations was how we're actually to try to expand try to expand the user base for this site. In the past, the site with locked down to members of federal depository libraries, so whenever you created, whenever you registered for the site, you had to put in your library number.

What we would do at our end at GPO is that we would look up that library number verify that that and person that was registering was at that institution. goal is not to keep out people who have an interest in federal information or the FDLP or anything like that. The site is designed to make sure that the site stays true to itself and that people who are looking for and interested in government information can have this safe site to go to.

So we're trying to keep out the scammers, the scrapers, the spammers, the people who are looking to post things off topic and keep it down to the geeks, the dorks, as is being filled in here from James Jacobs.

## (Laughter.)

MS. SIEGER: So we're looking now to expand it out so that we'll have to figure out what kind of mechanism that will be to verify that people work at that institution. So if you're at a public library -- I mean, if it isn't a depository but you're interested in federal information -- and you'd like to connect with other information professionals on this site, you know, we want to extend that registration open but at the same time still make sure that we still have weeding process in there so that Joe's Taxidermy doesn't sign up.

What we want to do is, once people

have been vetted, their account is activated by GPO staff. At that point, you have access to the site, and you can log in with your, whatever information you use to create your account. So you get to choose what your handle is, as well as your own password.

We just ask that, for your username, you don't pick your library number because, let's say, you have 20 people in your institution who all want have an account. Well, they can't all have that same library number.

This is where I see the distinction of the FDLP desktop and the community site. When you're on the desktop, you're doing things on behalf of your institution. You're posting things on behalf of your institution. When you're on the community site, you're acting more on behalf of yourself. That's why you're going to create your own identity on this site.

So I'm going to go ahead and log in as Adelaide Hasse. She's our test user.

(Whereupon, there was a long pause on the record.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. SIEGER: Okay. We are now in.

At this point, once you've logged in, you start to unlock some of the features of the website, where you can actually start to post pictures; you can go ahead and set a status for yourself; you can make friends. You can private-message other people on the site. On the community forum, you can start discussions; you respond back can to discussions. Ιf you're interested in blogging, there's a blogging mechanism on here. You can actually write your own blogs. If you see somebody else's blog that you're interested in, you can go back and comment on those blogs. So the public can come in and read the content on the site, but the only way to contribute is to actually have an account.

So, if you see here with Adelaide
-- I will go to her profile -- you can set up
a page that talks about you. You can set a
picture for yourself. You can decide how much

information you want share about yourself.

With that sharing, though, you can also set who can see that information, so you can set the privacy settings to say, you know, I would want to put out some information for anybody to see. So anybody can see what institution I'm coming from, for example, but only people from who are registered on the site can see my email address. But only my friends can see my phone number, for example. So you can set the level of granularity with your permissions.

If you look here, you can start to friend people and start to network with other One of the interesting things that people. you can do on the site is you can start to find other people on this site. You'll see we have over 600 users so far, but if you go over to our search feature and go to the advanced example, based off of search, for the information that you put in your profile, you could start to find other people now.

You could start to find people who

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

maybe, say, have stated they are members of AALL. find people who You can self--selected as specialists may be law or maps. So, if you have a question about cataloging maps, you can go ahead and find other people who, you know, have expertise in that area and friend them, private message them, have a private conversation with them and say, hey, this is a problem that I've been having, and I see that you are interested in the same topic and maybe we can talk.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But if you go into the advanced search feature, you can do -- where's John?

Hi, John. Could you help me? Would you be my monkey?

It's a little inside joke. We have a story about a monkey. The monkey uses the computer but does not talk, or at least we're told, until put on the spot at the last moment.

(Laughter.)

MS. SIEGER: But here, for example, what John will show is that on the pulldown

list where it says 'name', there are many different categories in here. So, if you could undo the subject specialist, we can choose subject specialist, and that bring up checkboxes for a variety of topics.

So, from here, you could turn around and say, well, let me find anybody who's interested in, say, anthropology, and let's choose maybe law. We'll give it two. We could also then click on the 'add criteria' button and then say find everybody in the state of California. So you can start whittle down people on the site and identify other people who maybe are in your same state or your same region or even across the entire community site.

We can go ahead and do a search for that, and let's get many people we get if any. There we go. So you can see that we have a number of people here. From here, you can choose to make them your friend. You can private-message them. You have a variety of options.

But why would you want to join this particular site, I guess is the big question. I see several advantages of this site. It's is specifically for community that the people depositories and other who are interested in federal information. We host the infrastructure at GPO, so basically, if you want to upload photos, share documents, things like that, you don't have to worry about taking up space on your own servers. GPO will take care of all that information.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The question is, now, why would you use this service versus the various listservs that are out there and other website? With regard to things like listservs, the emails that come in, they will add to your inbox. So, if you've got a finite amount of space, you've got a lot of email, that eats up into your email.

With the information that's on here, the information is public. It is searchable. And you could also set up alert triggers. If you want if you don't want to

monitor the site every day, you can come in and say, okay, give me an alert trigger, so whenever somebody goes to this forum thread and posts a new message, let me know. I'm interested in just this specific topic. So you can go ahead and put them all on the web and not eat into your particular email folder size. We'll do all the screening on our end. You don't have to worry about those pieces as well.

So it's, you know, that one spot that you can go to, and GPO will take care of the backend infrastructure pieces and let you actually communicate with various people across the country.

But, as I mentioned, this is a very beta version of the site. It is a little buggy; I will admit that straight out. But this is where this session is, you know, very important to me and my team. We would love to know how you're using the site, and if maybe you're signed up but you're not posting right now, well, why is that? What is the site is

doing or not doing that causes you not to want to post? Are people are like lying in wait, waiting for somebody else to do something first and then they'll jump on it? I don't know exactly what's going on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But this is a prime opportunity, before we start really diving into a redesign of this site, you know, to figure out what things you want on this site and then we can start to build tools around them.

The site has amazing capabilities, and it's just a matter of figuring out what those features are going to be and how we want to style those because what I found was, on initial version of the site, we blogging the homepage and everybody on blogged. But when I changed the homepage so that it did more of the social networking pieces, everybody started doing the social networking pieces and stopped blogging. So now I've got to find a way to advertise all the features of the site on the homepage and give it equal treatment so that everybody sees

that, you know, here's everything that you can do, and don't favor one over the others.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But if there are certain features that people say, hey, I'll never use this, don't put your time and energy into it, now is the time to let us know. The forum is a very untapped segment of this community site. It has great potential for people to be able to start collaborating and discussing information.

Would you bring up the form please? Thank you.

Web content in library services -we have been on this site and we've been trying to post information about the redesigns that we've been doing. So, various screenshots along the way, we've been posting, we've been asking for people's input on what tools do you use the most, so we can go ahead highlight those on the new redesign. We have gotten a limited response rate, but we'd like to get more people engaged in that discussion.

One of the things that we've been talking about recently is, when we first started the FDLP community site, it was very new when it came to social networking. GPO as had yet adopted agency not social an networking. So, when we went to our general counsel and said, hey, can we start, as GPO staff, posting on the site, we were told essentially no. And so we have been, you know, working on posting more and more into that community site. It's a growing thing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

One other thing that we're talking about now is, on the forum as it currently exists, we have certain tiers of forums that are set up, and if you look on the screen, you'll see that there's one called FDL discussion, there's a community groups area, and there's another one for GPO discussion. At present, the only place where GPO will respond on the forum is underneath the GPO discussion, but we're looking to perhaps break down that barrier and make it so that anybody from GPO can respond to anything in here.

So it may be а matter of dismantling the forum as it exists right now and rebuilding it with different forums and subforums and putting them in logical terms, and then say, okay, the community can respond back; GPO can respond back. There are some policies that have to accompany that at the GPO level, but it's a step that we're looking toward taking. But it also depends on what you all want.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

If you like the current set up where we have certain places where you can post and GPO will only post to one section, we can keep that in the future. If we want a more open and collaborative environment, we can start looking toward that as well.

I don't want to ramble on about the community site, so I want to give a brief overview about the types of things that can be done here and basically say that, you know, we are in that transition phase. We are looking for feedback. But we really think this can be a tool where depositories across the country

can come up together at any time day or night and talk with each other.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

have the ability to add like instant chat. things We've when broached that topic in the past, we had people said, well, I don't want that my staff chatting all day long. So, you know, we can turn on certain features, but if the community doesn't want them, that's not where we're going to spend our finite amount of time and That's what we're trying to get to resources. at two o'clock today is to say, here are the various sites; the sky's the limit. Once data is tagged, we can do basically anything with It now comes to the priority. should we focus our efforts, and when?

MEMBER BURKE: Thanks, Karen.

And can I introduce John Dowgiallo?

MR. DOWGIALLO: Yes.

MEMBER BURKE: You'll see his name, and it's always nice to put a face to a name.

I just want to mention and back up what Karen is was saying. If you take nothing

else away from today's session, just know that the community site is in transition.

In looking at it now, I would say and I think most people would say it's a pretty awkward site to use. But I believe, in January or whenever the debut would be on the beta site, whenever that happens, I think that singular thing that you're going to find that's true of the community site is what Karen alluded to.

The GPO discussion is the heading right now. You may go to other forums --GOVDOC-L, FGI, Twitter, whatever -- but right now and into the future, GPO's contribution will only be on the community site, so I really think that's a reason now to become familiar with the content available there, because you're going to get direct answers from GPO.

We may have gone to the knowledge base in the past. In the future, that, too, may be integrated into this site. So, as much as I think on, when I looked at the site --

and I've got two friends, and you may find that intimidating or off-putting -- I believe that there's much reason in the future to come back to the site and get more direct contact that's facilitated between FDLs and between FDLs and GPO, and it's a direct connection between FDLs and GPO. It's another point of reference. So the slide basically, just stay get connected and connected.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

As much as I represent, with Donna and Steve, the public library interest group, this really is of interest throughout the community.

Just rounding out the information that we get and looking for more confirmation from other sites like something GOVDOC-L is terrific; FGI, terrific; Twitter is wonderful too. But this is really where you're going to get direct information, or reinforcement maybe, from GPO and GPO staff.

The second point there -- I found it interesting that the forums reinforce each

In August 2008, in looking for this 1 other. 2 presentation, in preparing for this presentation, Ι looked for 3 good а representation, a review of the 4 community site, and where did I find it? On FGI, when 5 6 Rick Davis, the then-superintendent of documents in August 2008, announced the debut 7 of the site. So it's just reinforcing the 8 idea that looking in more places than just one 9 10 is to everybody's benefit.

Let me see if I can pull up that link.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

(Whereupon, there was a long pause on the record.)

MEMBER BURKE: Rick's blog was very helpful in that he talked about inviting people onto the site, talked about the fact that there would be the opportunity to have threads followed for a discussion that you might be interested in.

Also, another valuable piece of the community site is the ability to track the GPO's pilot projects, such as the catalog

record distribution one, the historic shelf
list. Again, you're getting information

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

directly from GPO staff about those projects.

In preparing for this, those were the entries on the community site that had the most views. That's another way of looking at the site and exploring it and just perhaps seeing where the most views, what the entries that have been the most viewed are. You can get that on FGI; you can see how many things there were for a particular entry. You can't get that on GOVDOC-L as readily. But you can get that on the community site. There may be some significance. You may ignore that. But at least you can see if other people have looked at this entry. Perhaps that's going to help you too.

Here's Rick presentation and some of the things that he highlighted -- creating an online profile, buddy lists, the private messages to users, reinforcing what Karen had suggested, that as much as GPO offers this site to us, they're not monitoring it for

inappropriateness. They're really just wanting to foster inter-FDL communication. And I think, to the degree that we can utilize that, it just reinforces the information that we may get from one source. You can verify it here as well.

Creating photo albums and uploading images is another feature.

Adding events to a community calendar directly there is another feature that's built into the site, that I think is promised for the future as well.

The last bullet point there that you may go to the community site -- you wouldn't go there for leading information, for news bulletins -- but you may go there to linger. You may go there to find information, to verify it, to get another perspective of it. But you may want to go elsewhere for leading information. But it's still a great site to go to.

I guess that's the end of my particular aspect here. I want to introduce

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Donna Lauffer, who's going to talk about the significance of the Federal Depository Library of the Year award. Her library won that last year. Part of the community site can also be an area where we can trumpet our successes so that others may discover them.

In the future, it's the monthly spotlight that we're using, and frankly, that's an underutilized source. I think the community site can be used to draw attention to efforts that the rest of us are being too modest to promote. I'd like to dovetail the abilities of the community site to reinforce the library spotlight so that we can really trumpet our efforts as much as we can.

Donna is from Overland Park, the Johnson County Library, and she'll talk more about their effort that fully deserved the federal depository library of the Year Award last year.

> MEMBER LAUFFER: Thank you.

Thank you, everyone. I just want to talk briefly about the site and also about how we apply government information, how we partner with organizations in our community, how public libraries are really using the information and working in partnership with

the people that produce the information.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

our community.

As she mentioned, we were the Depository Library of the Year last year, but I don't want to dwell on that. I just want to tell you that that was very important for marketing the library and the FDLP because a lot of people did not know what that meant in

We also received the National Association of County Award for our GovFest, which is an event where we brought a lot of government agencies together for one-stop for people shopping that are starting businesses. We got a lot of publicity out of that.

We also won a Stars & Stripes Award for Outstanding Partnership with the election office for doing the 2008 election. We did some team videos. And we also received in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Innovation Award for GovFest. So we've really gotten a lot of recognition out of just the work that we're doing, and also been able to promote the federal depository system to others that perhaps were not as familiar with it.

the One of things that we particularly concentrate public in on libraries is we are proactive in outreach. are trying to integrate our processing, we're trying to integrate the collection into the catalog so it's easier for our patrons to find. Documents are accessible to not only patrons browsing the collection there in a file but also online. And we do have some specialized reference services, even though we are a very general public library.

We have really concentrated building and innovating webpages, our career and jobs webpage is particularly heavy Statistics, in Bureau οf Labor and the Occupational Outlook Handbook is one of

1 most used documents.

For consumer information, the Federal Trade Commission.

For genealogy, public libraries.

There's always genealogy people in the community and they are some of our best supporters, using the Social Security death Index.

Grants and foundations, with Grants.gov.

Personal and family law.

Health and wellness, particularly community consumer health -- MEDLINEplus and pub med.

And local information and history and science, science.gov.

So we organize our webpages around those subjects. And here, you'll see an example of our business page that is probably the most used. We are a suburban county of about 570,000 people and we're mostly white-collar and high-income, high education levels, so we have a lot of small businesses

in the area. People are always using the library to meet their clients, to do their business plan, to try to get their marketing information.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Of course, government documents are a great source of all that information from the census data and the Bureau of Labor Statistics, so we focus that in our central library. We do have a reference librarian, and many of our patrons tell us that she's on their speed dial because she helps them get their marketing information. Our government documents librarian is also a part of that business team.

Here, you'll see the page for GovFest. We started GovFest about four years ago trying to bring all the different agencies together for one day for people to come by and see, get all their information from different agencies as to what they needed for their business. We started out with 90 people in 2007. We're up to almost 500. usually in November of each year, so we're

hoping to break the 500 mark this year. That has been very important to our county. We're a county agency. Also, trying to get that information about how important it is for us to have these documents and be able to access the documents.

In 2008, as I mentioned, we did partner with our election commission and the League of Women Voters of Johnson County and did a team video contest on YouTube. So if you go to the site, you can see it. It was called JoCoPolo, and that this little jingle that went "JoCoPolo". After you view about a hundred of these, you want to shoot that thing to smithereens, but it was great.

We did receive a National Association of County Information Officers award for that. It's just amazing. And the kids were encouraging the 18-year-olds to register to vote and get involved in the process.

Then another big element of our service is community engagement, civic

engagement. Here, you'll see we participated ago June with America in a forum a year Speaks, which is a national nonprofit and trying to get the public engaged in the whole and the whole future of debt issue economy. Believe it or not, we had 84 people attend this session, representing demographic of Johnson County. And I must say, Johnson County is heavily Republican. could not get the Republicans to come talk. talk, The Democrats love to but the Republicans did not want to come.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So, anyway, we had 84 people come. They six hours talking about spent the budget, and this is the result at the end of the day. I think maybe it's because, thank heaven, it's all over. But they were really energized and came to consensus, I must say, actually grappled with what we would reduce and what entitlements we would reduce. anywhere from the Tea Party to are extremely liberal. We also had the people out The Tea Party on the Coffee Party were protesting and then the Islamic Council was passing on information on Muslim culture. And by the time they all got together, they were

all visiting. So there was no riot going on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The results were reported to the president's debt reduction task force, and it really provided us an opportunity to, again, highlight federal documents and their importance in everyday lives.

Here's the community engagement We post on that site whatever topics site. are coming up right now. We are involved in Legacies of the Civil War, the 150th anniversary of the Civil War. In our areas of eastern Kansas and Western Missouri, course, we had the border war and there are lingering things still in our community. So we are discussing that and ending up in April with Jane Smiley coming to visit.

This is our civic engagement librarian, and she used the National Archives and the Library of Congress prints and photographs to develop a lot of our materials

for the Legacies of Civil War.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Melody Kinnamon is our consumer health librarian. Here, she's holding a MEDLINEplus pamphlet. We work with the health and on our webpage for health department services, certainly provide free meeting rooms for these different departments and also do research for them. But we do have a great in consumer health, and certainly, the National Library of Medicine is a great source of that.

We also have a jobs and career She is standing librarian, Marty Johannes. there with the Occupational Outlook Handbook. We do our outreach in this area. We do tours twice monthly. We do tours for the community college life skills class. We also provide specially designed tours for felons reentering the workforce, individualized career information job clubs, and certainly we were most recently called by the IRS recruiter in Washington about distributing job postings for them, which we gladly do.

And here again is another one of our websites. This is on-the-job sources that are heavily used, particularly during this economy.

We also do a lot of digitization of local documents and photographs, and here is our genealogy page and our local history page.

We have access to vital records and ports of arrival and Ellis Island records, and we do have a National Archives in Kansas City.

Then we also have tax support. We love the IRS, especially the first of the year. We are inundated with people. We are a destination because the AARP comes and helps people with their tax needs free of charge. So, last year, they did 3,500 tax returns for folks. But we do advertise that on our website and certainly do work closely with the IRS on that.

And then back to the FDLP community, one of the things that we've been particularly interested in is, on the website, you'll find the GovDocs Kids Group. Our state

documents group developed some outreach for kids in a Constitution poster contest. And when it first started, it was fairly small, asking kids to develop posters; of course they would have to learn about the Constitution in order to develop posters. And I think two years ago, when we were involved in it, there were 10,000 entries, I don't know, from multiple states. This year, I hear there are 25,000 entries, so they've hired a staff to try to look at all those entries.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But we did present the awards in 2008 at our federal archives area in Kansas City, which is just across the state line, and two of the kids in our community won awards and they were presented them by the congressman of the 5th District of Missouri, Emanuel Cleaver. It's a great way to engage the schools in the use of federal documents. And here is one of the winning award -- a very simplistic one, but very patriotic.

So we are really working to make the community aware of the resources that the

federal documents provide and make it easy to discover, easy to find, and these are just some of the techniques that we have used. So I hope that we may have some ideas that may be of use to you.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MEMBER BURKE: That's great. Thanks, Donna.

Karen also pointed out a new feature that the community site has, of blogging by GPO staff.

MEMBER BURKE: You may have seen, Caleb Robinson has done some blogging of late and he's just making himself very approachable as far as what he does and tracking publications, new acquisition titles from various agencies. And here's his that comes right up.

So this is a new assistant GPO staff are doing, pushing out some information

and looking for feedback. He welcomes it.

I think that's the end of our presentation. I wonder if there are any questions that Council might have or that --

(No response.)

MEMBER BURKE: No.

SPEAKER: Yes.

MEMBER BURKE: Oh, Shari.

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster, University of Akron.

Karen, I was wondering, what, if any, are the limitations on what could potentially be pulled into the community site to either use as the basis for resources or a basis for discussion?

I know that Helen mentioned potentially the GPO knowledge base, updated on a regular basis. Would that be possible to pull that in? What about GOVDOC-L? What about Twitter feeds on a hashtag? Basically, what kinds of things are you, at least, do you see as being technically and policy wise feasible to pull into the community site?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. SIEGER: Well, the community site is only as good as the content that is submitted by a community. I mean, the members really drive the entire site, so when you talk about a knowledge base, that forum could potentially be a knowledge base, but it also depends on who posts questions and who answers the questions.

If you're talking about pulling the existing knowledge base content into the site, databases are databases. You can pull in information from databases. It's a question of -- and Ted was talking this about this yesterday with regard the Council to recommendations and the other systems that GPO uses -- you know, the current AskGPO system is a system that's used by the entire agency. So, talking about how that knowledge base would come out of that or is a crosswalk talking to it, those are the types of things that we can start to discuss.

But again, the forum, as it exists right now, can do a lot of what the various

listservs do, what the knowledge base does. Basically, they're all answering questions. If you post a question and somebody gives you the answer, there are certain -- if you look out and see how forums are used out on the broad Internet, there are certain customs that are done. So, if you ask a question and then somebody answers your question, you'll change the subject line to say "solved," and that way, somebody who's going through and doing a search, if they come across that thread, they would know, oh, well, I see it's now marked as "solved." Somebody found the answer to their question here.

And you could kind of piggyback on what other people have asked in the past and see what their experiences are and say, hey, I don't need to post another message about this because somebody's already answered it. I just saved myself a lot of time. Or you may be posting something that other people have a problem with, as well, and they see other people's perspective.

So it may be that there may be one question, but there could be to a multiple perspectives to a question, and a forum with that give-and-take lets you go ahead and see, hey, I never considered it from this perspective. You know, there are four responses to this thing and I thought about it this way and I never thought about these other broader three ways. Now I've qot а perspective on this particular topic. provide your insights into the can own discussion. So there's a lot of flexibility with that system.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MEMBER LASTER: I think that what I'm also interested in -- speaking personally, one of the things of the reasons I only go to the community site when someone says sends a link that says, here's the forum, we want your answers, and then I click on it and I log in and I see all my friend requests sitting there -- one of the issues in integrating it into individual workflows of librarians is simply that there's not a lot of content there. I

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

don't think of it as the first place to look for an answer because I already use AskGPO when I need an official answer on the question or I need to report a broken PURL, all the regular tasks.

I think it will be interesting to re-imagine what kind of content could be on this site. For example, it would be kind of fun to -- I think it would be kind of fun --

(Laughter.)

MEMBER LASTER: have to discussion fora based on particular posts on GOVDOC-L because there are posts where people say there are a lot of posts where folks say email me off list and I'll summarize. if we can get people to, in addition to GOVDOC-L, which is what posting to actually end up seeing, to say, well, I've created a forum or I've created a post on community; log in; I'd love to see your ideas, and then they're all just there.

So I think it's kind of thinking of now we can take what we already use and

integrate it into this tool because, otherwise, if the tool is always an extra step, then it's not very useful.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. SIEGER: Yes. I would agree with that.

So far, one of the things we were trying to do is -- with the biannual survey, for example, we kept saying, hey, if you've got individual questions about the biannual survey questions themselves, if you don't know how to answer a particular one, go to that forum; you know, we have GPO staff that are monitoring that forum. And we've been responding back. That thread has been rather popular, and people are able to say, hey, I had a question about this; oh, I had the same question. I don't need to post it now.

But, yes, if it's another island out there that doesn't integrate with anything else, no, it's not very useful. If it's a system out there that people aren't posting to, no, then it's just a system setting idle. So we try to make this thing the best that it

can be. Help us now define what that's going to be. What systems should it talk to? Where else do we need to advertise it or try to get these linkages in so that we can truly make this a site where people want to post and come to it the first time, rather than saying, oh, you know, this might be in an arsenal that I'd go to, but it's not very populated, so that'll be last on my list.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MEMBER WEIBLE: Can I -- this is Arlene Weible, Oregon State Library. I wanted exactly what follow up on mentioning with the biannual survey discussion because I remember, I saw the message about, yes, it's on the community site, this forum, and I did have a question about it. connected to the community site, not with a direct link, to where the discussion because that email had long gone. Ιt literally took me 15 minutes to find where that discussion was taking place. You know, I finally got smart and used the search box. That was my own issue, I suppose.

If it's something that's a hot topic that a lot of people are interested in, you know, you were talking about what we should put on the front page of the site. That would be my number one thing, a link to that discussion. You've got a hot, you know it's hot because a lot of people are posting to it. That should really be right on the front page of it.

so I just wanted to describe that as a personal experience of me. And I did get a great answer and I was thrilled. But it took me a long time to get there, and that was unfortunate. And boy, I was frustrated to because it's like I don't think I'm an unsophisticated user, but that was really a frustrating experience for me.

MS. SIEGER: Yes, I totally sympathize with that one. You can see, obviously, the module at the bottom of the page has failed where it says "latest forum topics," and right there it says biannual survey, and it says 40 answers. That link

does take you directly to it, but obviously, it's too buried on the homepage.

But, yes, the homepage has really become the center of, how do we advertise the services on this site in an equal way so that people can see that here's what the server is offering you, so we can get the answers easily and not have to spend 15 minutes that you don't have.

MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library.

Just back to the biannual survey, even having it on the front page where you click on forum, which I'm doing right now, it's not even listed on the front page of the forum, so we're not even saying, you know, put it on the front page of the community site. But tell me where it is.

MS. SIEGER: Well, I guess I could also make that a global sticky, at least during the time that the biannual survey is running.

Hindsight is 20/20, and maybe in

about -- how much time is there left on this session? Give me five minutes after that, and I'll have the global sticky.

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony,
Brown University.

Just a quick clarification. The ability of non-FDL staff to join the community, is that current capability or is that something on the near horizon?

MS. SIEGER: Ιt is capability as long as I have some mechanism to contact that individual to say, you know, let me verify that you work there. So, if a phone number is provided there, for example, and I can call up, or here's the web address, for example, I can go to their staff page on their library website and say, okay, this person is truly a staff member there. If I have some way of verifying that that person works at an institution that falls within the parameters of the site, then yes, they can currently get access.

MEMBER O'MAHONY: So I may have

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

misunderstood your earlier statement. Is the idea, then, to extend community membership to folks who do not work in federal depository libraries?

MS. SIEGER: Yeah. Right now we haven't advertised the fact that we're opening up the registration because we haven't figured out, on the registration pages, how to put that verification mechanism in there.

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Okay.

MS. SIEGER: But if we get individual requests right now, we will go through and do a little extra legwork to verify and activate people.

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Okay. The reason I ask is this has been a site that's been discussed occasionally in regional or state or local areas where folks have government documents groups, and sometimes the memberships local of those groups extend beyond strictly depository libraries.

So, when I look down the group list and see lots of groups that have already taken

б

advantage of it, from Ohio and Indiana and other places, I guess my other question now to those folks is, you know, what's been your experience in using the community site as a means to foster communication within those local, state or regional groups?

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster,
University of Akron. Is there anyone else
from Ohio?

(No response.)

MEMBER LASTER: Okay, I think I'm possibly the only Ohio person here, so I will speak on behalf of my state.

For the Government Documents Roundtable of Ohio, we experimented with using the FDLP community site as our main page. It didn't work for us. We could not control the appearance and the way that items are posted to the degree that we needed to, so we actually have moved to WordPress for our roundtable site.

We will maintain our community presence because it is easy to post events and

to post materials, but we were not able to make it work for our particular group.

MEMBER MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, and that leads into something I have been thinking about for quite some time.

I've gone into file sharing here, and of course, I see Ohio and several other groups, but I've never been sure, in the beta, what the limitations are for your file sharing. Now I've seen that a lot of people like GODORT of Ohio had 76. Then we've got some 30 files, 37, zero -- ah, Depository Library Council, zero.

Could you define and tell us a little bit more about the file sharing? You might provide us with enough information so that maybe it will become more active.

MS. SIEGER: Yeah, when it comes down to the various groups or things like that, there are other capabilities that we could take advantage of here. It's just a matter of knowing the exact pieces that the community wants.

When it comes down to the sharing, these are the categories that are set up right now. We can expand those categories If somebody drops me a message and says, you know, I'd like to have this category so I can post stuff, I can go ahead and enable that. But right now, with the way the site is set up, GPO has to do a lot of that stuff. the future, I'd like to make it so that the registered members can make their own robust groups. With that, the file sharing would be integrated in that the so group automatically have a category and they could post things at will so that GPO isn't the one having to intervene on the pieces.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But given the that this is very beta and we're getting feedback on how to make it better, those are the types of things that, if you tell us, hey, I don't want to have to go ahead and ask GPO to create a category in the file sharing; I just want to go ahead and have a group auto-created. If I have a group that's made, from there, I'll be able to say

here are the limitations.

Right now, the way we have it set up, there are limitations on the number of documents you can upload. There is a limit on the size of the individual files. I think we have a limited now to 10 meg. A file can be no bigger than 10 meg when you're trying to upload it. If there's a special circumstance where you have a file that's 15 meg and you want to upload it, we would just need to know if that's the norm. Then we can change the parameter. If it's the exception, then we can just put up the file individually.

But those are the things that we're just trying to balance and say, okay, this site has potential. Let's figure out where it needs to go now. So, hopefully at two o'clock -- well, you guys won't be here at my session at two -- so you'll have to make a list for me, of things that you want the site to do, and then we can go through and say these feasible and these are not.

MEMBER BURKE: Any other questions

from Council?

(No response.)

MEMBER BURKE: Questions from the audience?

MS. WOLK: Thank you. Joan Wolk, Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, Maryland.

I'd like to address this to Karen.

I did join the FDLP community site and I found it very difficult to use. I didn't find it very user-friendly. I did like the fact that I received email when there was something posted, and it informed me. But every time I tried to post something, I was unable to answer. I'm not sure why that was. I also found the arrangement or the organization a little difficult to follow.

I think it might be interesting to, instead of having a heading for everything with a blurb -- I know it's a blog -- but possibly condensing everything to a link of conferences, where you could link to conferences that would then have subheadings of what you actually wanted to talk about.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And then you would be informed that there were a number of responses in parentheses that you could click on that link.

Say it was for the biannual survey and there were two responses. You could open that link and there would be a thread that you I'm kind of using this could respond to. example, as some of you might know, from like education with Blackboard distance and WebTycho. I do teach at UMUC and we find that very useful because you don't have to read everything. You have a conference and then you have your subheadings and then you can respond and you can also put in your subject line to specific people.

I think that that might be -- I'm just suggesting that -- but something like that. I notice it's a blog and that's a different kind of thing. But just seeing these headings and this paragraph written, I find it very time-consuming to read through. I think it could be more condensed and a little bit better organized.

Receiving the email confirmation is really quite good because I'm alerted to the fact that something's there. But I don't understand why I couldn't respond to somebody.

Thank you.

MS. SIEGER: Thank you. I'm sorry you had such a rough time with the site. We'll certainly work on improving that.

But, yes, what you're saying seems rather indicative of the lack of traffic that we seem to be beginning, or, well, not so much lack of traffic. It seems like people, like I said, lying in wait to see if the site improves enough in order to use it, and I sympathize with that. And I so want to dig into the site. But I have to do the desktop and Ben's Guide first.

I can't bite off more than I can chew at the moment. It pains me because I don't like hearing comments such as yours, where you get frustrated when you're trying to use a tool and you can't.

One question, though. With regard

want to look at a difference organization considering that we're now dropping down to one conference a year. We may want to consider some other topic segmentation for the forum and the blogs.

to organizing via conferences, I wonder if we

But, yeah, I will definitely, after this, take a look at the permissions and see if there's a reason you weren't able to post so we can at least get that taken care of in the meantime.

Thank you.

MS. SOLOMON: Hi. Judy Solomon,
Seattle Public Library. Very interesting
site.

I'm a member in Washington State of the Northwest Government Information Network, and we have our own site. We could use this, but I'm not sure, really, whether or not it set up for something like that.

Is the idea that this is kind of public announcements of what the different groups in the different states are doing? Or

do you envision it as an actual working site for each group where we can interact with each other, you know, start different threads, different comments, post things to each other, the kind of thing?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. SIEGER: Yes. What I see is sort of both. On the one hand, it's designed to bring everybody, regardless of their group affiliation, together in one place so that they can get to know the broader community, but at the same time, knowing that people have individual groups, it would give a place for the individual groups to collaborate. So it's kind of a mix, and trying to provide that functionality all on what's there obviously, is not quite working.

If we need more group interaction, I would just need to know the types of things your group wants to do and then we can say, well, let's build these toolsets and then groups can go over here. And then individuals who want to talk to each other have these collective tools to use.

Ι don't know enough about individual groups want to use the site, and knowing that will help me shape that area So if you have any details -- also, better. Shari, if you have any details -- if I can build that type of thing for you, I would certainly like to know what it is you're looking to do. 

MS. SOLOMON: Just as one follow-up question, I would say, for these sites, one thing we would like to be able to do is to be able to also have private conversations, things that are not discoverable by the entire group. Is it possible, given what GPO does?

MS. SIEGER: On the community forum right now, there are two types of groups that are outlined in one of the threads. You could have -- I guess there are three types. There's an open group so that if you're a member of a group, you can post, but so can anybody else who's a member of the registered site.

There's also a closed group, and

what that group lets you do is anybody from the public can read what's in there, but only members of the group can actually respond.

That may be the issue that was experienced earlier.

And then a third is you could actually have a hidden forum where you can only see it if you're logged in and only if you're a member of that group will you'll be able to access the content that's in there.

What we explain on the forum is, if you want to create a group on the forum -because, unfortunately, if you can create a group on the home page, it doesn't create a group and the forum, but that's the type of things I'd like to fix in the future. If you create a forum on the community forum piece, then you could say, okay, I want is open to everybody, or I want this only to my group, or I want to restrict it down so that nobody can see it except if you're in my group. That level of granularity as possible. But, as you've noticed, the current system is clunky

in its ability to offer that at the moment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. WILLIAMS: Rhianna Williams, Houghton, Michigan. I have two questions. First is, one of the ways that we might use this at Michigan GODORT is we're trying to constantly reach out to non-government document librarians and include those in our meetings. we've groups and And presentations to the local Michigan Library Association to that effect.

But I would believe that having to verify everyone logging on would be extra work for you. I mean, because this is something we would want those beat people to be able to access as well, would it be a possible solution -- I know on other forums that I'm a member of, that you can mark people as spam or flag them to be looked at later.

MS. SIEGER: I get a lot of spam registrations.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay.

MS. SIEGER: A lot of spam registrations. So I think I'd rather take on

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the extra work of verifying somebody from the beginning than to have to go ahead and expose you all to unsavory content after the fact.

I have been debating in my head about different ways, like, you know, You don't somebody has a dot-edu account. typically see scammers and scrapers dot-edus. You know, are they blanket-approved, and anybody who comes with a dot-com or Gmail, something that's a suspect, you know, those little bit more through initial people qo an screening process. Those types of things are what I'm starting to figure out.

But it's it's also evaluating the types of registrations I get right now and saying, you know, do I have some mechanism to say, hey, these people are pretty trusted and people fit in this criteria and need a little extra TLC when it comes to their registration approval.

But, yes, I see what you're saying, but I'd rather not have that content posted in

the first place. I'd rather protect the users that are there than expose and open the site up to a little bit more risk.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay, well, then, the second question is, in the way to populate the site and then thus make it poured more useful for events like this -- I don't know; I left my laptop on the plane -- like this one, has there been a question posted to the forum specifically for this discussion right now so people could be talking about it on the forum while we talk about it?

MS. SIEGER: In the past, we have created a sub-forum for a specific conference, but it's gotten no responses. Nobody's posted anything. That's part of the cross-linking of things.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay.

MS. SIEGER: And as we start to cross-link things more, maybe in the future, what we could do is, next time we offer, you know, an announcement about the next Depository Library Council meeting and Federal

Depository Library conference, we can say, hey, have the discussions here, kind of like we're doing with the biannual survey now, so more linkages between posting things that are, you know, official from FDLP.gov and cross-link them into discussions that are happening on the community site, so there is that tie-in.

Those are things that are broached in one of the Council recommendations, and we have been looking at that.

MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS. McDERMOTT: Hi. My name is Abby McDermott and I'm actually a student at the University of Maryland in the E-Government Online cohort that that school has offered since Fall 2010. And I came to this session about this community was really interesting, but since I am not employed by a depository library, selective or regional, and I don't know when or if I will be -- I don't know. I'm a member of GODORT.

I just, I felt a little bit

confused when I heard that basically I can't join this community, you know, because I don't fall into to any of those categories, but I am doing an internship through government information online. This is my second FDLP conference. I think this information could be useful to me, and as somebody entering this career field, I think I might have something to contribute. I know I'm not alone; there are four other students in here for my program specifically.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I just wonder if you considered people like us when you decided to limit the site in that manner.

SIEGER: Ιt MS. was not intentional, per se. Like I said, when we first started this site, it was very new. Social networking was very new and GPO was taking its baby steps into the social networking world. Now we're starting to let up a little bit and what we were saying earlier was that, yes, we're trying to allow other people who have, who are in scope of the

content being discussed on the site, into the
site so that we keep out the spammers, the
scrapers. Those types of people are the ones
we want to keep out. The legitimate users, we

5 want to invite in.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And so, thinking off the top of my head, maybe there's а way to have "recommended by", you know, maybe a "recommend a friend" link, somebody who's a community member says, okay, if you are right interning with SGI, maybe James Jacobs sends you a link that says 'you are now invited to the community site.' And because he sent that message out, you can then become a member and that won't have to go to the rigid screening process at GPO. That's just off the top of my head, knowing that we need to find an easy mechanism to get people registered on the site.

In the meantime, if you want to go ahead and, in one of the fields, just say, you know, I was at the fall DLC meeting, I want an account, I'll go ahead and approve that in the

1 meantime and get you access to the site.

But, yes, you're not the type of person that we want to exclude from the site.

MS. McDERMOTT: Right, and I'm not alone.

MS. SIEGER: Yes. So, yes, if we make that known -- right now, if you read the site, it says it's locked down to depository members -- but if we change that message and change the registration process, then maybe will have more than 661 people. Maybe we can get a well represented community going here and have some interesting discussions.

MEMBER LYONS: Sue Lyons,
Rutgers Law Library. I'm looking at the GPO
Facebook page and I see that there's only
1,300 people who like that page. Why
concentrate on an internal social network site
as opposed to just using Facebook?

MS. SIEGER: With regard to the community site versus Facebook, at that point, you've turned over all control to Facebook or any of those other sites. They now own that

content. They will not provide that content back to you. They consider that part of their intellectual property. We'd rather keep that information on GPO. We've got to keep it on dot-gov. We'd rather maintain the hosting of that material ourselves. We also can control the privacy of it; we're not I going to give out the data.

If you look at organizations like Facebook and so forth, they are businesses. They have revenue models, and the way that they make their money right now is through advertising. On the community site, you will not see advertising.

So those are the reasons that we opt for our version of the site versus things like Facebook. We have better control. We're able to ensure the privacy of our users. We'll take on the burden of storing that data and making sure that data is accessible to you, and we're not going to take ownership of that material.

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs,

Stanford University. I think that's a great 1 2 point to make on that especially because it 3 looks like another walled garden, but it's a walled garden that is not trying to generate 4 money off of our work and off of 5 our 6 information. That's a good point. 7 The point about inviting friends, I'd be happy to invite friends. If the tool 8 would allow me to link to my Gmail and pull in 9 10 addresses from there, that would be pretty cool, rather than having to have me remember 11 12 each person's email address. 13 MS. SIEGER: I'm sure John's already writing that down. 14 15 CHAIR JACOBS: Thanks, John. 16 Should I just refresh my page now? (Whereupon, there was a long pause 17 on the record.) 18 19 CHAIR JACOBS: Oh, he's writing it 20 down. He's not --(Laughter.) 21 Yeah. That would be 22 MS. SIEGER:

very impressive if you were able to refresh it

23

1	right now because he's only writing it down.
2	(Laughter.)
3	MS. SIEGER: Give him until like
4	five o'clock. Then you can refresh your page.
5	MS. ORTH-ALFIE: Carmen Orth-Alfie,
6	University of Kansas.
7	Related to that inviting people in,
8	I'm wondering if what we could do is send out
9	an invite to the library schools and say that
10	if you have a class on government information
11	and would like to be part of this community
12	during that time, here's how you would sign up
13	your class for that.
14	MS. SIEGER: That could be
15	interesting. We could do a "put this code
16	into this box," and that would authorize them.
17	Those are other suggestions that we can
18	consider for that.
19	Thank you.
20	MEMBER BURKE: Thank you. Thank
21	you very much.
22	Are there any other questions?
23	(No response )

4

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MEMBER BURKE: If not, I we'll just reinforce the idea that this is a tool that, right as now, it's we see state-of-the-art 2008. I think we're going to look and see a brand-new presentation of it shortly. Not as quickly as we want, but it will be a much better product for all this input. We really appreciate your comments and I know GPO does too.

So, with that, I think we'll conclude the session and I'll pass it over to James.

Thanks.

(Applause.)

CHAIR JACOBS: Thanks, Helen and Don and Karen, for that really informative I do have couple presentation. а announcements before we let you go a little early. The first one is that Law Librarians and Friends Dinner tonight -- meet hotel lobby at 6:15 to walk to the restaurant, and the restaurant will be Sine Irish Pub. sounds good. Even if you're

librarian, going to an Irish pub isn't always 1 2 a good idea. 3 The second one is that the public library attendees are invited to lunch on 4 5 Wednesday with the Public Library Interest Group with Helen and Donna and Steve and also 6 with Mary Alice Baish, the Superintendent of 7 Documents. 8 Do you know where to meet there? 9 10 Yes, meet in the lobby as well, Wednesday, for lunch; tomorrow for lunch. 11 12 guess you can post more information on the board as well. 13 That's all I have. We'll 14 Good. 15 meet back here at two. Thank you, everyone. 16 17 (Whereupon, the meeting recessed at 11:47 a.m.) 18 19 (Whereupon, the meeting reconvened 20 at 2:01 p.m.) SESSION 3 - TRAINING 21 Good afternoon 22 MEMBER TUBBS:

everybody. This is ways and means of teaching

23

and training, reaching out in creative ways. This is the special interest group on education and training. My name is Camilla Tubbs. I'm a member of that committee, along with Debbie Rabina and Peggy Jarrett. And our GPO contact for this is Cherie Givens up in front. So, if you have questions at the end of this talk or want to follow up later, please feel free to email us. We're happy to help out.

Before we get started today, I was kind of interested, since we just got back from lunch and everything, if you are teaching a government documents class or you instruct as part of a research class, could you stand up so we get an idea of the type of -- okay.

Thank you.

One of the reasons we're doing this presentation today, it's all a part of GPO's effort to increase its outreach and its training. And I think you might have seen over the summer, on the community desktop site, there was a form on different types of

tools, that GPO was trying to get an idea of what's being offered.

You'll also notice during this conference, there's a lot of different presentations on training. We had one earlier this morning on PACER. There's one going on right now in another room about how to use the TV show Jersey Shore to teach government documents. And we'll be asking a couple of questions of GPO later on about their training module, which was announced earlier yesterday.

For right now, we are going to be focusing on ways that you can create your own learning modules and your own types of educational programs in teaching government documents. We want this to be kind of a fun session and show you some creative means and some creative tools for teaching.

First up is Bill Cuthbertson -- or William Cuthbertson from the University of Colorado, Boulder. You may have seen his YouTube videos up on the Federal Register and other types of government publication.

They're very entertaining, so if you haven't seen them yet, go on YouTube and check that out.

He's going to talk to you a little bit about understanding your audience, the use of humor in videos and basically -- no?

(Laughter.)

MEMBER LYONS: No humor allowed.

And basically, he's going to talk about how you can use statistics and other means to assess how the videos are working or how to develop new content.

After that, we'll have Sarah Glassmeyer. She is the director of content development at CALI, which is the Computer Assisted Legal Instruction Institute and she will talk about various software platforms for creating research guides, with a focus, of course, of how to make this entertaining, engaging, and fun.

And then, finally, we will have a presentation by Kristine Unsworth, who's to my left. She is assistant professor at Drexel

University's College of Information Science and Technology, and she will provide examples of ways that high school instructors can work with others outside of the traditional GOVDOC silo, other ILS instructors, to help students, librarians, and others understand better how to integrate the use of government documents in the research. It's more of an interdisciplinary look at teaching GOVDOCS.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

With that, I will turn it over to Bill.

MR. CUTHBERTSON: All right. I am William Cuthbertson, University Colorado, Boulder, and hopefully, this will be a short and sweet presentation on our use of YouTube to do some kind of fun things with government information.

But first, let me talk to you about where started off. As outreach we an librarian, and even as a regular librarian, I'm sure you all are pretty familiar with problems face in that we materials out to our patrons. These are kind of the issues in general.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Government materials are often seen intimidating. Ι think there is as an accessibility problem in terms of both computer access and intellectual content or intellectual accessibility. There's also a problem awareness in that people aren't really clear about what we do or what our function is, especially the public realm, I believe. And finally, there's a change in behavior for what our patrons are doing and how they're coming to find information that we offer or how they're coming to find information at all.

the first one is that the So, materials are intimidating for external and internal patrons. I guess what I mean by that is we've all been in the situation libraries government where а reference question has been held separate for us to get to later. We've all been referred materials. Sometimes, our colleagues don't want to touch government question because there's a heavy level of intimidation of these materials.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

That's okay in the academic realm because you're getting higher level questions, in-depth research questions.

But this is a bigger problem when you get to the public realm and the public libraries because, really, if you're dealing with simpler questions about government information, or what we may feel professionals should common-knowledge be questions about government information and the public isn't aware of them or our colleagues aware of these things, then we're aren't really doing a disservice at a much larger level. these are fundamentally Ι mean, materials that inform the democracy.

So, if we're failing in our aspect make these accessible materials t.o ormaterials that people can engage with, then it kind of expands out in much deeper ways, I think, strictly than in а academic environment, which goes on with the problems of intellectual inaccessibility. Of course you're going to have patrons would have difficulty navigating government websites or who don't have the Internet access available to them at home.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Intellectual inaccessibility mean that the content is lost behind a lot of obscure terminology that we ourselves might be could be the intimidation of using. Ιt formats, such as hearings, calendars, multiple versions of publications, and then there are the old standbys of lawyer-speak regulations and trying to get the average person to understand that type of communication.

Then there is, again, the lack of about what the FDLP is, awareness government This is sources are. an interesting one in academic environments, where you're asked to provide your students with two peer-reviewed articles and they don't ever think of government information as option because that's not the vocabulary that describe their faculty is using to the assignment.

Just out of curiosity, how many of
us have felt that we have lost, at some point,
in our libraries federal materials because
there weren't high enough use statistics or

because there was a lack of understanding

about the content provided? Has anybody ever

7 | felt that way?

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

That's like four of us. That's all right.

There are also outdated ideas about what libraries can do and who librarians are. This is how we understand ourselves and I think this is all very accurate. We're technologically savvy. We're eager to assist, intellectually engage materials, and accessible all the time. I mean, 24/7 facilities, you know, midnight chat with your librarian, that sort of thing. Unfortunately, this is how the public sees us.

Ultimately, the larger problem is that where people are going for information has changed significantly. If you are on the left, then you probably know these two names

-- I'm forgetting their order. It's 1 2 Stewart and Stephen Colbert. SPEAKER: That's Rod Stewart. 3 I know it's Rod 4 MR. CUTHBERTSON: Stewart. 5 6 (Laughter.) And if you're on the right, you're 7 getting your information from Glenn Beck and 8 Rush Limbaugh. 9 10 I knew it was Rod Stewart. a lead-in joke. It's very awkward up here. 11 12 (Laughter.) 13 MR. CUTHBERTSON: Stereotyping librarians here in our face. 14 Anyway, this is actually one of my 15 16 favorite statistics from the statistical abstract in that, since 2008, Americans now 17 spend more time with videogames than with 18 19 books -- gasp. 2009, the 20 -- in average 124 hours per year 21 person spent videogames and 98 with books. I enjoy a game 22

or two, so I don't have a huge problem with

that. This is a tough crowd.

(Laughter.)

MR. CUTHBERTSON: So the voice of authority for libraries is certainly fading. It's not what we had assumed it to be even 10 years ago. People aren't necessarily going to the default for where they information or even what they see as trusted information. The voice of authority for government information is also intimidating. Again, we need to find ways to break through that, make to ourselves accessible and kind of a viable option for people who may be more casual users of this material than we would expect.

So the answer is that it's time to mix it up. We need to create accessible, discoverable content that explains our value to patrons of all different levels, and this is an attempt to do that.

This is first video that we made that talks about FDsys.

(Whereupon, there was a long pause

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

```
on the record.)
1
 2
                  MR. CUTHBERTSON: Technology-savvy,
 3
      that's who we are.
                  (Laughter.)
 4
 5
                  (Whereupon, there was a long pause
 6
      on the record.)
                                            This
 7
                        CUTHBERTSON:
                                                    is
      YouTube.com.
8
                  (Whereupon, there was a long pause
 9
10
      on the record.)
                  MR. CUTHBERTSON: Sarah and I went
11
      to graduate school together.
12
13
                  (Laughter.)
                  (Whereupon, there was off-mic
14
15
      discussion on the record.)
16
                  (Whereupon, there was a long pause
      on the record.)
17
                  MR. CUTHBERTSON: any questions on
18
19
      the first few minutes of the presentation?
20
                  (Laughter.)
                  SPEAKER: (Off mic.)
21
                                        Oh,
22
                  MR.
                       CUTHBERTSON:
                                             for
                                                   the
      University of Colorado, Boulder,
23
                                             it's
                                                    CU
```

1 Boulder, libraries. 2 SPEAKER: And could you give your name and your institution? 3 SPEAKER: (Off mic.) 4 5 MR. CUTHBERTSON: FDsys and Angry Birds is the question. 6 (Whereupon, there was a long pause 7 on the record.) 8 (Begin video at 2:13 p.m.) 9 10 (End video 2:15 p.m.) 11 (Applause.) 12 MR. CUTHBERTSON: So why YouTube? 13 This is a question that kind of answers It's clearly the go-to site for itself. 14 15 video, universally known and universally used. 16 There's really no question that if you're making video content, this is the place where 17 it needs to live. 18 19 The nice thing about YouTube, the 20 added bonus, is that when your content reaches certain thresholds, you get a certain amount 21 of viewer data. For all hits that you get on 22

traffic sources,

23

video,

your

location, and discovery data is released to you. But it's when you hit other thresholds that you get much more valuable information. At 500 hits, you get what are called from YouTube 'hotspots,' and I'll show you what those are in a second. At 800 hits, you get your viewer demographics. So it's a lot like the census, where I think they want to mask the individual locations of folks or their demographics before you reach a certain threshold.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So a hotspot -- this is what it looks like for the video that we just watched. This is a measure of how well users staying engaged with your content and they're really sitting through it. You can see that there's a little red thermometer that horizontally in the top right-hand runs corner. And then the rest of this, your video will play on the right, and on the left side, it tracks like when people are dropping out. This is actually pretty high engaging successful video because our thermometer here

1 is actually a very high. People are 2 dropping out midstream. You can see back here, here's that dip. It's about a third of 3 4 the way through, and that's when Elmo appears, I believe, so whatever hatred we have for Elmo 5 is manifest here in this video. 6 But it's really very interesting 7 8

And what we can use this for -- I'll data. talk about that in a second.

The other kind of information you get are the viewer demographics, and here's a little chart that shows this. But I thought a more interesting way to present this would be to show a nice little short video.

MR. CUTHBERTSON: We're going to launch that one more time because we're technology savvy.

Essentially, it's just presentation of locational data and how that kind of changed over time with the release across the GOVDOC-L listserv.

Here we go.

(Begin video 2:19 p.m.)

22

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

(End video 2:20 p.m.)

MR. CUTHBERTSON: So those are just taken from the map that you're provided at YouTube in the bottom right-hand corner. And it's just an animation that I made that shows, over time, exactly where people are coming from. And you get more interesting stuff from the domain level as well.

So using YouTube creates a couple of new challenges for us. I think this will be kind of interesting, how it plays out. But the thresholds for data require more professional appearing content, I feel, because if you're going to try to get 500 hits on a government document-related video, it had better be pretty and it had better keep people entertained is is kind of my feeling about it.

The upside is that the professional appearing content, I think, will increase your credibility with this new clientele that we have, that are more media savvy, that are more engaged in the visual than they are in perhaps the written. So it's kind of a win-win. I

think, again, the better we can create these things and the more engaging we can make them, hopefully, these are videos that can be reused and returned to, which extends their life in our statistics.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The data, going forward, we're going to use this information to kind of inform the success of our projects at Boulder and the style that we're taking with these things, so that data is really going to be invaluable. One of the challenges, actually -- you saw that part where the average age was 45 to 54, I believe; right? This is really interesting thing because to me that says that students are not the ones who are watching these videos and then, instead, it's us. this is a real challenge as librarians. Τ mean, we all love this kind of content, but it's a sold audience already, if you will. how do we transfer these materials so that they're engaged more by the average user? it a problem with where they're located. we need to get them out a little bit more?

But it becomes ever is an interesting intellectual puzzle about how we're going to get this stuff one step farther out if you will.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

think part So Ι of that is experimenting with delivery. Obviously, But we have at CU Boulder a there's YouTube. blog that my colleague Jennie Gerke started in about 2006, I believe, and that's been very successful for us. It's also a venue that we put these videos out on, but we do a lot of other lot content, of exploratory а information about documents. Facebook and Twitter -- we're engaged with those as well.

Again, the end level is just to make the materials that we offer, the materials that we have that we know about, more accessible to patrons at all different levels. I mean, our academic audiences may be kind of a given, but our public users and even our colleagues sometimes are not a given.

So the lesson that you get out of this is that social distribution -- I know a

lot of us may have had to argue to get these things out there or to get a Twitter feed for library or Facebook, our to get and questioned the validity, or had, at least in years past. But the real lesson to be learned from this stuff, and you can see just from the spread of interests that that one video gained nationally in terms of hits -- is that social media is not an option anymore. It's really quite a necessity for what we need to do to make these materials accessible and to get the public involved and engaged in what should be their government.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Our strategy at Boulder is going to be kind of a mix with these things. So we're going to have kind of these overhanging informative videos, or that ones take lighthearted approach to what we're doing and then those are going to be supplemented with more functional videos, with tutorials and things like that. I know that that GPO just announced that they're going to start doing tutorials fantastic for FDsys, which is

because that means I don't have to. We should all be pretty thrilled by that, quite honestly.

This is the approach we want to take. I mean, we really do feel strongly that this is an opportunity to broaden the reach of this content and to get our voice out as librarians, to build our credibility up in a fun and kind of engaging way for users, and at the same time, get the content out there where people can honestly engage with it.

This is second-to-last slide I had.

And again, this is just to say I was thinking about fishing, and I don't fish, so I don't know if this fish is dead or not. That's a yes.

## (Laughter.)

MR. CUTHBERTSON: But it's the idea that once you have these things out, you want to make them as discoverable as possible for your patrons, so you want to put them in places where they can find them, like the blog, Facebook, Twitter et cetera. You want

3

1

5

6

4

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

to have a YouTube channel for your library for whatever it is that you're doing. And you just want to make sure that if they come across one, they can very easily and quickly come across your other materials. So we've got cross-links in our videos to the other ones that are related to one another. posted on the blog and then repeat that kind of thing back and forth with Facebook. that's really just the survival mechanism I take to do think we need to successful outreach for government information.

That is all I have. I appreciate your patience with the technical troubles. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MS. GLASSMEYER: Hi. I'm Sarah Glassmeyer. I used to be a librarian up until earlier this year, actually, just like two months ago. But now, I am the Director of Content Development at the Center for Computer-Assisted Legal Information, aka CALI. Basically, it's kind of a think-tank. As a

vendor, we sell and create educational materials for law students, but we also create lot of creative comments, open source, materials that we are happy to use. So don't worry, I'm not going to do a sales pitch at all. If anything, I'm saying please steal our stuff. Take it; run with it. I am going to be mentioning some CALI products, but I also would have mentioned them had I still been just a librarian doing this talk.

So here's the agenda for my little part of this talk. Also, I'm fighting a cold. Ιt never fails. Whenever I'm doing presentation, my body's always like, oh, you're going to get on a plane and have to talk in front of people? You need your sinuses to explode right now. So I apologize for my coughing. Unfortunately, I mic'd, although, even when I'm on mic'd, I always feel the need to project to the back of the audience. I spend too much time in theater, I think, in high school.

Okay. So, as we said, I'm going to

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

cover the software aspects, just different
ways to either do training, maybe not so much
a class, but also just kind of your one-shot
bibliographic instruction sessions, even the
kind of, in-the-stacks surprise reference sort

of things. So that's what I'm going to be

7 covering.

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Also, don't worry, you do not have to be technologically savvy at all, really, to do anything I'm telling you about. I'm really not, too much. I work now with a bunch of tech people. Kind of our head nurse, his name is Elmer. I love him to death. He's a really nice But whenever Ι ask him guy. how something works, he would explain it to me and I'd stare at him, and he'd be like, you have no idea what I just said, do you? And I'm like, no. So now he just says, magic.

(Laughter.)

MS. GLASSMEYER: It's kind of a mutually satisfying answer, really. I like, oh, okay.

So a lot of this stuff works by

magic. You don't need to know how it happens,

how it works. It just does, and it's very

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

easy.

Just to kind of reemphasize some of the things that Bill said in his talk -- and again, Bill and I went to grad school together and we're buddies. I never, you know, it's so weird that we're now on a podium doing a presentation together. It's kind of hilarious.

MR. CUTHBERTSON: We're also drunk. (Laughter.)

MS. GLASSMEYER: But there are some reasons, especially in the gov docs world, to maybe kind of push yourself a little bit; get creative. I know that gov docs are totally cool and weird and interesting, and you know that, but students don't know that. They see this as just piles of statistics, and gov docs, it seems like they always kind of stuff gov docs departments in basements or in the library, weird far corner of the always kind of an adventure even to physically get there. And it's confusing.

I mean, my sister is a PhD in chemistry, so she knows her research. And I remember, she had to go over to the gov docs department when she was working on a PhD, and she came back and she was horrified. She was like, what the hell was that? There were slashes and colons. I mean, it was like she was betrayed.

(Laughter.)

MS. GLASSMEYER: She was like, I have no idea what that was, but I never, ever want to go back there again. But really, gov docs are awesome. You know, it can be kind of confusing, so you need to do a little bit more extra outreach and more education just to get people comfortable with the idea of gov docs.

But also, you can do it because you can. I don't ever want to use technology for technology's sake, even though I totally work for an IT kind of group now. that's not what I'm saying at all.

What I'm saying is that people

nowadays are used to having technology at I mean, I can't even go to the podium without taking my phone with me as a security blanket. People, technology is just kind of everywhere now, and in government, a lot of these things are being published now electronically, so that means that you can play with them a little bit and do some more interesting things with them. So when I say, because you can, that's what I mean; not just because it's there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

first software platform The going to talk about is Wikis. Everyone, I think, has heard of them by now. Wikipedia obviously is the most famous Wiki. also a little fact that everyone knows, but I always put it in every slide when I talk about it, "wiki" is a Hawaiian word for "quick," and it's initially created so you can do easy collaboration on websites, but it also means that you don't really have to have any web skills whatsoever. And this so and the WordPress, what I'm going to talk about next,

is good when you don't have access to your library's website, or if you do and it just kind of takes a while to get it edited.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I remember when I was a practicing It didn't happen often, but there librarian. were times that at 4:30 in the afternoon I would get a call. An undergrad class would be coming the next day wanting to take a tour of my law library; could have a research guide ready to go? Sure. So I would just do it on a wiki, just because it was faster, it was easier than talking to the IT guys and getting them to get the website going. And that way, I could hand out little slips of paper with the URL on it because, you know, I didn't have to make 20 copies -- actually, I would never really know how many students were going to show up -- copies of my research guide.

So wikis are really fast, easy way to make a neat research guide online. And then, because so many of these materials are electronic-based, you can put in the hyperlink to the materials so the students doesn't have

to write down a URL. I know Wikipedia kind of gives wikis somewhat of a bad name, thinking that anyone can edit them and that sort of thing. You can lock them down; you can even password protect them so you don't have to worry about other people coming in and changing your work. But really, it's as easy as, if you can use Microsoft Word, you can use a wiki.

Also, I don't think I mentioned, but our website. My website, SarahGlassmeyer.com, I have a list of all the different software companies that you can get this material from. I think there was a handout I made too. So you don't have to furiously write down this stuff.

Here's an example. This is McGill University in Montréal. They use wikis for their research guides, like just their official ones. I would do this behind the scenes to get around IT, but some places actually do this officially. So this is one way you could do that.

This is another one. This is the University of California at San Diego. have a whole series of research guides done on wikis. The nice thing is you can close these had pretty easily, so if I an undergrad English class coming that, for some reason, they always -- you know, I worked in a law library, so they're like, we want to write a paper on a law case. Okay. We've got thousands. Good luck. But then for like a political science class, their information would be slightly different. So you usually easily clone and this сору information.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Another good platform for using really quick research guides is WordPress. It was originally created to be a blogging platform, but it's open source so that means a couple of things. One, that means it's free to use. Another thing it means is that there's a wide educational or a wide community adapting it. So there's tons of themes and platforms or plug-ins that you can use to make

it do pretty much whatever you want.

For some reason, there were two main open-source software blogging kind of companies. This WordPress and there's Drupal. I prefer WordPress. It's much easier to use. Because there's a ton of people involved in higher education that are really WordPress and really developing it. If you Google the Corkboard, there's a guy, his name is Kyle something, but he was a librarian and now he's working on a PhD in library and information science. But he works on a lot of different adaptations the WordPress to make it do whatever you want. But again, it's really easy to use.

Again -- I put it on the other slide to -- WYSIWYG, that means what you see is what you get -- that's essentially when you're using WordPerfect or Word and you click the little "I" button and it makes it indented. That's what a WYSIWYG editor is. So WordPress is very, very easy to use.

Just some examples of what

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

WordPress looks like -- this is one I did last year, actually, for CALI before I even knew I'd ever worked for CALI. Ιt was combination between them and the Legal Information Institute, they wanted just to a research guide for free law, so this is all WordPress. This is, as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

There's a product called LibGuides or LibGuides, whatever you want to pronounce it, but this was kind of my attempt to make a LibGuide for free. So this is WordPress copying LibGuides. But again, LibGuides would also work for the stuff I'm going to talk about a little bit later. So, really, it's very easy to adapt WordPress to make it look and do whatever you wanted to do.

Again, this is the take-home message. Basically, if you have access to your website, your library's website, if you can adapt it anyway, perfect. Or if you have LibGuides, you can do a research guide that way; great. Otherwise, just remember, in wikis and WordPress, you always have ways to

get around IT roadblocks.

The other thing I want to talk about is mobile technology. I kind of have a broader definition of that, so obviously, cell phones and smart phones, iPads, other tablets. But also, I'm including e-readers and that's just because they're, you can do some things with them that you might find useful.

Basically, a couple things to remember. One, you need to adapt to the needs of mobile technology, which basically means your website, make sure you have a mobile version. There's a plug-in for WordPress that magically just makes it go, straight to your phone, just some things like that. But also, the real important thing is to exploit their strengths. One of them is that they often have a camera on them, so you can play with that.

iPads in other tablets, there are apps, and these are, A, free for the most part, or very cheap, and they do a lot of the stuff for you.

So I'm going to talk about QR codes in the second. So there are QR code readers that your patrons can use. They are absolutely free to download. There are podcasting applications that are absolutely free for you to use, you'll put a link to on your website or use a QR code link to.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

This is just my own personal You can record a pretty decent video with this and pop it up on YouTube within minutes. So if you want to do just a quick little library tour, you can do that. just remember, you know, you're going to exploit them pretty well. But the one thing also to remember is to be agnostic -- you know, the phrase is "be system agnostic" -- so if your website has Flash on it, you need to take that off or have some other alternative because iPhones, iPads cannot read Flash. you create an app, which you really don't have to do, and it's really hard -- if for some reason you decide to create an app, remember that's both have one for iPhones

Android phones and tablets.

Okay, now we're combining things. So you have a website that is your research guide that has hyperlinks to all of your different electronic resources, and we are aware that people use phones and e-readers. Here's a way to kind of combine the two. How do you get the website on the phone? A quick way to do that as something called a QR code. They're really becoming -- I live in Chicago now, so I'm seeing them everywhere, on billboards and that sort of thing.

It's basically a barcode on steroids, so you scan it with your phone, you have the app already installed, and it either directs you to a website or it has other information. You can have it send a -- you have an email address so that, magically, it starts to write an email. It can be a phone number, so it automatically jumps to your phone's text messaging service and it will send a text message to a number. So you can you can cram a lot of different kinds of

184

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

information, even just your information, just that basic amount of information. It kind of depends on what you And they're free to make. need is. There's lots of different websites out there, depending on what kinds of information you want to put in your QR code. You just type it in, magic happens, it gives you a QR code. It's an image. You cut/paste it, and you can put it anywhere.

So some ideas of how to use that -these are all people I found in the wild. On
the left-hand side -- yeah, it will be on the
left-hand side for you too.

Say you have periodicals that have stopped print publication and now it's electronic-only, have a book dummy at the end of that row, a QR code that jumps it immediately to the electronic version of it.

Ιf YouTube you have а explaining what resource is, have that QR code right there; people it because can scan YouTube magically has it cell phone-compatible, iPad-compatible version so they can watch it on their phone.

Research guides -- so, like I was saying, WordPress has a plug-in that will automatically make stuff mobile-friendly. LibGuides automatically go to mobile-friendly versions. So you you're in -- I don't know, name of federal agency; FDA -- the FDA section of federal government documents. And you can have, you know, just your research guide and FDA publications right there or even just a link to their website.

This is something that CALI's doing again. You don't have to buy it. You're more than welcome to take these, some of them. A lot of these, since we are aimed at the law school market, they're more pay, legal kind of information, but they're called LibTours. It's a QR code. People can scan it and then they get a little podcast about two minutes explaining what the resource is. But we do have some government docs in there, like the CFR, US Code. And if you would like to make

some, that's more.

I was talking to a librarian Deborah Wandrek in the back; she's also a law librarian. She was saying they're doing that, but with videos, so just kind of a video tour of what that resource is, or a little screen cast.

So, just different ways that you can kind of exploit technology that's now available, again, all for free, no real textiles available at all.

So if you have any questions -- I guess you have a panel here to do that afterwards -- but my name is Sarah Glassmeyer, Sarah@CALI.org. I'm always happy to answer questions about these sorts of things. Thanks.

## (Applause.)

DR. UNSWORTH: Okay, hi. I'm Chris
Unsworth. I'm an assistant professor at
Drexel University, where I teach government
information. So I want to spend just a few
minutes talking about some things I'm

experiencing as an instructor of government information, and just generally, at the end, hopefully get some input from all of you about some directions that we might go with, as we always hope to do, kind of extend our reach for the importance of government documents,

but also just teaching in general.

The numbers, these NITA are familiar issues for all of us here. We have legislation that's continually happening that's threatening to cut budgets, asking why need the GPO, why we need physical printing, anything like that. This is a question that my students asked. It's always on their minds. We have some of the Pew surveys that I'll talk about a little bit more, which is giving us an idea of the number of people that are online that are accessing information online in relation to government spending.

I have to look down on this one because it's too far away for me to see.

So, in relation to government

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

information, we have some percentage, you know, 23 percent of Internet users look online to see how federal stimulus money is being spent, for example. Fourteen percent looked up campaign funding. These are numbers that we're familiar with, and then again, the argument that things are being available, things are available online; there's no need to print. So these are just issues that we are constantly facing.

One way that we try and harness using online information is through something like the Internet public library. This is one example.

Are you all familiar with IPL? Okay.

A lot of us actually have our students take part. When we're teaching reference courses, our students actually take part in IPL, answer reference questions, as part of the course for learning how to do reference. They volunteer in the Ask a Librarian. But he question that I've been

asking and I want to kind of keep working towards is, how can we use IPL to understand the breadth of government information, the questions that are being asked, and as a way to highlight government information sources?

So this is just a screenshot of the IPL main search box. There are resources by subject, a large, large variety of newspapers, magazines, special collections for kids and for teens. There is a government and law section as one of the subject sections. I want to talk about this just for a second.

One of the things that myself and a PhD student I'm working with were curious about, and actually talking about Debbie Rabina about this as well, is how government information is being addressed in IPL. What's going on with IPL and government information? So what we started to do is we were able, working with our IT person to get -- the IPL is being hosted at Drexel, which is one reason I was able to get this information without too much of a hassle.

1 We decided to look at the 2 low-hanging fruit, the subject categories that had to do with government information and law 3 as our first kind of stuff to see what kind of 4 questions are being asked. I've got -- how 5 6 many? -- seven subject categories that 7 questions are put into when the patron or user asked the question of the system. So we took 8 all of the data from 1995, which is 9 10 beginning of IPL, to 2009 just to kind of chart where government information fits. And 11 12 you can see it's the, the heavy blue line is

government

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the

center.

Law questions are running right along to it pretty much, except, next interestingly enough, from 2006 to 2009, they really shot up. So this is an area that we're just starting to do some more analysis on. we can see we've got from 100 questions up to 400, almost 500 questions, I quess, for the top, which is in the business category. here is just the government information

information, kind of

questions themselves.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

of the questions that One I'm really interested in is IPL separates out into this subject categories, so we have government and law, but we don't really know if that's the only place government-related information is being asked for. So the next step that were going to look at, is to just do a simple for search the number of answers that reference a dot-gov site to get an idea where this baseball, if we're only seeing them within government and law, which I doubt very much.

I know for a fact, just doing a cursory look through the data, that there's a lot of reference to government documents in the history, as you can imagine, in business, and so on. We know government information goes throughout all sorts of our reference information. We can't just classify it as government information. So that would be one step.

A next step would be actually doing

23

a content analysis of the types of questions are being asked. What kinds of questions are seeing individuals who using are IPL we asking? We get a lot of questions from people saying, I'm writing a paper for my ninth grade history class; I heard that a president with so fat, he got stuck in the bathtub; who was All the way up to -- oh, I was just that? looking yesterday -- it was something about taking a gun to another state and if that was So it's a pretty wide variety of legal. questions that are being asked, and I think it's a wealth of information that we can tap into as government information librarians or as instructors to kind of get kind of a pulse of what's going on, what kind of resources are being asked throughout the country, internationally as well, for that matter.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So this is just what I was saying, the process that we're going to start looking at, and one way I can see this information helping is as a way to help train future government information specialists to kind of

get an idea of the type and breadth of questions that they may be faced with. And it's a fantastic way to highlight government resources.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So how many of you have already It's perused the American data? а very interesting report actually, particularly for us in government information. This is the generations online survey from 2010, and you notice I highlighted in yellow -- you can see it fairly well there -- government information ranks very high. This is only the top third of the chart, and I urge you to pull it up online and take a look at the different that people are giving for reasons online.

You can see that, for the Millennials, 18 to 33, government websites are fairly low down. But from ages 34 through 64, it is the fifth down after e-mail, search, health information, and to get news in general, which I would think for "get news in general," a lot of that is going to be, and

for health, these are also going to be
government sources. The Silent Generation,
which I think is such a weird classification
for people between 65 and 73, but anyway, it's
a little bit lower, as it is for the GI

generation.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I'm pulling this one up here, and I think it is big enough that you can see it. This is just in a one-year period between 2009 and 2010, the change in position across the board, but I've highlighted the government information. The only information that there was really no change was in this Silent generation. In every other place, government information has moved up, which I'd like to think that means that we are all doing a really job of publishing great our information.

Another interesting thing is, in this 2009 survey, health information wasn't a separate category, and so, now, health information, I think, was the third one down, so that's kind of a slightly different thing

that affects looking at this table. In any case, I think this is a really fascinating way to think about the population that we're serving and who we're hoping is actually going to continue to use government information and to use government information even more.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So the title of this presentation and what I think the main message is, is that, all know, government information is incredibly interdisciplinary. It's crossing boundaries and it touches on so many different of daily aspects lives education, and really, throughout every part of our world. So, when I'm thinking about incorporating government information into my classes and into pedagogy as a whole, I think this concept of, rather than about multidisciplinary work or interdisciplinary, it's transdisciplinary. It's really government information as a way that we really break down borders between silos of sciences or the humanities, social sciences, arts, all government sorts of things, because

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

information reaches across all those areas, and I think it's an amazing opportunity to tap into that.

I'm getting, each quarter that I teach government information, more students from public policy, for example, who want to be a part of the class, and they want to be part of the class because they're interested in where the information is coming from, not just how to find the information but how it I find that half of the course is works. about teaching civics or teaching authorship in the sense of, how is the society working? How is democracy working? And so, through like mining the IPL data, teaching things these courses, I think we can really reach out to a large group.

This is a large, long quote. I won't go into it, but the concept of transdisciplinarity really pushes on this idea of creating and tapping into a civil society and democracy in the most encompassing manner that you can think of. And I think that

government information, it is transdisciplinary, as I said. And by providing these kinds of tools, we not only help people who may be taking our classes or even coming into our libraries, but we're providing our students with an opportunity to work with others outside of LIS and to go beyond the silo of government information.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The next point I think is really important is that it's resulting potentially very rich experiences that could translate into professional collaborations and broader recognition of government information, and finally, with the goal of interpreting government information into the other courses across campuses, really joining together so that government information isn't this kind of scary thing off to one side with the weird call numbers that nobody understands and the deep, dank, scary basement that's dusty and no one wants to go into, but as a way to really get some excitement about the resources that we have.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So I hope, if anybody has any ideas about this, that we can talk about later. Thanks.

## (Applause.)

MEMBER TUBBS: Okay, so first we're going to ask а couple questions of the speakers and then we'll open it up questions for Council and then questions for And then we'll open up broader the audience. questions for everybody involved.

The first question is really for the speakers that creating are these presentations or creating these lesson plans. This question because I'm also comes up making online tutorials, and the first question my boss asked me is, how much time are you spending on this? And then, how much time is it saving you in the long run?

So how long does it take for you to create something like that two-minute video that we saw at FDsys? How often do you have update it because things keep changing online?

If you can give me a little bit of background

on that. And you've already discussed measuring success, so maybe Bill or Sarah?

MR. CUTHBERTSON: The FDsys video took about two months total, which sounds like a lot, but really the scripting was, very brief. That took about two days. I mean, of course, you write your whole text out first.

I may just be a little bit anal because two months seems like a lot of time even to admit to, but a lot of this is finding the weird clips. I mean, there's a lot of Photoshop involved. That's a lot of -- I'm a new user of Camtasia, so I was learning that software. So, hopefully, over time, you deliver more savvy with the software, so it shouldn't be a prohibitive amount of time. I don't think people should get wigged out about the initial investment.

But, yeah, I think the key is just to have a nice script ahead of time, and once you have that script written down, you can really manipulate it visually any way that you want, so that's how I would start.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. GLASSMEYER: It's kind of a similar thing. It depends on how comfortable you are using software. The first time I built my fake LibGuide using WordPress, and that was using the WordPress.com, which is all free -- they hosted for you -- it probably took me a day to do it. Same thing -- and also just kind of playing around and seeing all the little things the software can do, with wiki's as well. It eventually does become a timesaver, I've found, because I could easily adapt it, just cut, paste, putting the new wiki, change the professor's name, change the date, maybe, you know, a resource name change or something like that, just change the hyperlink really fast. So it became a timesaver, plus I didn't have to go to the copy machine in may 20 copies whatever. Deciding to what paper color to use, that always takes a good half-hour.

(Laughter.)

MS. GLASSMEYER: But as far as making QR codes, it's also, again, a little

bit of a learning curve finding which service you like best. But then, it's really just a matter of, you know, literally five minutes. You have your URL to your research guide, put it in, click magic button, and then you have it, which you can then cut and paste and put wherever you want.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So, really, I find just a slight learning curve, but then very, very quickly, and then eventually a cumulative timesaver.

One thing that I DR. UNSWORTH: would agree with both of the other speakers is government information, working with really build on the work of other people. Ι know for me, the lectures that I do, I very, very fortunate that I've had other government information instructors that have shared their work with me. And so, since government information is always kind slightly changing and in flux, you have a base that you can start with, but they'll have the slide that, you know, we like to think that available 24/7, and students

you're available 24/7 as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

think, Т in something like government information, it's constantly staying on top of, you know, the news, blogs, all sorts of current events, and building it into a core shell that you already have. So it could take quite a bit of time, I imagine, if you had to start from scratch, but I think we have so many great resources out there that hopefully there's a structure with that.

MEMBER TUBBS: And this question actually is for GPO. So, Shari, you can help us with this.

We briefly heard yesterday about the new modules that are coming out and free training sessions that will start in November, and I was wondering if you could elaborate on that a little bit, since I know that there's another session on this, but I believe Council will be here missing that. So I was wondering if you could flesh that a little bit.

What is the intended audience? Would it be government document librarians?

1 Is it for the general public? it 2 transdisciplinary? What kind of platform are you planning on using for the instruction? 3 And have you set up within these educational 4 method for evaluating 5 models and а 6 outcomes of what is a success, or how many 7 people are taking advantage of the training?

things like that.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So we've got three DR. GIVENS: main tracks. One is like a general track that would take you from being either a novice all the way into the advanced level, and they're designed in essentially, approximately fourto seven-minute clips so that you can get it as you would like because I guess, when we were first thinking about it, it's designed for everyone, so it's going to be open to everyone. But also, I guess, when we were first thinking about it, we had in government documents coordinators and thinking about how we have a regular turnover lately. government documents So now, we have coordinators who are having to man other jobs.

They're working the reference desk, trying to pick up this.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I thought one of the great ways to go about it would be to design it in clips so that you could pick that up; right? When there's a little bit of downtime, you could pick that up in the desk. And it's set up so that you can do them together in sequence or you could stop and then pick it up at a little bit later points.

through, like, So it goes the introduction, the background, basic, advanced searching, browsing. There's whole different section which deals with tips and tricks, which would be later on into it, and the two different tracks, one for legislation and one for regulations. So, obviously geared towards a slightly different group, but also accessible to everyone. Then, in our legislation and regulation section, we do a little bit of, I don't want to say civics teaching, but sort οf enough an introduction that you can grasp what

that we're going to be discussing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

We kept in mind that we would have users of all different education levels who would be looking at these. So that's what we were thinking, is to sort of keep it at a level where most people could follow along, no matter your education level.

As for what form -- we're looking at learning management systems now. Losing OPAL was sort of a surprise and so we looking into that. We've gotten our requirements done. And as you all saw, it was open for discussion and we were getting quite a bit of information from that. And we're also looking into the possibility of being able to piggyback with another agency for that, but that's not at all certain at this point, so it's sort of up in the air. we're hoping to get it done as quickly as we can get through the Procurement process.

MEMBER TUBBS: And then this question is for the audience, and it's really a question that's geared for -- we're trying

this

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

to

of

are?

gather

are most helpful?

information

training for your users and staff?

educational programming would

education committee, and we're wondering, what

are your needs in the area of education and

useful to you? What kinds of outreach methods

Would it be helpful to have just a quick

LibGuide, something you could take and then

altar to conform with what your patron needs

What kind of content would you like to

as

part

Is it videos for you?

of

be

What kinds

see or types of tutorials would you like to see being offered for GPO?

So I will see if anybody would be brave to come to the mic.

(No response.)

MEMBER TUBBS: And if there's nobody from the audience, I would also open up this to Council, if they have suggestions for content they would like to see, or platforms.

Yes.

MEMBER RABINA: I just have a question before we go into this -- Debbie

1 Rabina, Pratt Institute.

Bill, I'm just wondering if the music that you used, and Elmo, like, do you clear copyright? Is that all public domain, things that you're using? How do you work out that part of it?

MR. CUTHBERTSON: Yeah, I've got my question a couple of times in email after the first video came out, and my understanding of it -- Sarah's an attorney, so I'm going to hire her -- my understanding is that it's actual fair use.

We have a librarian here who's our music librarian who's pretty well versed in fair use restrictions. And from conversations I've had with them, it's pretty okay.

But what I have done is, like, the music and the FDsys video, I mean, obviously, the phone with the whistling, weird Bjorn and John song, that's just for us, so we'll just keep that on the DL.

(Laughter.)

MR. CUTHBERTSON: But for FDsys,

1 all that stuff, there's actually sites, I'm happy to share these links, for kind of 2 free access music. I mean these aren't full 3 tracks, but it's kind of designed to be music 4 that you plug in for programming just like 5 6 this; same with the sound clips, et cetera, et 7 cetera. So I do think what I use, because it isn't necessarily married to the content and 8 the brevity is good, that it's pretty much a 9 10 fair use kind of rights issue. 11 My attorney says it's okay. 12 (Laughter.) 13 MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett, 14

University of Washington law library. I will admit that am exactly your audience.

> MR. CUTHBERTSON: Thank you.

MEMBER JARRETT: And I'm a little YouTube nervous t.hat. knows that middle-aged woman.

(Laughter.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MEMBER JARRETT: It must be those Land's End catalogs that I'm always searching in.

My question is, how do I find clips and things that are relevant to the students? Now, of course I've got law students who are a little older, that they get the social context and I don't look like some old gal trying to be cool?

I notice that in your videos, you definitely have things -- you know, I remember the Moon landing, but law students don't. So how do you bridge that generational gap?

MR. CUTHBERTSON: That's a great question. I think any time you try to approach an audience, sincerity is always the best way. I think, if you try to play to a specific group, that never really succeeds in the way that you had hoped. So any kind of sincere attachment that you have can carry over very sincerely.

I'm a big fan of Battlestar Galactica, and I always want to try to sneak Battlestar Galactica into everything I do. But of course, that show has been dead for three years, so now I have to move on. And I

think there's actually -- I don't want anybody to run to the door -- but there was a session that was going on earlier at this slide about using Jersey Shore. 4 Oh, good. (Laughter.) MR. CUTHBERTSON: But it is a real challenge. I mean, 9/11 was 10 years ago, and of course, it's burned into our minds, but kids don't know it. I mean, they don't know 12 it in the way that we know it. So you just

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

to keep current.

I watched a lot of TV when I was a kid, so a lot of that is like those Theragran commercials. I mean, that was from like 1970-something. I don't know. I'm not giving you an answer.

have to -- I don't have an answer -- just try

O'MAHONY: Just MEMBER to follow-up. Dan O'Mahony, Brown University.

Once you've done your script and you have your first cut of this, I mean, do

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

you test it with folks? That's one of the ways in which we do it at our library, either have students help create the video and the content, or at least test it with a target audience.

MR. CUTHBERTSON: We didn't test it with students, interestingly. We had kind of a slow release for that first video because it was very, very different from what we'd seen anywhere else and certainly what we've done in the department before. So, you know, I showed it to my boss, and that was the first level, and then we showed within the department and then we expanded out. And I think the song video kind of show that we expanded out little by little, so we went to Colorado government group.

So we're kind of getting feedback along the way. And there were editorial changes that we made in, I think, both of the videos that I've done.

Debbie Rabina, MEMBER RABINA: Pratt Institute. This is а question

Chris.

Since we started talking about demographics, is this also data that you can mine from IPL in terms of who's asking these questions that relate to government documents?

DR. UNSWORTH: Is it? I am not entirely sure. I don't think people have to put in their age. It's something you may be able to deduce, but I don't know that you could say 100 percent. I would think that by doing some kind of content analysis, you might able to get a sense of age, but you wouldn't necessarily be 100-percent sure.

MS. SEVETSON: Andrea Sevetson from ProQuest. We've done a bunch of all of these different things. First of all, the Beloit guide that comes out every year, that checklist would be a really good place to remind people of where sort of undergraduates are. I hate reading it because --

SPEAKER: (Off mic.)

MS. SEVETSON: -- yeah, the mindset. It reminds you that these are kids

who were like eat when September 11th happened, and now they're 18, so they sort of have always grown up with that. It gives you that whole mindset. It doesn't necessarily tell you what TV they're watching, which may be a good thing. I don't know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But working for ProQuest, I tell you we do all of those things. live LibGuides, we do online tutorials, we do webinars, and everybody wants something different. So you can do everything and probably people will still say, oh, it would be great if you did this. And it would be just the new thing. So, given the kind of audience, you're going to want to see what you can harvest to do everything. It's just a matter of what you can do first.

With the web tutorials, I can't second enough the "have a good script," "have a tight script." We actually worked with an outside vendor on our YouTube tutorials, and the scrip came back to bite me in the butt I can't tell you how many times because I hadn't

-- like somehow, they had written statues of large, and I thought, well -- and then we have somebody else read it, too, as opposed to us say we would do it, which would have negated the whole problem because we would have just read right through that.

But the way this woman happened to read it, and she had a lisp and various other things that drove me crazy too, she said, "statutes of large citations." And I was like, oh, read the script. Have somebody check every single last word to make sure it makes sense and to have other people review the script so, when we have to do this again next year, the script is going to be where I spend the bulk of my time. I can't stress that enough. It is absolutely huge.

MEMBER TUBBS: Thank you. That's an excellent suggestion.

And to follow-up, I had a question, and this kind of goes back to GPO.

So here's one person that's making tutorials, and another person in the audience,

I'm making tutorials.

Will the community site potentially be able to host a lot of these tutorials that we're creating so that we're not generating these scripts over and over again from scratch or going outside and having somebody refine that? Will there at some time in the future be a place where we can store all of these and share them with our colleagues?

DR. GIVENS: We have exactly talked about that and thought that was a great idea and have started to get together a list of stuff that we've had that's come across through listservs and that. I think that is in the plans, but I guess it would depend on how many. I mean, it might actually turn out to be produced, and also, its relevance directly to our program.

MEMBER TUBBS: Yeah, absolutely.

MS. GLASSMEYER: Not to be all vendor shill or anything, but just to give a plug, CALI, we have a site that's called Legal Education Commons, but obviously, government

information folds into legal education. So, whenever you have PowerPoints, syllabi -- what do you call it? Research guides, that thing we were just talking about -- any stuff, if you want to send it to me, or if you go to the site, you can just upload it. We are trying to collect that just so people don't have to reinvent the wheel every time. And again, totally free. You don't have to buy anything; you don't have to be a member. It's just there for the community to use. It called the Legal Education Commons at CALI.

MEMBER TUBBS: So, when you do upload content to that site, is it moderated by professionals, just to take out any inaccuracies or problems?

MS. GLASSMEYER: The Legal Education Commons is not. That's totally, people upload it, but it's all identified, who did it. But all the other CALI content is all edited and cc licensed, so you can use it however you want.

MEMBER TUBBS: You know the law

1 librarians. We're always worried about 2 authenticity. 3 Yes, go ahead. 4 CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, 5 Stanford University. I just want to remind 6 folks that we do have a space like that. It's 7 called the GODORT Clearinghouse and Handout Exchange as well. And that's a perfect place 8 to park stop. That's also a wiki, so it's 9 10 easy to edit, easy to update. And I'm not on the GODORT education committee, so what the 11 12 personal plug. 13 (Laughter.) MEMBER TUBBS: Do you have to be a 14 15 member of go to work? 16 CHAIR JACOBS: You have to request a username in order to edit, in order to 17 18 create content. 19 MEMBER TUBBS: Okay. CHAIR JACOBS: But the email comes 20 to me, so I'll create that. 21 MEMBER TUBBS: Any other questions

22

23

from Council?

Yes, Steve.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

\_\_\_

23

MEMBER HAYES: In your first slide, you had something about outcomes. What's your measures of success? What, what are you looking for that indicates "yes" versus "never again," "take it down"?

MS. GLASSMEYER: For my research quide or times that I tried to use humor or that sort of thing, I could have looked at web I never did. But for me, it was always just the thank-you and, oh, this makes life so much easier. I'm very not, was never really too anal about my stats and return on investment or anything like that. For the most part, it's just, especially when I was an undergrads because I was used to dealing with undergrads because I was used to dealing with law students, when they were like, oh, the so less scary than I thought it would be. yes, that's how I did it, just the thank-you.

MEMBER TUBBS: I used online tutorials as part of my legal research course, and at the end of the semester, we actually

1 sent out a survey to the students asking, out 2 of all of the different forms of outreach we provided -lectures, hands-on exercises, 3 4 online tutorials, quest speakers -- what was the most effective for you, and why? And then 5 got into more specific questions about 6 7 And overwhelmingly, they preferred the online tutorials as a method of outreach. 8 So we're working on now expanding upon that 9 10 and refining the content and trying to trying

to make them hip too.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. Sort of the deployment end, where do you put these things, is it just social media that you're passing them around, or are you expecting them to be, you know, deployed within your OPAC or within a research guide or something like that? Can you talk more about deployment and point of need, point of use?

MR. CUTHBERTSON: Before I did the government video, I did one with a colleague for engineering village, for technical

1 reports, NTIS NTRL technical reports, and that was actually mapped in our catalog so 2 video lived its within 3 on own page our website, and then in our catalog itself, the 4 idea being that you could find it at an exact 5

6 point if you hit to that source.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Unfortunately, the way the catalog format it, it's a very texty page, so it gets lost very quickly. You can't do a screenshot. You can't do anything that lets people know that you're actually going to enter some video content that might be useful. So that's where the creation of of our webpages, I think, is part of our plan going forward. But really, I mean, we try to throw it out there in as many different places as possible just if so someone hits it, then they might be curious enough to explore it further.

I don't know if we have a real strategy beyond that, just trying to get it out there.

CHAIR JACOBS: I was thinking of that along the lines of, you know, you were

saying what the demographics of your viewers was, and if it was deployed more at the point of need, like within your database list, you have FDsys, and then there's a link that says, what is FDsys?

MR. CUTHBERTSON: Exactly, yeah.

CHAIR JACOBS: And you know, your demographics would probably shift a little bit.

MR. CUTHBERTSON: Yeah, we're going to create on our home page for the department, a video kind of launching point, and then we'll have them all collected there, as well as the traditional means that we're getting them out.

DR. GIVENS: Can I just interject for a minute?

MEMBER TUBBS: Yes.

DR. GIVENS: We have plans to put our tutorials up on the FDsys homepage, so that should help a lot as well. I mean, that's our plan that once they're up, you'll be able to access them from the homepage so,

ideally, someone who would come would look for information, want to know how to do it, and it would be clearly visible.

DR. GIVENS: Well, Bill, I think you mentioned in your presentation, too, that it's important to have them in as many places as possible, so putting it in your social networking sites, putting it in different websites, if you use Millennium, you can -- and you use YouTube or there's another version of it, Vimeo -- you can take the URL and embed it into your cataloging records and have it show up as actually embedded in your catalog page.

So, if you have users who like to use the catalog, they can find it there. If they like to use social networking, they can find it there. If they prefer blogging, they can find it there -- so, as many places as possible, unfortunately is the way to go.

MEMBER TUBBS: We still have 15 more minutes, so, any more questions from Council or the audience?

CHAIR JACOBS: Well, I'll throw out a provocative question then. I started to get to this point when Chris Brown was up and I asked a question about Q&As and posting them The reason I asked that was because to blogs. we've been doing at Stanford for several years, and I know my reference librarians were all like, why do we have to do that? extra work, blah blah, until I showed them a blog post, a Q&A that I had written in 2004 certain topic. about a And it's still trending at like number three or number four on the Google search for that keyword.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And then they got it. They're like, oh, okay, if you do it now, even four years from now, people are going to find that information and it's going to highlight your collections, your services and all that. So I wonder if you've thought about, you know, going beyond -- a video is nice to look at, nice to pass around Twitter; we all laughed. It was a really great video. But beyond that first success, how do you make it successful

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

over the long term? And would you think of doing other things other than video to do long-term success?

MR. CUTHBERTSON: Oh, yeah, absolutely. One of the things I think I pointed out was that we started a blog in 2006, and what we've done with that is we have more expansive articles. We've done one recently on Clarence Thomas and we did one on the FBIS database, so that's an opportunity get into more textual content, and it's really terrific site if you like to visit it. cubgovpubs.blogspot.com. And again, that's been going on for a while. So we track the stats from there and where those come from. It's a nice balance, I think, to this kind of stuff as well.

MEMBER TUBBS:

MS. KNIGHT: Rebecca Knight, University of Delaware Library.

Sarah, you were talking about using various tools out there among them, WordPress.

I use WordPress for some sessions that we

LibGuides. I might take it down. One of the difficulties for me is that its blog features, that it always the most recent posting first. Well, in most cases, my first posting was the one with the most content and introductory, and then the other little things are just kind of follow-ups. Do you have any ideas about that?

MS. GLASSMEYER: Yeah, that was an initial problem. There is now a plug-in that makes, you can either have a concrete first page, you know, a sticky blog, so that it will always be at the top, or alternatively, say, like the free law research guide. That one, the blog itself, there's a blog part of that, but it's shifted down a couple different pages. So the front page is just a static page.

It just kind of depends on what theme you use or different plug-ins, that you can now alter that, but that definitely was a big problem. There was like some, when I

first started, you have to kind of like -- if I knew this was going to be a static page, think in reverse, like what do I want my top post to be and decide to do it all in reverse.

But, yeah, now they've fixed that, yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MEMBER TUBBS: It almost goes back to the question on this first slide. do you keep up to date, the people who are creating this content revising or the curriculum? How do you keep up to date with the new cool tools, or the new WordPress plug-ins, or posting this type of information? Is it just professional association? How do you keep up to date?

MS. GLASSMEYER: For me, it's a combination. There's a couple of people I follow. I'm a law librarian, or was a law librarian, and for us, it always seemed like we were a few years behind the curve of regular librarians, so I would follow blogs of someone like Jason Griffey. He's a librarian in Tennessee, but he's very technologically savvy. David Lee King -- he's a public

library and him. So they always just kind of had different little tech tools. I would also follow things that had nothing to do with education or, you know, anything educationally.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Mashable is a blog that covers technology issues, so QR codes Ι noticing as I wrote up my talk, I just did today -- I first found out about QR codes a little over two years ago. And they had talked about it for commerce, so whenever any sort of tech blog talks about, you could use this for your business, I always think, well, how can I use this for a library?

So you're just going to have to think outside the box as far as different sources. So, Mashable, WebWorkerDaily, that sort of thing -- but also, you can just kind of follow government integration. I don't how far behind you guys are, if you think you're on the leading edge or not. But there are just some very techy people out there. You just kind of find their blogs and that, or

just look outside of the Library Land. 1 2 MEMBER TUBBS: Shari. MEMBER LASTER: Shari 3 Laster, University of Akron. 4 I would also add to that answer, 5 which I think covered a lot, that EduCalls has 6 7 a lot of material on emerging technologies and pretty much anyone who's looking at these 8 issues in terms of higher education, you can 9 also kind of adapt that to a library setting. 10 (Whereupon, there was a long pause 11 12 on the record.) 13 MEMBER TUBBS: Well, with that, I'd like to thank all of my speakers today for a 14 15 very informative presentation. 16 (Applause.) And, again, to the 17 MEMBER TUBBS: audience, if you have ideas for modes 18 19 educational outreach or if you have ideas for 20 you would like content that to presentations, please feel free to email us on 21 Council. 22

CHAIR JACOBS:

Too bad those people

23

left because these announcements are for the people walking outdoors now.

(Laughter.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIR JACOBS: Two announcements, from this morning both well as Law Librarians and Friends Dinner tonight, meet in the hotel lobby at 6:15 walk to restaurant, which is Sine Irish Pub.

And then tomorrow, lunch, Wednesday lunch -- public library attendees are invited to attend lunch with the public library interest group and Mary Alice Baish. And again, that will be meeting in the lobby.

And I've got one other announcement
-- hold on -- hot off the presses. And I'm
being told that the regional meeting tonight
starts at 7:00 p.m., not 6:00 p.m. So, 7:00
p.m., that'll be a hot one, so make sure to be
there.

That's all I have. See you again at four o'clock.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken at 3:26 p.m.)

1 (Whereupon, the meeting reconvened 2 at 4:03 p.m.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

## SESSION 4 - OPEN DISCUSSION

CHAIR JACOBS: Okay, so the four o'clock session is an open session, where Council were going to brainstorm on the working group sessions that we had yesterday afternoon and then all day today.

I want Council to start thinking about the themes and issues that have been raised during those sessions, with an eye towards starting work to towards recommendations or issues that we need to work on, ideas that we need to focus on. Okay? Ι did send an e-mail to that effect, but I guess some of us didn't get the email. I'm not naming names because I don't want to go on the record -- Jill Moriearty.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR JACOBS: Let's start with the first Council session. Yesterday afternoon, we had the Council session on regionals in transition and what can selectives do. We had

a couple of really good speakers. Hui Hua
Chua, Carol Drost, Kathy Edwards, Robin
Haun-Mohamed, Ann -- well, I guess Ann didn't
speak. Bruce spoke, Bruce Sarjeant, but it
was led by Ann, Arlene, and Stephanie.

So, what kinds of issues and ideas bubbled up from that one? Council?

And then, after Council, we can open it to the floor if anyone else wants to grab the mic.

MEMBER WEIBLE: Arlene Weible from the state library in Oregon.

Well, my take on this, and I've talked to several people also, is that -- I mean, there are many issues here, obviously -- but in terms of what Council might think about, is a recommendation getting at issues of communication. In the Michigan situation particularly, I think we saw a lot of issues surrounding communication between GPO and the libraries in the state.

I, I'm not really sure exactly how something like this would be phrased, but

again, I think that's what I would like to see us take a crack at, is what we can do to advise GPO about improving the situation so a better dialogue can go forward, and learn some lessons, I think, from that situation.

MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Stephanie
Braunstein, LSU.

Following up on what Arlene just said, I know that there are many venues for communication already in place. I don't know that we lack the venues so much as just that need to impress that as ideas are formed, they need to be shared earlier rather than later.

CHAIR JACOBS: I mean, when you say, ideas need to be shared earlier rather than later, are you talking specifically about libraries or GPO or both?

MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Both, yeah, obviously. I think it was surprising to me in yesterday's session that there were a lot of people who were actually players in the Michigan-Minnesota issue that didn't know all of the facts and parts to the puzzle and

didn't find out about them, in some cases,
until yesterday.

MEMBER MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty,
University of Utah.

I've got a note here to myself,
"But what does Council really think about
interstate regionals?" I'm not saying that
this should be a recommendation.

This was an excellent opportunity to talk about the 800-pound gorilla, to have people voice their concerns publicly, and have everyone here. Nevertheless, I kind of thought some of the people were expecting us to say something. And after the meeting, I certainly heard that. Yet I don't know what we would do and say.

CHAIR JACOBS: Yeah.

MEMBER MORIEARTY: I thought about.

CHAIR JACOBS: Yeah. James Jacobs, Stanford University.

I know for myself there's a lot of things that I think about that issue, and I don't think -- there are so many aspects to

that issue that you can't just say, yes, I 1 2 like bistate regionals or, no, I don't like 3 bistate regionals, because there's so 4 issues involved. It's, you know, what are 5 they going to do? How are they going to do 6 what they're going to do? Those kinds of things. So it's difficult to answer. 7 MEMBER MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty. 8 Exactly -- oh, sorry. 9 10 CHAIR JACOBS: Jill's on a roll. 11 MEMBER MORIEARTY: I'm sorry. Jill's on a roll. 12 13 CHAIR JACOBS: Go ahead, Jill. MEMBER MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, 14 15 University of Utah. 16 I guess the other aspect of this, and just want to 17 Ι say it, is you're 18 absolutely right, there is no easy answer. 19 There's not a yes; there's not a no. 20 going to come down to a compromise, a middle I just, I would like to see, however, 21 road.

CHAIR JACOBS: Agreed.

Council play some active role in this.

22

23

MEMBER MORIEARTY: I think we can provide the leadership.

CHAIR JACOBS: Shari.

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster,
University of Akron.

Something that I've been kind of thinking about, discussing specifically the communication aspect and what went wrong there, I think, Arlene, you're act exactly right, and Stephanie, that the biggest issue is the openness and timeliness insofar as such things are possible.

One other aspect to consider that may or may not be an appropriate part of a recommendation is, in any sense, I would never want to advocate any kind of doublespeak or less than 100-percent forthright honesty on the part of GPO. But there is a sense in which GPO needs to be marketing itself to its constituents.

We are GPO's partners in this, but GPO represents itself in specific ways, and I think, in some respects, the ways that GPO has

represented itself did not have the appearance of being considerate or understanding of all of the factors and influences in play. So, again, I would never want to say, GPO, you should have your PR director read your internal letters. I don't think that's the case at all.

But I think there is an aspect of, you know, the way that these issues are addressed and discussed that need to make sure that the spin that is put on them has the appearance that GPO wants it to have. I think there's a lot of misinterpretation or partial interpretation that took place, and some of it It may have been just the way that the words were interpreted by readers.

MEMBER HAYES: Steve Hayes,
University of Notre Dame.

I always thank Dan very much for sending out his documentation as to background on this. I would make two points, one as a Councilperson, that everything I've read so far about the desirability of an action that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the parties involved wish to take. I have no objection to them. They seem to be well grounded in the philosophy of the depository system and what we are trying to do and the clientele we are trying to serve.

Three decades ago, I got in trouble because I reminded the community that community has a very bad habit of asking GPO to try and accomplish something that is not either within their statutory abilities to accomplish, or within their budget, or within the restrictions that have been placed upon them by their oversight committee and others who really have control over them. I think they're a very welcoming community, and that the double-edged sword. They ask opinions --I'm guilty of this as anyone else - you asked my opinion; now why aren't you going forth with what I wanted done? I think that's always a tension with what comes in with GPO.

So, if Council's going to say anything going to say anything, you know, I think it's more about the, I think the

communication aspects of the process, I'm less comfortable with. But I would like to say I have all the facts. Do Ι have percentage of the facts? Do I have a hundred percent? I'm not sure, but I have impression about the process.

The outcome would be nice. I agree with the outcome. But I also, in reading -thank you, Dan, again -- the material that was
put out there, I understand the no. We don't
like to hear no. I understand the know. I
understand the rationale behind the no. And
I'm not going to go down that route, because I
do not think it is in Council's best interest
to counsel GPO to go some direction that could
potentially have a more negative effect than
we already have with the bad vibes that are
going on.

CHAIR JACOBS: Peggy, did you have something?

MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library.

This is a little off of this, but

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

related. One of the troubling aspects of the communication is that things that I'm hearing and reading, people seem to be conflating more than one issue. I think it's really important that when we decide if we can respond, that we know exactly to what we are responding, and that we remind people that the Michigan-Minnesota decision is very different than what's going on in ACRL and other things.

MEMBER SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. It would be wildly inappropriate for me to comment on any of this and so I'm trying to figure out a way to say this.

As a member of Council, I would be most interested in our focusing our energy in what we would like to see Title 44 look like, to permit the kind of things we would like to see the program grow into. Now I understand that with the role here in our advisory capacity to the public. We're not going to lobby, we're not going to -- I understand that that has to be very carefully orchestrated.

I don't think that there's really any value at this point in expending any more energy talking about a specific proposal that's been put out there and responded to, because anything else is just, you know, thrumming our heels against the carpet saying we don't want it to be so. It is.

I think that, as a community, we really need to deal with the hand of cards we've been dealt, and if we don't like a hand of cards that we've been dealt, then we have to go back to the deck. But we still don't have -- I think it would be very presumptuous of Council to try to make any impact on the decision that's already happened, and I don't think that there's a great deal of percentage in our analyzing who did it well and who didn't. I just, I don't think that's productive at this point.

MEMBER LAUFFER: Donna Lauffer,

Johnson County Library. I Am relatively new

to this whole discussion, and I would think

that the Council should continue to encourage

the communication that we saw yesterday. I

don't think it's something that people get

over with just one take. I think there needs

to be a consistent openness to have the

discussion, whatever the issue might be in the

future.

My only concern is, and I'm not proposing that we weigh in on this one way or the other, but there are some people that are left in limbo, and I have a hard time saying tough cookies. I feel like we need to discuss more about what do you do about that situation, but that might not be appropriate for the Council.

I also think that concentrating, as Ann Marie said, on Title 44, would be productive thing. That is a huge undertaking, and obviously, it's been undertaken many times before. But that's where it is.

CHAIR JACOBS: Thanks.

Sue?

MEMBER LYONS: Yeah, I think that ultimately, GPO has to meet the needs of the

selectives in Michigan and resolve these problems, but how we get there is something that I think is still unknown, and we shouldn't be focused on, well, right now we're at an impasse; right now we're in limbo. They can't be the status quo, and I'm confident that GPO is going to work to resolve these problems.

I'm not sure what the answer is.

I'm not sure how we get there. But I think

Council can assist GPO in moving productively

toward the resolution.

MEMBER SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan.

I think that GPO has indicated and that they will follow through with the libraries in Michigan. The libraries in Michigan do have options. Obviously, their option of first choice is not viable, but I think that there are still -- I don't think they're in limbo any more so today than they were at any other time.

It's just that it's a situation

that's still evolving, and I just would really think that Council inserting itself into that process would not be helpful. I think that's something that has to be resolved between GPO and the libraries of Michigan, and I think comment from anywhere else is not necessarily beneficial. I'd much rather see Council flying at 150,000 feet and looking at the structure of the program and the future of the program and what we want to see achievable, rather than the specifics of an individual situation in an individual state.

MEMBER TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library.

I agree with you, Ann, and I kind of want to dovetail on with that. My impression from yesterday's session was that people are -- of course there was a problem of communication, but there also seems to be a misunderstanding about the law and what it is, and what's the most current version of the CRS report that we should be relying on.

One of the things that Council did

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

at the San Antonio session was that they asked about some basics of GPO's budgeting procedure and just kind of an explanation of that, to the extent that they could provide it.

Could we get something similar to that by GPO, on just what is the current state of the law so that, if in the future we do look at revising Title 44, we all understand it?

CHAIR JACOBS: Anyone else want to weigh in? Shari?

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster, University of Akron.

I do have in my notes, and I just want to bring this up kind of for the record since we're on the record here, there was one question that came from a Michigan selective that GPO left a little but hanging, which was, how will GPO support us? While I definitely is between agree that that GPO and selectives, I would hope that kind communication is forthcoming between those two parties.

1 CHAIR JACOBS: Peggy.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library.

I do want to say that I agree with shouldn't Ann that we can't, we insert ourselves into a specific situation. think in our role, our advisory role, address the communication issue generally is important, and it sort of fits with what was just said, is that a lot of what I'm hearing is that they want to know more about the law, the decision, all of that, the support that's going to happen in Michigan because they're afraid that it's going to happen in their state too. People are scared.

MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Stephanie Braunstein, LSU.

something Going back to that Camilla said about understanding what the law actually is, you know, I'm not an attorney, but I do understand that there is the law as the statutory then there's the law and interpretation. So I think we've again bumped

Δ.

that guy.

into situations where there's a disagreement about the interpretation, not necessarily so much about the law itself.

And then, to go back to the commentary that revolves around, do we want to tackle Title 44 yet again, I've been curious as to the phrase I read and hear frequently when someone says, oh, no, no, we don't want to do anything with Title 44. It will "open a can of worms".

Maybe it could get a lot worse. It probably could, but I think we're already sort of crawling around in the can of worms right now.

## (Laughter.)

MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Excuse me for that rather ugly metaphor, but this has gotten ugly. I think it's time maybe to stop being frightened of suggesting that there be some real looking at changing Title 44.

CHAIR JACOBS: Steve Hayes?

MEMBER HAYES: I'm on the side of

247 1 Steve Hayes, University of 2 Dame. MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: What side are 3 4 you on? CHAIR JACOBS: Are you inside the 5 worms or outside the worms? 6 I'm, if I put my 7 MEMBER HAYES: Indiana hat on, my Hoosier had, which I'll 8 never wear -- that will get me in trouble in 9 10 the transcript when they read it, won't it? -and my GODART hat on, opening that can of 11 12 worms, I'm still on the side of, I'd rather 13 not go down that road because the can of worms

> With my council hat on, advising the public printer, I don't have -- and maybe Dan, or maybe the lawyers amongst us -- have a better view of what is Council's role to say you should be asking for these changes in Title 44 to accomplish these sort of outcomes?

is still too unknown to me to do that.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I'm not sure I have an idea firmly that is within the -- you hear this from me a lot -- the abilities of GPO to do.

very old metaphor, the documents were delivered here and we slid them through the tube and you have them now and we're done. So I don't know if it's within their statutory authority to make such a proposal, and if so, to whom. I do not know, and it would be one that I would walk very carefully.

As I commented to my roommate when he suggested another opinion, I was cautioning him that you may get a yes, we reconfirmed that opinion, and guess what? We want you to undo something. Those are the downsides. You could get, you know, we changed our mind; go for it. I'm not sure.

While I'm talking, I would also go back to what Peggy said in terms of, I think we need to split this. I think we need to look at -- and again, I would like to say I'm an expert on all the issues that are going on, but to look at the ACRL and say, what are they trying to do? What are they trying to accomplish? Where is it running up against those areas that are within GPO's abilities to

affect? And if we can identify those, I think it's a wholly appropriate recommendation to put forward to begin to address what seems to be some of the angst that coming through from ACRL with the vehicle of Michigan and Minnesota as the carrier for this.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So I would second, you know, let's see if we can split these; can we true highly identify as far as Council's reading of the ACRL issues here, here, here, and here. can we request? Can we see what solutions are there to make them less unhappy than they are now short of giving them carte blanche to say, try whatever you want. We're in that kind of I don't think that Ι would be a mode. comfortable as a Councilperson to recommend GPO do that. So I would put two different ones in there.

But the big question still is, you know, within our abilities as a Councilperson, what can we say other than other than to say, gee, we really think Title 44 should be modified to allow us to do this, this, this,

and this.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIR JACOBS: Dan.

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, I would just remind us what Brown University. the Superintendent of Documents at the end of that discussion, and I'm reading from notes. She said that her goal was to work community to within the FDLPchange digital age, collect program for the to information from all the depository libraries over what their forecast for the next five to seven years was, change the law to needed; that is express qoal of an Superintendent.

So I think where we can support that process, advise that process, steer that process, help gather information toward that end. That's a great role for us. In the meantime, because that's not going to happen by the end of this conference, and folks are in real straits, dire straits, in terms of, you know, not only it's happening to me, but it could very easily happen to me, I agree

with everything that's been said in terms of the need for clear communication about what might be possible, understanding that there are as many permutations and possibilities as there are creative ideas out there. So we

can't dice and slice all that stuff.

But there is a document the GPO has produced in terms of guidelines for regionals and selectives losing their regionals. So, at least as a starting point, we could look at that, and if we can't make sense of that document, then provide feedback on that document or ask for clarification on that document. But I would again strongly support the communication part of how we can assist in this effort.

In terms of the substance of multistate regionals, I don't think we need to have the thumbs-up or thumbs-down vote on that kind of thing. I mean, anybody who's looked at this thing from 1966 to the present, you know, is unanimous in the need for something other than a strict state jurisdiction. But

1	again, it's whether or not that's admissible
2	with the law.
3	CHAIR JACOBS: Any last comments
4	before we move onto the next one?
5	MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: One last thing.
6	CHAIR JACOBS: Yes. Name?
7	MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Stephanie
8	Braunstein, LSU.
9	Is, then, what I'm hearing
10	something along the lines of, Council will
11	have a recommendation to give further
12	recommendations?
13	CHAIR JACOBS:
14	Meta-recommendations.
15	Dan?
16	MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony,
17	Brown University.
18	I mean, if we have a statement or
19	recommendation or whatever you want to call
20	it, it can be as broad as, you know, Council
21	will, a statement of affirmation that Council
22	will work with the Superintendent of Documents
23	to work with the depository community to

gather information and identify those areas where the law may need to be changed.

I think we'll learn a lot more. I mean, it's good that we're having this conversation now because we're, in some ways, reacting to the most immediate discussion. But Thursday, there's going to be a lot more discussion about this, and sort of next steps, so I think we'll be better positioned at the end of that conversation to maybe know where we may be headed with this.

CHAIR JACOBS: Arlene?

MEMBER WEIBLE: Arlene from Oregon State Library.

I do think that -- I mean, we really need to also not just think about Title 44 but also the way that GPO policy and guidelines are written. And I do think that that may be a place to start, not the Title 44 isn't out there too, but in terms of maybe this conference, that might be a place to kind of start looking at doing a little bit better review of where the gaps are.

And also, I think when you talk about communication breakdown, one thing that you can help to facilitate that a little bit better is give a little bit more guidance about what are the best tools to do a communication and, you know, issues with timeliness and all that kind of thing. That could be addressed in procedures.

CHAIR JACOBS: Okay.

MEMBER WEIBLE: So I do think that that might be a productive place to start, at least.

CHAIR JACOBS: Yeah.

Go ahead, Jill.

MEMBER MORIEARTY: I know you want to wrap this -- Jill Moriearty, University of Utah -- I know you want to wrap this up.

I wanted to thank all of my colleagues here because I started part of this chain by asking what does Council think. And I think we have a good overview, we have several -- well, as outlined by Arlene -- several issues or several concerns, but I

think we also represent the community as a whole that we all have differing concerns, differing issues, differing views on this situation, and we're supposed to be in the know. I can only imagine what the community is thinking at this point.

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I'm also reminded of a discussion I was having with a friend of mine. This was several months back, but he and I were talking about Title 44 and all this stuff. And he said, well, a lot of the things that people are talking about, Title 44 needs to change; the SODs are the application of the law. And so it could be that reviews the SODs could be taken up, instead of opening up the can of worms, so to speak.

So we could look at the SODs, and I think it would behoove us all to read back on us and see what they say, how they need to be changed, because those are things that, internally, GPO can change without having to go to the Hill and doing all of that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So I would like Council, not this evening, unless you're not sleepy tonight, to look back at those SODs and see if there are some issues there that we can speak on as well.

Okay, let's go on to the next one.

The second working session was this morning,
the 8:30 session about electronic collection
management, or, as I wrote down on my notes,
Brains and Zombies.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR JACOBS: Any comments, themes that bubbled up, possible recommendations that you're thinking of? Shari?

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster,
University of Akron.

Well, I'll start out with the obvious big one to me, which was the excellent question Karen Sieger asked. What enhancements to the PURL referral tool do the community want? Are talking what's we important to the people who use this tool? those of us who have not used it in the past

begin to explore it, what do we learn? And I don't necessarily think that this is something where Council, sitting in its own little room, can make an informed recommendation because what it really comes down to is what the people who use it want to have. This may be something where something as simple as open discussion will gather important feedback, or maybe it's something that we need to go back and forth a little bit to find out what to do.

There were some other small issues that I think were brought up. For example, the idea of either the FDLP or some of other party somehow identifying superseded electronic titles. Again, these are kind of small mechanical issues that may or may not need a full recommendation behind them.

I've also mentioned to James, and I'll just mention to the rest of you, that there is a cataloging issue, actually, that has been discussed, and I will not even attempt to reproduce the details here on the record, about the particular use of a fixed

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

field the GPO is using in a certain way that is perhaps going to cause a problem for statistics-gathering down the road.

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.

I've talked to the person in question, and he was be sending me some email, which I'11 send the Metadata to Collections Group, and then we can work with our GPO liaison to do that. I can send it to all of you. You'll get all the painful details.

Dan.

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony,
University.

I'm just connecting the dots between the last thing we talked about, and this. If, going forward, there is to be a wide conversation about where the program needs to go, and perhaps resulting ideas or changes to the law, in this day and age, that conversation probably necessarily has to have a virtual component rather than just the more

traditional channels of trying to gather information.

I'm not necessarily suggesting that there has to be hosted or, you know, implemented on the FDLP community site, but just looking ahead over the next year or 18 months, that's probably going to be something that would be important to happen somewhere. So I just throw that out there.

CHAIR JACOBS: Arlene.

MEMBER WEIBLE: Arlene, Oregon
State Library -- Arlene Weible.

I think that when you're talking about themes that we're hearing, I do think that the theme I'm hearing with a lot of particular services is that GPO would like some help identifying development priorities. Karen raised a couple of those scenarios in the sessions throughout the day. So I do think, given that one of the development goals is the tool that we're potentially talking about using to collect it.

I am concerned about just, let's

throw it up on the community site and hope for the best. I do think that we need to be thoughtful about how we want to, if we want to advise GPO about a methodology to go about gathering this data. I have heard in a lot of instances from GPO staff that, I mean, they put these questions all the time and it's dead So I think we really need to talk silence. about what are the ways that GPO is going to get the information that they can really use, and I'd like to see us -- you know, there are specific services that we want to make sure that information gets through, but I think the method is probably a good one worth talking about amongst and perhaps us recommending something.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MEMBER PHILLIPS: Mark Phillips,
University of North Texas.

One of the themes that I got from the first session was just the overall need to show -- not necessarily need -- but desire to show impact of this sort of content and show value of the program in general within the

libraries; you know, why, why take time to
place content records within the catalog? You
want to show more usage.

One of the areas that I tend not to hear a lot of usage statistics from and just overall numbers is from the usage of that FDsys, and that may be a statistic. They could start to work into the overall publicity of the programs. How much is this content that's going online being utilized?

You know, we talk about new collections going into the system. Are they getting used? Are some things heavily used, and other things not? Does that make sense? Is that the trend within libraries in general? I think that kind of data could be really interesting, and it may help tell a different kind of story to the various constituents the GPO serves.

CHAIR JACOBS: Thanks.

(Whereupon, there was a long pause on the record.)

CHAIR JACOBS: No talk about

zombies?

MEMBER LAUFFER: I just want to have a general kind of reaction to that Session 2.

It brings me in the mind of, you know, as we try to connect the end-user with these documents, we try to integrate them into the collection. We try to make them findable through webpages. We try to inter-file them. And all of these things, we're all doing the same thing; we're just arriving it at different ways.

So, I'm thinking of the FDLP system is not widely known in other circles. And when we talk about communication, it's getting that out to all kinds of other folks that play into the library arena. For instance, some of the things that you're talking about in your collection management would be enormously useful when you're trying to argue for funding in your advocacy work, but I don't see -- some of those connections are not there.

CHAIR JACOBS: Right.

1	MEMBER LAUFFER: So I would
2	encourage the Council to think about ways that
3	we can broaden that awareness as part of our
4	ongoing development and try to make of this
5	work together.
6	CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs,
7	Stanford University.
8	Donna, do you see that as sort of a
9	question or a recommendation for the
10	MEMBER LAUFFER: Kind of like a
11	piece to ponder.
12	CHAIR JACOBS: Okay.
13	MEMBER LAUFFER: Just an
14	observation, I guess, not really a
15	recommendation. But it needs to be teased out
16	a lot more.
17	CHAIR JACOBS: Yeah, so how to
18	connect start of the technical processing
19	stuff that we do with the outreach and
20	MEMBER LAUFFER: Advocacy.
21	CHAIR JACOBS: advocacy that we
22	do or need to do.
23	MEMBER LAUFFER: Right. Or maybe

1	we don't even need to do it. Just somebody
2	else needs to be doing it, and they need to
3	get the information so they can do it.
4	CHAIR JACOBS: Okay.
5	(Whereupon, there was a long pause
6	on the record.)
7	CHAIR JACOBS: Other themes?
8	(No response.)
9	CHAIR JACOBS: Okay, let's go on to
10	the third one, then.
11	Dan, did you just move to do your
12	mic?
13	MEMBER O'MAHONY: (Off mic.)
14	CHAIR JACOBS: Yeah. Yeah.
15	MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony
16	where am I from?
17	(Laughter.)
18	MEMBER O'MAHONY: Brown
19	University. Sorry. I'm a little brain-dead
20	now.
21	I'm just reading from Arlene's
22	notes because what I found when you suggested
23	that we use the Google Doc, every time I had

an idea to write something down, I saw that

Arlene had already written it.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER O'MAHONY: So I just kept following Arlene's notes online. So I'll read from Arlene's notes because they were really good.

But some of the points made during that session included that GPO could help with the identification of superseded electronic information.

I'll just skip down to bottom because this was the other one that I was going to write, was GPO perhaps -- this has been talked about a little bit already -some point or clearinghouse serve as tutorials and other kinds of educational products that the community was puts forth.

So those were two possible ideas.

CHAIR JACOBS: Okay.

James Jacobs, Stanford University.

My question to John about the superseded list is I think it would be really

3

4 5

Ū

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

interesting to not only have a database list 1 2 superseded titles but also sort of conceptualization of when do 3 you pull 4 superseded title out and when do you keep it in your collection? When is it still useful 5 6 for historic research purposes? When is it --7 you know, health data that in 1987, one thing, 2000 said don't eat veggies 8 and whatever. 9 10 MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, 11 Brown University. I got it right this time.

(Laughter.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MEMBER O'MAHONY: And those decisions to the large part are made locally, library to library --

CHAIR JACOBS: Yeah.

MEMBER O'MAHONY: -- depending on the scope and their users and all that fun stuff.

But just as there are general guidelines and help that GPO provides now with respect to what constitutes a superseded thing and then what can replace that superseded

thing, you know, that level, that sort of macro level guidance, as well as, where possible, identifying at the piece level what these things are, you know, whatever they could help to facilitate that process would be nice.

Arlene?

CHAIR JACOBS: Arlene?

MEMBER WEIBLE: Arlene Weible, from Oregon.

I do think that one of the points that John was trying to emphasize was that, you know, working with superseded material is quite different in the electronic world because your methodologies for identifying it are quite different. And librarians need some help because it is that much different.

I think he made a small point about maybe, the point of cataloguing the kind of thing, and that to me sounded very promising; you know, how you would record the data and all that kind of stuff. It would need to be worked out.

1 I mean, GPO does have pretty good 2 guidelines for superseded documents, like you said, at a macro level. But I think what 3 we're talking about is extra help with the 4 electronic stuff that's kind of in a different 5 6 realm. CHAIR JACOBS: 7 Yes. James Jacobs, Stanford University. 8 So are you thinking along the lines 9 10 of maybe best practices for how to find the zombies, how to evaluate the zombies, and how 11 to kill the zombies? 12 13 MEMBER WEIBLE: Well --CHAIR JACOBS: I really like this 14 15 16 (Simultaneous conversation.) Or letting you know 17 MEMBER WEIBLE: that this is a potential zombie. I mean I 18 19 think that's -- actually, that sounds silly, 20 but in some ways it's really true. I mean, if you look at a catalog record, sometimes you 21

it's going to

So there may be some educational

have

22

23

quess

material.

that

1	things that could happen, but also, just maybe
2	there's some more information tools that GPO
3	can help us with.
4	SPEAKER: You'll know a zombie when
5	you see a zombie.
6	CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs,
7	Stanford University.
8	So this will be the zombie
9	recommendation.
10	Any other comments on this one?
11	(No response.)
12	CHAIR JACOBS: Wow, I got the last
13	word. Excellent. We're at 450, so we're
14	doing okay.
15	The next one is on the community
16	site. This was where is it? public
17	libraries, Helen, Donna, and Karen talking
18	about the community site.
19	What sorts of things bubbled up?
20	To me, it was needs and wants, but I'd like to
21	hear what others thought.
22	MEMBER BURKE: This is Helen Burke,

Hennepin County Library. I don't have a

well-formulated recommendation, but building upon the feedback from GPO for last spring's recommendations, the first one there, GPO is in the midst of updating the priorities that they revealed to us, the desktop, the Ben's Guide, and the community site.

So I can't help but think that a recommendation that we can offer would encourage them to build on that momentum and to maintain those priorities in the face of who knows what economic threats coming, so that that momentum that's there now should be carried forward so that those consolidation of one site -- one password to use, easy access, continued access directly the GPO -- I think that's the gist of what our recommendation would say.

CHAIR JACOBS: Arlene?

MEMBER WEIBLE: Arlene Weible from Oregon.

One thing that came up in that session that really struck me was the library school student who said, why can't I get in?

1 I'm certain that Karen heard that message, 2 very much so, so I don't know if we really need to do a recommendation.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But, you know, it did strike me as something that's kind of like a bigger issue for the program. You know, it was manifested in, I can't get into the community site, but it's a bigger issue of what can we do to open up these sources to more than just depository librarians. I mean that always goes in in conflict. But you need to have privileges in order to want to be a depository librarian.

> CHAIR JACOBS: Yes.

MEMBER WEIBLE: That argument only goes so far, I think.

do think that broadening the perspective on some of these tools might be something to be thinking about, and I think the community is maybe one place to start. But the tutorials, you know, opening up an that, that exchange for is something wouldn't want just depository librarians

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

actually, I don't really want depository librarians looking at that. I want other librarians to be looking at that.

CHAIR JACOBS: Yeah.

MEMBER WEIBLE: So, just that idea that we need to invite other people into these resources, you know, again, not a well formed idea, but something along those lines.

CHAIR JACOBS: Yeah.

James Jacobs, Stanford University.

Some of the things that sort of bubbled up in my own mind while Karen was talking about the community site was the need for tools for depositories to communicate, to collaborate, and to sort of track history in a broad sense and whether that's, you know, blogs or wikis or the community site itself or the desktop, or other tools outside of the control of GPO but clothed in. know, there could be ways where the community site just points out to the GODORT exchange or other places that are already in being used by the community. I don't know that having the

community site be the be-all and end-all of our communication tools is the way to go, but that's sort of what was bubbling in my head.

MEMBER BURKE: Helen Burke,
Hennepin County Library. I think that's not a
foregone conclusion that there should be one
place to go.

CHAIR JACOBS: Yeah.

MEMBER BURKE: I think there should be -- again, building on the momentum we've got going -- there's enough redundancy that checking more than one site should lead to better practices.

And interesting to read, which I recently read, the recommendations, the replies to GPO's Replies. Recommendation 1 from the spring. They refer to the idea that "[f]urthermore, GPO is expanding the potential user base of the FDLP community site to include anyone interested in the FDLP and federal information so that the more involved, interactive community can evolve." I thought we came came up with that, like, today and

formalized that, but here's the statement that

GPO has already been working on.

CHAIR JACOBS: Yes.

MEMBER BURKE: So, again, I just want to affirm the progress that's been made and not have it be derailed by another emergency that comes up. I think we're all headed in the right direction. I just really want to continue --

CHAIR JACOBS: Yes.

MEMBER BURKE: -- so that we become more prominent and have less tendency towards obsolescence, or being overloaded.

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs,
Stanford University.

Yeah, I think that's, I think all of Council, we're all in agreement, maybe, that the positive energy coming from GPO on those fronts, we want to grow and expand and make sure it continues and not say, oh, you tried this, it's terrible, don't ever try anything ever again. That's definitely not going to be helpful.

Shari?

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster,
University of Akron.

I just want to say that I love the blog that's coming out of, I think it's the acquisitions. I think that's fantastic. I really do. I enjoy reading it and I think it helps the community see a little more of what happens behind the scenes, and I think it's great. I was grateful that Helen and Karen brought it up because I think it's an example of a project that should be applauded.

CHAIR JACOBS: Hear, hear.

James Jacobs, Stanford University.

Anything that GPO can do to more humanize itself, I think, would be great because sometimes it's seen as there's a big government agency over there, and we sometimes forget that there are people, very talented people, working within that agency and doing good things.

MEMBER PHILLIPS: Mark Phillips,
University of North Texas.

1 I don't know -- one of the things 2 I've heard was the idea of reaching out to library schools, and especially groups that 3 have government information courses. 4 don't know if it would be helpful to kind of 5 6 pool ideas on groups to actively solicit for 7 -- you know, once it's figured out, the mechanism to actually invite a broader user 8 group for the community, to actually be a 9 10 little more proactive about bringing in users and extending the education, I don't know, 11 12 just doing some brainstorming, coming up with 13 ideas the community, "Ask some on the Community," but that may be something that 14

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony,
Brown University.

could be helpful to GPO staff.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I agree, broadening the community breadth and depth and reach is really, really important, and I don't want to pretend to speak for anybody from GPO.

But what I thought I heard, part of what I heard, what they were more than willing

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

\_\_

23

to do all these wonderful things because they are all wonderful things to be done, but there are limited people, limited resources, limited time to do all these wonderful things, and that they would like some direction, priority, as to which of these many wonderful things they should spend most of their time on.

advocating not one versus another, the priorities but that you've outlined that they responded to last time in terms of, you know, Ben's Guide, the desktop, the community site, all of these things are a lot of work. So I think we just need to try to be clear and helpful in specifying, where we can, which of these is more important and which might have a greater impact than others, given the limited resources that they have.

(Whereupon, there was a long pause on the record.)

CHAIR JACOBS: Any other comments?
(No response.)

CHAIR JACOBS: No? Okay, the fourth one, the last session was this

afternoon. Let me just see where that is.

Yeah, that's the -- wasn't I here? I wasn't

here.

(Whereupon, there was off-mic discussion on the record.)

CHAIR JACOBS: No, this is ways and means of teaching and training, reaching out in creative ways, so marketing, outreach, and tools.

What sorts of ideas bubbled up from there?

MEMBER TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library.

Kind of in the theme of greater communication, I guess being that I'm on that special-interest group for education and training, I just wish I was a little bit more in the loop as to the modules, how they were being created, what kind of feedback they were getting on the community forum site, just so that I can provide more insight and expertise in the future.

I didn't really, I don't know

anything about the modules other than what I 1 2 learned today. CHAIR JACOBS: Peggy? 3 4 MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett, UW Law Library. 5 I'll just second what Camilla said. 6 It was a little frustrating not knowing as 7 much as -- we should have known more before 8 today about what GPO was doing 9 on 10 modules. But I was really interested in what 11 12 our non-, the speakers talked about, and I think that one of the challenges is going to 13 be trying to mesh together the things that GPO 14 15 doing and that we're doing in 16 community, not that they need to be meshed together, but just so that everybody knows 17 that all of these things are available. 18 19 CHAIR JACOBS: And when you're 20 talking modules, are you going back to the community site? 21 22 MEMBER No, the **GPO** JARRETT:

training modules.

1	CHAIR JACOBS: Okay, the training
2	modules
3	MEMBER JARRETT: on how to do
4	FDsys.
5	CHAIR JACOBS: Got it.
6	Arlene.
7	MEMBER WEIBLE: James am I
8	remembering correctly, tomorrow, are we having
9	a session with GPO where they're going to be
10	doing more updating with us?
11	CHAIR JACOBS: Yes.
12	MEMBER WEIBLE: I think that's
13	important. That should maybe have happened at
14	a different time, perhaps earlier in the
15	conference or something, but that's neither
16	here nor there.
17	But do we know for sure exactly
18	who's going to be there and what kind of
19	topics are going to be covered?
20	CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs,
21	Stanford University.
22	Some of the topics that we put
23	forward were specifically FDsys and PACER.

1	Possibly, the FDsys update could include
2	And you had two more; what were
3	they?
4	MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster,
5	University of Akron.
6	I think I had two specific things
7	about a thesis. I don't quite remember them,
8	but they were in an email that I sent to you
9	that presumably you forwarded onto GPO
10	CHAIR JACOBS: Yes, I did.
11	MEMBER LASTER: so they know
12	that we want to hear I assume I still want
13	to hear about whatever it was I wanted to hear
14	about whenever I sent that email.
15	CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs,
16	Stanford University.
17	Yeah, I did forward those, so, you
18	know, during the FDsys update, I'm sure we
19	can, we can ask questions on, oh, so what
20	about these training modules? What are they?
21	(Whereupon, the was a long pause on
22	the record.)
23	CHAIR JACOBS: Anyone else? It's

getting late -- it's getting early, actually.

We still have 25 minutes. But it looks like

we may end early.

Are there any comments from the floor, questions from the floor, ideas from the floor?

Sure. I'm shocked. Michelle has something to say.

SPEAKER: She doesn't like the zombie resolution?

MS. McKNELLY: I hope that I'm not known as the zombie person from now on. I'm sorry I started all that.

This actually goes back to the training modules. And when I was listening to the update the other day, I thought, oh, 33 training modules for FDsys and all these things, that's great. But taking training modules and laying them out in external places, to me, does not work.

I really would like to see the Council recommend that this stuff be embedded into those resources so that when we're

working with civilians and they want to know how to use some of these more complicated things, instead of saying, oh, go to this wiki and look this ups, we could say, bing, it's right here under the question mark or the video camera or whatever it is, and they have the ability, then, to go back later on and go over it again. 

Many of these are fairly complicated training sessions and they need that reinforcement. And if you have to go to a secondary side or a tertiary, they don't do it.

CHAIR JACOBS: Thank you.

Any other comments?

MEMBER WEIBLE: I have a question.

CHAIR JACOBS: Arlene?

MEMBER WEIBLE: What are our next steps in terms of recommendations? I mean, you know, we've got some ideas that we've talked about and we've got some notes and all that.

CHAIR JACOBS: Yes.

1 MEBMER WEIBLE: So what are 2 next steps? 3 CHAIR JACOBS: The next steps I'd like to see is, you know, tomorrow during our 4 wrap-up session, we're going to have -- part 5 6 of that wrap-up is sort of bullet-points on 7 the recommendations that we're thinking of working on. 8 don't We have have the 9 to 10 recommendations completely fleshed by tomorrow afternoon, but I would like to be 11 12 able to show the community that there's some 13 ideas that we've heard that we're working on. 14 And so maybe the working groups can 15 together between now and tomorrow sometime and 16 just at least have a couple of bullet-points. What's that? You knew it. 17 18 (Laughter.) 19 MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett, 20 University of Washington Law Library. Won't we be talking a little bit 21 our off-the-record working 22 about that and

session tomorrow at 8:30, about maybe things

that we want to talk about? 1 2 And then, I think, Arlene, what you're asking is then we come up with these 3 things, and I think we've got like a couple of 4 weeks that we work on them. 5 We're not 6 presenting recommendations. CHAIR JACOBS: No, we're not doing 7 8 MEMBER JARRETT: -- at the end of 9 10 the day tomorrow --CHAIR JACOBS: Yeah. 11 12 MEMBER JARRETT: -- like had been 13 done in past years. CHAIR JACOBS: No, that's the last 14 15 thing that I want to do. 16 But tomorrow is a working session, the 8:30 session. 17 James Jacobs, Stanford University. 18 19 Part of that working session, maybe 20 a large part of that working session, is going to be electing the new chair, so we'll do that 21

but they we'll also continue to flesh out

23

recommendations.

Dan, were you going to say something?

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Since I'm always Google Docs-challenged, is that list up someplace, number one? Number two, while we have this time -- I'm always trying to think of, okay, when Council closes at the end, does our community have a sense of, it looks like we're going to look like this, this, this, and that's sort of thing.

CHAIR JACOBS: Yes.

MEMBER O'MAHONY: And that's why I'm wondering, if I had an opportunity to look at the list, that we could say, you know, in my opinion, these are the top ones we wish to concentrate on. And while the other ones are great to have on a list, I don't want to communicate to them that we're really going to work on those.

I mean, in priority order, what I'm hearing is advising GPO on how to set some of their priorities. We did some of that. I'd like to see if we truly can flesh something

out for them that they don't have to come back
again next Council going, okay, now we need
recommendations again on which priority should

we set.

If we could have those broad strokes, it would go, okay, we worked on what we interpreted based on your document that you gave to us. We have some specifics here that are more poignant saying, should it be this or should it be that, because your guidance you didn't give us was sufficient to allow us to truly do that. That would at least be one of my top picks from what I've heard so far.

But like I said, being Google Doc-challenged, I'd like to look at the other ones.

CHAIR JACOBS: Arlene?

MEMBER WEIBLE: Well, what I was thinking -- you know, I kind of didn't purposely do this, but my list is kind of bullet point-oriented and, you know, I did jot down some of the things. And I could continue to build this bullet-point list and have it

ready for us for tomorrow's discussion. 1 2 You know, am I hearing that we don't want to this in Google Docs? 3 Because, I'll do whatever you need to do it. 4 MEMBER O'MAHONY: Once I learn how 5 to get into Google Docs, it's (off mic.) 6 7 MEMBER MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. 8 We've got 20 minutes yet. Let's 9 10 accomplish something here. CHAIR JACOBS: Yes. 11 (Whereupon, there was off-mic 12 13 conversation on the record.) CHAIR JACOBS: Are you typing in 14 15 the notes document? 16 MEMBER WEIBLE: I'm typing in my notes based on --17 CHAIR JACOBS: Into the shared --18 19 MEMBER WEIBLE: -- I've kind of 20 amplified some of the things that were here to kind of -- and it's becoming more of an ideas 21 list. I was thinking more in terms of formal 22

recommendations when I first started this, but

you know, it's really more of a concept list, and trying to put some things together.

CHAIR JACOBS: Okay.

MEMBER WEIBLE: So we can either talk about doing more of that. Or I could just, you know, try to fill in the gaps that I've identified -- and of course, everybody else in Google Doc -- so that we can all edit it at the same time.

CHAIR JACOBS: Hear, hear.

Dan?

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony,
Brown University.

Thank you, Arlene, for not only the good notes you've already taken but the elaboration of those into bullet-points for capturing the essence of what those recommendations might be.

I don't know if we want to talk more about the substance of any one of these things, but in terms of that discussion about priorities and how to give feedback about particular things, one idea I was just sort of

float out to start that conversation could be something like, just for reaction purposes, you know, how we weigh starting a new project versus finishing up an existing project that's already been identified as a priority and that substantial work has gotten been done toward. You know, that could be one axis that we look at, or part of the criteria or whatever it is that we come up with.

There could be other ways in which, you know, other factors to consider because life isn't static. Other things come up and we have to weigh competing priorities. But it seems to me that there are a lot of really good projects that this particular area within GPO was already working on -- Ben's Guide being one of them -- and they've made really good substantial progress in that, you know, I wouldn't want to dilute away from other good progress that they're making to start other good ideas if that means that that's going to delay some of the things that are, you know, real close to being wrapped up.

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster,
University of Akron.

Dan, I think that's exactly right, and one of the things that could perhaps be the basis of a recommendation, which I think we've really already discussed, is for setting priorities. How do we get information to distill down to GPO in addition to how GPO is already seeking information for setting priorities?

We have these working groups, which I hope to see working more directly with GPO in the future, and I also think that Council as a body needs to look at how we gather information (I know we all talk to our colleagues), especially when there is are focused questions about prioritization, how we might go about it in a more formal way -- I know no one wants more surveys -- but in a more formal manner, get some feedback from the community.

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.

1 (Whereupon, there was a long pause 2 on the record.) 3 CHAIR JACOBS: I'm editing the Google Doc now to cut the section on the notes 4 5 the section versus on the possible 6 recommendations. So maybe we can make those 7 bubble to the top. (Whereupon, there was off-mic 8 conversation on the record.) 9 10 CHAIR JACOBS: Oh, see, I haven't been tracking yours. Should I not do that? 11 12 Should I do a separate document? 13 SPEAKER: No. Leave it in the document. 14 CHAIR JACOBS: Leave it in this 15 16 document? All right. I love to confuse Steve. 17 I am now deleting that. 18 19 Okay, I've just deleted that. 20 It's about 5:15 now, and seeing people walking out the door, why don't we end 21 session officially and then 22 this can

continue to talk amongst ourselves.

This session is officially fini. (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 5:17 p.m.) 

## U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

+ + + + +

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE & FALL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 19, 2011

+ + + + +

The Council met in Salons A and B of the Crystal Ballroom of the DoubleTree by Hilton Hotel Washington DC-Crystal City, 300 Army Navy Drive, Arlington, Virginia, at 8:30 a.m., James R. Jacobs, Chair, presiding.

### PRESENT

JAMES R. JACOBS, Stanford University, Chair STEPHANIE BRAUNSTEIN, Louisiana State University

HELEN BURKE, Minneapolis Central Library STEPHEN M. HAYES, University of Notre Dame PEGGY ROEBUCK JARRETT, University of Washington

SHARALYN J. LASTER, The University of Akron DONNA LAUFFER, Johnson County Library SUSAN LYONS, University of Rutgers-Newark School of Law

JILL A. MORIEARTY, University of Utah
DANIEL P. O'MAHONY, Brown University
MARK PHILLIPS, University of North Texas
DEBBIE RABINA, Pratt Institute
ANN MARIE SANDERS, Library of Michigan
CAMILLA TUBBS, Yale Law School
ARLENE WEIBLE, Oregon State Library

## ALSO PRESENT

MARY ALICE BAISH, Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office CINDY ETKIN, U.S. Government Printing Office ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED, U.S. Government Printing Office

SELENE KNOLL, U.S. Government Printing Office TED PRIEBE, U.S. Government Printing Office LINDA RESLER, U.S. Government Printing Office LISA RUSSELL, U.S. Government Printing Office KAREN SIEGER, U.S. Government Printing Office DAVID WALLS, U.S. Government Printing Office

# CONTENTS

GPO Update	4
FDLP Web Enhancements	12
ILS Enhancements	22
Web Harvesting	30
GPO Changes in Regulations	38
GPO Federal Digital System	49
PACER/Court Opinions	58
Results of Users Survey	86
Charter Changes	95
Council Recommendations Discussion	126
Working Group Session Summaries	145
Discussion	165

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

10:32 a.m.

CHAIR JACOBS: Okay, hi, everyone.

This is the 10:30 session. Seems like the natives are getting restless. The Council natives are getting restless.

The 10:30 to 12:00 slot today is going to be a GPO update. And so the way this is going to work is that GPO staff are going to give an update on a specific issue, then there'll be time for Council to ask questions and make comments.

And then we'll open it up to the floor and we'll just go down the line like that. So it'll be, you know, GPO, Council floor, GPO, Council floor, like that.

Sound good? And with that I'll invite Ted up here, Ted Priebe?

MR. PRIEBE: Thank you, James. Good morning. Ted Priebe, GPO. What we've got for you today is a set of updates related to some topics, several of which DLC had asked for us to provide information on.

And so with that I've got some slides that really just gap the topic, and then we've got our subject matter experts that will come to the mic.

And I'll start with the GPO phased approach to shutdown. Karen?

MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. As you know, FDsys became the system of record back in December of 2010. Since then, GPO has been working on phasing out GPO Access.

So we're trying to make sure that, you know, since GPO Access has been around for quite a number of years that, you know, all the various URLs that were posted over time either in print publications, out in various press releases, people have bookmarks to various GPO Access Web pages and applications, documents, that we're providing an easy transition from GPO Access to FDsys.

So we are targeting for November, the archive-only version of GPO Access. So we're starting with the approach of, with this archive phase that GPO Access will be

available in read-only mode.

It will not be updated, and like I said, we're targeting that for November, so whenever that date hits, and we will announce it to the community.

For example, the following day or that particular day, the Federal Register, for example, will no longer be available on GPO Access in its, a daily release mode.

The archived editions will still be available, but from then on out any content that is published from GPO will be available exclusively on FDsys.

Following the archive-only phase, we are working on the actual shutdown of GPO Access. I don't have a time frame on that at the moment, but that's where the true meat of the work is coming in as we go ahead and create one-to-one redirects from the GPO Access URLs to FDsys.

MR. PRIEBE: Council, questions, additional information requests?

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster,

University of Akron. Karen, what steps will be taken with respect to portals to waste-type information?

For example, getting to the item list or getting to the add/drop, that's all kind of at least in appearance on that same platform.

Are those sites going to remain operational as they are until the list transformation is complete, are they going to move gpo.gov just as is or how is that being addressed?

MS. SIEGER: Yes, Karen Sieger, GPO. As part of the actual phasing out of GPO Access those resources will remain as-is. Those are not part of GPO Access, they are part of the FDLP Desktop.

So they will just as-is until the new systems lists, ADT, things like that come online.

Along with that I'd like to add that there have been concerns about the e-CFR. The e-CFR will continue to operate and be

updated after the archive and the shutdown phase of GPO Access. So the e-CFR is not considered part of that GPO Access shutdown, it is a separate system.

It will be maintained and there are, GPO has been working with the Office of the Federal Register on planning the replacement version of the e-CFR to take advantage of today's Web technologies and, you know, provide further enhancements that have requested by various agencies and by users.

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. So I'm assuming that the PURL server's doing okay?

MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. Yes, PURL server is doing wonderfully.

CHAIR JACOBS: Thank you.

MS. ROWE: Beth Rowe, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill.

We're in the midst of migrating a Congressional legislative tutorial from tutorial to a LibGuide, and we had relied on some links from GPO Access, some Congressional

bill glossary and things like that.

We're finding some of them redirected. We're finding some haven't. Should we just be patient and wait longer? Should we notify you?

Is everything going to be migrated?

Are the plans to take all of the content that's been on GPO Access and migrate it, or are there actually some plans not to take some of it with you?

MS. SIEGER: I'm Karen Sieger, GPO. Yes, we're going to be taking all the content with us. So as we're going through the actual shutdown phase of GPO Access we are looking at every single link on the Web servers to make sure that an equivalent exists on FDsys, and so we're creating those one-to-one redirects.

So you have seen some redirects been implemented so far, those are regarding PURLs. So some PURLs have been modified from their GPO Access targets to their FDsys equivalents.

But we still have to finish that and we're looking after this conference to go ahead and work on finishing that piece. In the meantime, we're also writing the redirects from the Web servers over to FDsys.

Those are the redirects that will go live in time for the actual shutdown itself. So on your part at depositories, you can start updating your links now to point to the FDsys equivalent.

The GPO Access redirects will be in effect a number of years, but we would encourage you to replace those URLs with the FDsys equivalents so that we're advertising FDsys rather than GPO Access.

And I'll put this out there for the community and for Council, we have the file that has a listing of all the redirects. Is that something the libraries would be interested in getting a hold of so they can see what those redirects are?

MS. ROWE: I think my problem is -- Beth Rowe, University at Chapel Hill, again,

is that we aren't finding some comparability of the FDsys.

So that was the concern, that they were orphans and hadn't been migrated or weren't in the plan to be migrated.

MS. SIEGER: Okay, yes. We can look on disseminating that, those couple files that, you know, basically list all the GPO Access links and where they go to on FDsys.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. So without any additional questions on that, I was going to ask Karen to do the FDLP Desktop Web enhancements discussion.

And then as a side note, she has another educational session that she was asked to participate in.

So if there is a related question that you have that you might want to ask and it's related to something that Karen could answer, it would be a good time after she gives this update for our Council or for someone in the community. Thank you.

MS. SIEGER: Okay, Karen Sieger,

GPO. With regard to the FDLP Web enhancements, we are currently working on redesigns for the three Websites you see up on the screen, the FDLP Desktop, Ben's Guide and the FDLP Community site.

We are currently working on coding the template for the FDLP Desktop design. Yesterday in our session we got some great feedback on sort of the pie in the sky.

We'd love to have features for the Desktop as well as, you know, concerns about existing functionality within the Desktop that people hope we address in the redesign.

And so we're going to take that back and examine all those contents and see what we can apply. We don't have a time frame yet on the Desktop.

We're hoping to figure that out once we get back to the office and we look at all the comments, and start coming up with a set release schedule for features.

But we are actively working on it and will make a beta site available for the

community to take a look at, you know, in the next maybe week or so.

Just need to coordinate a few things back at the office before we announce that.

For Ben's Guide, people got to see what the home page, what a Master Learning Adventures page and a detailed content page would look like for Ben's Guide. We got feedback on that as well.

We are actively working on that Ben's Guide design and we will, based off the comments, go back and tweak those designs so that we can start working on templates for those sites and then start looking at porting the content over from the existing Ben's Guide site to the new live site.

The FDLP Community redesign has not yet begun. We are sort of in that planning phase, and based off of the feedback we've gotten from this Council session and from the educational session yesterday that we see that there is quite a bit of work to do on the

Community site to make it a little bit more user friendly.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But that is something we're committed to and we'd like to have your feedback so that we go ahead and make this site as, you know, robust as possible so that you can use it as а true, a real-time collaborative tool.

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs,
Stanford University. I think all of Council
will join me in thanking Karen for her hard
work on all of these three items.

It's yeoman's work, and I know having dealt with CMSs and programming of CMSs I know that it's a lot of work, and so thank you very much.

MS. SIEGER: Thank you.

CHAIR JACOBS: Yeowomen. I did have one suggestion for the Desktop if I may. Under Depository Administration in the top nav, if you could put a link to the Depository Library Council there.

It is in the lower left corner on

the bottom of the Desktop, but I've heard from several people in the community, they're like where's the, you know, where are Council updates?

Where are the minutes, where are those kinds of things? So if you could put that in the top nav, I'd really, I think the community would really appreciate it.

MS. SIEGER: I'll take that back, yes. Thank you.

CHAIR JACOBS: Thanks.

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster, University of Akron. While we're throwing ideas at you, and I think you guys probably already considered this, I would hope that there's some way to more closely integrate the content that is uploaded.

For example, all the files that are uploaded, into the display, so that the files that are associated with things are easy to get to and it's not just a case of linking to the File Upload Center.

MS. SIEGER: Yes, that is something

that we're looking into. I don't think, Council didn't have a chance to see the redesigned sandbox site that we have up right now, but what we're hoping to do, it's basically a left content pane and then a right column.

The left content pane has the content of the article and then the right side has any kind of affiliated, any forms, any documents that are referenced in that article would be called out on that right hand column.

So we're trying to, instead of having to go dig in the file repository, if there's a file or a form or anything that is related to what you're reading, it would be available right from that article.

MEMBER HAYES: And you may have gotten the impression yesterday from some of our discussions that some, what has been previously known as internal documentation within SupDocs might very well be useful to have on the Desktop since they are not, would

about

1 appear they are no longer without 2 educational -- I just blanked on the phrase 3 from Title 44. Robin, don't shoot me. educational 4 So they have some 5 benefit that you may want to decide maybe 6 there are some SODs, to mention a specific, that might very well go up on the Desktop that 7 since it does inform the community. 8 MS. SIEGER: What session was that 9 10 discussed in? MEMBER HAYES: Yesterday Council's 11 12 session. I'm sure it's all in the court 13 reporter's --MS. SIEGER: Okay, I'll have to go 14 15 through and find it. I don't think I was at 16 that session. MEMBER HAYES: You were lucky then, 17 18 I guess. 19 MS. SIEGER: If somebody was they can fill me in, so I'll just make sure that 20 whoever was there can fill me in. But yes, 21

we'll have that discussion and see

getting those documents back for you.

23

22

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Kate Irwin-Smiler, Wake Forest University, Professional Center Library. Is there a time frame for Ben's Guide?

MS. SIEGER: With Ben's Guide we're actually looking at a phased approach. So what you saw was we're going to have at least three sections, the Apprentice, the Journeyman and the Master.

What we're planning for is for the Journeyman and the Master to go live initially, and that the Apprentice maybe we'll just have a game, so sort of a teaser. You know, hey, this is coming soon.

The bulk of the work is going to go into that Apprentice level, because that's where it's going to be most interactive, most of the kids, you know, playing games and interacting with Ben himself.

Whereas, with the other ones there's a little bit more reading based off the comprehension levels of the three groups. So we're targeting so that the Journeyman and

the Master go live.

And we're hoping within the next few months, but we haven't started coding the template yet. We want to get that template done first. But I would like to in the next three to four months be able to say that we're launching the Ben's Guide design.

But we don't want to rush anything.

We want to make that the site goes up and

it's complete and we're not doing piecemeal

work.

I'd like for it to be done so that we can focus all the attention then on the Apprentice level and get that out as well.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Okay, thanks. Twitter thanks you.

MS. WONDRACEK: Hi, Jenny Wondracek, University of Florida Legal Information Center. My question is, will the FDLP Desktop have a mobile version? Because I know not all the menus work with my iPad.

MS. SIEGER: For the new version and for all the sites we're looking more to

HTML5, so that regardless of platform you can get on a, you know, a tablet, you can get a mobile device, that we're going HTML5 friendly so that you will have full accessibility on your mobile device.

MS. WONDRACEK: Fabulous. Thank you.

CHAIR JACOBS: Sorry, James Jacobs, Stanford University. One final point on the Desktop, and maybe you covered this yesterday in your session.

But I notice when, in the document repository when you hit View, it still just downloads the document rather than giving us a view of the document. So that might be something that's not working very well.

There's a Download and a View and a Details buttons for each document in the repository. Download does download, View downloads.

MS. SIEGER: View likes me. It doesn't seem to like you. What browser are you using?

the

of

and seven

CHAIR JACOBS: I'm using Safari. 1 2 MS. SIEGER: Oh, I'll check on Safari and see if that's an issue with Safari. 3 CHAIR JACOBS: Okay. Oh yes, I'll 4 check on Firefox and see if that works there. 5 MS. SIEGER: Okay. 6 CHAIR JACOBS: Okay, thank you. 7 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. 8 if there's no final questions, suggestions, 9 10 comments for Karen related to the Web services we'll move on to ILS enhancements. 11 12 Linda? 13 MS. RESLER: Good morning. Linda Resler, I'm the Manager of the Library 14 15 Technical Services Support section, and one 16 of my major responsibilities is the Aleph Integrated Library System. 17 Thought I'd start out with some 18 19 statistics. We continue to see an increase in 20 usage of the CGP, the Catalog of Government Publications. 21 fiscal '11, 22 for And we had

23

24,110,497 searches,

months had searches over 2,000,000, and the other five were above 1.6 million. So we're pretty pleased with the continuing level of usage.

I also brought Z-39.50 statistics. Starting in 2008, shortly after release, we had 2,772 users who retrieved 6,055 records. And if we jump to 2011, we've seen 9,304 users and this is for the fiscal year, and then 22,589 records retrieved.

So it's a significant increase over time and we're happy to see that also.

What have we been up to this year?

We did a minor upgrade service pack to the software, partially to implement the fields for the RDA, the new cataloging standard resource description and access.

And we've implemented a field in the OPAC display. Starting out we've just done one, we're kind of early adopters of this. But we're working with cataloging as we go on to implement more of these fields.

We're also supporting the

cataloging distribution, cataloging record distribution project with records from the CGP.

We've also hired a new Aleph Systems librarian. We're very excited about that. She's going to help us with some of our new initiatives including the stand up of the Aleph Acquisitions Module.

That's mostly going to be important to us internally, but it'll be a big boon for us. It's been a long time coming.

We also need to refresh the CGP.

It's five years old now and it's looking a little, you know, it's starting to show its age.

And in conjunction with that we need to reflect the GPO Access sunset in the CGP because we've got links to GPO Access all over it.

We're also working on an initiative to make what we call brief records upon discovery. The Content Acquisitions staff put in brief records in the catalog, but they stay

suppressed until they go through the entire process, classification and cataloging.

And so we want to unsuppress them upon discovery, and so that should have an effect on lost docs and fugitive reporting. We're working out the final details and we're hoping this before the turn of the year.

We're going to be working on batch loading records to OCLC, right now we go the other way from OCLC into Aleph, probably the historic shelf list of records starting with those and continuing to go the CGP.

As far as access to historic shelf list records, the project's been ongoing for two years and there's over 108,000 records now that are viewable in the CGP. And we put in a note, historical shelf listed a note field so that they're retrievable by any of the CGP searches.

In the electronic titles, what have we done with that this year? We added the CSV format so that depositories would have a little bit of flexibility and be able to

manipulate that data rather than just the static HTML report.

And this year we added three fields to that report by, let's see, popular request I guess you would say, the OCLC number, the Aleph system number and the date cataloged.

So as we hear from you all about what you would want, we try to enhance these things to make them more useful to you.

MetaLib is one other thing that we're kind of excited about. We configured the Federal Digital System this year to enable simultaneous searching of FDsys and the CGP, and we just released this last month.

And what you can do is go to MetaLib and we've created -- the MetaLib terminology is QuickSet, a predefined search set that you can select and then you can search the CGP and FDsys simultaneously.

So we're kind of excited about that. We know that that's a step in the direction of simultaneous searching of FDsys and the CGP.

And that's -- well, let me give you a little bit, I did bring statistics on MetaLib. We did release it a year ago, MetaLib in general, and we've had 184,871 searches and this was of the 10th of October, and 28,000 user sessions.

And we released FDsys in MetaLib about three weeks ago, and as of the 10th of October we had 1,200 searches of FDsys in MetaLib itself and then 144 searches of the QuickSet.

And this is without really any marketing except release to the depositories through FDLP-L. So we're kind of excited about the FDsys and CGP searchability.

That's really all I have. Are there any questions?

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I wonder if you could, when you said the need to refresh the CGP, can you let me know if you're thinking about having static URLs to bib records?

Or, because as it is now it's

session oriented and so it's really difficult 1 to do a search in CGP and send a record to 2 3 somebody just by copying the URL. Does that question make sense? 4 5 RESLER: Linda Resler, GPO. MS. 6 The refresh, we were more thinking of 7 discovery interface type of thing. what that refers to. 8 CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, 9 10 Stanford University. If I could then put a plug in for static URLs to bib records as 11 12 opposed to dynamic URL session oriented URLs. 13 MS. RESLER: Okay. CHAIR JACOBS: Stable. Stable URLs 14 I guess is the parlance. 15 16 MS. RESLER: I'll take that one back with my automation team. 17 Any other questions? 18 19 CHAIR JACOBS: Sorry, James Jacobs, 20 Stanford University. One other question I had, can you tell me if the CGP is open now to 21 being indexed by search engines? 22

MS. RESLER: It is. We still have

a robot.txt file on. We've moved, the main reason for that was we had the original hardware and we've upgraded the hardware.

So these things are under discussion now, the same as the Z-39.50 is still passworded. So these are issues that now that we have our new hardware in place we can reevaluate.

CHAIR JACOBS: Thank you.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Any questions from the community related to ILS, MetaLib, some of our enhancements functionality? And if not, David, if you could join us on an update for harvesting, please.

MR. WALLS: Good morning, everyone.

I'm David Walls. I'm the preservation
librarian at GPO. And we have begun a Web
harvesting pilot program for the year through
a contract with the Internet Archive using
their Archive-It Web harvesting service.

The content will actually be hosted on their Wayback Machine, but GPO owns the

б

content and we have already paid for the migration of that content to FDsys eventually.

So part of the year on pilot program will be to determine whether we can provide links in the CGP to the Web harvested content and whether we can provide a link within FDsys to the content that's hosted on Wayback.

But the important thing is that this is our, trying to meet our goal of being able to provide more preservation and access to Web harvested content as more and more federal agencies publish on the Web.

Any questions?

MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library. Could
you repeat that? And I think really what I'm
interested in is, I believe that you said so
you have this contract with that --

MR. WALLS: Right, with the Internet Archive.

MEMBER JARRETT: With the Internet Archive, it's going to be in the Wayback. But

1 then you said, where I missed was the 2 connection then with FDsys. Well, FDsys is MR. WALLS: 3 our digital, you know, search engine, our digital 4 repository, so the question inevitably arises, 5 6 why would we park content on Wayback?

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And it's largely just right now for the pilot, it's easier to do that. It's part of their built in service. We have the goal of migrating it to FDsys but we need to do some work during the course of the pilot project for the year to determine how best to do that.

MEMBER JARRETT: Great. Peggy Jarrett, University of Washington Law Library. I was just concerned about the goal of putting it back into FDsys, just to make sure that I heard that correctly, which I did.

MR. WALLS: Right, correct.

MEMBER JARRETT: Thank you.

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster,
University of Akron. David, has there been a
scope set yet for this particular pilot in
terms of the content that will be harvested?

MR. WALLS: Well -- I'm sorry,

David Walls, GPO. The scope set is

publications that are now Web based that would

be within the traditional scope of the FDLP

program.

MEMBER LASTER: So all agencies in other words?

MR. WALLS: All agencies that seem to be putting out more and more content that is Web based.

MEMBER WEIBLE: This is Arlene Weible from Oregon State Library. How are you going to figure that out? You know, we use Archive-It in our institution and it's very much what they call a feed based, where you have to really identify your content on the front end.

So I'd like to hear more about how, and maybe you need to still do more work on this, but that is a kind of challenging part of using Archive-It. So I just am curious to hear more about that.

MR. WALLS: Okay. David Walls,

GPO. You're correct that what you do is feed the Archive-It service seed URLs, which would be of federal agencies.

And the question is not only to select the URLs but to also select how deep you go within the Web sites to achieve the content you want.

This is part of our own internal project to sort of look at acquisitions and how we gather content and how we make some of those scope determinations.

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. Thanks, David. I think this is a great pilot project.

I know that a couple of us at least on Council have some experience with Web harvesting, and so if you would like to update us more, you know, behind the scenes or whatever, and ask questions on our experience in the past, we'd be happy to have that conversation.

MR. WALLS: Thank you. Any other questions?

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO, if I can to add to that. So that would be, we appreciate the offer from Council, and I think maybe off line what we can do in terms of our harvesting working group that we have internally, we affirm in terms of the member or members from Council that could have some roles on that.

I did want to add just a tad bit more context, and I think David touched on it, but in terms of this harvesting pilot, very early in terms of the team's formation.

So we have a vehicle now and a tool that we can use. And as Mary Alice talked about the first day, we are looking at from our business unit and the needs of total life cycle management, how we can integrate such a tool into our acquisitions team and the process.

So we touched on the fact that we have acquisitions team members that are focused on specific agencies based on what they're uncovering in the face-to-face

meetings, viewing the Web sites.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

That's going to help us perhaps initially in terms of driving that prioritization of where do we go, because I think the reality is, for everyone, is you can't reach out to every agency site at once and we want to look for where we can get the most information, the content that's most at risk to ensure that we've got that accessible.

So part of the docs discovery made process when we're aware from the community, these are all pieces to that new life cycle management puzzle that we're trying together from organization to put an standpoint.

Questions from the community on harvesting and what we're doing?

MEMBER PHILLIPS: Mark Phillips,
University of North Texas. I think this is a
really great direction that GPO is going. I
encourage GPO to take advantage of some of the
other opportunities that are available in the
Web archiving arena.

Like we've said, there's a lot of experience on Council, and in certain areas this isn't new. You know, there are folks across the way in the Library of Congress that have quite a bit of experiences and I'm sure you're already working with them.

Another thing is, and May is going to be the annual meeting for International Internet Preservation Consortium. It'll be in Washington, D.C.

And usually involved with that there's a lot of open sessions relating to Web archiving, and it'd really be great to see GPO involved in that process.

And that may be something to reach out to the Library of Congress to try to coordinate, because there's a lot of work in this area.

And it's great to see GPO moving in the direction of being involved in it because there could be some great leadership that could be put forward from GPO if they choose to.

MR. WALLS: Thanks for mentioning that, Mark. David Walls, GPO. We have reached out to the Library of Congress. We're sort of, I think we've had three or four meetings with them talking about how they've scoped their Web harvesting program.

And we are very excited that the IIPC meeting is going to be in Washington, because for about the last two years it's been in London or Singapore, places that we couldn't possibly travel to.

So we're very excited to see what role we can play in that meeting, because GPO is a member of that international organization and we hope to work with those folks.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO.

Thank you, David. Our next topic we've got is

GPO changes in regulations. Robin?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Good morning.

Robin Haun-Mohamed with GPO. I'm sorry my

voice is a little bit cracking here.

Hopefully it won't take too long.

GPO sent to all depository

libraries in early summer, the legal requirements in program regulations -- excuse me, of the Federal Depository Library program.

And this superseded the handbook and also the one-page FDL requirements that were on the Desktop. Those resources are still available on the Desktop at this point because a lot of the information in the handbook is going into a resource tentatively called Guidance, at this point.

It's a lot of the information that you found in the handbook that are best practices and recommended ways to meet the requirements, but of course libraries have the ability to be innovative and flexible in how they actually make those resources or meet those requirements.

It will be a Web based tool, and Karen has left, but Karen has been an integral part of setting this up. It is one of the first pieces on the new Desktop that will be released.

And we of course will welcome

feedback on that tool. The leader of that project is Ashley, and she's not in here right now, but Cherie Givens also played an essential part in putting together the front matter of the resource, the legal requirements document.

The idea behind the legal requirements document was to take what is required and just fill it down so if a director says, what do I have to do, you can hand them this.

I only have a paper copy, Ann has a good copy. I made a mistake and didn't bring lots of wonderful -- you gave it back to Mary Alice, and she's going to pull it up, 64 requirements. Two more requirements in that.

One is for cataloging of new tangible resources and the second was to put either -- thank you very much, Mary Alice -- the FDLP logo or wording stating the depositories of the Federal Depository Library Program are participating in the program.

We've had a couple questions related, several questions related mostly to the cataloging requirement.

And we have asked libraries to let us know by the beginning of January how they're going to meet that requirement.

Doesn't mean you have to have it all in place.

What we want people to do is tell us of what steps you're taking forward to meet that requirement and how we can help you if necessary. And then we'll work with each library as it becomes, if it becomes an issue.

At this point, the Guidance document to supplement this is essentially all completed but it's not available because it's going into the new Desktop.

And what will happen is there'll be a lot of active links. So that as you pull up a portion of the Guidance document talking about, for example, checking a shipping list, then the requirement will pull up also to the side and any other linkages.

So for me it's a bit difficult to understand because I'm not a real good Web reader. I'm still reading off HTML pages one by one by one.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

However, younger folks in my group assure me this will be wonderful and very intuitive to a good number of people, so more will be coming on that.

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. Actually the one new regulation that I was interested in that I had sent some early discussions to Council about where it was about the FDLP logo on Web sites and whether you have any further direction for how you'd like that applied. looked at, you know, a dozen or so different FDLP libraries. Some have the logo some don't. Some have the, one university, the University of North Texas, has the logo on their front know, page at the, you top level library.unt.edu.

Most do not have it that recognizable or that up toward the top. Some

have the regulatory language included in all text or actual text on the page, some don't.

So are you giving other recommendations for how that should be applied or are you just letting depositories do it as they wish?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: We try to convince people it's a good idea to put it on to a very top Web page. We realize that in a lot of cases that is not going to happen.

We like the logo with the statutory language, but some institutions just want one or the other.

What we're asking is that it be visible to the users so when a library says they're an electronic depository, we have a lot of that going on, that there's a way to identify them besides digging down, down, down, down, down, down.

Sometimes that's the only place they can get that information, James. So again, we're trying to work with each library.

If there's a concern or an obstacle, we'll

work with them.

We do like it at the top page with the page for Federal Depository Library materials for that resource.

MEMBER WEIBLE: Arlene Weible from the Oregon State Library. Can you talk about how, or have you gotten feedback from any constituency in the community about the Guidance document?

I guess not only from a content point of view but from a structural point of view. This is a really, you know, these documents are very essential to how we understand how to operate in the program. And I want to make sure they're as user friendly but also as readable as possible.

Being a regional librarian, I often get questions where I have to refer to these documents, and so it's really important to me to be able to find things easily and in a language that's understandable.

So could you talk about, you know, any efforts to kind of have some of the users

of the documents give feedback about it?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. No, we haven't put it forth for feedback yet because like I said, it's being put into the new Desktop.

And the way that it's being written is for the new Desktop, so the Guidance document that you knew in the past, the handbook, it's going to look very different.

Feedback will be important, and of course we'll ask for Council's input on this just as we did through the regulations piece.

The reason we can't like farm it out and have feedback now is it doesn't really resemble what I'm told it's going to look like.

I myself have asked that it be a document. That is, can I pull it together in one spot, pull it down and print it off if I need to? That's not really what's going to happen at this point.

However, my viewpoint has been heard and Karen's going to try and meet my request. I will tell you it will look very

similar to an article that you now see on the Desktop.

But because the revised Desktop is programmed out we literally wrote the articles with the goal of meeting that new Desktop format.

So if it sounds a bit confusing,
Arlene, I apologize. I definitely will have
Council take a look at it before it rolls out.

MEMBER WEIBLE: That was my main concern, is before it goes out to the whole community I think that kind of beta testing of that kind of tool is really important.

And you might want to think about possibly expanding it beyond Council to maybe some regionals who are the, you know, as I said we often are in a position of using these tools to help the community, so that would be another user group to maybe poll about this.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Thank you, Arlene. There is a group of testers that we do tap on, on a regular basis.

And they are often participating with the biennial survey review or other questions that we might have. Not all are regionals. A few are just people that act in the gatekeeper role, however, for others in the community.

MEMBER HAYES: And Robin, I don't know if I would second your -- Steve Hayes, Notre Dame. The idea of I'm all for taking advantage of technology and the Web in its full capabilities, but sometimes you actually want to walk away with it.

In the print structure, yes, I'm the, you know, Boomer generation, so I still like things on paper. But, you know, eventually you have to be able to get at that.

So I would, if you're the only one letting that message know you've now got a second one on Council that says, no, that's an important portion of it.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Thank you,
Steve. Robin Haun-Mohamed. I'll pay you

later for that one.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO.

Thank you, Robin. Any questions from the audience? And if, there we've got one.

MS: MCANINCH: Sandy McAninch,
University of Kentucky. Over and above a
printed whole set of the guidance, will it be
searchable as a whole document?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. That is definitely one of my concerns. And my staff members have assured me that yes, indeed, it will be full searchable.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO.
Thanks, Robin. Our next topic and update is
on GPO's Federal Digital System. Lisa
Russell's here. We also have Selene Knoll
from our Program Strategy Technology Team, so
thank you.

MS. RUSSELL: Lisa Russell, GPO. In the past year we have worked with NOAA to bring in the Coastal Zone Information Center, also known as CZIC.

One of the things interesting about this collection is that it's actually the first collection that we had marked records from the agency, and we brought it in.

So that was, I think, a good learning experience for us to see how we could use the marked records into GPO, or I'm sorry, into FDsys. It's to get the metadata that way.

We also worked with the Library of Congress to bring in the digitized statutes at large from 1981 to 2002, and this brings up our complete coverage of the statutes at large from 1951 to 2007.

We also worked with the United States Courts to bring in the court opinions which is a beta, which I hope some of you got to go to the demo the other day.

Cindy Etkin has been leading that for us so I'm going to let her talk about that when she gets up in a couple minutes. We also had some things that we enhanced that were already out there as collections.

One of them was economic indicators, which is now available as Excel spreadsheets as well as the PDF version. We have enhanced the government manual so that we can now bring in the content as XML when we get the content.

We also enhanced the public papers of the president so we can bring in the XML, and that XML is now also available on data.gov.

We also enhanced the Congressional Record to put in the Constitutional Authority statements, and those are now searchable as separate files on FDsys.

Any questions from Council? Any questions from the audience?

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. Just wanted to say thanks for all those enhancements and for starting to work on the technicalities of ingest into FDsys.

I think that's something that the community has really been interested in. Now

that you're getting your hands dirty with sort of other agency digital content, I hope there's an interest within GPO to look at the digitization registry and maybe work with, I know that posters, I think posters from someone have been ingested.

But looking at other depositories' digitization projects for ingest as well I think will be another interesting sort of next step down the road. Thank you.

MS. RUSSELL: Thanks. That's a good point, and actually on the public papers of the president I think is a good example of that.

They're now bringing that in with XML which should make it easier to process it faster. So we expect the new editions coming out faster than the previous editions have.

MS. ROWE: Beth Rowe, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill. You just caught my interest, I'm just curious. You said something about -- Beth Rowe University of North Carolina Chapel Hill.

You caught my interest about mentioning data.gov. Do you all have a former partnership or working relationship with them?

Do you send stuff to them, they send stuff to you?

MS. RUSSELL: I'm going to hand it of to Selene because her area has worked on that a little bit closely than mine.

MS. ROWE: Thank you.

MS. KNOLL: Hi. Selene Knoll. There is a process in order to register your datasets with data.gov, and so we have an account and we are able to push content to them.

You have to fill out an entire record. It has to go through an approval process to actually have it posted on data.gov.

So for example, the public papers of the president, the first Obama book, is available on data.gov. We're awaiting approval on the government manual XML, but we have pushed all of our XML datasets up there.

the

We've also worked with the Office 1 2 of the Federal Register to allow them access to their product records. So from now on, for 3 example, when the next Obama volume comes out 4 for public papers, OFR will be pushing their 5

be just we'll handling content and the policy side will be with the

Office of the Federal Register.

record directly.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Just to add one more thing on the XML, as Lisa pointed out, with the XML for the public papers it will be easier to bring the content into FDsys when the next version comes out.

With the government manual that's also the case as well. One of the things that we've talked about is doing virtual additions that would be in between the print volumes and we can version it every six months as opposed to the, previously when the printed volume came out every two years.

Now the print volume will be every one year and we can do virtual editions every

six months. And then of course you have the government manual site which is constantly updated.

So again we're finding new ways to reach audiences with information in different ways.

MEMBER PHILLIPS: Mark Phillips,
University of North Texas. It's sometimes
hard to know exactly, but as you push content
off the data.gov and you're releasing these
datasets, if you ever hear back stories about
how users are actually taking this data and
doing interesting things or different things
than could be done with the traditional means.

Sending that back out to the community, I think would be really helpful so that we could get an idea about how this information is being used outside of how we think about using this information.

MS. KNOLL: Selene Knoll, GPO. I actually have one. I don't know if people have gone to the federalregister.gov site

within the last few days, but there's a blog available from that site.

Within the past few months for federalregister.gov, we released an API, a development API so that people could create their own apps using the XML Federal Register.

And in Berlin, Germany, a man released an app that is for, it was developed to track polar bear protection documents in the Federal Register.

And so he's starting with the Federal Register documents and he's building from other sources to create an app to track regulations to protect polar bears, because it's a very hot topic right now in Germany.

So that's just one small way that people are using content to reach audiences who are interested in this information but aren't necessarily going to go and search the Federal Register to find polar bear regulations.

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster,

University of Akron. If you can get 1 2 individual to write something for the FDLP 3 connection that would be fantastic. That's a good idea, 4 MS. RUSSELL: thanks. 5 6 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. So 7 just a couple adds to that. In Mary Alice's opening speech she also talked about CONAN, 8 additional work that we're doing on the bound 9 10 Congressional Record. So this update was really focused 11 12 on accomplishments, things that were completed and enabled. There certainly are a lot more 13 things that are going on behind the scenes. 14 15 just from the audience's So 16 perspective I wanted to provide that context 17 additional well. as Any last questions or comments from Council, and if 18 19 not, from the audience related to FDsys? 20 Okay, moving forward, Cindy, if could come up and discuss PACER and the Court 21

MS. ETKIN: Good morning. Cindy

Thank you.

Opinions.

22

23

Etkin, Government Printing Office. We've got two projects here, two different projects, but related.

The first one is PACER Access and Education, and this is not a pilot, it's a program at the request of the Judicial Conference.

The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts is working with GPO and AALL and we are implementing a program that is training based.

It is to increase awareness of and access to the content in PACER, and building on the activities taking place in libraries' training that they're already doing.

This is a training component for PACER. We have been in beta, and we thank San Bernardino County Public Library and the Law Library of Congress for testing our procedures and some of our documentation. And if you weren't at the session yesterday morning, let me announce that we are now going beyond beta and looking for more volunteers to

participate in this program.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

We're doing a phased-in approach to make sure that the PACER Service Center can handle the account process as more and more libraries enter into this program.

So we're looking for about 50 more volunteers. We had very good session yesterday and we got some volunteers out of that session. So we're very pleased about that.

This is opened Federal up to Depository libraries first, but the overall program, again because it's from the courts and their interest to increase to access PACER, is also going to be opened up to all public libraries and all public law libraries.

Any questions about this one?

MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,

University of Washington Law Library. I have a couple questions.

MS. ETKIN: Yes, Peggy.

MEMBER JARRETT: My first question is, can you, and I'm not sure because I know

Wendell Skidgel did the presentation yesterday, expand on the training requirement?

Exactly what is meant by the

Exactly what is meant by the quarterly training, what qualifies, where can we get more information about that?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. Thank you for asking for some more details about that. There are some, the training obligations, and we are asking for participating libraries to conduct at least one session for the public per quarter.

It doesn't mean that you have to have a session solely devoted to PACER. It could be incorporated into a session that you already do for related materials. It doesn't have to be its own.

There are also, there's a requirement that the staff who are providing service and may be asked questions about PACER also be trained.

And more information about, that

was the other part, more information and where to find it?

MEMBER JARRETT: Well, but back to the training. Peggy Jarrett, University of Washington Law Library. Would one-on-one training count? Would a Web tutorial count?

MS. ETKIN: Yes.

MEMBER JARRETT: Okay, and all of that will be made clear. Because it is, I have to say I'm very, you know, I'm very pleased that we're finally getting to this point after all of these years.

I do wish it were more, but we don't require, to get depository information we don't require anything else like this.

This is a unique situation where it's something provided by the courts, but there's no requirement anywhere else that we do public training on using the government information that we get as depositories.

We're required to do, to give public access and to assist the users, but this kind of worries me that people might think that you

need to have a formal training session, when the reality is that when the patron comes in it's that one-on-one thing, and do you count that would be how it's done. We're not going to get all of our pro se patrons who want to use PACER in one room at the same time. It's just not practical. So I'm hoping that there's flexibility within that.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. I'm really glad that you brought that up, because those of us participating in the organization of this program and are beta testers had a meeting yesterday after that session and these issues were raised.

And we did talk about the one-onone, because if somebody comes into the
reference desk and you're working with them
right there, that is a type of training.

One-on-one and as well as a session that might be held, advertised as part of your regular training program, that's fine too.

And actually San Bernardino County

Law Library has put things up on their Web for self serve, and they're just tracking the downloads of the documents on their Website.

So we're trying to be as flexible as possible in this obligation for training as well as trying to meet all the different learning styles of users that might come into the library.

MEMBER JARRETT: Thank you so much,
Cindy. Peggy Jarrett, University of
Washington Law Library. The PACER fees are
going up next spring.

Is the \$50 library amount going to be increased proportionately when the PACER fees go up next spring?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. That hasn't been discussed. I can ask. I can ask and get back to you.

MEMBER JARRETT: Well, no surprise,

Peggy Jarrett, University of Washington Law

Library, that we -- please, because otherwise

then it's a decrease and it becomes less of a

benefit.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. One of the goals is actually for the libraries who are participating in the training and -- oh, actually let me mention also that the Administrative Office of the Courts now has for the first time a free database that can be used for training, so that the cost to the library for participating in this has just drastically decreased.

So the hope is that libraries will not have any fees at all, any bill at all and not reaching that.

But that said, I will address because we did talk about the fee going up in April for the per page cost for the users, and I will ask and get back to you about that.

MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library. And I
said this a lot and other law librarians have
said this, but there are patrons that we're
going to have to do it for them, and there are
patrons for whom getting an account no matter
how easy it is, is a barrier to access to

information.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And so that's why that \$50 is very important, because it's just how we tell our interns that yes, it's best to help the user learn how to use the catalog, but there are some users that you just hand them the book.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Absolutely correct. I'll talk with Wendell and see what I can find out about that and get back to you.

MS. BAISH: Thank you for your questions, and Cindy, for doing such a great presentation. I did speak with Wendell about that issue, and just remember this is a pilot project.

Its success is going to depend - (Off microphone comments)

Okay, thanks. MS. BAISH: It is a pilot project and its success is going to depend on getting many libraries as to participate in this project, and Administrative Office is doing the training and making it freely available.

But in terms of that \$50 per quarter, one of the goals of the pilot is to see, is this the right level of no-fee access for the libraries that are going to be participating in this program?

So I think that's the kind of data that Wendell is looking for. In other words, is that waiver of \$50 per quarter, is it going to be adequate to meet the needs of those libraries that take on this new role and responsibility?

MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library. Mary
Alice, I really appreciate you addressing
this.

Cindy just said that it was not a pilot that it was now a program, so I think we need some clarification on that, please.

MS. BAISH: In terms of -- well, they're collecting the data to be able to determine whether that \$50 per quarter is sufficient amount of funding for you to do that.

So that's the kind of data that we're, they are going to be looking at so that they can go back and report to the Judicial Conference, which is their oversight body if you will.

Does that help, Peggy?

MEMBER JARRETT: Is it a pilot or is it a program?

MS. ETKIN: It is a program, but as we're going through this beta testing of how to actually do the final implementation, Mary Alice is correct.

This is the kind of data we need to get to evaluate and go back to the Judicial Conference and say, this isn't quite meeting our needs, can we have a little more, or something of that nature.

But it is a program that the Judicial Conference wants implemented.

MEMBER LYONS: Sue Lyons, Rutgers Law Library. I would suggest that one of the places that could look for data about whether or not that \$50 is sufficient would be the

free PACER pilot project that ended a couple of years ago.

With the exception of two or three libraries where there was massive downloading, you know, if you exclude that and look at the other libraries I think you'd find that \$50 is probably too low, probably something like \$50 a month would be compensate for the effort usage of that service.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. I do have that data, Sue. I'll take a look at that and see if there's anything we can determine in the way of the dollar figure level from that previous data. Thank you.

MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library. And
following up on what Sue said, that was a
Council recommendation in the spring that this
become an exclusive benefit for FDL libraries,
and is it possible that depository libraries
could get a higher amount?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. To

be determined. We'll have to take a look at the data usage and that kind of stuff to evaluate.

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. Sorry, Dan. Cindy, this might be the kind of thing also where \$50, looking at the usage data, may not give you the whole answer because, you know, people might be saying oh, we're going to use \$50, and stop because now it costs more.

And so if you, it would probably, I think in my estimation it would be better to have the pilot be high, something like \$50 a month as Sue suggested, and look at the data there to see if people are actually using that higher amount rather than setting the scale low and see if they're hitting that low spot.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. Thanks, James, for that comment.

One of the things that we know of course just as you've indicated that usage is not everything, and because one of the goals

of this is to have the actual users go out and create their own account and part of the training is to train people how to manage their own accounts.

So any of the usage of those people who go out and get their own accounts is not going to be able to be tied to this program.

But we also have to know that this is a program that is under the oversight of the Judicial Conference just very much like the FDLP is under the oversight of the JCP, and while they can take recommendations that has to go through the committee structure of the public access folks at the United States Courts.

We can discuss that. It's sort of out of my control, we'll see what happens.

Thank you. Any other questions about PACER access and education?

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony,
Brown University. Just a quick clarification,
Cindy.

If I understand it there's a subset

or training database or something that isn't the full-fledged database, but it's some kind of an access to it that I would imagine folks are encouraged to use that in the training activity itself?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.

Absolutely. Yes, this is --

MEMBER O'MAHONY: And it's free access to that?

MS. ETKIN: Absolutely free access to that and everybody's encouraged to use that for training, which is again one of the ways that that \$50 might then be okay, but to be determined.

The way to get to all this information, off the FDLP Desktop we do have a PACER Access and Education page that went live on Friday.

We will be announcing this to the broader community next week. When we get back to the office we'll be announcing that as well as asking for additional volunteers to participate in the program.

The page is off the Desktop. If you scroll down to the bottom, under Help there's a link to tutorials. So this is all training and education related so it's under the tutorials category.

Click on tutorials and then you'll see a list, PACER is in that list.

MEMBER BURKE: If I could make one comment about public library participation. I think I'd be happy -- oh, my name is Helen Burke, Hennepin County Library, excuse me.

I'd be happy to talk further with you about that. Any public library that hears \$50 a month will not listen for the rest of the sentence, so I'd be happy to talk to you further about how to encourage public library participation. Thanks.

MS. ETKIN: Thanks, Helen. Cindy Etkin, GPO. Any other questions or comments about PACER Access and Education?

MEMBER LYONS: Just one comment.

Our experience at Rutgers when we did

participate in the free PACER pilot program

was that about 90 percent of the users were pro se litigants.

Many did not have computers and were actually relying on this to get their own documents or orders, motions filed in their case.

If they actually had a real computer they would have gotten these documents electronically and wouldn't have needed PACER, but they didn't have that kind of access so they depended on us.

And sometimes they would come back almost every day to check on their case. So if we're going to meet this need we need to make some provision for people who have no other access.

MS. ETKIN: Thank you.

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University -- sorry. And just one more thought on that from me. Perhaps GPO could talk with Judicial, what was the name of the group?

MS. ETKIN: Judicial Conference.

CHAIR JACOBS: The Judicial Conference about possibly bringing PACER content into FDsys but maybe have a rolling wall where it doesn't necessarily break their funding model but gives free public access after a certain point.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Thanks, James, for that wonderful segue into the Court Opinions pilot. And I'll quote my colleague, I'll pay you for that later.

The newest collection in FDsys is the U.S. Courts Opinion collection. It is right now in public beta. We encourage you to take a look at it, and we are very, very interested in comments.

We had a very good session yesterday, got lots of good feedback from the folks that were attending that session, got a list that we're taking back.

We'll talk with the courts, we'll talk with the people in Selene's area about making some changes and the possibility of some of the other suggestions that we got.

Again, currently this is in public beta. There are just three courts that are available, the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, the District of Rhode Island, and in the bankruptcy the Southern Florida.

We are very quickly going to be moving to add nine more courts. This pilot project was approved by the Judicial Conference to include 12 courts.

When the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts announced that they had talked with GPO -- we're going to go forward with this, please let me know if you're interested -- within three days they had more than 30 courts that were interested.

So we're very pleased that the courts are interested in this project, and so while we'll be moving to 12 courts very, very soon, we will be moving to more than 30 courts in probably January. January is our milestone date there.

Again we're very, very interested in your feedback. The Administrative Office

of the Courts has to go back to the Judicial Conference and report. We'd very much like to include your comments with the report that goes forward.

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster,
University of Akron. Cindy, I think I know
how you're going to answer this, which is
good.

So this is clearly a pilot project and it's got a very limited scope compared to the universe of the content. It's content that we all agree needs to be in FDsys at some point in some way.

Just to clarify this, almost this technical point, if this project is deemed that a scratch, in that the approach is wrong for any reason, will the content that is being loaded now remain in FDsys?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.

That's a very good question. I can't answer that. I would hope that it would remain.

MS. BAISH: Good question. And there were two great presentations yesterday

with Wendell Skidgel and Michelle Ishakian, who is the Branch Chief at the Administrative Office of the Courts.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I was able to hear her speak I believe at the end of the session on Court Opinions. The Administrative Office and the Judicial Conference are fully supportive of this effort and I think she made that clear to those who attended the session yesterday.

So I don't personally see backward motion on this. Selene, been working with them as well Cindy, and I think I could comfortably say that this is something once the Judicial Conference approved the pilot and then the numbers came back in terms of courts volunteering to do it, and with Michelle's comments yesterday, I think they are entirely committed to moving forward with this.

Selene, you've had meetings with the staff. Cindy, you have, so is that correct impression? And I think Michelle wanted to make that clear to everybody yesterday.

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. ETKIN: Thank you for that clarification. Cindy Etkin, GPO. I do also want to say that the content for the three courts and for the ultimate courts that will be added will go as far back as April 2004.

For some courts they have digitized earlier materials, so I think for the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals you may see opinions in there for 2001, 2002. But we're looking for sure from April 2004, which is when E-Government Act passed was required public access to these opinions, so that's the starting date. And Wendell likelihood also mentioned the of even providing more historical data, which another indicator of the continuing of this pilot and going into something more permanent.

I do also want to say that GPO is receiving these opinions electronically. The chain of custody is in place which allows us to authenticate the opinions, so it does have the GPO authentication statement at the top

and the actual seal is down in the lower left of the opinions.

This collection actually has a pretty big footprint right now -- thank you, Selene -- on the main FDsys page. So if you go to fdsys.gov, the beta collection is right up there.

There's a direct link to the advanced search, to the browse, so you do have browse and search capabilities as well as a link to the feedback.

And again I can't encourage you enough to take a look at this collection and please provide us feedback. Even if you don't have suggestions, let us know that you liked it or not.

All of this information is very important as we report back to the Judicial Conference and look for the further expansion of the collection.

MEMBER SANDERS: Ann Sanders,
Library of Michigan. Cindy, is there a page
on the Desktop like the page on the PACER

information for this beta, because that would be really helpful.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. Not exactly like that.

if But you qo to the FDLP Connection that was issued for October, there's an article there that explains a lot of this and has some screen captures and there's a link to the feedback.

MEMBER SANDERS: Okay, I'll look for that. But for example, my state law library isn't necessarily tuned into something as audience specific as the FDLP Connection.

So if I can have another, I mean I will hunt that up, but if I can find another way to link the people who really want to know this on a daily basis without having to have it come through me would be really helpful I think on both sides.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.

Thanks for that comment, Ann. There is actually already some pretty extensive help on this collection if you click on the About.

And we will be changing that and adding the courts that come into the collection when they do, and will be beefing up the information there. But I have a feeling you're looking for something a little bit different.

MEMBER SANDERS: Yes.

MS. ETKIN: Okay. We can put together something and put it out. Thank you for that. Any other questions?

MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library. Thank
you. As much as I wish that the pilot was
much larger, this material's been a long time
coming.

And although it is a little frustrating that it's such a small amount, I think that those of us who work with the courts understand the glacial nature of this.

But that said, how long is the Administrative Office saying that this pilot is going to last is one question, and then the other question is, are there slides or a

recording or any sort of information from both this program and the PACER program that are going to be somewhere on the Desktop?

Not just for the people in this room who weren't able to go but for all of the other people who really are interested in this information? We are hungry for knowledge.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. In this instance I'm glad you're hungry. The Judicial Conference actually stated when they approved the pilot that it would be one year.

We are talking about one year from the implementation, which was October. So while I know there are only three courts, we're expanding like I said to 12 very soon, and we look for further expansion in January.

And in hopes that we can get some good data and some good comments that we can continue to expand the number of courts that are added as they take information to the Judicial Conference.

Did I get all of your question?

MEMBER JARRETT: Yes. Peggy

Jarrett, University of Washington Law Library.

The other question was about the material from yesterday, availability.

MS. ETKIN: Oh, yes. Cindy Etkin, GPO. That was actually videoed. Karen Sieger and her folks came in and did a video of that session.

And I don't know what the time frame is to have that up on the Desktop but it will be made available, and of course we'll let you know when that happens.

And as we came to public beta we've been working with our public relations office to get a press release out, and I believe the Administrative Office is as well. So that will be coming shortly.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Just one quick add in, what Karen facilitated was really a handheld camcorder.

I don't know that we should reaffirm that that's at a quality or at a level that can really be posted for a broad release at this point. Let's take a look and

1 see if it's something that's usable. 2 If there are slides --MEMBER JARRETT: Can I see the 3 video? 4 MR. PRIEBE: 5 Yes. 6 MEMBER JARRETT: It might keep me a 7 little quiet. So we've got about 8 PRIEBE: seven minutes and I think we've got one last 9 10 If there aren't any last questions we did have -- oh, somebody from the community? 11 12 dive Okay, into can we 13 Survey, because we don't want to go people's lunch. 14 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. 15 16 forgot this slide was going to be up here but I'm glad it is. 17 18 We ran a Users Survey, users of 19 Depository Library survey from October through 20 the first week of March or something of this year, and we had about 560 libraries that had 21 participants, or had users participate in the 22

survey and actually submit a survey online.

The final report is up on the FDLP Desktop, and the final report will have aggregate data from all of the respondents as well as reporting by the different segments, library types.

And there's also reporting in that main report with data that are aggregated by selective and regional. So that's available up on the FDLP Desktop and was released in August, the first part of August.

The individual library reports are now available for downloading. An announcement went out about that last week that gave the information on how to download and where to go to download those reports.

For those receiving reports, you who had respondents that submitted surveys, there will be aggregate data for all of your respondents as well as the comments, the textual comments that anybody may have submitted with their survey.

It will also have comparisons to the segment, library type, that's matched up

with your library type as well as all of the respondents.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

For those of who had you no respondents you can still get a report. when you log in and you will see a link that has your state and you click on that and it will bring up а report that shows aggregate data for your state and it will compare it to the aggregate data from all of the respondents.

And we hope that even though you had no individual respondents, we hope that this will be beneficial to you to provide you with some kind of benchmarking for what's going on around you in your state.

MEMBER HAYES: Cindy, I actually started to go through that report, thank you. For someone who's data driven that was very useful. I'm Steve Hayes from Notre Dame, in case you still haven't -- yes.

Are the individual reports going to be done, available to other libraries? The reason I ask is that, you know, Notre Dame has

a set of peers that we have identified and it would be nice to see similar, in it runs in a similar vein to what we're used to with Live Call, again we get.

So I don't know how broadly our individual report's going to be made available.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Thanks, Steve, for asking that question. Actually because of the nature of some of the responses and it gets, some of the comments that were provided, it gets to some privacy issues.

So at this point we are making available reports to libraries only. Now if you want to contact your peers and your benchmark institutions and ask to share, that's something that you can do.

But because of privacy and because not all libraries had a whole lot of responses, we can't.

MEMBER HAYES: Thank you. That's why I asked the question.

MS. ETKIN: Thank you.

MEMBER HAYES: I understand that, 1 2 thanks. Steve Hayes, Notre Dame. 3 MS. ETKIN: Any other questions about the survey? Let me just add, we really 4 do hope that you find the results beneficial 5 6 to you in benchmarking where you are 7 looking at this for planning purposes using these performance measures to plan for 8 improvement. 9 10 And I must say that the results 11 overall were very, very good, so it's an 12 indication of the dedication and the good 13 service that you all provide to your users. 14 So in some cases your goal might be 15 not to drop rather than to try to improve, and 16 that's a good thing. 17 Ted Priebe, MR. PRIEBE: GPO. 18 Thanks, Cindy. If there aren't any 19 questions or comments, I want to thank 20 everyone for their time. I don't know if there's any last 21

23 CHAIR JACOBS: Thanks, Ted, and

announcements before we break. Thank you.

thanks, GPO staff. That was really helpful.

Two announcements really quick. First one and most important is to remember to turn in your evaluations.

I know some people are leaving after today and not staying through tomorrow, so please turn in your evaluations. You can give them up at the registration desk as opposed to the front desk, which I've been confused about this whole conference.

But please get them in soon. It does help GPO and Council plan for future events. And just another reminder that the public library attendees are invited to lunch, that's today very soon, with Mary Alice Baish.

So I guess you're meeting at the café in the lobby, and that's in three minutes or as soon as your biobreak is over. And that's all I have, so we are adjourned for this session.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 11:59 a.m. and went

	87	
1	back on the record at 12:02 p.m.)	
2		
3		
4		
5		
б		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19	A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N	
20	2:02 p.m.	
21	CHAIR JACOBS: Good afternoon,	
22	Council.	
23	PARTICIPANTS: Good afternoon,	

James.

CHAIR JACOBS: We are definitely getting feisty, aren't we? So I'm looking at our schedule, and it looks like we're going to be talking about the Council charter.

Now I have this listed as a Council working session. Are we in need of the court reporter, are we not in need of the court reporter?

(Off microphone comments)

CHAIR JACOBS: Yes? Because of what it is?

(Off microphone comments)

CHAIR JACOBS: Okay, sounds good.

I just, you know, wanted to let the court reporter know that we needed him or didn't need him, and we do. We need you, thank you.

Let the record state that the court reporter smiled.

So I had asked -- well, actually Dan posted a document to the shared folder, but I wasn't able to find it. I don't know if he was able to resend it.

1 He's working on it. No pressure. 2 (Off microphone comments) 3 CHAIR JACOBS: No, he has а separate document called Charter Issues, and 4 5 something like that. 6 (Off microphone comments) 7 CHAIR JACOBS: Yes. Yes, there was one in May that was sent that had Charter --8 That's it? pardon me. 9 10 (Off microphone comments) If you put it into 11 CHAIR JACOBS: the DLC Shared Folder it should propagate to 12 13 everyone. (Off microphone comments) 14 Oh, good. 15 CHAIR JACOBS: Well, I 16 haven't looked at it. Yes? (Off microphone comments) 17 This is 18 CHAIR JACOBS: really 19 sausage making here. It should be within the DLC Folder, I believe, correct? 20 21 (Off microphone comments) The only one I have 22 CHAIR JACOBS: in DLC Folder is Charter and By-law Changes. 23

But that was from May or something like that. 1 (Off microphone comments) 2 CHAIR JACOBS: Let the record show 3 that we're just trying to figure out where a 4 document is, and so there's a lot of crosstalk 5 that doesn't need to be in the -6 7 (Off microphone comments) CHAIR JACOBS: Excellent. 8 are going to be talking today -- James Jacobs, 9 10 Stanford University. 11 We're going to be talking today 12 about the exciting topic of Charter Changes, 13 seeing as we're going from two conferences to one physical conference and virtual options, to 14 15 as yet to be defined virtual options 16 discussion. Dan has shared, Dan O'Mahony has 17 shared a Google document called DLC Charter 18 19 Options. Everyone should have that. 20 PARTICIPANT: We're working on it. CHAIR JACOBS: All right. So shall 21 22 I go down through the document or do you want

to do that?

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony,

Brown University. I can give just a little bit

of context to this and maybe summarize, because

I don't know that we need to go through it with

CHAIR JACOBS: Okay.

a fine-tooth.

MEMBER O'MAHONY: So some of you may all remember that about a year ago we had a similar conversation.

CHAIR JACOBS: This time last year.

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Because we just literally revised the charter to bring it up to date last year, and that had been the first time since several, maybe a decade or more that it had been looked at.

On the heels of that, however, things change, and the main issue that I think we have to look at most immediately is there are instances in the charter that specifically assign activities and timetables to the previous assumption and the previous practice of a distinct spring meeting, a distinct fall meeting.

And with the assumption as past experience was that those were physical meetings that we all came together, so that's not our reality now.

So what has been highlighted are simply those instances in the text where it refers to the spring or the fall meeting, and then at the end of this, in this document I've just sort of outlined some issues related to that.

It's not a comprehensive list but just some issues to get us thinking about what we might want to do in relation to that.

So just identify very, very quickly sort of the kinds of things we're talking about, in the section under Membership, it states Councils shall meet a minimum of twice each year with the meetings approximately six months apart, and the timing of when new members should be appointed prior to the spring meeting.

Moving down that paragraph, each fall members elect the Chair-elect as we did

this fall, and when the timing of when that term comes to play immediately following the spring meeting.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The Chair is responsible for the agenda at the two meetings. This next one is one of particular interest, I think, since we won't have a physical on-site spring meeting, the provision that at the spring meeting members of the Depository Library Council shall elect a Secretary, and the timing of when that term begins.

And then again, some summary stuff at the end. So you can see in the last page which just again outlines some of the issues involved here, some of the things to consider.

So I'll just throw out some these ideas and we can discuss them. One approach perhaps might be а interpretation of the term "meeting", sort of agnostic format neutral, if you will, interpretation of meetings that it could be a virtual meeting, could be an in-person meeting, could be whatever kinds of meetings.

And we take a minimalist approach to whatever changes we might need to take in the document and just proceed accordingly. And you can see some of the other stuff there.

Another approach might be, you know, to respond to the fact that we, for the foreseeable future at least will be meeting one time and, you know, in terms of charter language it could be as simple as changing it from two meetings to at least one meeting, and then let the rest of it fall.

I would throw out for consideration, however, in terms of the timing, and again we don't have to make any formal decisions just yet, but one of the things that drove us last year in this discussion in terms of when we did what had to do with when folks came on new as new Council members.

And I'm speaking now specifically to the election timetable when Chair-elect gets elected, when a Secretary gets elected.

And I think the fact that in the last revision we now have specified and hopefully the

practice will be that new members come on as of June 1, that that can help facilitate a lot of, ameliorate some of the problems we used to have.

One of the issues is it used to be that even at the fall meeting people may literally have been coming to the fall meeting sort of in the first instance of anything having to do with the Depository Library Council at all.

Hopefully that won't quite be the case, because since June 1st new members will have been members. They may not have sat up at this dais before but they will have had some, you know, formal or informal orientation or acclimation to what some of those responsibilities might be.

One of the practical reasons why that's an issue is just the number of people eligible in a realistic way for some of these terms, Chair-elect or Secretary.

You know, if you literally have no clue what this body is about you're much less

likely to volunteer to be, you know, a Secretary or a Chair-elect or something like that.

So the fact that we're starting in June, that might open up the, you know, possible candidates for Secretary. Typically the Chair in recent history comes from sort of the next class, somebody that's had at least a year under their belt.

But in terms of the Secretary election, so that's a long way of saying if we found it useful for elections to actually take place in person that it might be workable to have both the election of the Secretary and the Chair-elect at the same meeting, the single fall meeting in person as opposed to having a virtual election, if you will, for one office and an in-person.

So there could be some advantages to that so that was why that long explanation led to that.

The other thing that's just down here on the last sort of bundle of issues is,

and we've already begun to talk about this in the morning that, you know, it gives us the opportunity, if you will, to think about what is distinctive about the Council sessions, the Council proceedings, what Council needs versus all the other good things that happen when depository librarians come together for educational and other reasons.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And for us to, you know, be clear about making sure we meet our needs in whatever timetables that make sense to us in synchronous or asynchronous fashion, in-person or virtual or whatever comes down the road, so that's sort of the lay of the land. In the most immediate sense, since it would probably be inappropriate for us to actually move to change the charter and change the charter in the same session, I haven't talked to the Secretary about this, but we could probably find a way to either interpret the existing language, because I will point out that the language relating to the Secretary is that the Secretary shall serve for one the

1 Secretary may serve for more than one term.

It's been noted that the Secretary did see that language. So in a transitional phase if we were to make some change, you know, there's some interpretive flexibility there that might get us through an 18-month period if that was the way we wanted to go.

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster,
University of Akron. Looking at the secretary
issue first, I would love to hear from the
current and past secretaries of Council who are
on the dais to see what they think.

MEMBER TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale
Law Library. I'm in the interesting position
of we kind of broke this rule when I was
Secretary.

I volunteered my first year in the fall, and then just kind of did it for the following two years without a reelection, because it was an interesting time. It was a time of transition, I'll put it that way. So we've taken these rules liberally before.

MEMBER BURKE: Helen Burke,

Hennepin County Library, currently the Secretary. And I think transition may be with us for the foreseeable future, so I'm okay with continuing if that's okay with the rest of Council, or not.

MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett, UW Law Library. My question for Helen and Camilla is, in an ideal world what do you think the time line should be?

MEMBER BURKE: In an ideal world I think it's good to have some time on Council and then take on the position. I don't think it's ideal to start the term as a Secretary from the get-go.

MEMBER MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty,
University of Utah. Did you want to talk a
minute?

One of the things that I thought was brilliant is having the election when we elect our Chair. At the get-go that makes a team that can start organizing and start planning immediately.

And that to my mind makes an awful

lot of sense, especially since we're moving toward a virtual world and now we'll have to get a jump on it.

MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library. But what
I don't understand about that is wouldn't that
mean that you would be volunteering to be the
Secretary your first meeting?

I think that's what we're trying to avoid, which is why keeping in it --

(Off microphone comments)

MEMBER JARRETT: So then you would start right away? If you're elected in October, when would you start?

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Well -- Dan O'Mahony, Brown University. I think if we were to change the timing of the election we would then probably want to look at changing the timing of the starting of that term.

The current model that we have in terms of a fall election is with the Chair-elect. And the election takes place in the fall but that person doesn't assume that role

until after the following spring meeting.

MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library. So if
you come in the fall and you're elected
Secretary you would start after the spring
meeting.

But unless you're then the first, so that would mean that it would be the third year from whom the Secretary pool. And I think that it's, the Secretary is something that a second-year class -- no, to be the second-year class then you would have to volunteer your first meeting.

You would show up, volunteer, get elected, and then you wouldn't be the Secretary until after the spring meeting. You'd be the Secretary for your second year, and that's what I think we should avoid.

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs,
Stanford University. We should really
facilitate that because Secretary is probably
the hardest job. I mean Chair's hard, but
Secretary has to do a lot of writing and a lot

of keeping track of things.

MEMBER MORIEARTY: Yes, and -- Jill Moriearty, University of Utah -- and I was not thinking of the Secretary as waiting a year.

CHAIR JACOBS: Yes.

MEMBER MORIEARTY: Yes. And that way second and third year people could do it.

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster,
University of Akron. The other thing that at
least to me seems to be worth consideration is
the fact Council members do start in June.

And so the Secretary -- as long as we don't have a period where we have no Secretary.

So in other words, someone who was in their third year would not be able to, it wouldn't really make sense for them to run for Secretary.

But ideally, the person who volunteers to run will at least have had a few months of conference calls, having seen the minutes that are taken by the current Secretary, they would have some idea of the

work involved.

CHAIR JACOBS: Well, that might point then towards -- James Jacobs, Stanford University, might point towards us having a virtual election in the spring or something to that effect, where you're not getting elected and then you wait nine months to come on to start serving on June 1st. I don't know.

MEMBER MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty,
University of Utah. You're right, Shari, I
hadn't thought through the third year.

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony,
Brown University. I completely agree with
Shari's point. And given that folks do start
in June there is a little bit more of a ramp up
that there didn't used to be.

The other thing that I would just point out in terms of, not that it's not necessary perhaps to have a lead time once somebody has been elected Secretary, part of the point of that in the Chair-elect is that the transition from Chair to Chair-elect, it's desirable for that to be as smooth as possible

and for those directions to all be heading in the same, you know, way.

So that Chair-elect year is as much a direct commitment of time as the year of Chair. Whether you consider yourself a Chair apprentice or whatever, you're very much learning and participating in that process.

I don't know if the same experience is necessary on the Secretary side. So that sort of gap just seems a little bit odd, to me at least.

MEMBER TUBBS: Yes. Camilla Tubbs,
Yale Law Library. I don't think you need a
year lead-up to take notes. Not to undermine
the work of the Secretary, and Helen you could
disagree with me if you want. But I did
not need a year apprenticeship to make bullet
points of telephone conversations.

MEMBER SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. Some of this kind of leads me back to the tradition we've had in recent years of both the Chair-elect and the Secretary coming from the same class.

And I don't know if formalizing that tradition in some way would be helpful or not. I'm just throwing that out there.

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony,
Brown University. I think it's a very fine
tradition, but personally I would think long
and hard before codifying such a thing.

I think whether it's through timing or other processes, the more we can broaden the possibility of folks being eligible or, you know, open themselves up to the possibility of being a candidate for the position, would be a good direction as opposed to kind of narrowing the scope to one of only five people, one of whom may be Chair, one of whom, you know, might have dropped out.

We've had, you know, it's not been unusual for, of a class of five, for at least one if not more of that class to not finish the full three-year term.

So you really begin to narrow the ranks in terms of look to your left, look to your right, who's going to be Chair?

So if we could a), have an

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs,
Stanford University. So do I hear a consensus?

Do I hear any sort of idea for, you know, June
versus October?

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University. I'll just throw out a possible plan of, you know, idea for action for next steps, because as I said before I don't think there's anything that formally we should be voting on per se.

But given the sense of the discussion, I'd be happy to go back and draft a possible revision to this.

I think as others have pointed out as well, our most immediate concern is just sort of acknowledging how we're going to deal with the Secretary office over this next period, you know, until we get to whenever that next election is going to be, if we do it virtually in the spring or if we hold off until, you know, the fall if that's the direction we go.

affirmation that the current Secretary would be willing to continue and then a sense of Council as to what we would like to do there, I think that's sort of our most immediate concern.

MEMBER BURKE: Helen Burke,
Hennepin County Library, currently the
Secretary and willing to continue. Thank you.

CHAIR JACOBS: I think we have consensus. James Jacobs, Stanford University. So let it be stated that Helen Burke is going to continue I guess until we can figure out exactly when we do that.

And we'll figure that out as we do the wordsmithing of the charter. I think Dan's idea is good that we, you know, we don't want to do the discussion and the wordsmithing at the same time. We can discuss all the issues.

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Thank you, Helen.

Dan O'Mahony, Brown University. So I'll go
back and I'll revise some, put out some
suggested options for changes to the text.

The way we did this before was we posted it publicly once we decided what our

revisions were going to be so that folks could comment, and literally did receive three responses from the community last year when we

4 went through this process.

So it's important to try to be as transparent as possible. And then we vote on it at the subsequent meeting, the Council would vote on it at the subsequent meeting.

In looking at that, not to make major revisions certainly, but one of the things that I've begun to look at and will continue in sharing the draft is not wanting a charter to have to be revised after every appropriation cycle.

So those kinds of things like specific numbers of this, that and the other sometimes can, you know, be a stumbling block there.

On the other hand, you know, it's good to have something, you know, that we can point to but perhaps, you know, for this round we'll look at something a little less specific.

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster,

University of Akron. Dan, would you be willing 1 2 to work with someone else who is not in their 3 final year on Council, so that if this is something that continues past this spring there 4 5 is someone who has a full command of the issue 6 and can handle this moving, looking to next 7 year? O'MAHONY: 8 MEMBER Dan O'Mahony, Brown University Library. I would of course be 9 10 happy to work with anyone who might have an interest in something quite so arcane. 11 12 (Off microphone comments) 13 MEMBER O'MAHONY: Yes. CHAIR JACOBS: Jacobs, 14 James 15 Stanford University. Do I hear any volunteers? 16 MEMBER JARRETT: Jarrett, Peggy University of Washington Law Library. 17 I'm sort 18 of thinking of it since I have that 19 attention to detail thing, which hopefully we all do. 20 CHAIR JACOBS: It's a feature not a 21 22 bug.

(Off microphone comments)

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. And I think Dan's point about not being too specific in our charter is well taken.

I would, I mean I know that we're, that GPO is going through some difficult budget times now, but that doesn't mean that, you know, in five years, I don't know, that they go back to 2010 appropriations or, and they're able to fund two conferences, in-person conferences.

So we also don't want to say, you know, only one conference per year, because then what happens if they can fund two? But on the other hand, we don't want to say four conferences a year either, although I'd love to come to D.C. four times a year.

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony,
Brown University. Just to state the obvious,
these don't carry the weight of law.

CHAIR JACOBS: While they're not as weighty as law, they don't necessarily reflect the tradition of the two conferences per year.

So is there the presumption that there will never be funding of a actual face-

to-face meeting of the Council members at any

CHAIR JACOBS:

other time except in the fall?

James Jacobs,

And it's very easy to see a new SuDoc come in and say oh, only one conference a year, okay, and not even know that in the past there were two. Not that GPO would ever let that happen.

(Off microphone comments)

MS. HODUSKI: Is it possible for a question from the audience? Bernadine Abbott Hoduski. The decision's been made by GPO that they will not fund two conferences. Does that mean they will not fund any kind of physical interaction of the, just the members of the Council or a virtual meeting in the spring?

I mean I thought I understood from previous discussions you would continue to talk to each other and have subcommittees and so on.

Stanford University. The presumption currently, I think, is that there will only be a fall conference, not two conferences.

We have not actually asked the question of GPO whether they would fund Council getting together in a physical location without the accoutrements of a conference.

I think that's a very interesting option. It could be something to ask.

MS. HODUSKI: Well, at the very beginning I was on the very first Depository Library Council meeting, and of course we met without an audience.

It was just Council and GPO staff including the public printer sitting around in a circle and actually talking to each other the whole time.

This is like -- well, this is so different from the first five years. But also during that period we did have a meeting at an ALA, two ALAs, Las Vegas and Chicago, where people were going to be there anyway and the Council got together.

That's still a possibility. I'm just concerned that, I don't want you to rewrite this charter to exclude you, the Council, getting together in some other place where you would be there anyway, and all you would need is the cost of a room, and it could be at a conference where GPO goes anyway.

So I think your rewriting needs to be flexible enough that if in the future that was a possibility of meeting in Vegas, if we ever, ALA ever meets in Vegas again, and getting together in Vegas if you were all there.

CHAIR JACOBS: But then we couldn't say what happened in Vegas, right?

MS. HODUSKI: Right. It would just, simply between you and the public printer. It would be a secret.

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony,
Brown University Library. I think the advice
to keep it flexible so that we don't limit our
options current or future is right on target.

My understanding or my hearing of

part of the reason for going to a single meeting was specifically to cut back on travel expenses.

And a good part of that travel is the travel of 15 Council members to someplace. So a second meeting wherever we may be, if GPO is footing the bill, I don't think that's in the cards at least for the foreseeable future.

In terms of how we make do, I think from last meeting in San Antonio and continuing to even this morning's conversation that, you know, many of you all probably didn't hear we began the reflection upon, you know, well, what do we do instead? Because it's important for the group to meet, to deliberate, to get feedback from the community, and how can we do that? Whether that's in a virtual setting or some other way, and we've begun to, you know, brainstorm some ideas about doing that.

I would only also point out just from my perspective, even though I'm an ALA member and lots of folks may go to ALA

meetings, I haven't been to an ALA meeting in quite some time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And there are lots of folks around the table who, you know, are affiliated with other associations. I don't go to AALL meetings and I don't expect them to come to my meetings.

So I don't know that there is a single other venue where a critical mass of Council members equitably would be available to have the meeting anyway.

MEMBER TUBBS: Yes, Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library. My sense was from this morning that we were going, there is a strong consensus that we want to be able to meet and want to continue to educate and to connect.

just not exactly sure We're what the outlet for that will be but we are meeting in subgroups. And will be we corresponding with Lance to see what our options will be for the future.

And the biggest question right now that we can't answer is what GPO will be able

to support. They're still under a continuing 1 2 resolution at this point, so we're not exactly sure what the funding will be for the future. 3 So we're considering all options 4 and we're brainstorming right now so that when 5 6 we do have more concrete numbers or we do know what we can work with we can set some more 7 positive things in writing. 8 CHAIR JACOBS: Bernadine? 9 10 MS. HODUSKI: Historically, first --11 12 CHAIR JACOBS: Can you state your 13 name? Bernadine Abbott 14 MS. HODUSKI: 15 Hoduski, member of the original Council. 16 paid our own way. My institution, EPA, paid my 17 way. Everyone else's institution -- or 18 19 they paid their own way. It's a recent event 20 that you all get your way paid. I've never had my way paid to a meeting except 21 bу institution. 22

23 And so it is possible perhaps, if

you have the great dedication to the program 1 2 that you do that you might pay for one trip yourself or your institution might pay for it. 3 4 I mean that is something you can 5 6 consider as a possibility. There was a time 7 when everyone paid their own way. CHAIR Thank 8 JACOBS: you, Bernadine. Further comments? 9 10 MEMBER HAYES: Ι like Dan's 11 suggestion. Let's move on. 12 CHAIR JACOBS: Okay. James Jacobs, 13 Stanford University. So Dan's going to flesh out some verbiage with Peggy's help to give us 14 15 some options for editing the sections of the 16 charter that we need to edit with a few towards flexibility, openness, creativity. 17 18 (Off microphone comments) 19 CHAIR JACOBS: Sure, charters can 20 be creative. Did we want to talk some more about possible recommendations or do we want to 21 save that for the last session? It's 2:40 now 22

so we have 40 minutes, 50 minutes.

23

Arlene, do you want to work on a bucket list with us?

(Off microphone comments)

CHAIR JACOBS: On the record's fine, I think.

MEMBER WEIBLE: Arlene Weible,
Oregon State Library. I'll just kind of
describe what I have been doing.

I start, you know, I originally just started this for my own purposes, but I have been listening to what, everything that has been talked about in terms of perhaps Council should say something.

So I'm not trying to propose that we do all of this, I'm just trying to document kind of what has been talked about. I also added some language where some people had asked me to remember things like transparency and that kind of thing.

And then I also tried to group the bullets and kind of like things, although, you know, that's just kind of my opinion about how things go together.

And some things are maybe really specific and some things are broader, but I just wanted to kind of capture all it so that's kind of what I was doing.

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. So these are the recommendation ideas in the Council notes fall conference, right?

MEMBER WEIBLE: Under the heading,
Arlene, which I would be happy to remove.

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster,
University of Akron. In general I think that
the more specific type recommendations, just
especially those related to the Website, may
not need to come out as formal recommendations.

And I think we've discussed this already, the idea would be to have sort of an all-encompassing, Council encourages the continuing work and continuing discussions with Council and with the community on setting priorities, when we're talking about these.

I mean, for example, I really don't

want to on my own come up with a list of enhancements for the PURL Referral Tool. I think Karen doesn't need this to come in a recommendation in order to, you know, do what the community wants.

So I think it's good for us to have these in our notes for the record though.

MEMBER WEIBLE: Arlene Weible,
Oregon State Library. I do totally agree with
that. I do have to say though I am concerned
about a methodology I guess for how feedback is
collected by GPO.

And I think, and that's not specific to a particular tool or product. You know, I've heard in several cases we put it out there and we heard nothing.

So I want to make sure that we talk about the best methods for doing it and I don't want it to be a real passive process.

And if Council can, you know, facilitate it like, you know, I mean one example could be that each of the subgroups have responsibility for not necessarily giving feedback, but making

sure people in the community that they know or 1 2 they know are interested do do it, there's a little bit more proactive, so 3 isn't stuck with one or two comments on the 4

community site and that's it. 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Т do think because these are important things, Ι mean prioritizing with limited resources, I think we really want to make sure GPO gets good information.

Good point. CHAIR JACOBS: I hear what Arlene MEMBER HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame.

is trying to say. the same time you can lead that horse to water, yada, yada, yada.

would suggest, springing off yours, that a methodology for how we can attempt to facilitate feedback is probably the best we're going to be able to do.

mean short of indicating that, you know, if GPO does not receive X percentage of feedback comments from the identified core group of blah, blah, blah, blah, it does not go forward, I think it's one of those.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Everyone is busy, I only want to comment when it really, I want to comment. The rest of the time, this just works on our faculty on campus, you should have read my mind and asked me specifically for my feedback on this.

So I think I like your idea of the subgroups that Council is now active in working more closely to say, you know, and I'm getting more adept at the public library group and would be a learning curve to me, but I rely on my colleagues more to say, here individuals, we at least want to touch base with perhaps a phone call, I'm big on the phone call, to say we did, the feedback I got was they really did not want to, or this is what they gave me, or they chose to remain silent on it.

At least I think if I'm reading your mind, at least reassures the community that we've done a certain due diligence and that the, you know, ringing silence was not taking as either acceptance or rejection that

we've done that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And I think that activity is an ongoing role for Council that I wholly approach, or approve of and would be willing to participate in.

I would hope all the other Council members would agree too but, you know, we all have finite amounts of time. But I think that might be a methodology to be a balancing act between let's put out a vote and if I don't get a plurality it dies type of a thing.

Arlene Weible, MEMBER WEIBLE: Oregon State Library. I do think that, it's been my experience that when you ask people specifically, your expertise is really important, people will when invited specifically and when they are, you know, you touch their ego -- oh, you're an expert, they may be more likely to find the limited amount of time.

So that's why I think it's worth the effort. You know, we're not going to get everything that we absolutely want, but I think

just, you know, a discussion amongst the work
group identifying three people, each one person
contacts one of those people, you know, you do

what you can do.

But I do think it can help if we kind of reach out, and I'd really like to see that happen because, you know, I know John Stevenson is going to give good feedback about the things that he's concerned about, you know, I don't worry about that.

But I think there are other people that are out there that could give some really good feedback and I'd like to at least try to help encourage people to think about doing that.

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. We might also ask GPO to give more targeted questions about feedback not just, what do you think but, you know.

MEMBER PHILLIPS: Mark Phillips,
University of North Texas. One of the things
that may, I mean if the primary vehicle for
this that we're worried about is the Web, maybe

that encouragement of GPO to use its inner design methodologies and to have more of a, you know, stated process for, because a lot of the things that we're talking about fit right up into that.

And if that is the way that they go about designing their Web content and delivery mechanisms then that assumes that you're doing, that you're identifying target groups, you're interacting with them, you're getting requirements, you're testing requirements against that same group and not just developing a level.

CHAIR JACOBS: Good point.

MEMBER WEIBLE: Arlene Weible, Oregon State Library. So maybe one suggestion I might make is that we go through and look at all of the bullet points that involve specific tools and see if they fit with a subgroup.

And then try to maybe spread it out a little bit if that's, if it's all landing in one place.

And then still I think there is a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

recommendation kind of in what Mark was saying about encouraging GPO to use, you know, standard methodology for Web design and maybe, you know, have that be the higher level recommendation. But we divide up the specific tool encouragement tasks among the work groups.

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I would agree with that And we could go through each of the process. bullets and then at the end parenthetically put, you know, the group name if there is a group name, to that bullet point so we can then work forward on that.

Does that sound good?

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster,
University of Akron. Just to clarify, some of
what we're talking about is the formal
recommendations and some are the points where
we need to, in other words, implement.

The only reason I'm kind of making sure that this is not just talking about each bullet point will be incorporated into a formal recommendation that there's a ton of overlap,

yes, and we don't two recommendations to say
the same thing or have to write two and then
pick one.

MEMBER WEIBLE: Arlene Weible,
Oregon State Library. I really do think that
what we're talking about is eliminating things

from this bullet list and putting, getting them

off the list and assigned to someone.

So we will be working with more of a list that will be recommendation oriented. That was my thinking at least.

CHAIR JACOBS: And I would say some of these bullet points are more like tasks. Some of these tasks might warrant a recommendation and some of these tasks might warrant just talking to our GPO liaison.

There are other things that could happen, sound good?

(Off microphone comments)

CHAIR JACOBS: Okay, sounds good.

So we have the first bullet point, shall I read it? Okay, GPO work on improving communication and transparency with libraries.

1 MEMBER JARRETT: James? 2 CHAIR JACOBS: Yes. 3 MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett, UW 4 Law Library. Do you want all of these read in the record? 5 These are, you know, Arlene's 6 notes. 7 CHAIR JACOBS: They're very rough. MEMBER JARRETT: Yes, so let's just 8 think about that. 9 10 CHAIR JACOBS: Duly noted. 11 MEMBER BRAUNSTEIN: Can I ask 12 tactical question here? Ιf we're 13 forward with this now at this stage, assuming that because we're that far ahead of 14 15 ourselves, what be done way earlier, does that, 16 do we have an obligation to sort of stick in some sense with what's on the schedule here? 17 18 So since these are open meetings 19 someone may want to be here when we discuss 20 some of this and then they find that we've already finished. Just a thought. 21 22 That's a good point. CHAIR JACOBS:

MEMBER

HAYES:

From a procedural

23

thing, number one, I think it's clear in the record now that these are real rough and we're just talking. This is Council just being Council making sausage.

I would hate to be going on the record, off the record, off the record, because the audience is here. You know, I don't worry about it as much and perhaps I should.

Second is, if I understand the process we will be doing similar to last year, we've identified broad areas but the true crafting of a recommendation is really done by Council after this particular meeting with the finalizing wording and everything else being done then.

So we're giving, simply giving audience members and someone who reads the record a sense of the process that we went through on this.

So I'm more on the record than off the record, on being recorded versus not being recorded, and this is Steve Hayes at Notre Dame.

MEMBER BURKE: Helen Burke,
Hennepin County Library. Building on what
Stephanie said though, it's nice to take
advantage of people who are here and encourage
their participation.

The outline, the description of this session was so open ended, you know, it just had to be, and there is tough competition with the Federal Register session going on right now, that unless somebody really was into following Council and they're in the audience, for following Council as opposed to the free Wi-fi, we're preventing participation by doing something now on the spur of the moment.

CHAIR JACOBS: Yes.

MEMBER BURKE: I don't think anything's deliberating being done but I want to prevent problems, perception problems.

MEMBER JARRETT: James?

CHAIR JACOBS: Yes.

MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett, UW Law Library. I don't know if, this is just a

suggestion. But there are two things going on.

One is the tasks and then one is the areas that we want to have the recommendation. So can we maybe do the tasks now and then when we meet for the Council wrapup at 4:00, then we work on the issues that will become recommendations?

CHAIR JACOBS: Arlene?

MEMBER WEIBLE: Arlene Weible,
Oregon State Library. I totally agree, and I
think instead of your approach, James, of going
through each one, we should pick out the ones
that are just tasks and like I said get them
off of this list.

CHAIR JACOBS: Okay, yes. James Jacobs, Stanford University. That sounds like a good process.

The only thing I would add to that is during the 4 o'clock session I'd like each of the working groups to sort of summarize briefly what each of their sessions was and then summarize briefly any recommendations or

ideas for recommendations that they will be working on going forward.

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster,
University of Akron. I think it would also be
nice to say to, if we could maybe talk about
the tasks as well.

To say that this what we learned in the session, here's what our interest group is going to be working on, on the side, and this is the formal recommendation that may also come from this session.

CHAIR JACOBS: Yes. Thank you for the summation. Sound good? Steve Hayes, Notre Dame?

MEMBER HAYES: If I heard Peggy correctly, we still want to try and get some participation from the group. That seems to be a real hefty, we're going to summarize, we're going to identify and we're going to try and gather feedback at the same time.

I mean, you know, it's laudable.

Procedurally I'm wondering now. You're going
to be doing real good with boom, boom, boom,

boom, boom, feedback, boom, boom, boom, boom, boom, boom, feedback. Steve Hayes, Notre Dame.

MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster,
University of Akron. Can the summaries be more
like very brief statements of say who our
panelists were?

And what they roughly in a sentence or two the entire group covered rather than summarizing everything that was covered in each session because that's honestly, at least for Council sessions, what the transcripts are for later.

We could just keep that summary to the bare minimum of facts and then discuss. And I'm sure that what, for example, if we were to say this our interest group, working group has determined that these are tasks that we need to do, there might be questions and comments that are as based on those tasks themselves.

CHAIR JACOBS: Yes. James Jacobs, Stanford University. Yes, that's what I was hoping for. Not a blow by blow but a very

1	brief description of each of the sessions, the
2	working group sessions. Dan?
3	MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony,
4	Brown University. And I think you'll get the
5	feedback and the communication that we're
6	interested in when we try to articulate, you
7	know, what those questions, what those issues,
8	what those potential recommendations are and
9	then ask for a reaction.
10	You know, folks will provide some
11	feedback to that as well as once we have sort
12	of laid out the set of possible recommendations
13	that we're going to address, asking for gaps.
14	You know, what else have they
15	heard, have they experienced, were they
16	expecting that we've not identified?
17	CHAIR JACOBS: Good. Great point.
18	So shall we break early then and then come
19	back at 4:00?
20	MEMBER MORIEARTY: I'd kind of like
21	to get our group together.
22	(Off microphone comments)
23	MEMBER MORIEARTY: Yes, so we can

caucus, exactly. We've got the time. I want to get this work done now. Yes.

CHAIR JACOBS: Everyone in agreement? Then -- James Jacobs, Stanford University, we're going to end this official Council working session a little bit early and each of the working groups are going to caucus, so that you'll be able to come back at 4:00 and have a short, brief coherent message. Okay? Thank you all.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 3:01 p.m. and went back on the record at 4:03 p.m.)

CHAIR JACOBS: So this is the wrapup session. James Jacobs, Stanford University.

This is the wrap-up session, so what my plan was, my agenda is, is to have each of the groups very briefly describe their sessions that they had and talk about any sorts of ideas, possible recommendations, work items that each of their groups has to move forward on.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

This is not a wordsmithing session and so the community will just have to wait a few weeks until we're able to get the recommendations done and sent to GPO and finalized. hope I that's okay with the community. Thank you.

So why don't we go around, as I held out my left hand. Shari, did you have something there? No?

(Off microphone comments)

CHAIR JACOBS: Give you a break?

Come on. I'm going to go in order that the committees were done. Sorry, Stephanie. And so the first committee that came to order on Tuesday was the regional selective issues.

MEMBER WEIBLE: I'll fill in.

Arlene Weible, Oregon State Library. Summary,
we discussed the current situation in detail of
three states, but the point of our session was
to hopefully have the groups or -- I'm sorry, I
should have been thinking about this a little
bit more, the summary.

I mean our intention for that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

session was to really try to give the community, particularly those who are in selective libraries, some hope that, hope and examples of how they can get more involved in the discussions in their states when a regional is going through transition in the state.

I think inevitably the situations in, that are currently taking place came into the discussion and, you know, we were there, and everybody that I've heard said that they thought it was a good session because they were very happy that some of the trickier issues were discussed in an open forum.

So in that sense I think it was pretty successful. In terms of what we see as action moving forward, we do think there is room for a recommendation around one of the issues, and we actually just put together a little draft of it knowing that it needs to be wordsmithed quite a bit more.

right it reads, But now "We recommend that the document quidance for Federal Libraries Depository relinquishing

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

\_ \_

23

regional designation be reviewed and expanded to include other possible regional transition situations and emphasis on open communication and transparency is strongly recommended."

So our group would like to have that come forward as a recommendation. The other issue that was originally on the bullet list had to do with getting more clarification about the responsibilities for regional when it comes, regionals in terms of developing their collections in the sense of a comprehensive collection.

For those of you that attended the regionals meeting last night, there was effort, there will be а group οf representatives from the regional coordinators meeting with Robin Haun-Mohamed, to kind of discuss those issues a little bit more and see how get little more documented we can а quidance around those issues.

So we really don't think that Council needs to weigh in on that specifically at this point because there is work moving

1 forward on that issue in the appropriate place. CHAIR JACOBS: Great. James Jacobs, 2 Stanford University. Thanks, Arlene. And just 3 as a reminder, the working group on Regionals 4 Selective Issues is Arlene Weible, 5 and 6 Stephanie Braunstein and Ann Sanders. 7 So really appreciate your work on that in a somewhat touchy situation. The second group 8 was -- at least I gave you one. 9 10 MEMBER WEIBLE: James, I'm sorry. 11 Are we going to have any questions? 12 CHAIR JACOBS: Oh, yes. 13 MEMBER WEIBLE: Of Council? CHAIR JACOBS: That's a good idea, 14 sorry. I was rushing --15 16 MEMBER WEIBLE: mean I'm just Ι assuming everybody wants to do exactly what we 17 said, but --18 19 CHAIR JACOBS: Yes. 20 (Off microphone comments) CHAIR JACOBS: No, we can do them 21 one at a time. So open it to Council for any 22 comments, questions, ideas, 23 further

things that you heard that perhaps you want the regional selective group to look into.

Any questions or comments from the community? Seeing none, let's go on to the next one.

The next Council session was the working group on GPO Infrastructure and Technology. And just as a reminder that is Mark Phillips, Sue Lyons and Shari Laster.

MEMBER PHILLIPS: All right, Mark Phillips, University of North Texas. We had a panel of five speakers, and I wanted to go through and kind of read the, and they were primarily focused on Electronic Collection Management Issues and Challenges.

Michele McKnelly from the University of Wisconsin River Falls talked about, There Are Zombies in My OPAC, which is a great phrase that kind of came back several times during the discussions.

Karen Sieger from GPO talked about the PURL Referral Reporting Tool. John Stevenson from the University of Delaware,

issues of maintaining catalog records and tracking PURL usage.

Susan Kendall from San Jose State
University, electronic government publications,
collection, development and considerations.
And then finally Chris Brown from the
University of Denver, Documents Click-Throughs,
Finding Meaning in the Numbers.

And so there was a lot of focus within that session on really trying to make a case within the various collections to show that the electronic content is being utilized.

There are challenges associated with electronic publications specifically being placed into catalogs and OPACs and managing those.

There were a couple of suggestions and there was a lot of discussion and some possible future directions that I think another group within Council will possibly touch on, dealing with the idea of having superseded lists, some sort of tool to help identify

those.

And there was also a quick discussion or a point made that statistics and/or just usage numbers from FDsys would be really helpful in trying to communicate the value of this content, especially if it's what we all think it is, which is just a heavily utilized resource by everyone.

It would be great to show that, and I think when it was said we saw that jotted down by many of the GPO staff. And that's something that I think the working group's going to continue on with.

Something that we pulled from a bunch of the other discussions were the need to have possibly a better process for engaging input from the community in, coming from an active institution it's, you know, how do you discuss with the right people, the right time, asking the right questions about the right initiatives?

And it's, you know, these are really hard things to do. You know, everyone

wants to be asked when they want to be asked.

3

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And so I think we're going to try

to figure out some possibilities of suggestions for that both informally -- and then we have of recommendation that the start а looking at which is for GPO to work with Council to develop a methodology for soliciting user involvement throughout the development process of new and refreshed interfaces and systems when they directly involve stakeholders of the FDLP community. And try to -without wordsmithing on that, but really trying to figure out a process that can be laid so that everyone feels that at least out there's a process in an understood way of how you interact with the community in certain situations and solicit feedback in the most effective way for both parties. And that's about it.

> CHAIR JACOBS: Great.

Unless there's PHILLIPS: MEMBER anything I forgot that any of the rest of my group wants to add.

CHAIR JACOBS: No? Thanks, Mark.

James Jacobs, Stanford University. Questions,

comments from Council? Discussion items?

Anything they forgot? Cool.

Any comments from the floor, from the community? Come on, community, I know you love about infrastructure. Okay, seeing none, let's go on to the next one.

The third session was the session on public libraries. And just as a reminder, the public library working group is Helen Burke, Donna Lauffer and Steve Hayes. Take it away.

MEMBER BURKE: Helen Burke,
Hennepin County Library. A draft summary of
our session, we had Karen Sieger from GPO
provide an overview of the GPO Community site,
whose current format is state of the art 2008.

She also communicated that GPO is committed to fully revamping the site. Council and attendees provided specific feedback.

And a resulting recommendation

might be, Council endorses GPO's continuing enhancement of the FDLP Desktop, Ben's Guide and the GPO Community site, and Council will assist GPO in establishing its priorities as GPO moves forward in these initiatives.

So that's what our group came up with.

CHAIR JACOBS: Great. Questions or comments from Council? James Jacobs, Stanford University. Great. Any questions or comments from the community?

All right, fourth session of Tuesday was the session on education and training. And as a reminder, the education and training working group is Debbie Rabina, Camilla Tubbs and Peggy Jarrett. Take it away.

MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library. Our
session, ways and means of teaching and
training, reaching out in creative ways, we had
three speakers, William Cuthbertson from the
University of Colorado Boulder, Sarah
Glassmeyer from CALI and Kristine Unsworth

who's an assistant professor at Drexel University.

And we learned some creative ways, some interesting ways of reaching out to a variety of groups including LIS students, YouTube videos, online tutorials. So it was I think a really good educational session.

From that we have a couple of tasks and a couple of possible recommendations. And one of our recommendations is that GPO create a clearinghouse of government information tutorials, not just GPO tutorials, but tutorials from other places sort of like the digitization registry.

And we also think that the tutorials should be, the FDsys tutorials should be embedded in FDsys. So we'll kind of try to draft something around that.

Our second recommendation is actually about PACER training, so I don't know if you want to wait, James, until we get to that update session wrap-up, or should I just go ahead and talk about it right now?

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. Go ahead.

MEMBER JARRETT: Okay. We thought that the PACER issue since what's unique about -- well, there's so many things that are unique about the PACER, now program, and one of them is that there's this requirement for training.

So we decided to take that under our wing. And we want to craft a recommendation that GPO continue to work with the Administrative Office of the Courts to analyze whether the PACER subsidy is enough to adequately meet both the training and research

needs of the Depository librarians and patrons.

And one of our tasks that we have, which is not actually a formal recommendation, is to request that GPO approach the Judicial Conference to ask if this PACER training database could be opened up to ILS students and instructors.

Right now the program is available

for, at least starting in January I think they're going from the 2 to some number and then everybody later, public libraries not necessarily depository libraries, public law libraries and depository libraries, but there's this whole group of other people that aren't available, or don't have that available to them. So that's about it.

CHAIR JACOBS: Thanks. James Jacobs, Stanford University. Any comments, questions from Council?

MEMBER SANDERS: Ann Sanders,
Library of Michigan. About the recommendation
to create a clearinghouse of tutorials, I
distinctly remember James commenting at the
time that GODORT has a clearinghouse of similar
stuff.

CHAIR JACOBS: A handout exchange.

MEMBER SANDERS: Yes, and so I'm really, the handout exchange. And that's been successful for many years and so I'm a little unclear how the community's planning to correct that recommendation that it doesn't essentially

duplicate a resource that's out there.

MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library. I'm
going to try to address this and then see if
Camilla might have something to add to that.

You know, I don't think of GODORT as that exchange because I'm not a member of GODORT. And so I think that part of this to put together something that is available to all people in the Depository Library community.

Not that the GODORT stuff isn't available, that it's just not what I think about. But I think Camilla might be articulating this better.

MEMBER TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library. No, it's along that same vein of -- I'm not a GODORT member either, and I know of other associations that are putting similar documentation together using government documents in a different context, associations that I belong to.

And I just like the idea of being able to look at a portal where these different

projects are being put together.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony,
Brown University. And just to expand on both
points, I think during the discussion it was
pointed out that it wouldn't necessarily mean
that, you know, duplicate copies of things
would have to reside at the GPO host.

They could be points to or links to other resources at other associations or other locations, but that, you know, folks coming to site for the the FDLP FDLP program for information about how to service FDLP information that it might be a good idea to have, you know, that as a starting point to get folks where they needed to go.

MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett, UW Law Library. Thank you, Dan, for articulating what I was trying to say. I think I have conference fatigue.

And I think maybe we, even though we said we weren't wordsmithing, that maybe it's just that clearinghouse isn't the right word.

Maybe portal is the right word or we'll figure out some other word, registry pointers, that we are not trying to duplicate something where the stuff resides but just exactly what Dan said.

CHAIR JACOBS: Yes. James Jacobs, Stanford University. And I think I remember the woman from CALI mentioning that they also had a wiki of content as well.

So the point is that there's stuff already out there in lots of different venues, but we need to focus it. And whether it's quote unquote "republishing" content or just pointing to content on other -- yes, a registry.

Good, thank you. Other comments, questions? Comments from the community. Oh, I thought you were walking up to the mic, George.

Hearing none, the last group was a group that didn't actually have a session. We were a catch-all session. This was the Council session on metadata and cataloging, or

cataloging and collections, collections and metadata, that's what it is.

I'm part of that group so I should know what the working group title is. But that group is myself, Dan O'Mahony and Jill Moriearty, with three vowels.

And so our group, we did have some bullet points that Arlene was nice enough to articulate on our collaborative document. And we sort of went through and caught the things that sort of went through the cracks or went into what we thought would be other groups.

And we do have one recommendation that we're working towards. Let me see if I can find it there. And it had to do with, of course it had to do with zombies.

Yes, the recommendation that we're working towards is to encourage GPO to explore ways to help the community identify quote unquote "zombie" superseded electronic materials and include information at the point of cataloging.

So that's a recommendation that

we're working towards. I believe there was a task that we were working towards as well.

Yes, there was a task about setting priorities specifically for the PURL Referral Tool, and that may feed into what Mark was talking about

as well, and so those tasks might be combined.

Was there another one? Yes, there was another task having to do with the way PURLs are displayed in CGP bib records. And we've got more background from a community member, and we're going to feed that information towards GPO and work towards a resolution on that.

Any questions or comments? Did I miss anything, working group co-members? No, cool. Any questions or comments from the Council? Questions or comments from the community?

Excellent, this is going to be a short final meeting. Any questions or comments from GPO? Not even a nod. There we go, thank you. Okay, so that's what we're working

1 towards. Oh, yes.

(Off microphone comments)

CHAIR JACOBS: Oh, yes, there was one more down toward the bottom, wasn't it, about virtual meetings. Was that the one, Dan?

Yes, there was a task that I raised my hand to take on as Chair, and that is the articulation of Council's needs for virtual meetings between annual conferences as well as articulation of possibly working towards having an in-person Council meeting not centered around a whole conference.

So I'll be talking with GPO more about that to see, you know, to see what's possible now, what's possible in the future. So I'll be working towards that.

And that'll be sort of in conjunction with the working group that we set up with Camilla and Peggy and Ann, sorry, Sue, myself and Shari about virtual meetings.

And so we're going to come up with some tasks for Council and some things to work

towards, and we're going to do that on a very 1 2 short time frame because spring is almost here. 3 I know it's strange to talk about 4 in October, but spring is just around the 5 6 corner both physically and metaphorically I 7 quess, I hope spring is right around the 8 corner. Thank you. I'll be here until 9 10 Thursday. Questions or comments? Okay, hearing none -- oh, yes, George. 11 12 MR. CARLSON: George Carlson, Santa 13 Clara University. Just to demonstrate that we're all awake out here. 14 15 CHAIR JACOBS: That you'll do 16 calisthenics again? MR. CARLSON: No, please. You've 17 been talking about, you know, action items for 18 19 all your different groups, and I was wondering 20 if you weren't considering commendations as Council has often done in the past. You know, 21

like for the different projects GPO's been

23

working on.

1 CHAIR JACOBS: Sorry, George, could you repeat that? A couple people didn't hear 2 quite what you said. 3 MR. CARLSON: Are you considering 4 commendations also as well the action items 5 you've been talking about? 6 7 CHAIR JACOBS: Commendations? In the past, often 8 MR. CARLSON: Council did resolutions of gratitude for things 9 10 that GPO had been working on or if, you know, different members of the community had done 11 12 something, you know, truly outstanding or even 13 useful. CHAIR JACOBS: Thank you, George. 14 15 James Jacobs, Stanford University. That's a 16 great point. We hadn't really talked about that. 17 18 MEMBER WEIBLE: Arlene Weible, 19 Oregon State Library. I do think some of our 20 recommendations do some of that without falling

encouraging of current initiatives and, you

I think some of our recommendations are very

under the category of commendation.

21

22

know, continuing support.

So I think that spirit is there and we're just calling them recommendations, but more recommending to keep up the good work maybe.

CHAIR JACOBS: Thank you. George, did you have any commendations in mind?

MR. CARLSON: George Carlson, Santa Clara University. Well, just examples like the improved functionality of the PURL Referral function and the PACER project. I mean a lot has gone forward with that, it's encouraging.

And I think, you know, to address Arlene's statement, you're right, that does include it. But I think it's nice to have a more formal commendation as well.

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. Duly noted, I think we'll try our best to include that kind of language in our recommendations and in our discussions with GPO.

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony,
Brown University. I think also some sort of,

although we have acknowledged it and thanked it and commended it unofficially so many times, unofficial commendation and acknowledgment of all the work leading up to the 150th anniversary would probably be in order.

MEMBER MORIEARTY: I was thinking about that wonderful display Monday, that George Barnum and the staff at GPO had done. And at one point I thought, well, should we commend them? And then I thought, yes, it makes sense that we should.

It was a wonderful, beautiful display and it was lovely of you to have the event and invite us. A nice commendation in a letter, something suitable to embarrass George.

CHAIR JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I'm just writing this down on our document, and I appreciate George for bringing that up and for, Dan, for mentioning that.

We have mentioned the 150th anniversary several times unofficially, but I'll certainly write a letter from Council

officially marking that and officially thanking George Barnum and GPO staff.

Who is the -- Linda, the woman who was the designer of the, McNamara, and so I will do that. Thank you. Questions from the floor?

MS. HODUSKI: I just wanted to have you include the bookstore people. They were extraordinarily gracious and they've done a fabulous job of reinventing that bookstore, and maybe that will mean other bookstores throughout the country eventually again. But they were wonderful.

CHAIR JACOBS: Thank you,
Bernadine. James Jacobs, Stanford University.

And I'm writing that down as well, the power
of Google Docs, because I don't have a memory
any more.

## Cindy?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I want to thank George for recognizing the work in the PACER project and also like to mention that something along the commendations from our

Council that could be shared with the Judicial Conference would be very beneficial.

And if you think that something along the same lines is in order for the Opinions collection, you might want to consider that.

Maybe not at this time, our year is up next October, but I don't know how that timing would go with the meeting. We don't know that yet, but I'm just thinking about all the good comments we've heard in the last couple days about those two projects and the continuation and expansion of them is very dependent upon that Judicial Conference. And something of this nature would be, I think, helpful.

MEMBER JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library. Dan, I'm
going to be asking something of you
specifically.

So we talked earlier about ways that Council, the kinds of things we could say, the venues in which we could say them. Is that, and anybody can answer this but I'm just

looking at you, that is this something that Council has ever done, would be to, you know, send a letter to the Judicial Conference and say thank you, this is great?

MEMBER O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University Library. It may have been done in that kind of way in the past, but one way it could be done is in the form of a commendation or a acknowledgment in support of the project and the success of the project in reporting back to the public printer, and then, you know, those folks run with that information and share it broadly to all the audiences that need to see it.

But I think, you know, consultation with GPO folks about how else that might be communicated could happen.

MEMBER JARRETT: All right. Peggy Jarrett, University of Washington Law Library.

Thank you, and thank you, Cindy, for suggesting that. I think it's a good idea.

CHAIR JACOBS: Great, thank you.

Okay, seems like we're getting close to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

wrapping up. So I do have some final things to remember, some final announcements and a couple of closing remarks.

first the housekeeping Okay, so stuff. Do remember to turn in your evaluations. GPO staff relies on that information to plan for future conferences and it really does help both us and GPO to get those evaluations in, so thank you.

Looks like there is a box at the registration table if you want to turn them in.

Do it now, do it early, do it often, Chicago style voting.

And I have some numbers that Lance was able to give to us. Oh, one other reminder just before the numbers I give. Certificates of attendance will be emailed upon GPO's staff return to the office to those that requested them.

So you'll be receiving them in your email shortly. Probably not this evening, but seems like tomorrow when they get back to the office.

And lastly, there were some numbers, 428 people registered for the conference. I think that's a larger number than spring or last fall even.

Well, I don't know about last fall but certainly spring. Three hundred and eighty six were in actual attendance, and that includes GPO staff and Council.

Three hundred and sixteen actual attendees in attendance without GPO staff and Council, so 316 came. Of that the breakdown was 179 academics, 138 did not mark, 34 law, 21 public, 56 special or others, and that makes four and twenty eight.

There were 42 no-shows, so there were people that registered but didn't come up. Fifteen Council members, that's good. I'm glad there weren't more Council members that listed or left, yes, and there were 55 GPO staff that registered for conference.

So thank you, everyone, for attending. It's been a great conference and tomorrow is going to be even better. Yes?

2 CHAIR JACOBS: Oh, do have Ι information about PowerPoints? I do not have 3 information about PowerPoints, but I will get with GPO staff to find out how soon we can decks, expect to have PowerPoints, slide 7 whatever you call it, from the educational sessions posted to the Desktop.

(Off microphone comments)

Last year or last conference took them, it was within a reasonably short time, within a week or two that you can expect to have the slide presentations posted to the Desktop. Thanks for the reminder.

We also did elect a new Chair of Council. I guess I shouldn't forget because I'm going to be passing the gavel on to Shari Laster from University of Akron.

Congratulations, Shari.

(Applause)

CHAIR JACOBS: That Shari is going to start, June 1st is her official first day. Well, it's yet to be decided because in the byit states that it happens right after

9

8

4

5

6

11

12

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

spring conference.

But since we're not having a spring physical conference Shari will start sometime in the late spring. How's that?

(Off microphone comments)

CHAIR JACOBS: Spring is coming, spring has sprung. So I know that this has been a time of great budgetary upheaval for both the GPO and for a lot of libraries out in the community.

But despite that I'm really heartened by the community's dedication and their willingness to have open, cordial and positive dialogue.

I really felt throughout this conference we had that and I hope that that momentum continues through tomorrow when we have our all day conference on creating our shared vision.

I hope folks here are going to stay for tomorrow's sessions because it's going to be really good. I'm excited to participate in tomorrow's proceedings if for no other reason

1 than to hear Cass Hartnett's comments that she decided to table last night at the regional 2 session, because I'm sure they were really hot 3 4 comments. I think that's all I have. I do 5 see someone standing up the mic, so please. 6 7 MS: MCANINCH: Sandy McAninch, University of Kentucky. I'm just curious 8 whether Council thinks they will take anything 9 10 they hear tomorrow and perhaps express your 11 sense of the group recommendation, et cetera. 12 sound like you are kind of 13 wrapping up your work this afternoon, but we still have all of tomorrow to go. 14 15 CHAIR JACOBS: Thanks, Sandy. 16 did you -- no? James Jacobs, Stanford University. All right, all right. 17 18 PARTICIPANT: That's why you get 19 the big bucks. 20 CHAIR JACOBS: I get bucks? Man.

James Jacobs, Stanford University. Yes, we had discussed that as we were talking about what recommendations and what items we had to work

21

22

the information from 1 on that tomorrow's 2 proceedings will definitely feed into either 3 the recommendations that we're already writing or they may bubble up to other recommendations. 4 5 So while we're officially ending, 6 7 you know, our portion of DLC Fall 2011, we're all going to be there tomorrow, and so we're 8 going to take information and feed that into 9 10 our working processes going forward as well. We hadn't forgotten and we're not 11 12 running away. But thank you for the question. 13 Okay, I have no other comments. Anyone else on Council have any comments? 14 15 MEMBER LASTER: Shari Laster, 16 University of Akron. Thank you, GPO, for a fantastic conference. 17 18 (Applause) 19 CHAIR JACOBS: Thank you. With 20 that I'll close our portion. Oh, one more thing. 21 22 MEMBER And thank WEIBLE: you,

James Jacobs, for his herding of cats.

1	CHAIR JACOBS: Thank you, thank
2	you. Thanks.
3	PARTICIPANT: And it isn't over
4	yet.
5	CHAIR JACOBS: The herding is not
6	over, there's just a lull in the storm. So
7	with that I will call Council's portion of DLC
8	2011, the First Annual Depository Library
9	Conference, to a close. Thank you, all.
LO	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter
L1	was concluded at 4:44 p.m.)
L2	
L3	
L4	
L5	

## U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

+ + + + +

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE & FALL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL MEETING

THURSDAY
OCTOBER 20, 2011

+ + + + +

The Conference met in Salons A and B of the Crystal Ballroom of the DoubleTree by Hilton Hotel Washington DC-Crystal City, 300 Army Navy Drive, Arlington, Virginia, at 8:30 a.m., Mary Alice Baish, Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, presiding.

### PRESENT:

MARY ALICE BAISH, Superintendent of Documents,
U.S. Government Printing Office
MARK AMES, U.S. Government Printing Office
KATHY B. BAYER, U.S. Government Printing
Office

STEPHANIE BRAUNSTEIN, Louisiana State University

KRISTINA BOBE, U.S. Government Printing Office ASHLEY DAHLEN, U.S. Government Printing Office BLANE K. DESSY, Library of Congress CHERIE GIVENS, U.S. Government Printing Office JAMES JACOBS, Stanford University DANIEL P. O'MAHONY, Brown University ARLENE WEIBLE, Oregon State Library

# C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Opening Remarks3
FDLP Forecast15
Community Needs & LSCM Projects34
Strategic Changes Through Cooperative Efforts68
Summary of Regionals in Transition178
Projects GPO is Currently Working On192
Recap of Morning Session
Strategic Action Plan for the Future of the FDLP 2012-2017216
Close and Wrap-Up275
Adjournment292

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

8:36 a.m.

MS. BAISH: Okay. I think we'll get started. Those back in the back of the room picking up your handouts can multitask, and I'm sure everybody can hear me.

Good morning, and thank you all for attending the Fall Depository Library Council and Federal Depository Library Conference. Especially for staying this extra day to join us for an honest and open discussion on creating our shared vision, roles and responsibilities for the Federal Depository Library Program.

Recognizing that not all of you were able to attend the Council's Monday afternoon session on Regionals/Selectives, I want to begin the day by restating what I said during that excellent session.

When Public Printer Bill Boarman offered me the position of Superintendent of Documents, I was not only extremely honored, but I was also excited by the opportunity and

the challenge of bringing this wonderful community together to determine what the FDLP of the 21st Century needs to be in order to serve the information needs of the American public.

While each of us is committed to the mission of the FDLP to provide for no-fee public access to federal government information now and for future generations and also to the values of the program, we are at a tipping point.

If this program which is the very foundation of our democracy is to grow and flourish and become more robust, it must change to embrace the digital world, while continuing to value the historic tangible collections in many of our libraries. It is not our goal today to dwell on the past, but to look to the future.

That said, I attended my very first Depository Library Council meeting twenty years ago this month, in fact, and I had the honor of serving on the DLC from 1997 to 2000.

Twenty years ago many of us here today, and I've been asked not to name names, were discussing the very same issues we are facing now.

How many years ago did we have serious discussions about the need to have what we called then Super Regionals?

And how many times have we asked ourselves why in the digital age, can't every library in the nation be a depository library?

Therein lies our challenge. The very word "depository," it gets in the way as we rely more today on building digital collections and providing new services both at GPO and at your library.

As I said on Monday, it is very much my intention as Superintendent of Documents, to work with you to determine not just the changing needs of the program, but how the needs of each type of library within the program map to the legal requirements and program regulations of the FDLP.

Throughout the conference, I and

other GPO staff have made ourselves open and available to listen to the concerns of the community.

It's very clear that all federal depository libraries, regionals and selectives alike, are facing tremendous challenges.

Among the very real and serious constraints are shrinking and stretched resources in terms of budget, staff and space, demands for new services, and limitations of a legal authority that was originally designed for a print distribution model.

These challenges apply to all partners in the FDLP, depository libraries, the Government Printing Office, and the agencies.

Tt. is GPO's intention and regionals commitment to work with and selectives to provide the best possible service to libraries and the public they serve, working within the realities we all face.

Today, we will begin a serious

23

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

outcomes-based collaborative process to reach agreement on the future of the Federal Depository Library Program.

I cannot stress strongly enough that this day is but the beginning of a process that will require hard work by all of us.

If you are truly as committed to change and to working together to achieve it as we at the U.S. Government Printing Office are, this process will allow us to resolve the complex legal, policy and technology issues we have been discussing for so many years.

This morning you'll be hearing about our data-gathering activities over the last few past years and how the results are driving our project priorities. We are listening to what you're telling us, and we are taking action.

After the morning break, we will address information gaps that are essential to our planning process, and how we can best obtain this data.

At that time, Blane Dessy, Executive Director of the Federal Library and Information Center Committee, will facilitate our discussion along with our wonderful LSCM staff.

Later this afternoon, Blane will lead us through a conversation which will be the start for the development of a strategic action plan for a national structure for the future of the FDLP through collaboration and partnerships.

Our new national plan must highlight civic engagement. And that means building communities by creating and reinforcing relationships, I think a good metaphor for the FDLP, between people and promoting a healthy, deliberative dialog about active participants in civil life.

At GPO, we've identified civic engagement as the theme for the next FDLP marketing campaign, and some of you may have attended the brown-bag session Tuesday afternoon led by Kelly Seifert.

A couple of the possible taglines for the FDLP that were discussed then, and we will be seeking input from others not able to join us today, go back to the very foundation of democracy.

We, the people, federal depository libraries and you, community partners in civic engagement, or the federal depository libraries connecting the people with our government, these are the ideas that we hope to stress in terms of how we articulate and frame to members of the public, to members of Congress and other stakeholders, what exactly the FDLP is.

We are going to apply this civic engagement during our strategic visioning and planning process, because we believe it will strengthen the FDLP community and better fulfill our historic mission to keep America informed by ensuring no-fee, equal and equitable public access to official government information in the 21st Century.

I want to make it very clear as we

begin this process today, that every library has a space at the table. One of our goals is to engage the entire community in this collaborative process during which every depository library will have an equal voice.

We must learn to be honest and open, and we must listen and learn from each other.

I want to thank Donna Lauffer,
Helen Burke and Debbie Rabina on Depository
Library Council, for their work in the
Committee working group on public libraries.

They put together a wonderful lunch just yesterday, and I think the 10 or 11 or 12 public librarians - raise your hand if you're still here today. We had just an enlightening, energizing and very engaging conversation over a two-hour period. The voice of the public library partners in the FDLP is very important to me.

To facilitate involvement, the transcripts of today's session will be available on the FDLP Desktop and you'll be

able to review it. And those who are following us on Twitter or otherwise could not be with us today, will be encouraged to review it as well.

The discussion that begins this morning, will also migrate to the FDLP community site where we can bring more of our partners to engage with us.

I don't think I need to go through the whole list of assumptions that we all agree to, but let me name just a couple.

Developments in the larger library world inform the future of the FDLP. Fewer federal depository library professionals are going to be steeped in the FDLP or federal resources. Collaboration, cooperation, partnerships are essential and have been the hallmark to our very successful past.

Competencies to lead and manage the depository library of today and the future, are different than those of the traditional depository library.

GPO has a lot of responsibility in

coordinating the program, and we must help you promote your libraries and your services outside of the FDLP.

A primarily electronic FDLP offers opportunities to make more information locally available to the public with enhanced functionalities. And, yes, GPO will need to create new services that meet the needs of different types of depository libraries as technologies and libraries evolve.

In ten months, we expect to see from the process that is beginning today, a State forecast and State-focused action plan from every state or region served by a regional depository library, and each state currently without a regional depository. GPO will analyze that data and present it at our annual meeting next October.

We will be providing templates for this data collection, and it's very important that again we have the active participation of every depository library.

We need to fill in certain gaps in

information that we have not been able to collect through biennial surveys and other studies and needs.

We need to see how depositories are already collaborating or would like to collaborate at the strategic region-served level.

In two years, we as a community will have reached consensus on what changes, amendments, clarifications are needed to Title 44 and we will validate these. The changes must support the mission, the goals and the objectives of the FDLP, and also strengthen the program.

I've had a lot of experience in the legislative arena both at the state level helping to draft legislation, and also at the Federal level.

Many of you here in the room, as well as Dan O'Mahony, a member of Council who's going to talk about the challenges of getting legislation enacted - I was very involved in drafting sections of the E-

Government Act of 2004, for example.

So, I hope that experience and that certainly my commitment to you that we will work together, we will hear every voice within the community, we will be asking for input from the major library associations and other stakeholders who require access to federal government information.

Now, I'd like to invite Dan O'Mahony with whom I worked very closely in efforts in the late 1990s on an act to reform Title 44. And he's going to tell us a little bit about that experience, and what we learned from it.

Thank you very much for being here today, and I look forward to more conversations and dialog with each and every one of you, and all of you who are not here today. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. O'MAHONY: Need a little help here. Sorry.

Thank you, Mary Alice. Good

morning. While we're getting that set up, my name is Dan O'Mahony. I'm from Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island. I'm currently a member of the Depository Library Council.

And Mary Alice has asked me while we are looking forward into the future, to just take a brief step back and offer some historical context around the bundle of legal, political, logistical and emotional issues that goes by the name of Title 44 reform.

First off, just a real quick obligatory disclaimer. My remarks today are solely my own. I'm not speaking on behalf of council. Certainly not the Government Printing Office. Not Brown University. Not the State of Rhode Island. None of my family or friends.

(Laughter.)

MR. O'MAHONY: It's just me, and nobody else. So, in thinking about the longer term developments surrounding Title 44 reform, I went back to the passage of the Depository

Library Act of 1962, which many of you all know is the most recent statute that dealt with the current overall structure of the Federal Depository Library Program. And I examined the historical record going forward.

As best as I can tell since then, the only time that some kind of reform to Title 44 was not under serious consideration - (Laughter.)

MR. O'MAHONY: -- was a brief 15minute period in the middle of the night on
August 21st, 1976. And most historians
attribute this aberration to the unusual
alignment of the full moon that occurred that
night, rather than any perceived lack of
deficiency in the law.

(Laughter.)

MR. O'MAHONY: Now, obviously I'm being a little bit facetious here, but the underlying message here is still quite true.

Rarely has the library community been satisfied with the legal framework that is Title 44, and with good reason.

First off, statutes generally by their very nature, often are unwieldy and usually are borne out of some level of compromise.

Those compromises sometimes either have unintended consequences, or they leave significant needs and issues still unmet. Moreover, rarely are the wheels of government's legislative process speedy and nimble enough to keep pace with developments in the real world around us. And this can be especially true in areas dealing with rapid change like information technology.

So, I guess my first point here is that dissatisfaction with Title 44 is the status quo.

Now, closely aligned to this sad fact is the day-to-day necessity that we all face, depository librarians and GPO staff alike, in trying to make the best out of a legal structure that is less than adequate.

Over the years, lots of creative efforts have been initiated to meet the

dynamic government information needs of users. Sometimes these initiatives are officially aligned within the FDLP. Other times they complement the official services offered by librarians in support of the FDLP.

But going way back long before the 1962 statute, even, a continuing challenge in the world of government documents librarianship has been, on the one hand, to try to find practical ways to meet the ongoing needs of the program and our users despite the limitations of the existing law. And on the other hand, to work to identify those areas where legislative action might be required to improve the situation.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Since 1962, the official successful improvements to the law, that list has been relatively short. But in each case, change did move the program forward by expanding the reach of the FDLP usually in relation to the types of libraries participating in the program, or the types of materials available through the program.

So, in 1972, we saw the inclusion of the highest state appellate libraries. And in 1978, we saw the designation accredited of law school libraries.

And of course in 1993, the GPO Access Act officially ushered in the electronic age at GPO. Although, it is worth nothing here that while this law would have a profound impact on the FDLP, the statute itself technically did nothing to Chapter 19 of Title 44, that part of the law that deals specifically with the Federal Depository Library Program.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Instead, it created a new chapter,
Chapter 41, on access to electronic federal
information.

Aside from these few successful attempts to Title 44 reform, there have been a number of other attempts over the years to revise the law that fell short.

Two notable efforts, both in which the library community had a significant role,

were in 1979, the Public Printing Reorganization Act, and in 1998, the Wendell H. Ford Government Publications Reform Act, Senate Bill 2288.

Now, right off the bat I need to say that both of these bills ultimately failed to be enacted. So by definition, they're not necessarily models to emulate.

However, they do represent the thinking behind the two major efforts to reform Title 44 since 1962, and both attempted to address the library community's concerns. So, it's worth looking at them for what they might tell us.

Some common elements about these two bills and the approaches that they took included, first, they both were comprehensive efforts to change all of Title 44.

The changes to Chapter 19 dealing specifically with the FDLP, were just part of a larger package to address the overall printing and dissemination apparatus of the federal government.

One advantage to this type of approach, is that it tries to get at the root problem. A lot of what is in one section of Title 44, relates to provisions in other sections of Title 44.

So, it can be difficult sometimes to isolate a specific change that by itself will solve a targeted deficiency.

A disadvantage to this type of approach, of course, is that it is infinitely more complicated both in terms of the substance of the law that it's addressing, and the politics of the stakeholders involved. Stakeholders who often have competing interests.

A second common element was that as part of these changes, the oversight administrative structures within GPO were revised. Although, each bill attempted this in a different way.

Third, in both cases Congress was interested in reducing the costs involved in producing and distributing government

publications.

While the library community was certainly amenable to this, we're all taxpayers, this was not the driving motivation of the library community. But with any piece of legislation, it is imperative for members of Congress to find a compelling motivation for them to invest their political capital in the cause.

Fourth, both bills attempted to expand the scope of materials in the FDLP to include all branches of government and all formats, specifically electronic information.

This was the paramount motivation for the library community.

The 1998 bill built upon this point and introduced the explicit responsibility of the program to provide permanent, public access to government publications regardless of format with the emphasis on born digital materials.

Finally in terms of process, both bills resulted from an extended undertaking

led by members of Congress and their staffs that included input from a broad array of constituencies, which included, but certainly was not limited to, the library community.

Now, while the library community certainly has an obvious vested interest in Title 44 especially as it relates to the FDLP, we are not alone in our interest in government information generally.

As a result, from time to time bills are introduced that would revise Title 44 or related laws, but they do not originate from anything that the library community might have been involved in. And they may or may not align themselves with our interests and our values.

Taking just the current 112th Congress as an illustrative example, we see that a number of bills have been introduced aimed at cutting costs, primarily printing costs, or perceived printing costs.

In addition, the last one here on that list is an example of a law that on its

face has nothing to do with Title 44 per se. Nowhere in the text of that bill does it mention any part of Title 44, but potentially it could change the responsibilities of the federal government and how it disseminates and preserves government information.

So, one takeaway point here is that while the library community historically has been an active player in trying to effect legislative change in this area, we are not the only player. And to state the obvious, the outcomes and even the very existence of legislative proposals do not always conform to our desires, nor our timetables.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I think it's also the case that while lots of folks, including sometimes some members of Congress, are quick to use the rhetoric surrounding Title support issues. Very few are interested enough to deal with the practical day-to-day nuts-andbolts details of what it really means provide no-fee public access to government information all in forms from all three branches of government now and in the future.

We often hear praise for free-flowing public information as the lifeblood of a healthy democracy, for an informed and an enlightened citizenry, for holding government accountable to we, the people, all the things that warm the hearts to us as documents librarians.

But while this general spirit is invoked by lots of different players, actually achieving this ideal at the ground level is not always their top priority.

It is our top priority. It is the single, driving, common motivation of this community.

We each may bring additional interests to the table as well, but the uniting principle that arouses our passion, that incites our advocacy and that invokes our professional obligation, is our collective cultural commitment to no-fee public access to government information in all forms from all three branches of government now and in the

future.

As I take a step back and reflect on some of the lessons learned in trying to effect legislative change in this area, three key factors for success jump out at me.

First, a clear sense of what needs to be changed. Whether this is in the vein of a broad, comprehensive reform, or specifically targeted surgical strikes, it is imperative that we know what we want to change, what we're trying to accomplish.

Second, the library community speaking with a united voice. Sometimes this isn't as easy as outsiders think it should be.

The 1,208 federal depository libraries represent all different types of libraries, different geographic regions, different funding sources, all the other differences as varied as the nation as a whole. Add to this the broader community of some 120,000 other nondepository libraries, and the plot thickens.

But as a community, we always have

had more in common than whatever differences may have distinguished us. And when we can unite around a common purpose, we have been known to do great things.

Third, one or more champions in Congress to lead and shepherd a proposal through the legislative process. We, as librarians, may have the best idea in the world. We often do.

(Laughter.)

MR. O'MAHONY: But unless there's at least one member of Congress who agrees that this is important and is willing to do the necessary work to sensitize his or her colleagues in Congress and convince them that these changes have value for their constituents, then that good idea isn't going anywhere.

As documents librarians, we all know how a bill becomes a law, and it has to start with a member of Congress introducing a bill.

This may be the most obvious point

on the planet, but it also can sometimes be the most difficult and time-consuming step in the process to identify, cultivate, educate and rally around members of Congress that are willing to support this cause.

Having all three factors in place does not guarantee success by any stretch of the imagination. But without any one of these, the chances of failure are infinitely greater.

In closing, I will leave you with one final thought.

(Laughter.)

MR. O'MAHONY: This is a picture of my son in his first Halloween costume. He's probably about 15 months old in this picture, and that was over ten years ago.

Now, this is a government documents crowd. So, I don't have to tell you what he's dressed as.

(Laughter.)

MR. O'MAHONY: If you can see the little "T44" on his chest plate there, then of

course you know he's Super Title 44 Man, the superhero dedicated to truth, justice and, say it with me, no-fee public access to government information in all forms from all three branches of government now and in the future. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. O'MAHONY: Now, it would be nice if such a superhero existed. Alas, such is not the case. I'm not exactly sure what the process is in government to requisition a superhero, but I strongly urge GPO to look into that.

In the meantime, however, the way the system is going to get changed is likely through much more conventional channels. It will not be easy. But as we have seen, success in the past did not come easily.

It will not happen overnight, as generations of documents librarians can attest to, but success in the past took the necessary time to plan, gather support and execute a legislative strategy. And it can't be done by

just one or two individuals, or one or two libraries, or even one or two associations. The superhuman effort, if you will, that it will require must come from the community as a whole.

We are that community charged with the professional responsibility of stewarding and providing access to government information past, present and future.

When I was about his age, Congress passed the Depository Library Act of 1962. It's now just about fifty years later, and that's still the governing law on the books.

That law doesn't work in today's environment. It hasn't worked for over thirty years. It needs to change. And we collectively as a community, have to be the agents of that change. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. BAISH: Thank you, Dan. And I hope everybody who's tweeting, caught some of those wonderful statements that you made during your presentation.

And not to age myself, but I do recall when Dan's wonderful wife Tina was pregnant. I think that was the time I was on the Depository Library Council and we had our meeting there in Rhode Island.

So, first of all, I really need to not only extend my gratitude to all of you for being here today for those of you following us on Twitter, but I really need to thank my staff.

The men and women at GPO are magnificent. And the men and women in LSCM mostly up in this corner of the room, have worked so hard to make this conference and meeting and today's events possible.

And you haven't heard yet what they have to say, but I would like you to please join me in thanking them.

(Applause.)

MS. BAISH: We have a full day ahead of us. An incredibly busy day. I'm happy to say we are right on time.

The next session which is from 9:15

until ten o'clock, will be led by Kristina Bobe and Ashley Dahlen. It's called Community Needs and LSCM Projects. It will end promptly at 10:00, if not a few minutes before that, and that will give us all an opportunity, I'm sure, for a much needed break.

Thank you again for coming and, Kristina and Ashley, please join us here.

MS. BOBE: Good morning.

MS. BAISH: Cherie, would you like to come up as well? Thank you.

MS. BOBE: Thank you, Mary Alice.

So, as Mary Alice stated, my name is Kristina Bobe. I'm one of the outreach librarians along with Ashley, Cherie, Mark Ames, Melissa Fairfield, Kathy Bayer. We work in LSCM, Library Services and Content Management, in case you didn't know what LSCM was.

In this section, we'd like to present an overview of community needs and projects that have been developed at GPO.

So, many of us, many of us, have

been to DLC conferences over the years, heard remarks from number we've а individuals, but there are many voices that go unheard in these situations. Voices that are left out of the discussion at conferences, and others who maybe choose not to participate even virtual conversations such listservs, or other communication vehicles.

So, to get a representative crosssection of the FDLP community, I turn to the
information sources that we do have. These
should give us all a better sense of the
issues that are significant to the FDLP
community while being further enhanced by some
detailed data analysis that has been done on
some of that data.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The following includes some statistical samples approaching 90 to 95 percent. So, the margin of error is fairly slight with the understanding that respondents when they answer their biennial surveys are being forthcoming in their answers.

The first slide here is referring

to the 2007 biennial survey of federal depository libraries. We received submissions from 1,199 depository libraries.

I'm going to go just over some percentages from 2007. And then as we move forward to the present day, I'll move away from the percentages.

Looking at written policies, a written collection development policy for government documents, 94 percent had that in place. A written policy for providing public service for those documents, 79 percent. A written access policy, so underscoring the requirement of access to resources, 84 percent.

Only 63 percent, and that's still a good number, had a plan for training staff on the use and management of the depository collection. So, keep some of those things in mind; training, access and so on.

In the area of collection management and selection, 59 percent were already substituting official online resources

for tangible materials. 40 percent were creating catalog records for pre1976 materials. 69 percent, this is a high percentage, had performed a full review of their item selection profile within the last two years. That's what they said.

In the area of staffing, 30 percent or three out of ten had experienced a staffing decrease in the last five years. 68 percent, on the other hand, had procedures to train staff in reference sources and services for federal government information. So, they're making contingency plans.

Looking at the physical facilities and public access to the physical documents, only 17 percent still had that separate reference desk that some of you may have worked at, at some point in time.

I know I worked at one and I went through the merger of the government documents desk with the main reference desk. It's more than norm now to have that single service point. 91 percent had adequate housing and

growth space for the next five years, according to their item selection rate.

And then looking at digitization efforts, those homegrown efforts and storage of online publications, 12 percent reported current or future plans to digitize within scoped materials. 26 libraries, not 26 percent, but 26 libraries were participating in the GPO registry of digitization projects.

And in the breakdown of selection of formats, 81 percent collected a mix of tangible and electronic. Then 13 percent collected primarily tangible. And six percent reported they collected primarily electronic.

Only six percent.

Over 99 percent of the libraries when asked if they wanted to stay in the FDLP or if they planned to stay in the FDLP, reported yes.

Next slide, please. In 2009, it was a little different. We had a customer relations program. There was a 2009 biennial survey and needs assessment. So, these two

were combined. It didn't ask the same, exact questions as 2007, but it looked at similar data points.

Probably most of you in the audience were familiar with or even filled out both of the surveys that I'm referring to.

There was about a 90 percent response rate in 2009, or 1,129 responses included in this analysis. So, very broad.

I think I'm going to put in another plug here for libraries to fill out their biennial survey not just because it's a legal requirement of all depository libraries, even the highest state appellate court libraries, but any late responses or nonresponses aren't included in these analyses that we look at. So, we don't hear and we don't include those in the data analysis afterwards.

So, in 2009, 20 percent, so, one out of five of the depository libraries, characterized their financial problems as major.

Between like 58 and 80 percent said

financial problems were minor, but they were still an issue. They were still coming up.

And the most important service provided by the FDLP was access to depository resources. That's kind of a no-brainer. 50 percent or more rated the FDLP Desktop and free access to fee-based databases highly.

The additional services or resources requested by at least half of these libraries included digitized historical collections of FDLP publications, addition of pre1976 cataloging records to OCLC, and online historical coverage of the GPO Access/FDsys titles.

So, regarding satisfaction with FDLP services, at least sixty percent indicated that they were satisfied or extremely satisfied with the majority of FDLP services.

A majority, a clear majority, 87 percent, considered staffing adequate to fulfill basic depository responsibilities.

Although, state and local government libraries

and public libraries reported the most difficulty in fulfilling those responsibilities.

Overall really in 2009, economic issues held primacy. It's hard to imagine a time where they don't, but it was really evident in the 2009 data.

Libraries indicated that budget constraints, staffing, workload, space considerations and cost containment were either major or minor issues. And most libraries said they were planning to remain in the FDLP, one percent indicated a desire to leave the program, seven percent were undecided.

So, earlier this year GPO - we're moving forward now to 2010-2011. GPO published the results of the analysis of the 2011 Depository Library User Survey. The survey was designed to support planning efforts at GPO and at newer FDLP libraries.

Show of hands, how many libraries participated in that survey?

(Show of hands.)

That's great. Excellent.

So, in this survey we were able to review responses from FDLP users, not the coordinators, not the administrators that signed off on your surveys.

There were a total of 3,305 respondents at 549 FDLP libraries. Really, a tremendous response. These were distributed across geographic regions and types of libraries.

38 percent of respondents used an FDLP library at least six times per year, and 58 percent used one library. 20 percent used more than one.

Academic research, education, personal use, were the most cited reasons for using FDLP resources. Law and legal research, legislative research, were also noted.

The most used types of information were historical materials, 67 percent. And then followed by statistics, 66 percent. And then current information.

Regarding the format of materials, electronic only used for legal, was legislative and fiscal, like economic Print only was highest materials. in the category of maps, and also in historical materials. So, services reported to be access frequently used were online to documents and the library website.

Regarding alternative sources for U.S. government information, respondents said they used Google at 55 percent. And 49 percent reported using other web-based services, which makes me think that maybe they were using Google Uncle Sam, or just Google, Google. I don't know. But now, we don't have Google Uncle Sam anymore.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So, 79 percent responded that FDLP resources provided key information, fulfilled their purpose and added value to their research. 55 percent strongly agreed with the statement that they would use FDLP resources again, as well as recommend them to friends or colleagues.

Challenges reported were in the areas of difficulty of use, finding materials in catalogs, nonavailability of preferred formats, and gaps in library holdings.

far the desired As as most users said improvements, more online materials, online tutorials to explain government activities, and increasing access to older, historical materials.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So, overall the key findings of need were more online materials, better finding tools, and more training in the use of government information resources.

Next slide, please. Public access assessments. How many of you have had a public access assessment?

Fewer hands. So, during the public access assessments, or PAAs, and we've done at least 112, and I think a few more last time I looked at our internal spreadsheet, we speak directly to library staff in depth.

And although GPO is required to conduct firsthand investigations of the

conditions in depository libraries per Title 44, and this is accomplished through the PAAs, we learn a lot about the current state of affairs in a number of different libraries; urban, rural, large, small, academic and the like.

We haven't analyzed the information that we've collected from these comprehensively, had some data analyst come in and crunch the numbers, but we've conducted a number of PAAs since we've started and we have to read and review all of our colleagues' reports as well. So, we're getting a sense of what they're saying.

What are we seeing? Well, for the most part, libraries are doing well. We have a few libraries where follow-up is required to bring them into compliance, but we're finding that libraries are actively engaging their communities and helping patrons access U.S. government information.

Staff in many of the libraries we have talked to have been working with

documents for years, even decades. They understand how government documents work, and they also understand the challenge and uniqueness of working with those collections.

They're finding many ways, free and no-fee ways of promoting and increasing visibility of their depository collections.

At the same time, they're challenged by electronic access to documents and how to provide continuity between those tangible, visible publications that they have on their shelves that are gradually being replaced by electronic access, and how that visible collection can turn into an invisible collection if you don't promote it.

Some of the biggest take-aways from the PAAs, staff turnover in libraries. Some of the staff turnover that we heard about in the 2007 and 2009 biennial surveys, it makes it difficult to mentor new, incoming people and staff.

Organizational memory is lost, staff retire, they take that document

specialization with them, the vacancy ensues, new staff may or may not be hired, and they don't have that awareness of depository requirements or specifications. They sometimes don't even know which questions to ask or where to get started.

Now, for our part, we do reach out to them because we all see whenever there is a change in the Federal Depository Library Directory and we send out welcome messages to those new coordinators that come in.

Sometimes we recognize the names. We realize there's just been a change in staffing and someone who used to work with the library is filling in again. But whenever we see a new name, we follow up, give our contact information, give them more information about the program, just give them a place to get started.

Some coordinators continue to select more than the library may need or formats that are not desired. So, they may be receiving documents that are not wanted or

needed, but simply haven't been deselected yet. And this makes weeding down the road even more of a challenge.

Collection development plans may not match current collection development decisions.

Regarding access to electronic information, security and access issues are cropping up. Internet access for minors, authentication requirements for computer access, identification requirements to gain a building, can access into all present challenges to the general public. Physical barriers are combined with, or even replaced, by online barriers to access.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Training and professional development activities are tough to fit into a busy schedule. So, budget cuts mean travel funding is limited. So, virtual training is now taking the place of onsite and in-person training.

Virtual training like online tutorials or webinars are typically low or no

cost, and they're more flexible for scheduling purposes.

At the end of the day, though, many of the libraries say they are very proud to be in the FDLP and they restate their commitment to staying in the program.

We haven't comprehensively analyzed askGPO questions. There's really no way of doing that. I think no good way, no easy way of collecting data also from personal interactions or on a one-on-one basis.

I think that's why I was really prompted to look back at these broad, comprehensive, data-gathering efforts that we've done to really get a more accurate sense of what's going on.

But they do provide clues to needs and trends within the FDLP community, the kind of educational sessions that are presented, the kind of presentations that we've put up afterwards.

We've also looked at reasons why libraries recently have dropped from the FDLP.

And these reasons include staff cutbacks or reductions. So, the increased workload due to staff reductions, statements like our coordinator is retiring and not being replaced.

Reduction in funding, budget cuts crop up again and again as a reason to drop status. In some cases, libraries feel that their patron needs can be met with a combination of online resources and search engines. So, FDLP participation is not necessary.

We can't control the many pressures that libraries are facing today, not just FDLP libraries, but all libraries, but we can try to foster that dialog for finding some solutions.

We can also hopefully try to cultivate and develop relationships, as well as resources, so that libraries continue to find value in the program. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. DAHLEN: Hello. I'm Ashley

Dahlen.

So, Kristina talked about what our sources of information are, and now we're going to talk about some of the projects that we've been working on at GPO, or things that we are working on or recently developed based on our understanding of your needs. And these projects benefit your depository aberration, as well as address community-wide needs.

Our goal in summarizing these is to show you what projects we're working on now and to set the stage for the next session.

To start off with, I'm going to summarize the projects that we have recently completed or are currently underway that provide greater access to government information as found through FDsys.

The first initiative I'm going to talk about is looking at ways to simultaneously search FDsys and the CGP, or the Catalog of Government Publications.

There's two parts to this.

Part 1 is MetaLib. MetaLib is a

GPO-created tool where users can search within multiple federal databases simultaneously. And GPO just released a new MetaLib collection that enables you to search the CGP and FDsys at the same time.

Also related to simultaneous searching is we've started an internal group to begin examining the FDLP community's needs for additional CGP-FDsys integration and options for making that happen. That's an ongoing project right now.

Constitution of the United States of America Analysis and Interpretation more commonly called CONAN, I should point out that we had a slide that had an image of Conan the Barbarian all oiled up. He didn't make it into the final presentation.

The idea behind CONAN is to provide enhanced public access through FDsys to an authoritative version of CONAN - I need to speak closer to the mic? Okay.

It will permit greater access to searching and authentication of the material,

and the content is going to be updated as soon as updates are made available beyond the normal two-year supplement cycle. So, greater updates. This is an ongoing project that we're currently working on.

Also related to greater access to information through FDsys is the Statutes at Large and the Bound Congressional Record Project. This is a partnership with the Library of Congress to digitize and make available through FDsys the Statutes at Large from 1951 through 2007. We just recently completed that.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

We are currently working on the Bound Congressional Record Project, which will bring content from 1873 through 1998 into FDsys.

working We are the on Administrative Office of the U.S. Court Opinion Collection. This FDsys collection will give access to court opinion documents from the United States appellate courts, district courts and bankruptcy courts.

content will date from 2004 forwards.

We're currently in public beta. We have access to 12 courts right now. We're working on getting access to over 30 courts, though, pending Judicial Conference approval.

Another collection that was recently released on FDsys was the Coastal Zone Information Center, the CZIC collection.

We acquired the content through a partnership with NOAA's Coastal Services Center. And the collection has more than 5,000 coastal-related documents, and it spans over 30 years worth of data.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Library Services and Content Management is investigating FDsys as a tool for a web-harvesting initiative. A task force has been organized to investigate several concepts; web harvesting of publications that meet the scope of the FDLP, how to make that content available to the public, integrating that content into FDsys archiving and searching, and cataloging that harvested content into

CGP.

We're researching three possible methods of achieving this and exploring the risks, benefits and costs associated with each method.

The first two methods, insourced and partnershipped-base models that we're looking at, we're going to look at that in the future. What we're working on right now is an outsourced model.

We're currently working on using Heritrix to do web harvesting, and using the Internet Archive's Archive-It web service to provide access to it. And this is a joint partnership that we're working on with the Library of Congress, FEDLINK, and the Internet Archive.

LSCM has also created an FDsys training group who has written curriculum and online-recorded modules for FDsys. These educational sessions are for in-person and remote online training through a virtual environment, and the curriculum has been

developed for onsite training. We are awaiting the acquisition of the virtual training software to record the training sessions.

And finally, there is work going on for the authentication through FDsys. You all know that we can authenticate PDF documents on FDsys. Now, we're investigating the use of new technologies to enable bulk content integrity assurance of XML files. And that's something that we're working on right now.

So, those are projects that were related to FDsys, and here's some projects relating to information sharing:

We recently ruled out the Legal Requirements and Program Regulations of the FDLP. You'll see the acronym L-R-P-R. We call it ler-per, because it sounds better than leper.

## (Laughter.)

MS. DAHLEN: This is a concise resource to clarify and update depository library requirements that hadn't been updated

in quite a while. It was developed in response to community questions and was written by GPO outreach librarians who are former depository librarians.

Related to the legal requirements, or LRPR, is the guidance. The guidance is currently being developed. It's the more detailed explanations that accompany those regulations such as what depository management tools you have to use, and how to actually use those tools.

Since we're hoping to update those tools, we didn't include it in the actual legal requirements document, because we want to keep the requirements up to date and short and sweet. And this guidance information will reside on the FDLP Desktop.

You'll notice that that other clip art made it in, but Conan didn't.

(Laughter.)

MS. DAHLEN: We are working on a lot of projects related to cataloging services and cooperative efforts. The Catalog Record

Distribution project is now in its third year.

And through this project, participating libraries receive bulk bibliographic record files based on the individual library profiles.

This is a contracted service with Marcive, Inc. We at GPO, are learning from this project. And we're looking at turning it somehow into a long-term solution for bibliographic record distribution.

Also related to cataloging services is the Shelflist Transcription and Bibliographic Record Cleanup. This is a project that was developed at the request of libraries who are cataloging their historic material. It involves the conversion of GPO's historic card catalog from the 1870s through 1992 into MARC format, and loading those MARC records into the CGP. This is an ongoing project.

Catalog records that are in the CGP are currently available to depository libraries at no cost to them through the use

of Z39.50. It will involve the future cleanup of those catalog records. And it's going to take help from you guys, because we don't have the materials in our hands.

Another project we're working on is the Selected Dissemination of Information or what we call SDI. It has to have an acronym. It's another cataloging tool that's being developed and continually worked on.

Through SDI, depository library staff can create queries and alerts in the CGP and have those results emailed to themselves. This tool can be used to identify catalog records by subject, item number, key word, geography and more. It can also be used to identify catalog records of any format such as online-only resources.

Another cooperative effort that we're working on right now is the future marketing of the FDLP. It's a new initiative right now to rethink how we're going to market this program. And with help from you all in the community, GPO hopes to develop useful and

cost-effective tools that will educate the public about the FDLP and hopefully reach the broadest audience possible.

We are also working on cooperative cataloging partnerships. And in general, these cooperative cataloging partnerships contribute to the creation of the National Bibliographic Inventory, as well as increased tangible historic depository access to collections. It enables depository libraries to acquire cataloging records to complete their own retrospective cataloging projects, it increases access to content digitized by partner libraries, and it shows the cataloging workload among many librarians.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

There four this are ways partnership can work. One, GPO can accept catalog records from partner libraries. GPO can create cataloging records in the CGP for documents and partner libraries, partner library digital collections. Three, GPO conduct research can and create Superintendent of Documents, or SuDoc,

classification numbers for historic government publications in exchange for partner library-created cataloging records. And, four, the GPO can partner with libraries to work creatively to provide access to depository collections, which is another way of saying we have an idea, give us a call, we'll talk. This is an ongoing - or these are several ongoing projects right now.

Another cooperative effort is MetaLib enhancements. I briefly talked about MetaLib and the fact that we just ruled out the CGP-FDsys combined search, but a new enhancement that we recently did was giving everyone the ability to further refine their search results.

If you do a search in MetaLib, there is now on the right side, clusters and facets modules that you can click on to filter your search results.

All right. So, there are a lot of cataloging and marketing projects underway, but there's also a lot of collection

development and management tools that are being developed and worked on right now.

One, the automated disposition tool not to be confused with that home security system ADT, but this is a tool to automate for the depository community, the disposition of depository materials. And this is being developed in response to primarily conference discussions.

We're also working on the National Bibliographic Inventory, as I mentioned earlier. We're working on creating this comprehensive list of all the historic federal publications that will serve for both the FDLP and the Cataloging and Indexing Program that Library Services and Content Management runs.

It's being developed at the request of the community through conference discussions and biennial survey data, the needs assessment, things like that. We know that you guys are very anxious for it.

We're also working on LIST, or Library Information System Transformation.

This is basically our legacy system migration with the goal to replace the Item Lister, the amendment of item selections form, and the infamous Depository Distribution Information System, or DDIS.

This is being developed in response to community discussions wanting FDLP participation to be a little more up to date, streamlined, not to mention more stable.

We're also working on the PURL referral report. The new tool that just rolled out enables libraries to capture government information used as statistics from their library's web pages, guides, catalog and more.

And the new report gives you a better analysis of what resources users are actually taking a look at - we can get you a list of the top 50 hits, things like that - and also what avenue did they come into your system, like what tool did they use? Did they come in through your webpage? Did they get it through some guide that you have developed?

That sort of thing.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And finally, there are several projects that are underway provide to educational outreach. We have archived online programming for all libraries or OPAL sessions.

As you may have heard, GPO is no longer using OPAL for virtual training. As a result, recorded OPAL sessions that have been done in the past are now in an archive where all may benefit from the recorded sessions at their own time and at no cost to them.

OPAL was pursued at the request of the community for remote or virtual training. Now, related to that, we are working on procuring a new virtual training tool. The training needs have been identified as important in the needs assessments, the public access assessments and a survey that was posted to the FDLP community site.

To coincide with the development of the training curriculum for FDsys, we anticipate procuring an online training

software that will replace OPAL, as well as serve to meet your needs for virtual training.

And finally, we are working on public access to court electronic records, or PACER. Through the needs assessment and conference discussions, we've learned that fee-based agency databases are of very great importance to you all.

PACER is an access and education program that partners with depository libraries to provide the public training on PACER's court records, including the court opinions, as well as to provide training on how to manage PACER accounts.

We are currently beta testing this program and the development of training documentation is underway, and we are looking for volunteers.

All right. So, to sum up what we've talked about here, we've listed a lot of Library Services and Content Management's current and ongoing projects. We've also briefly discussed where we get our ideas and

input from.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

All right. We're going to wrap up early, I think. Do we want to take a half-hour break and come back early? Okay. I'm seeing Robin nod her head.

So, let's come back at - I'm sorry.

Questions?

(Laughter.)

MS. DAHLEN: Ask Kristina. Did you all have any questions?

Actually, that reminds me. Please submit your biennial survey. We kind of wanted to wrap this up by saying if you don't submit your survey, we're going to send Conan after you.

(Laughter.)

MS. DAHLEN: Okay. So, I say we wrap up early here. Come back in a half hour.

(Applause.)

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 9:44 a.m. and resumed at 10:22 a.m.)

DR. GIVENS: Is everybody ready?

Yes? Okay, good.

So, we're starting Part 3, and I'm Cherie - am I too loud? Okay. Okay, that's it. I guess I'm leaning in.

Okay. So, I'm Cherie Givens. I'm from Education and Outreach. And to begin this session, our collaborative session, I'd like to briefly recap what efforts we already have underway to address the concerns of the community.

We've examined the responses of biennial surveys, depository library surveys, public access assessments, discussions at conferences just like this one, and of course including this one as we move forward, one-on-one meetings, and we've examined the reasons given by libraries that have dropped out of the program.

In response to this, we have implemented projects that provide greater access to information on FDsys, made program requirements and regulations more concise, we've increased cataloging services and

cooperative efforts, increased efforts to improve collection development and management tools, and developed an FDsys curriculum, and are in the process of procuring a learning management system in order to make that information accessible to everyone. But now, it's time for us to work together to shape the future of the FDLP.

We're asking for your participation to provide quantitative data to document and support the most pressing problems that are faced by FDLP libraries.

We need to come to consensus about the key issues that the FDLP library share, and to better understand and document the unique issues that are faced by certain states and regions, and also by certain library types.

We're seeking to document the issues in context and to build a foundation of both quantitative and qualitative research that will allow us to factually and conclusively support the need for changes.

GPO plans to analyze this information and use this more in-depth and comprehensive assessment of the current state of the FDLP libraries as a foundation for the national plan. It is also to serve as a basis for clarifications, reinterpretations and possible revisions to program regulations and requirements.

We're seeking information from all library types, and for all library types to have an equal voice as we move forward with this discussion.

We need your help in forecasting. We are trying to get the fullest picture of what is going on across the nation.

We want to know what initiatives are going to be implemented and to help GPO to determine how best to assist libraries and determine what changes are most crucially needed.

We are in the process of completing our forecasting template and will be presenting those elements to you today, and we

are seeking input to perfect this tool. We want community input into how we should go about filling out the last pieces of this.

And coming to this session, we will be discussing the type of information we're seeking, why we're seeking it, and asking the community questions to help us to refine and perfect the tool.

We also plan to do a pilot test of the questions with different types of libraries in the FDLP program to make sure that we're asking the right questions, and that we get back information that can help us to bring about change.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Our current targeted date for responses to the forecasting questions is June 30th, 2012.

In addition to the time that we'll have today to discuss these issues, GPO is providing an online community area for your questions and to seek advice as you create your own FDLP state forecast templates for your state or region collaboratively.

There are many benefits to completing these aside from just simply assisting us and being a part of the change that will happen.

By completing an FDLP state or regional forecast, you're not only helping us, but you're helping to better identify the issues in your own library and to provide documentation in a quantitative manner that can support what's going on. It can be a vehicle to inform others of the most pressing issues that your library is facing, and to bring this to your parent institution or library.

In uniting in this endeavor, we can shine the spotlight on the issues in context, and it may be a useful mechanism for providing change even across your state.

We have a new administration and we have a new opportunity to work together to address these issues, and I hope that you will join us in doing so.

In addition to Kathy Bayer and Mark

Ames who have worked diligently on the development of the FDLP forecast model and research and examination of collaborative efforts, we are pleased to have Blane Dessy from the Library of Congress. He has kindly agreed to facilitate this session for us.

And before I ask him to come up, I'd like to tell you just a little bit about Mr. Dessy's background.

Blane was appointed Executive Director of the Federal Library and Information Center Committee and the Federal Library Network at the Library of Congress in June of 2010.

Prior to this, he had been Director of Libraries at the United States Department of Justice, and the first Executive Director of the National Library of Education.

Blane came to the federal government after working as a state librarian, a deputy state librarian, a library consultant, and a public library director. So, he brings quite a wealth of information

and expertise.

He is currently also an adjunct instructor in management at the Catholic University School of Library and Information Science.

So, to start our discussion about this collaborative endeavor, I am pleased to welcome Mr. Blane Dessy. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. DESSY: Thank you, Cherie, and thank you all for being here. I took off my jacket, because this is going to be a work session. So, it's going to be a lot of fun.

I want to start by saying how impressed I've been this morning by the FDLP staff. I've known several of them for a number of years. But just in talking to them over the past week or so and getting ready for this, and then being here and hearing their comments this morning, I, as an outsider, sort of that disinterested third party, I am really impressed by the dedication of the staff that is here today and the work that they have

done.

Sometimes when we're outside of the Washington area, we think what do they do? Why are they doing that? Couldn't they be doing something more effective for us?

But I just want to thank you all for the efforts that you make as staff to really make this program better and better every day. So, I just had to get that off my chest. Okay.

I also wanted to say that I am a librarian. I've been in lots of different types of libraries. Actually, many of the libraries that I've worked with have been depository libraries. So, I've dealt with the issues of depository libraries, but I am here as that disinterested third party.

I'm not here to tell you what is so good or what is so bad. I'm here to engage you in a conversation about what we need to be doing over the next two years.

And what I really want to impress upon you this morning if I can get my bully

pulpit out, is that this program is yours. We do have this wonderful staff working here, but this is -- the ongoing success of the FDLP is dependant upon you and your energy.

So, just as the staff here has been very committed to this, I really want to ask each of you, if I may, to become just as committed to seeing that the work that gets done is really of the best level and that each of you commits to making it as successful as can be.

So, this is the time for you to take ownership of the process and to really make it work and to support not only each other, but the staff here in Washington, D.C.

So, I'm going to take you through a few pieces of information. We're going to stop along the way, because we have microphones set up because we do want to elicit information back from you.

I've already been told that Mark

Ames has just lots of things he's dying to

say. And so, I've given Mark permission just

to sort of jump in when he feels so moved, or anybody else, for that matter. All right?

If you can't wait to say something, just stand up and say it. And I can deal with that, okay?

So, what we want to do is we want to have the community members, that's you, determine the needs of your libraries and your constituencies within your state and your region.

This is going to play up to a national strategy, okay? And that means that each of you has a role to play.

Can we flip through to that map real quickly - or the chart. The pie chart. There we go.

I want to reiterate a point that Mary Alice was making earlier this morning. There are many different types of libraries in this community. All of you play a role, right? All of you bear some responsibility for making this a successful activity.

And if you've felt like you've not

had a voice before, if you feel like you can't be heard because the larger libraries are taking up all the air in the room, this is your time.

So, whether you're with an academic library, a public library, a state library, whatever, this is really an opportunity for you to become invested in the future and to really make your voice heard.

So, I just want to reiterate what Mary Alice said. Everyone needs to be heard in this process, okay?

So, let's move on. And all of those, I should say, are going to be weighed equally. All of those inputs are going to be weighed equally by the staff when they get those results. So, the results will not be skewed one way or the other.

I've got so many charts up here and notes. I have to tell you the staff was exceptional. They gave me more notes and charts to work from. So, I'm sort of multitasking.

And I must tell you I have to have Cherie up here, because I cannot speak and advance PowerPoint at the same time. One time was giving a presentation and Ι speaking, and I was supposed to be advancing. And Ι was twenty minutes into the presentation and had never advanced a single So, that's why I have Cherie who's slide. going to keep us on target here. Okay.

So, let's talk about creating that FDLP state forecast, okay? We really need your help to identify the pressing needs of the libraries in your state. That's very important.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Now, earlier we heard the usual litany of needs that every library has. And I've heard it since the day I got out of library school, right? And, I mean, I can predict the future. You'll tell me it's money, staff and space.

And if I were to ask you that twenty years from now what are the pressing needs of your library, you would say money,

staffing and space.

I think we all get that. There's never enough money, there's never enough staff, there's never enough space.

However, I don't believe that can be all of the needs that you may be having. And this is the time for you to think creatively about what some of those other needs might be such as training, the impact of technology, rethinking your collections, rethinking your collaborations.

So, what are some of those needs? You need to think creatively about what those are and really not contain yourself to that big trio that we hear about time and time again.

The other value of doing this type of activity is that it shows the value of your depository within your own organization. As librarians, we also feel we never get enough respect, right? No one knows what I do, no one appreciates me, I'm off in some wing of the library, no one cares.

This is a chance for you to break that mold if it exists in your organization. Talk to your management. Talk to your colleagues. Talk to your users. This is a chance for you to take that leadership role in helping to think about the future.

And you can talk about the value of free access to government information and how it really does make a very positive impact in people's lives.

So, you can use this not only as a way to gather information. You can also use this, and I'm real big on this, as sort of internal or even an external marketing tool.

What do we do? Why do we do it?

And here's why it's important to this organization. Start thinking about that as you think about the future of your libraries.

How are we doing, Cherie?

DR. GIVENS: Good.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Working together.

So, let me give you some of the ground rules for this.

First of all, you have to work together, right? That means if you've not talked to some of your fellow FDLP members, you should. And you should do so regularly, right? You may not always agree, but you should keep those lines of communication open.

In fact, I might even go so far since I'm doing this extemporaneously, to suggest you should also talk to people in libraries who aren't in the FDLP program, because maybe they could use some of the expertise that you have or they could use some of the information that you have.

So, I know we were talking about getting all the FDLP members in the state to work together, but let's think big. Maybe there are people not in the program that need to be consulted about what you're doing. And there are avenues for you to do that, okay?

So, we need you to work together.

And I think most of you probably have some familiarity with that. We need you to be concise. Mark was ranting about that just a

few minutes ago.

I believe in the notes that Cherie had given me, the staff is asking for five pages, right? Front and back, five pages. Ten pages of content, five pages of print; is that right?

DR. GIVENS: Yes.

MR. DESSY: And since we're all trying to be green, duplex it. That's a good idea, okay?

(Laughter.)

MR. DESSY: They should be one inch on either side, an inch-and-a-half on the top, and an inch-and-a-half on the bottom. No smaller than 14 point font.

(Laughter.)

MR. DESSY: Some of us have old eyes, right? And now I've lost my train of thought. I got so consumed in thinking about margins.

Now, I'm saying do I need to really talk about like color and stuff like - no, I don't. I don't need to do that at all, but

they need to be concise. These reports need to be representative of all the libraries in the state.

The idea is that you in your own library, are going to fill out this form which is going to be available on the website around November the 10th.

So, I don't want you taking the handout you got this morning and rushing home immediately and putting pen to paper. You should look at it, think about it, but the actual form becomes live around November the 10th and it will be on the website.

The idea is that each of you in your own library working with your colleagues, is going to do that. Then as a state group, you're going to come and it's going to be merged into a larger state summary.

So, the final result is going to be fifty summaries - do the territories count?

Okay. Fifty-ish summaries will be coming in to be reviewed and analyzed by the GPO staff, okay?

Now, I understand, and, Mary Alice, you can correct me if I'm wrong, you're going to be asking the state library agencies to be the coordinator for this?

MS. BAISH: We're asking them for their help.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Because it's sometimes hard, well, who's in charge? Who's going to really do the synthesis? Where do I send this thing once I get it done, etcetera, etcetera.

So, your state library agencies will be asked to assume some role in that, but all those little details will become clearer around early November, okay?

So, this is a chance for you not only to think about your own library and your own constituencies, because remember we're public service, right, your constituencies, but it's a chance for you to talk to your peers about the state as a whole and where things could be made better or made different.

And the idea is that you would

start in November, have this completed and sent to GPO in June of 2011.

MS. BAISH: June 2012.

MR. DESSY: June 2012. I just finished Fiscal Year 2011, and I can't make that transition.

Which means you have about six good months, probably. The holidays are coming up. People are going on vacation. If you really think about it, it's maybe about six months of realtime, six or seven months of realtime for you to do your own, do your synthesis and get that in to GPO.

So, it's time to start thinking, and it's time to start thinking very, very creatively.

Does that make sense? I think that's the first part - oh, go back. I forgot GPO is going to take those reports, analyze them, summarize them, address issues and make some predictions about the future.

When I teach management, what we really call this is the environmental scan.

This is knowing your environment, knowing your community.

When I was hearing about the biennial survey earlier this morning, I was thinking, well, that's really telling me about the libraries.

Now, we want to hear about you and your relationship to the community, which is a much different type of conversation that GPO wants to have with all of you. And in some ways, it's perhaps the more important conversation that we all need to be having as we move forward into the future.

Okay. Everyone cool, calm and collected? Do you see the point of why we're trying to do this? No? Yes? Give me some feedback, because there's a quiz at the end of this.

(Laughter.)

MR. DESSY: All right. Your future is hanging by a thread.

Okay. So, that was the introduction to

doing the plan, and now we're going to walk through that a little more specifically and - let's start with that.

So, what do we mean when we say what is a forecast? And again, I think you have the actual template in front of you on some colored piece of paper. It's a handout. It's in blue - it's on yellow. I'm sorry.

Yes, sir.

MR. SUDDUTH: Before we move on, I just wanted to ask a question.

MS. BAISH: Use the microphone.

MR. SUDDUTH: There it is. You've mentioned two levels of information. Most of it is state, but you've also mentioned region.

MR. DESSY: Right.

MR. SUDDUTH: And so, is region a really defined area of which forecasts are going to be done, and who's going to do the forecasting for the region? And is region within a state, or is region within a group of states?

MR. DESSY: Okay. I'll tell you

what I think, and then I'm going to turn it over to the experts, right?

To me, a state is a state.

MR. SUDDUTH: Well, I mean, I'd agree with that.

MR. DESSY: Right? I know it sounds simplistic, but I kind of have to set the terms.

To me, a region generally means one or more states in collaboration, but that's my definition of it. However, we do have staff here who can probably give you a more explicit answer.

MS. BAYER: We're asking each state to do a state forecast. For those in Hawaii and Florida, we're asking you to work with the territories. It would be fascinating to see a territory forecast. And they will create that information and bring it to the state.

For the action plan that's coming up after the forecast, we're asking for plans from the current area served by regional depositories.

So, for example, Maryland serves D.C. and Delaware as well. So, we would get an action plan from those three, or they could create their own action plan per state.

But for the forecasts, we're looking for a forecast from each state. And then Hawaii and Florida can determine whether or not they want to include the territories.

MR. SUDDUTH: Are other entities going to be asked for action plans since there are groups of libraries that work together? Is that going to be included or possibly included?

MR. DESSY: When you say other groups, can you be a little more specific?

MR. SUDDUTH: Consortia.

MR. DESSY: Okay, consortia.

MS. BAYER: Well, actually we're asking you to include information about that in your action plans.

MR. SUDDUTH: Okay.

MS. BAYER: We'll be getting there a little bit later, but that is exactly what we

want to know.

MR. SUDDUTH: Okay.

MS. BAYER: We want to know if, say, all 49 states want to go to Hawaii and work with Hawaii.

(Laughter.)

MS. BAYER: Just for an example, we want to know what consortia you have, what consortia you're planning, and those kinds of things.

MR. SUDDUTH: Okay. Because within states, there are certain areas where there are, what, nine depositories around St. Louis. There are eight to ten depositories in the Atlanta area. I mean, I could see where that would apply too.

MS. BAYER: Actually, that's a precursor to information you're going to hear later in the day, yes. So, you're exactly right, Bill.

MR. DESSY: Did that answer your question, sir?

MR. SUDDUTH: Thank you.

MR. DESSY: Any other questions before we proceed? Bill broke the ice for us. So, thank you for doing that.

(No response.)

MR. DESSY: Nothing else, okay.

Let's keep moving.

So, let's talk a little bit about what we mean when we say a forecast. And, again, the forecast over the next several months is going to be occurring at two levels, right? The individual depository level, because you're all going to be asked to sort of do one for your own organization, and then the larger state forecast.

So, think of this - I'm only going to be sort of going through this once, but you need to think of it as it occurring twice, in a manner of speaking.

So, a forecast really contains those components that we think about when we're doing those environmental scans, those community analyses, those strategic planning documents. And the first one we want to talk

about are the economics of your situation.

Do we have a separate slide for that, or no? I thought we did. Thank you. Thank you, Cherie.

So, even though I've said I already know none of you have enough money, we're going to ask you about money anyway.

What is the status of your budget?

And by that, we mean your individual library's budget. Is the X library's overall budget going up or down? And, again, I think that's going to be - that's going to have to be just a loose projection perhaps.

And then the question becomes, well, within that, how is your depository program fairing?

Is it rising proportionately? Is it declining proportionately? Is it being shrunken disproportionately, etcetera, etcetera,

So, we need to know a little bit about how your library is fairing financially and how your depository program is fairing

financially.

And I would think when it comes up to do the state level, there will probably be a broader statement about the overall economic status of libraries in that state.

MR. AMES: And I just want to make it clear that we're not asking you to tell us what your budget is. Is it going up, down, or is it remaining static?

We just sort of need to know the trend. I want to make that clear that you don't have to go out and get all these sort of financial figures. Just give us a trend up, down, or static. That's what we're looking for on that.

MR. SUDDUTH: Thank you.

MR. DESSY: I bet we can all guess what we'd say, right?

(Laughter.)

MR. DESSY: All right. We also want to know about the economic health of your communities. It's a hard time in America. A

lot of communities are depressed. On the other hand, some communities are thriving. So, is your community on its way up, holding its own, or on its way down?

Again, as Mark had just said, we're not looking for real specific economic indicators, but we're looking to see what is the overall financial health of your larger community.

Now, when we get to the state level, it might be a little trickier, because there can be pockets of affluence that are bursting open, and there can be probably some very severely depressed economic areas.

So, I would think at the state level it's going to get a little more complicated, but still can be kept to a fairly simple description.

Continuing education

opportunities, I'm assuming this is for library staff, not for the community at large, right? So, do you have opportunities for continuing education?

I know when I've spoken with Mary Alice and some of her staff, the issue of training comes up again and again and again. We need more training. We need more localized training. We need training on our desktop computers. We need training on an as-needed basis. We need short tutorials.

So, what source of opportunities are you getting for continuing education opportunities? And again, are you seeing an increase? A decrease? Tell us.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Can you go to the mic?

PARTICIPANT: All types of continuing education within the library?

MR. DESSY: Or just FDLP.

MR. AMES: Mostly we're looking for the sort of financial levels of support that you're getting as a coordinator to go and get continuing education or government info.

We really want to narrow it.

That's very specific to your situation at the library and what sort of financial support you're getting for continuing education.

MR. DESSY: What we're trying to tease out of this is the continuing education financial support.

MR. AMES: Yes.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Not so much ten programs versus five programs, but is your continuing education budget going up or down, or do you have a budget, right?

Okay. Thank you for asking that.

That's an important distinction to make,
because that's another financial indicator,
okay?

And then we also want to know about anticipated impacts or risks such as changes in the services offered, the service model, staffing, collection development or other.

The question here is, given what you've just told us about your financial situation, what's that leading to? Is it leading to less staff; do you think? Is it leading to less collection development? Fewer hours for public service?

Many libraries are cutting their

hours. So, does that mean that public access to this information might be somewhat more limited than it is?

This is sort of your summary laid out Now that we've statement. the economic information, what's that really translate into for us?

Yes, sir.

WOODS: So, just from MR. а practical standpoint -

MR. DESSY: Sure.

MR. WOODS: -- I have some concerns about the questions that you're asking.

MR. DESSY: Okay.

MR. WOODS: And the fact that because you're asking us about economic indicators, all of us are going to do this differently. And it seems like a lot of that information like demographics, economic indicators, population decrease, increase, all of this is out there.

MR. DESSY: Yes.

MR. WOODS: And if you have a single

22

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

person that is going to standardize the way that information is collected, you're going to get a better sample, consistent sample of our areas with the same methodology as opposed to having us go out there and do it in different ways, in different mechanisms.

I can see asking questions that the information is not out there like the Census doesn't have it or the economic indicators aren't out there.

MR. DESSY: Yes.

MR. WOODS: But it seems like some of those questions you're asking us, the information is out there.

MR. DESSY: There you go.

DR. GIVENS: Okay. So, I would like to address that because part of this process is for us to get your opinion of what's going on.

Obviously, we're all librarians.

So, we can all gather this information. And

I'd like to think that since we've all had

research methods classes and some education in

that, that we won't be getting that far apart on it, but what we want to know is your perception of what's going on.

Because just as important as the information itself, it's a good understanding of what people feel is going on. And also, it's looking at the different types of libraries within your area. And we don't have the access to that sort of information.

Yes, we can get state forecasts that would tell us this, but can we get it for the public library? No.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. DESSY: Well, I mean, let me just jump in here as the facilitator. I mean, understand exactly what you're saying, because a lot of this is sort of statistical data that may be available. But what I'm always interested in hearing about program manager, the perceptions. are Regardless of what the facts may tell me, what are the perceptions?

Are people feeling optimistic about the future? Are they feeling pessimistic

about the future? Is the glass half full, or half empty?

And I think that's also what the staff here wants to hear. They want to hear how you're feeling about the future of this program, the future of your library, the future of your community, things like that. So, thank you, sir, for that comment.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. ORTH-ALFIE: So, just a point of clarification. You're asking more for a narrative of - rather than just a bunch of statistics?

DR. GIVENS: So, we're asking for a combination. None of these questions is asking as for giving your precise budget. We're asking do you feel it's going up? Is it going down?

And, yes, we assume that you would look at some of that information, but it's, yes, it's going to be a short narrative as well because what we're trying to do is a mixed methods study where we're getting both

quantitative and qualitative information to get the most comprehensive picture that we can to make decisions about how best to assist libraries.

MR. DESSY: Right. For example, I could imagine if I were asked that question, I might say in looking at my past five years, our budget has either declined on a certain percentage through each of those years, our budget has actually had level funding, which means I've lost all sorts of purchasing power over the past five years, or over the past five years I've seen incremental growth of one to two percent per year.

I think that would - yes, ma'am.

MS. HODUSKI: Bernadine Abbott Hoduski.

I think it's important to also get the data on the institution that they're part of.

If you're at Harvard or Columbia with a great big endowment for your institution, it's certainly a different

situation if you're at the University of Montana where there's no endowment.

MR. DESSY: Yes.

MS. HODUSKI: And so, just because the library level or the documents level budget is not increasing, doesn't mean the institution doesn't have a lot of money.

MR. DESSY: Correct.

MS. HODUSKI: They have chosen how much money they are going to devote -

MR. DESSY: Correct.

MS. HODUSKI: -- to the library. They may be building a new football stadium rather than a new library.

So, unless you put it all in context, you're not going to get a true picture.

MR. DESSY: Right. Well, and I think that's what the GPO staff would like to see. If you have that context to add, then please do it.

I mean, again, as you said, your particular program might not be seeing any

growth at all. But if you're at an Ivy League school that has billions in an endowment and is doing very well and they're building all sorts of things whether it's football fields or medical labs, I think you can add that in to show the context of the situation in which you're dealing.

So, I think that's why not only do we want some of those numbers, but we want to hear maybe a little bit of what's behind those numbers.

MR. AMES: And the place to put that sort of narrative, just to be specific, is under anticipated impact risk, okay, to be very specific of where we're looking for that to show up.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Are there any other comments before we move on? Because now we're moving on to demographics.

(No response.)

MR. DESSY: I feel like I'm back in library school. We asked you about money. Now, we want to understand a little bit about

the demographics of the communities that you're serving. The same type of thinking.

Is your population staying the same? Is it changing? Are you in a rapidly-growing metropolitan Sun Belt area? Are you in a slowly-shrinking Midwestern Rust Belt situation? Are the ethnicities changing? Do you have a rapidly-growing Hispanic population or Asian population?

We need to hear something about the community that you're serving, okay?

MS. BAYER: May I interrupt just for a moment?

MR. DESSY: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, it's you. I was looking in the audience for someone.

(Laughter.)

MS. BAYER: I completely forgot, and I really do apologize. I'm Kathy Bayer at GPO. And for the sake of our court reporter who has to work doubly hard, if you could state your name and institution, that was my fault. I forgot to do that when I spoke.

1	So, just a reminder, and I'm sorry
2	to interrupt the flow, Blane.
3	MR. DESSY: That's okay. Any
4	comment is a good comment.
5	Yes, ma'am, and your name and
6	affiliation.
7	MS. WALSH: I can wait if you want
8	to keep going.
9	MR. DESSY: No, no, no, no.
10	MS. WALSH: Mary Jane Walsh, Colgate
11	University.
12	Over what time period do you want
13	to see these changes?
14	MR. DESSY: I would think - I think
15	we would like to see them maybe perhaps
16	starting in the last few years, and maybe
17	projecting into the future for a few years.
18	I know that's a very loose answer,
19	but I think we're looking to see where the
20	pattern is going.
21	It seems like I didn't answer your
22	question. Mark, or Cherie?
23	MS. WALSH: It would be really

useful if we had a hard number so we're all working on the same time frame.

MR. AMES: Sure. I'll just go ahead and state - Mark Ames, GPO - I wouldn't go any further back than five years, and don't go any further forward than five years on your projection on that.

MR. DESSY: Does that help? Okay. So, you've got five years back, five years forward.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. McKNELLY: Michele McKnelly, University of Wisconsin, River Falls.

We have officially designated congressional districts that our depositories are supposed to serve. But in my instance, that has absolutely nothing to do with reality.

And so, when we're forecasting, can it be the reality rather than the official designation? Thank you.

MR. DESSY: You got that? We like reality.

(Laughter.)

MR. DESSY: It can be any reality you choose, I guess, you know?

(Laughter.)

MR. DESSY: Okay. It has to be the officially sanctioned Mark Ames reality. How's that? Okay. Yes, ma'am, over on my left.

MS. SMITH: Mary Paige Smith, Nova Southeastern University Law Library. I just have a question about the purpose of this presentation/discussion.

It seems like we all want very specific things. And it seems like the people who are presenting, you all are - just have kind of vague parameters in mind.

So, my question is, will we be getting more specific parameters before we are required to produce these forecasts?

MR. DESSY: Do you want me to take a stab at that, or would one of the staff prefer to?

MS. BAYER: Hi. Kathy Bayer, GPO.

We hope to get some feedback today based on the preliminary information that we're sharing for each section. And we have a projected date of sometime in early November of when we're going to get all of the specifics posted up on the FDLP Desktop, but we do plan to have everything specific up there for you.

This is just an opportunity for discussion today for you to tell us what we're obviously missing.

MS. SMITH: Okay. So, we can stop asking specific questions.

MS. BAYER: Kathy Bayer, GPO.

Please ask specific questions, because that will help us know what we need to share in the instructions information.

MR. DESSY: But what I'm hearing is that you would like the directions to be as specific as possible.

Is that sort of the general consensus that I'm feeling in the room? Okay.

I'm hearing this rumbling. What does that

mean?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. HALE: This is Kathy Hale, State Library of Pennsylvania.

That is a resounding yes.

MR. DESSY: Okay.

MS. HALE: Because if we're going to do this in the time period that you are allotting to us -

MR. DESSY: Yes.

MS. HALE: -- the more specific that you are to what you want from us, the more those at state levels, regional levels, the regional librarians, can go to their selectives and say, this is what we want from you when you work with us, because I'm sure that we are going to get these questions pounded at us.

MR. DESSY: Okay.

MS. HALE: And the more that we can point to specifics, the better for all involved.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Point well taken and heard. And I see the staff writing

furiously as we're speaking.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. AMEN: Kathy Amen, Blume Library, St. Mary's University, San Antonio, Texas.

I agree with Kathy, the other Kathy, but - there's a lot of Kathys around here. But I don't think there's any reason not to have open-ended questions as long as you're clear in the instructions about what you want us to do, what you want us to give you.

MR. DESSY: Right. And I think, too, the data will tell us - well, the data will tell the GPO staff one thing, but I think what's going to be just as interesting is to hear how you in your library or you in your states are interpreting that data, right?

We can figure out the population and the ethnicities and the - I mean, that's all fairly straight forward. But what's intriguing, at least would be intriguing to me is, what's that really mean for you?

What hardships does that pose for you, or what opportunities does that pose for you, or what sorts of changes are you going to have to be making over the next period of years that we need to think about longer term for Title 44 and what that's all about, right?

So, again, yes, I think the staff heard clearly that you all want specificity, but you would be remiss if you didn't put your most well-informed opinions along with it. Okay.

DR. GIVENS: I'd just like to add that in addition to the feedback that we're getting here, we're also opening a forum. And if you think of any questions along these lines that you would like to give to us in terms of feedback, we would be happy to have it and help us to further refine the tool.

So, this is not our only opportunity, but we're writing down everything you say now and we'll go through the transcripts as well. And we definitely would like to get as much feedback as we can to make

it the most comprehensive tool that we can.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Yes, ma'am.

MS. GERKE: Hi. Jennie Gerke, University of Colorado, Boulder.

MR. DESSY: Yes.

MS. GERKE: I'm just remembering that 2009 biennial survey that we all guessed answers to.

(Laughter.)

MS. GERKE: And it might be useful in addition to these, like, what do you want this for? In that final description, why are you asking us this question?

So, I'm at a regional, and we just put down the population of the state. It's, you know, because if we know what you want, what you're trying to do with these numbers, then we can give you a better number. Thanks.

MR. DESSY: My overall impression is this data gathering is going on, this information gathering is going on so that it can be analyzed by the GPO staff here and really be used as a basis to have more

informed conversations about changes to Title 44, right?

So, this is sort of the data gathering so that when you all come back together and have future conversations about where you're going with that particular part of the code, you'll have some data that you can talk about or some projected scenarios that you'll be able to talk about as you think through those issues.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. MORIEARTY: Hi. Jill Moriearty,
University of Utah.

I know you're going to have a cover letter stating exactly that, but I want to make it real clear I'm going to fill this out with my team, but I'm going to have to run it through at least two layers of administration.

And they're, honestly, going to ask me all of these similar questions, and they want it in one or two sentences. Why are you doing this, why do I need to see this, and what does this mean?

MR. DESSY: Okay. So, you want to ensure that there's some very clear explanatory language about not only this task, but where it fits into the larger planning strategy.

PARTICIPANT: Yes, jot it down for our administrators.

(Laughter.)

MR. DESSY: You notice the person who said that didn't identify his name and institution.

I'm just teasing you. I'm just teasing you. I happen to be an administrator, and actually I concur with that.

Actually, if you can give it to me in like three sentences, that's really fine, right?

MS. MORIEARTY: No, it's fine. But if I could have a half-hour or an hour, I'm going to include this, but I'm also going to pass other things too.

MR. DESSY: Okay, okay, okay.

MS. BAYER: That was Jill Moriearty,

University of Utah.

MR. DESSY: Well, and it sort of goes back to that sort of internal marketing that you can have with your own administration about why this is important, why we're part of this larger movement, why it's really going to have a positive impact on the future of the institution, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library.

I know the turnaround time is very short, but are you going to do any testing with actual people who will be filling this out?

And if not, I think that would be a great idea even with the short turnaround.

MR. DESSY: So, you're asking about the possibility of a test?

MS. JARRETT: Right. Just like you've done with the biennial survey this year. Some people looked at it before it went out, and some actual people like the people in

this room.

MR. DESSY: Okay. I'll turn that over to the staff for an answer.

DR. GIVENS: Hi. Cherie Givens, GPO.

Yes, we are going to do a pilot where we send these questions out to each of the different library types to get feedback on exactly that before we release our full tool, the completed tool.

But in addition to that, we're also hoping to solicit feedback not just in this forum, but also online so that we can have the best chance at making it comprehensive and at making it something that we can really use to give us conclusive answers.

MR. DESSY: Now, would people who aren't actually part of your pilot, be able to comment on the form now?

DR. GIVENS: Yes.

MR. DESSY: I mean, was that grammatically correct?

DR. GIVENS: We welcome feedback

here, online and up until it's completely released, because our goal is to make it the best possible and not simply to just release it at a certain date.

We have our goal time on when to release it. Because the quicker that we can get rolling on this, then the better our chances of getting things made in a timely manner.

But, certainly, to have it be accurate would come before having it be timely.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Yes, ma'am.

MS. CHUA: Hui Hua Chua, Michigan State University.

Am I correct in understanding that GPO will not receive the individual responses from individual libraries, and only the state forecast?

I ask, because I can see myself answering this for my institution in a very different way from what other libraries in the state would answer. And as such, I can spend

as much time as I like putting in as much contextual information, but it will not be reflected in the final state forecast.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Let me ask the staff how will that be consolidated at the state level to ensure that every library's unique voice is heard somehow?

DR. GIVENS: Cherie Givens at GPO.

That's an excellent question, and it's one that we have thought about. And what we're hoping is that you will do each one for your own library, and then come and meet and have agreement for what you're going to send out.

But in addition to this first step, we're also going to be doing focused interviewing, which would be a qualitative step to add a different level of information knowledge.

And, certainly, I think we would welcome if you feel strongly that your opinion would not be or has not been adequately represented at the state level and you want to

go ahead and sent those in. By all means, do. MR. DESSY: So, group а librarians could in addition to sending you to the state summary, they could attach their individual library reports. Did you all get that? Okay. Yes, ma'am, and then we'll come back over here to my left. MS. WALSH: Mary Jane Walsh, Colgate 10 University. Hamilton, New York. I'd like to go back to something 11 that was said earlier and get clarification on 12 13 where we send these reports. Ι heard the higher education 14 15 authority in our state, or are we supposed to 16 be sending these to the regional? Who's coordinating that state plan action? 17 And sorry, Michigan. 18 19 MR. DESSY: You're asking about who's coordinating at the state level? 20 MS. WALSH: Yes. 21 MS. BAYER: Kathy Bayer, GPO. 22

We're asking that you send a state

forecast and an action plan, and we have yet to share information about how those two connect, to the Government Printing Office.

MS. WALSH: No, the state plan.

MS. BAYER: The state plan, just to be sure about terminology, is something that's completely separate from this. A lot of states do have state plans. They tend to focus on service guidelines.

MS. WALSH: Okay. A vocabulary issue.

MS. BAYER: Yes.

MS. WALSH: And I may be jumping the gun, but we as individual libraries are going to fill out a forecast. Then somehow we come together and have a state forecast, all right?

How is that coming together? I thought I heard something about the higher education agency and the states coordinating that.

MS. BAYER: This is Kathy Bayer at GPO.

We envision that you decide the

group that will do that, but we encourage all federal depository libraries to be involved.

So, for example, if you've got a GODORT-like entity within your state or an entity called GODORT, that may be the organization that does that. Some states actually have a group of depository libraries that got together and created a state plan.

So, you decide within your state how to do that.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. WALSH: All right. So, us dysfunctional states are in trouble.

MR. DESSY: But I think I may - so, it would be helpful then to explain that also in the material that's put up on the pages as to how - now, Ι know that someone had mentioned to me they were going to be talking to the state library agencies for the types of assistance they can provide. But all that material will all be explained in more detail when the final things are put up on website.

MS. BAYER: This is Kathy Bayer,

GPO.

We are asking you to report to us fairly soon what organization is going to be working on this within each state. And if there hasn't been a group that has come together within a certain period of time, we'll certainly be working with you in your state.

MR. DESSY: Yes, ma'am, and then yes, sir.

MS. MALLORY: Mary Mallory,
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, and
Kathy may have just answered my question by
reading my mind.

But in Illinois, and I'm sure this is in the case in some other states and regions, we have a Coordinating Council, a Government Documents Coordinating Council.

So, my question was at what point would they come into play and what role would they have?

And in Illinois, for example, I can't give you an exact percentage, but some

of the people who are serving on the Coordinating Council are not depository librarians. They may be university library administrators. They may have other roles.

So, their interpretation of these reports from the individual depository libraries may differ from what those of us who are direct depository information providers might like to see in that report.

So, I'm concerned about this. And I also wanted to add that - will you require that the final report for each state be publicly available to all of the rest of us, including the people in the state? Thank you.

MR. DESSY: Okay. I'm taking the nods from up here at the head table, that, yes, the reports that are submitted will be made publicly available. That's an affirmative on that.

And I think, too, that because there's so much variance among the states, that perhaps it's going to be up to each state to sort that coordination issue out. But I

also know that everyone here from the Federal Depository Library Program is going to be there to provide technical assistance to you.

So, as you start to move through this process if you find that you're having some difficulties or you're trying to determine who's the best body to help organize this, the staff here will be very happy to help you with any of those issues.

MS. MALLORY: Could I just - oh, I'm sorry.

MR. DESSY: I'm sorry, no. Finish your thought.

MS. MALLORY: I just wanted to ask that then when this meeting takes place instead of just the Coordinating Council be there, are your expectations that every depository coordinator who has prepared one of these reports, will be in the room at the same time as that final report is determined?

Is that your image of this?

DR. GIVENS: Cherie Given, GPO.

I think that would be fabulous, but

probably somewhat unrealistic.

MS. MALLORY: Unrealistic, okay.

DR. GIVENS: So, no, we're not anticipating that, but it is our hope that coordinators of like-type libraries will talk with each other.

What we want ideally is not to have one group giving the opinion of what will be the forecast for the state, but for everybody to have an equal voice. And it's okay if everyone doesn't agree.

This is what we want. But I think the idea of having the - releasing the information back and if you don't feel that you were accurately represented, to be able to send us that information as well, I think, is a good solution. But I'm certainly open to any other ideas and to discussing it.

MS. MALLORY: Thank you very much.

MR. DESSY: Yes, sir.

MR. GAUSE: Rich Gause, University of Central Florida.

I think it would be a good idea if

you received - built into what you want is to actually receive each of the individual institution's responses, because the consensus document for the state might have specific opinions that could have been reflected in it.

And to say, well, if you disagree with what your state consensus report said, could put some people in a difficult position of trying to, poof, push their response forward.

If you just received it, then you could actually see that yourselves.

DR. GIVENS: Cherie Givens, GPO.

Well, I must say that I am just thrilled to hear this. When we first were planning this, it was our thought that this would be - that if we asked for that very thing, that we might get a lot of pushback.

I am just thrilled if you want to send us all the individual ones. I think that would make the data so much richer and give us a broader prospective. And, yes, we'd be happy to take them.

MR. DESSY: So, you'll talk more about that when you put out the official materials. Okay. Thank you, sir.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia.

There are a lot of federal libraries in Virginia, and I just wonder how you plan to deal, you know, are federal libraries going to be asked to do this as well?

MS. BAYER: Kathy Bayer, GPO.

All federal depository libraries are going to be asked to do this. There is no distinction on library type.

MR. DESSY: Well, and, gee, if FEDLINK can help you do that, we'd be happy to do that. We talk to all the federal libraries. We work with about 2,000 federal libraries worldwide.

So, we can certainly if we can get our muscle behind the GPO project, we'll certainly be happy to do that.

Okay. Yes, ma'am.

MS. RAWAN: Atifa Rawan, University of Arizona, Tucson.

I'm questioning the categories of the forecast. What's most important to me are issues these days where it's hard to find information or legal in political situations. And those are the ones that are impacting the economic issues, and as well as other factors; population, migration.

And so, I'm wondering if you can do the grouping and categories such as that, that other things could be grouped together with that.

I mean, when we talking about legal issues, nowadays there are a lot of issues related to copyright, trademarks, legal issues like illegal immigration and how it impacts the population and so on and so forth.

So, I'm just questioning just the validity of this grouping of the forecast.

MR. DESSY: Well, when we get towards the end, you're going to see that

there's also sort of an open-ended question which is what didn't we know enough to ask, right?

So, if there are legal battles swirling around your library or your state, if there are those sort of issues, there is a place for that information for you to add.

So, if you think that copyright is going to be a major issue, then I think you need to put that in your report and here's why I think copyright is going to be a big issue.

I'm not a copyright expert. So, I know nothing. But if there are issues like that that you think need to be voiced or to be heard by the FDLP staff, then I think you need to build that in.

So, even though there might not be a specific line item for that particular issue, if it's important to you, it's important to the staff here.

How's that? Yes, ma'am.

MS. CLARK: Kirsten Clark from the University of Minnesota. Kind of just two

questions.

You mentioned the state agencies or state libraries - state librarians. Seeing as I talked to mine last Friday and this never came up, I'm really wondering have these conversations happened with these agencies already? Where is that in the process of this?

Because the piece I'm trying to conceptualize is we have system in place with the regionals and selectives where the regionals have, you know, they're the ones that in many cases pushed forward on the state plans and the things that we're already doing in terms of a region or state.

And I'm really getting the sense that that's not necessarily what you're focusing on here. That in many ways, the regionals and selectives are kind of being we're all at the same level, we're all, you know, everybody's comments have the same voice.

So, is that where the state agency

piece is coming in as kind of like that outside entity to ensure that everybody is on the same voice?

I guess I'm really confused as to where that's fitting in and especially as I haven't heard anything when I just talked to the person last week.

MR. DESSY: Right. And maybe - I maybe misspoke. I know that Mary Alice is going to be attending the next COSLA meeting in Santa Fe in the next week or so, I believe. And it's her intention to speak with the state agency directors about this project and what role they can potentially play in it.

So, it's not been presented to them as an unfunded mandate for a state library.

And some state libraries, I think, may choose to have more or less involvement.

I mean, I think every state library is a depository of one sort of another.

GROUP: No.

MR. DESSY: No. Oh, God, no.

(Laughter.)

MR. DESSY: So, I guess it's going to be up to that particular state library agency to decide what their role is going to be, but it is going to be presented to them and we'll work that out.

So, if you want to tell your state library agency director he may be hearing about this in the next couple of weeks, you could probably do that.

Okay. Let's see. Who was first?

Yes, to my left. Go ahead.

MS. MALLORY: Mary Mallory,
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, and
I apologize for belaboring this.

And this issue may not be an elephant in the room for too many people, but I've been carrying this elephant around with me in my back pocket all week.

And how will you sort out the responses from the individual institutions that may be coming from the depository coordinator versus coming from the library administration?

MR. DESSY: So, the question is, how will we distinguish between these reports completed by a depository coordinator versus a report compiled by a library director?

MS. MALLORY: It's not so much that the director or administration would compile it. It's that they will - I assume that most of us will have our reports reviewed by the library administration. And if they feel compelled to revise or edit it, I wondered how, you know, they may have one point of view. I might have another, for example.

I just wondered if you're anticipating that and what that means. And I guess I'll leave it at that. Maybe it's just something to think about and maybe I'm the only one who's concerned about this. Thank you.

MR. DESSY: I mean, Mark is saying it is something to think about. Speaking as a real bureaucrat, we people here in Washington always have to be very careful about respecting the autonomy of an institution.

So, it's going to be an issue, but I don't know that a federal agency can dictate who has the final sign-off on a particular report that's submitted that way, but that's my own answer.

Yes, sir - oh, I'm sorry. Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry.

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia. I guess I would just like to sort of second what Kirsten Clark said.

I do hope that regionals are involved and I hope that we have the ability to listen to every library in our state and not force a particular way for that to come out.

MR. DESSY: Right.

MS. SELBY: I think many selectives and regionals around the country would believe that is perfectly possible. And we already have the relationships in the states with the depositories that would that the world were perfect, but the director of the state libraries may not have those same kind of

relationships.

MR. DESSY: Exactly. Exactly.

Well, I think there's this desire to gather the information. But as we know, every state is different. And I think some of that's going to have to be done at the local or the state level so that it makes sense for you.

And I think that's where the technical assistance from the staff here can be very beneficial in working with you to make that happen.

But, again, just to keep going back to that point, everybody has a voice here. Whether you're at a small public library, a major academic library, a regional depository library, everybody has a voice. And we just need to ensure that every voice is heard.

Yes, sir.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, University of Notre Dame.

Coming from an academic institution, this process is somewhat familiar. I think it's going to be critical

the GPO articulate the purpose of this.

Because what I'm hearing here in terms of some of the concerns and it's going to be edited by my upper administration, we don't have a coordinating body that we can do, you know, this is the group that we got together, is exactly the type of information that is important to GPO to have to synthesize.

If we know that, and Dan hinted at it in one of his three points that he made, we have to speak with one voice with - Congress just wants to know what is it you want? And it's not, well, I want five options. You pick which one I want.

The information that we're giving them will feed in to say, you know, we haven't got a snowball's chance of any consensus of anything based on data that's going forward. And that if we wish to receive and get to one of Dan's points, which is we have to go forward with the plan, we have work behind the scenes that we're going to have to accomplish.

And I think that's part of where are we going with this? What's the information we would like to get? You need to be able to see how we're going to get it to you, because the conclusion is going to have to go forward to, in essence, finally get this 50 different ways and different options and umpteen things, you put it forward.

So, I think critical is going to be exactly with what people have been asking for. Give us the purpose, the type of information that you want and we'll do our best to get that communicated to you as best we can.

MR. DESSY: Thank you. That's a very nice thing to say. Yes, ma'am - I'm sorry. Yes, ma'am, and then the lady in the red scarf. Go ahead. I'm sorry, I don't know your name.

(Laughter.)

MR. DESSY: I had to identify you somehow.

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

I just want to say for the record, Wisconsin doesn't have a state library. Yes, Mark knows that.

I am excited about this process, but I will say - and I am one of the regionals in our state.

Some of my libraries don't ever comment on anything. It's like pulling teeth.

And I keep saying I come here and I represent a big - I have been at a large academic institution. And that's the perspective I can give.

I need you guys to tell me what a public library can give, and it is hard. Some of these - some people don't have much time to think about it.

So, the justification and any kind of carrot that you can give to smaller selectives to say and, you know, we are going to use this information and it just - just me saying they want to hear from you several times, is not going to do it.

I have some ideas, but anything GPO

can do to entice libraries to participate - and just that you guys understand that we have, you know, I keep hearing every library's voice will be heard.

I just have libraries that don't want to say anything.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Thank you. And that's kind of one of the interesting issues I think many people will be facing. And that's what makes this such an intriguing issue, because it's how do we energize everyone to want to contribute something to this process.

How do we get those people who are usually silent, to participate? And that's a very intriguing question for me.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. SANDERS: I'm Ann Sanders from the Library of Michigan.

I'd just like to suggest that we're hearing over and over again that every voice will be heard. And I understand that every state has its own, for lack of a better word, politics about who speaks and who doesn't and

who speaks for who.

And I think GPO has already given themselves a very effective vehicle for addressing that when Cherie said that they would be conducting interviews.

A lot of the kind of concerns that are being expressed here about does it come from the coordinator, does it come from the institution, I don't have a state library, you know, all of those - and some people don't want to talk and you can't make them, all of those things can be addressed, I think, very effectively by GPO through the interview process once they get the information from the states about their environmental scan.

And I think it's built into the process, and I think we're kind of belaboring the point to no end.

MR. DESSY: Right. And what's going to happen is once these reports come in which will be due in June of 2012, GPO is then going to take a reasonable amount of time to analyze those reports. And I'm sure there will be

many, many interviews, calls, follow-up conversations about what was meant or what, perhaps more importantly, was left out.

So, yes, ma'am.

MS. TATE: Vicki Tate, University of South Alabama.

I'm in one of those states that has two regionals, one of which currently does not have a depository coordinator and will not be filling that position any time soon. So, we are down to one regional effectively.

My request to you is to make sure that these transcripts that you're compiling from this meeting be published before you put this out.

I'm the only one from Alabama at this meeting. So, I'm going to be talking to my regional and let him know what's going on. But I think it would be helpful to make sure that all these comments that are coming through are available for those who have not been able to attend these meetings, to know what's going on and what the issues might be.

Thank you.

MR. DESSY: So, you would like to see the actual transcripts, not just summaries.

MS. TATE: Whatever the - don't you normally do transcripts for some of these things and that's the reason why you're getting us to identify -

MR. DESSY: Oh, yes, yes.

MS. TATE: I'm assuming those will be available on GPO, right? Okay. But do it in the near future, not six months from now when we've already had to deal with it.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Point well taken. Yes, ma'am.

MS. STEWART: Tammy Stewart,
Missouri State University.

I would just like to ask a favor, and it may be a silly favor. But the first thing I can hear my director saying is, why are we doing this? We just did the biennial survey.

So, can you please make it clear

why this information is needed in addition to the biennial survey?

MR. DESSY: And make a clear differentiation between the biennial survey and this data-gathering exercise.

MS. STEWART: And it's purpose.

MR. DESSY: And it's purpose, okay.

Okay. We've got to move on, because I've got to get you out of here by noon. I believe that's your lunch hour, and it's already 25 to 12:00.

So, this has been great, by the way. We're always concerned is anyone going to say anything at all? And the fact that you're all being so engaged -

(Laughter.)

I mean, what you'll see as part of the forecast document, there are other pieces.

There are issues that we would want you to address, but you already have those.

So, we're going to jump ahead to the state-focused actions and the national strategy, right?

Now, this is where those individual reports are being put together into the state-focused action plan. Am I stating that correctly? Okay. And it's the green handout.

So, everyone pick up that green sheet of paper, right? So, this is taking those state documents that you - or those individual documents and - let me see here. Yes, and then building that synthesis document.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

it And states you can see specifically here, state and regional initiatives. That should be built into the state-focused action plan. And then that's going to build into the national plan, which again is going to be used to inform conversations about the future of Title 44, okay?

So, we're building up. We're starting at the grass roots, and we're building up to the state.

So, the state-focused action plan.

And, again, I want to reiterate I think Mark

had told me this is the five-page, doublesided, state-focused action plan.

We want this to build on the issues identified in your state forecasts. If every one of your individual reports paints a very gloomy economic picture, we need to hear that.

If there are bright spots in the economy in your state, and there are depressed areas, that needs to be identified in there.

The state-focused action plan needs to be representative of the entire FDLP community in the state or region, but I want to harken back to the comment made by the gentleman from UCF that you can attach your individual plans so that if you feel that there are things not being described or put out there forcefully enough, you can do that as well. But the state plan is meant to be the overview.

And the state plan should also include those initiatives for all the libraries or initiatives that specific types of libraries want to take. That is, what are

you going to be doing? What do you think you want to be doing over the next, let's say, five years?

MR. AMES: It's listed right on there. We're looking for the next one to five years, the initiatives you're going to be taking. So, there's your time frame.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Is this making sense so far? Okay. You want to click to the next one?

about initiatives, but what specific goals you want to have over the next several years for your state or regional, how those goals are really going to strengthen the role of the FDLP in an improved service to the public, and how you're going to develop and maintain federal government information, reference skills, expertise and services.

So, these are your summary statements, I suppose. When you look at all those individual plans, what can you say about the large group as a whole in terms of

initiatives, goals, training, public access, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera.

Again, while GPO wants to have data, I think what GPO also wants to hear is what do you as a group of people in a particular state, see your future as being, all right? What does the future hold for you? How boldly do you want to move into the future, or are you just too browbeaten to do anything other than survive the future, right?

I would suggest you go with the former. Okay. Moving on, Cherie.

And then an example of a state initiative is all federal depository libraries will have appropriate collections and expertise so as not to put too much burden on any single library.

And then the steps following from that would be determining needs in areas of expertise, distributing materials to each other, develop reference service, develop best practices for question referral. Sort of a shared or virtual reference system, perhaps.

So, that's what GPO is trying to get a sense form the states about - or the regionals. Okay.

Now, this is, again, just to reiterate, this is all supposed to be done and to GPO by June 30th, 20102. Don't really start putting pen to paper until you see the material officially on the website in early November.

And since the staff here has been taking really copious notes, there will be a lot more material on the webpage in early November explaining the why's, the how's, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. Okay.

I'm sorry. Go right ahead.

MS. BAYER: This is Kathy Bayer,
GPO.

I'm not familiar with forecasting and action plans. I had to have my very knowledgeable colleagues go through an example for me to really understand it. And we tried to provide some examples on the yellow and green handout.

So, just summarizing the process, you at your individual library develop your own state forecast. You find out the data about the economy. And then you go a step beyond that, a step beyond the data that's publicly available nicely from the U.S. government in many cases, and you list risks or anticipated impacts on that.

So, for example, there are - you anticipate your population is decreasing and anticipated impact is that your collection is no longer going to serve the federal government information needs of the community served.

So, then you take that, synthesize all that into a state forecast, one document.

And then you create one action plan. And you take all of those RISKS and anticipated impacts that you've created - is that correct?

I've got it.

You take all those RISKS and anticipated impacts, and you develop initiatives based on those.

And you can - this is where you list or describe what consortia you have. You could say I'm going to utilize the existing consortia, or I would like to dream up this new consortia or collaboration that is going to serve this purpose.

So, we need the forecast to go into the action plan, and the action plan develops into the national strategy.

I hope that clarifies. I certainly wasn't familiar with these tools before.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Oh, I see people have questions.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. WALSH: Mary Jane Walsh, Colgate University. Thank you. That answered the second of my two questions. The first is a comment.

June 2012 is the end of my fiscal year. My fiscal year has already been plotted. This is a lot of work in a very short period of time. I think you've given us too little time.

DESSY: Okay. The staff MR. taking, I mean, I don't - I cannot speak about that issue, but I'll turn it to Cherie. DR. GIVENS: Cherie Givens with GPO. I will take that back and ask if we can make adjustments to that, but ultimately those are decisions that are handled at a higher lever. And we will certainly post that if we are able to get an extension. 10 MR. DESSY: Okay. Yes, ma'am. MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University 11 of Virginia. 12 A couple of questions about the 13 initiatives. I'm assuming that these - it's 14 15 kind of blue-skying. So, we don't necessarily 16 need to be restricted by the current legal environment? 17 18 MR. AMES: Correct. 19 MS. SELBY: And my second question oh, you want to say more, Mark? 20 MR. AMES: Mark Ames, GPO. 21 Correct, blue-skying. 22

(Laughter.)

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, UVa.

And my second question, I guess I'm little - so, you take the risks which the economic climate, include all The initiatives, I mean, I guess I'm things. - are the initiatives also supposed to be sort of blue-skying if we could do these things, or should they be really grounded in what we really can realistically do even if it's not even if it's outside the current law, but you see are they aspirational? Is that what you Which then sort of maybe makes it seem like we could do more than we actually could, or are they more this is realistically what we really need and can do, if that makes sense.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

DR. GIVENS: That's a great question. Cherie Givens, GPO.

That's exactly what we want is a realistic assessment of what you think you can do, because that will give us a better idea of what we can do to further support you so that we can work in collaboration.

MR. DESSY: Yes, ma'am, and then to

my left, and then to my right.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. MONGEAU: Deborah Mongeau,
University of Rhode Island.

This is so much like the strategic initiatives and goals and action plans that I've had to do for my director, for the university, for the Board of Governors.

We are experiencing - this will be Number 4 that I'll be working on in the past year. So, there's a lot of strategic planning fatigue going on at my institution.

And my director is going to say the first thing he's going to say is, what are
we doing this for?

So, I want to reiterate that not only does GPO have to articulate what they want this for, but the more detail the better.

So, if we have details of deadlines and dates and what we're expected to do by these certain dates, I would like to ask if GPO can come back and say once we get this information by next October 1st, we're going to do X with this information, we'll be

reporting it out. By December 30th, we'll be writing this up and doing whatever.

MR. DESSY: Okay.

MS. MONGEAU: It's got to be the more detailed, the better. Because I know the first question I'm going to get is, what are we going to be doing this for? We've already done this. Been there, done that, and this is just yet another layer on what we've already been doing.

MR. DESSY: Right. Actually, I heard two thoughts in that. One is the more detail, the better.

MS. MONGEAU: Yes.

MR. DESSY: But what I also heard you saying is that GPO needs to commit to really doing something with this and reporting back to you all with it.

MS. MONGEAU: Yes.

MR. DESSY: That this just doesn't go into a black hole in Washington, D.C.

MS. MONGEAU: Yes, exactly.

MR. DESSY: So, you want GPO to

23

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

commit to you to do something meaningful and productive with it.

And I think they said that, but we'll just put it on the table again.

MS. MONGEAU: It's a two-way street.

MR. DESSY: Right.

MS. MONGEAU: I mean, we're being asked to do a lot of work, and to do it in a certain time frame.

MR. DESSY: Right.

MS. MONGEAU: I think it would be nice if we know that once this was done and we did our part, that GPO would be stepping up to the plate and there would be a detailed plan of what they would be doing with the time frame, what they would be doing with this information.

MR. DESSY: Right. I think GPO would be more than happy to make that commitment to you.

Yes, ma'am.

MR. AMES: Wait. Mark Ames, GPO.

MR. DESSY: Oh, I'm sorry.

21

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

MR. AMES: I just respond that what you're talking about, strategic planning burnout, at my old public library we went through this every three years. And so, a lot of it go ahead and draw on as much of that as you've already done. You don't have to start all over again. Those of you who are in that 9 situation where you've done a lot of strategic lot of information 10 planning, you have a available, bring it in. Bring it in to what 11 you're doing at your individual level, okay? 12 13 Reduce the amount of, like you said, strategic planning burnout that you're going through. 14 15 MR. DESSY: Okay. Yes, ma'am. MS. MALLORY: Mary Mallory -16 MR. DESSY: Oh, I'm sorry. Who had 17 18 a comment? 19 DR. GIVENS: Sorry. MR. DESSY: Cherie. 20 Cherie Givens, DR. GIVENS: Yes. 21

The only caveat I would add is that

GPO.

because for us at this moment it's unknown how many forecasts and action plans we will get in, if as we've heard that some libraries may be sending their own, this may complicate our ability to give a firm date on when we'll be able to have all the data analyzed and moving forward with that.

It is our plan to do that. But if we get fifty, that's very different than if we get 1100.

MR. DESSY: I'm sorry.

MS. BAYER: This is Kathy Bayer,
GPO.

I just want to reiterate the purpose of us asking you to do this. We know it is a lot of work. It's going to give you an opportunity to network with all of your colleagues, though, too, which has a lot of side benefits, but we're asking for this information to gather things that we don't know.

You may think we know them or we may know pieces of them, but we need to know

information from each state so that we can put it together into a national plan.

So, that's the purpose of us asking you to do this.

MS. DESSY: Okay. Yes, ma'am. You've been very patient.

MS. MALLORY: Oh, Mary Mallory.
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

It sounds like - was it Mary Jane?

She was asking for a timeline. So, I think
that would be great if you gave us a timeline.

But I wanted to say is please don't delay this process. Move, if anything, move up all the deadlines to the end of May.

(Laughter.)

MS. MALLORY: There are entities out there who are making strong statements. And they are having an affect, or they may not have an affect on all of us, but they want action.

Please do not delay this process.

I really think it would be useful to move the date up to May 30th, 2012, and not have it at

the end of June during most of our fiscal years.

I really encourage you to think about that as hard as that will be for everyone.

MR. DESSY: Okay.

MS. MALLORY: And the other thing I wanted to say is that I love forecasting and I think it's wonderful that you're doing this.

And I should also add a P.S. that I've had my trip completely supported by the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign library dean Paula Kaufman. And she is very supportive of access to government information.

So, in that our remarks are going to be published for all -

(Laughter.)

MS. MALLORY: -- for all the world to see, I really love my job and I do not want to go home and find out that I do not have a job. Thank you all.

MR. DESSY: You're welcome.

(Applause.)

MR. DESSY: Yes, sir.

MR. GAUSE: Rich Gause, University of Central Florida.

I think that it would be important when people are filling out their institutional responses, not make it requirement or an expectation. But if they have ideas for the action that will be in the state plan, that they actually be - there be somewhere for them to prepare those and submit those as well so we don't get to the table in April with a group that's trying to pull things together and doesn't have something already - some ideas already ready to go forward.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. DESSY: Okay. Good observation.
Yes, ma'am.

MS. ORTH-ALFIE: I have sort of a general comment, I guess.

MR. DESSY: Your name and -

MS. ORTH-ALFIE: Oh, I'm sorry.

Carmen Orth-Alfie, University of Kansas.

As I understand it right now, the whole, big purpose of this is to broach the rewriting of Title 44. Am I understanding that correctly?

In light of that, I see this whole process as a major learning opportunity, education opportunity not only for our own community, but for everybody else, and to try to get input from all those other libraries out there and raise awareness.

So, I think that we should be trying to push the awareness of this as much as we can at our conferences that we go to, and every opportunity we can to let everybody know we're doing this.

And I just want to say I went to the excellent workshop on the Federal Register yesterday. And I really would encourage you to make this announcement this is happening, in the Federal Register.

And also when you start gathering information and get comments, summarize it and get this into that whole process, because one

of the challenges we have is to have people be engaged in our government. And I think we should also use those same mechanisms.

MR. DESSY: Thank you very much. Yes, ma'am, and then we'll go to my right, and then to my left.

MS. McGILVRAY: Jessica McGilvray,
American Library Association.

As Dan said, speaking in one voice will be most effective with Congress. So, I'd like to encourage everyone to work within the associations that you're members of whether it's ALA or AALL or whatever. So that when the time comes, we can all come together and be supportive of one plan. Because that's really what's going to get the most response from Congress.

And if you are a member of ALA and you want to be a part of that process and you want to have a voice, please come speak to me, because we're going to have to create some process within the ALA to do that.

MR. DESSY: That's greatly

appreciated. Thank you. To my left, and then to my right. Yes, sir.

MR. WOODS: Okay. So, what you're going to get - oh, Steve Woods, Penn State.

So, what you're going to get form this is a consensual document. Consensus in a state. And I'm imaging my dean being willing to sign a consensus document like that. Each administrator is going to have to weigh in. We sort of talked about this before.

I guess what I don't understand is why are we afraid of that elephant in the room, ARL, who has sent out a pretty strong statement?

Why not have them, why not have public library associations and American law library associations also do what they think is a forecast?

If we give them a voice, then I can say to my administrator that's where you - the ARLs can communicate or ACRL can communicate their thoughts about the program and where it ought to be going.

be really handy This can providing a consensus, but I think that the reality is that academic library an is different than а state library. Ιt is different than public library. а Ιt is different than a law library.

So, being able to get those needs and have them do this in that context, I think, can be a lot more helpful than just a consensual document.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. DESSY: So, can I ask - sir, don't go away, because I need to get a better handle on what you just asked for.

Are you suggesting that GPO reach out to each of these various professional associations and enlist their support in doing this?

MR. WOODS: Yes.

MR. DESSY: Is that what all, I mean, I captured what you wanted?

MR. WOODS: I know that not everybody in this room wants that, but that's what I was saying.

MR. DESSY: So, you're saying reach out to the ALAs and the SLAs and the ARLs.

MR. WOODS: The ARLs, the ACRLs.

MR. DESSY: And recruit them to help in this effort?

MR. WOODS: Ask them to provide a cohesive, supportive document in what they think the future of FDLP ought to look like.

MR. DESSY: Okay.

MR. WOODS: And what they're looking for.

MR. DESSY: Okay. I just wanted to clarify it. Thank you very much.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. McKNELLY: Sort of along those lines it would be very interesting to go to the - Michele McKnelly, University of Wisconsin, River Falls - to go to the State Library Associations because when we're talking about this, we continuously -- I'm hearing depository libraries, but there are huge numbers of public libraries and school libraries that are not represented in our

particular program that are very dependent upon the type of information that we provide.

And we miss out school libraries every time. And as far as I can tell, they're not getting a lot - they're not getting the ask I most states. And they need support and they need materials.

And if we ask them, I think they might answer.

MR. DESSY: Thank you very much.

One last comment, because we have to break for lunch. Yes, ma'am.

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University.

It concerns me that you can't even get responses from all the depositories to the biennial survey, which is legally required. So, I know there are going to be depositories you don't get a response, you know, the individual forecast from.

I wondered if perhaps a neighboring depository person might be willing to volunteer to go visit and do sort of a Kinsey

style interview with the library director or whoever they could get an appointment to see just to sort of pull some input out of the nonresponding libraries.

MR. DESSY: Okay.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

DR. GIVENS: Cherie Givens, GPO.

I think that's a fascinating idea.

And I would say that we would certainly welcome that, but that we would need to know that that was how the information was obtained so we'd have a better sense as we go through it, but I think that's wonderful. Thank you.

MR. DESSY: Okay. So, just to start wrapping that you can all up so have pleasant lunch, this has been just wonderfully productive session. This did just what I think the GPO staff wanted it to do, which was to lay out some ideas and to have you respond to make it an even better process. So, thank you for all that.

More information will be shared on the FDLP Desktop. There will be a form provided for further discussions, and where

will that form exist, Cherie?

DR. GIVENS: On the community side.

MR. DESSY: Okay. And then FDLP-L will be another channel of communication where you can find more information.

I would encourage you, though, since you all know these folks on a first-name basis, don't hesitate to call, write, whatever it is, but thank you so much for your commitment to this process.

(Applause.)

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:58 a.m. and resumed at 1:39 p.m.)

\_

\_

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

1:39 p.m.

MS. BAYER: I'm very pleased to see you come back for the afternoon. If you have been here since Monday, especially pleased to see you on a four-day conference. And if this is your first day here at the conference, welcome.

For the next 45 minutes, we're going to share some information just to give you teasers, information that we hope gives you some ideas as you take the risks and anticipated impacts from the forecasts and

decide upon initiatives for your state-focused action plans.

These are just a few ideas. We could have spent four days talking about all of these possible activities. And the Council did quite a bit of this, and there was lots of discussion, of course, about the future activities in the Program throughout the conference.

But we're just going to give you a few ideas here as we talked about the forecast this morning, and then transitioning over to action plans.

But before Mark and I discuss a few things that we've been working on, we wanted to give you a reminder of the current state of regionals and selectives with the existing models.

And since the Council, Depository
Library Council Regionals and Selectives
Interest Group has already prepared this,
prepared it for their presentation on Monday,
we asked them at the last minute if they could

help us out and give this overview.

And if you weren't at the session on Monday for regionals and selectives, of course this will be new information. But we kind of wanted to put everybody on the same page here with this information so that if you've been working within one state for a while, you're very familiar with one model, but just want to give you reminders of all the other models out there that you may consider to incorporate into your action plan.

So, we really appreciate the participation of Arlene Weible from the Oregon State Library, and Stephanie Braunstein from Louisiana State University.

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Okay. I'll go first. Stephanie Braunstein, Louisiana State University.

And before I recap the statistics that I shared with everyone on Monday, and for those of you who may not have been here on Monday, you will hear them for the first time, I'd like to draw your attention to the nice

pie chart that you were provided with earlier that has on one side the large pie. But if you turn it over, you see there is a drops by library type graphic there.

And that notes that of course the largest number of drops have been by public library. And it's kind of hard to read this, actually. And academic general is the next largest size. And of course this corresponds in many ways to how many - obviously, the ratio is going to be consistent with how many of this type of library is actually in the system anyway.

I also want to point out the note in here is that the data is from mid-2008 to September 2011. So, when you pick up the information that I have that's more simplistically statistical, this actually picks up the following month in October of 2011.

And as of that date, this is the current situation with regionals that have either dropped completely out of the system,

or dropped to selective status.

And there's only been one regional depository library as of this point that has dropped completely out of the system, which was the State Historical Society of Wisconsin.

And this happened in 2002.

However, since 1970 there have been 11 regional depository libraries that changed status from regional to selective.

And starting back in 1970, that would be the State Library of Massachusetts; the Nebraska Library Commission in 1985; the University of Arizona, 1987; the Wyoming State Library, 1990.

And there is a footnote on my format here that says Wyoming had contracted with the state of Colorado for regional services up until 2008. But since 2008, Wyoming has no longer been served by a regional depository library.

Going back to my other list, in 2006 the Detroit Public Library dropped down to selective. Portland State dropped down to

selective in 2008. New Mexico State Library, 2008. Denver Public, 2009. Clemson University, 2010. University of Nevada, Reno, 2011. And then the State Library of Michigan also in 2011.

Which leaves us at this point, with a list of three states that are currently not served in any capacity by a regional depository. And that would be Wyoming, Nevada and Michigan.

So, this kind of gives you a sense of where we are status-wise in the regional dropping to selective category.

And Arlene is going to go ahead and give you some more detailed information about some of the issues that are state-centered.

MS. WEIBLE: Well, thank you, Stephanie. Arlene Weible, Oregon State Library.

During our session on Monday, we talked - I was fortunate enough to talk about one of the models that happened in the state of Oregon to cope with the decision that was

made by Portland State University to drop from regional status.

And that was, you know, our plan to shift the regional to the Oregon State Library, and then execute a series of housing agreements with partner libraries to share the regional collection.

So, that's one model, a way of coping with a library who is no longer able to fulfill all of the responsibilities of the regional. It was the solution we worked out in Oregon.

There are certainly many other models for how regionals are providing all of the services that they're required to do in states and we could spend a lot of time talking about each individual model.

But I think what I wanted to do for this talk, is just kind of talk about some of the themes in the way that libraries are collaborating to provide regional services for the depositories in the state.

We talk a lot about - when we talk

about regionals, we talk a lot about collections. But I think sometimes we forget about the fact that regionals are really required to provide services, as well as a collection.

And I do think that there are many opportunities for regionals that are under stress, to look to other institutions within their state to assist them.

That's one of the things that we did in Oregon when we knew that -- when we decided that we were going to take on the responsibility of being the regional, we knew we couldn't do it without that kind of support.

One of those services that regionals obviously provide is the oversight of the disposal process in the state. So, that was one of the issues we solved by spreading the responsibilities of the disposal process among the four institutions that were partnering with the collection.

Another state, Missouri, has

recently put together not necessarily a similar kind of agreement, but has been working with a library within the St. Louis area to help them coordinate the disposal process for the St. Louis area to help maintain the integrity of the collection in that geographic area of the state.

And this is all within the purview of what regionals can do. They are responsible for designing the process for the disposal process in the state.

So, there are lots of opportunities out there to look to partners in the state, and I think that those are just two examples of what can be done.

Another aspect of regional service is providing outreach and training for depository libraries. And I have to say that while there can be formal agreements about that, you could actually theoretically even outsource that aspect of regional service to another library.

I think all of us understand that

that kind of outreach and training service has a very long tradition of being collaborative in many states.

I don't think in the history of the State of Oregon, we've ever really relied solely on a regional coordinator to help us with providing training. We've always tried to do that collaboratively with using our State Documents Interest Group within the Library Association or, as we know, there's all sort of flavors of that throughout the state.

And I think that that's another area where regionals really have an opportunity if that isn't the case in your state, you can really try to exploit those kinds of situations where you can really get people to help identify your training needs, and then help deliver those training needs.

We have really good experts in the Census. For example, in Oregon at University of Oregon, we let them do the training. We don't - I don't even try.

So, I think that those models are out there. And while they can be formal with formal agreements, and maybe in some cases they really need to be formal, there are also good things about informal collaborations.

And I think what I would say, is that I think GPO has done a really good job at least in my experience, to really encourage those kinds of different ways of thinking about providing regional services.

I worked with them a lot when we worked out our situation in Oregon. And I know the folks in Missouri obviously worked with GPO as well.

So, I think that there's a lot of opportunity to think about what we can do within the constraints of the current law, but then also imagine what we really ideally want.

And so, I do think that we need to look to each other to get ideas of what, you know, well, that worked in Oregon, and maybe that wouldn't exactly work in Oregon, but maybe I can take an idea from that to build a

model in my state that's going to work for my state and my situation.

And what the regionals need and what these institutions need is encouragement and support to do that. And that's what I hope we're going to be hearing next is some of those kinds of ideas.

MS. BAUNSTEIN: I'd like to interject one more bit of boring information.

Back to statistical information.

I didn't mention before that if you were wondering why after 11 regionals had - 12 regionals, essentially, had stopped having regional status and that at the final analysis there were only three states not served by a regional depository, in all but one case there was another regional in the state when the one that dropped from regional to selective status did so.

MS. WEIBLE: Or it transitioned to another.

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Right.

MS. WEIBLE: Like in Oregon.

MS. BAUNSTEIN: You guys are just different than everybody else.

MS. WEIBLE: Yes, I know.

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: And then at this point again as of October 2011, the remaining states with two regionals include Alabama, Louisiana, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Texas and Wisconsin.

So, we've still got that many - six states - I think I said "five" on Monday.

That's because I can't count on Mondays, but it's six.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And know from personal mУ experience Louisiana with having in two regionals, divide the state we geographically so that we have selectives who report primarily to me that are in southern part of the state. And Rita Franks who is in the northern part of the state, has a group of selectives, a fairly equivalent number, that report directly to her. But we work, again, very collaboratively on state plans. We have meetings two times a year.

share training.

And, again, as Arlene was saying, a lot of the training that we do as part of our regional requirements is done through the vehicles of our State Library Association.

And we have a GODORT for that. And we're very active in that.

And that's how we communicate frequently new ideas and new things that we feel our selectives need to know about that are in the program.

MS. BAYER: Kathy Bayer, GPO.

Thank you very much, Stephanie and Arlene. I think that was a very good summary giving you a reminder of the different options available to you.

You may be in a state currently that functions differently than Louisiana or Oregon, but their situation may be your desired outcome. Just something to think about looking at the other models out there, looking at new models out there, that may be your desired outcome as you go through the

forecasting and action plan process.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So, following along the theme of this all happens because of cooperation within the state, I just wanted to give you that little pitch again.

Getting together in your states for the state forecast and the action plan, provides you an opportunity obviously to coordinate with other library planning activities.

Ultimately, the goal is to provide improved or enhanced library services to your patrons, but it's also going to strengthen, we the relationship all the hope, among depositories in your state or your defined service area, and most likely, hopefully, strengthen the relationships with nondepository libraries as well who you'll be communicating with.

We know that most of the decisions you make about cooperation and collaboration are initiatives you take upon yourselves, because you know your local service area, your

consortia, your area served, and you take advantage naturally of these existing opportunities, or you develop new ones that make the sense for your community.

So, as you take advantage of these relationships, it's going to be very interesting to see what comes out of the forecasts and the action plans.

So, Mark and I are going to tagteam this just a little bit. We just wanted to share with you some of the projects that we're working on.

These are not currently in place.

I wanted to stress that, but these are some of
the ideas that we've been considering and that
are floating around.

We don't necessarily expect you to incorporate these into your action plans, but we just are sharing these to give you some ideas of the types of things that you may think about in terms of services for your state-focused action plan.

MR. AMES: Okay. Mark Ames, GPO.

One of the areas we're looking at is building relationships between the depository libraries in their area. And there are a number of libraries who are already doing this, and we're tracking what they're doing. And we're finding agreements between depositories and nondepositories concerning just training, allowing the nondepository librarians to take advantage of the training that's provided through the depositories.

We're also finding arrangements for referrals. Really good best practices for what happens when the nondepository gets a question that it just can't answer. They have formalized referral relationships.

By formalized, I've seen everything from a handshake agreement, to literally a shared service agreement between the two institutions at the directorial level.

And that also - that organization is also doing a shared website to delineate exactly what's going on. And in that particular case, the nondepository is doing

strictly state documents. And the depository three miles down the road is handling federal information. And they're referring each other back and forth, they are sharing training. And it looks like it's going to be a good model for their particular situation, because they're in such proximity.

And another relationship we've seen, as I'm sure you know, San Jose. We'll be looking into what San Jose is doing, because they're in the same building. So, we want to investigate how that's going along.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Other ideas we're thinking about is seeing if there's ways we can reach out to school media centers. Other types οf libraries where we're finding in informal conversations, that there are lots of libraries who would like to have the training and would like to have ability to pass harder questions on along, but we're seeing things where they feel as though they can handle 200 This is actually a number I questions a year. got from someone. And they had about ten they

need to pass along. So, we're trying to find a way to make that happen.

And we're interested in knowing what you guys are thinking. If you have ideas that you're doing, if you know of informal and formal agreements, please let us know.

We're just at the beginning of this and looking into it. And any help you can give us of things you're already doing is great. Things you're doing through your government information organizations at the state level that include nondepositories and trainings and things like that. Anything we can do and we can know about to help support these efforts, because we want to expand awareness of GPO products, awareness of the depositories, what kind of services you're making available. And we want to do it both formally and informally.

We think that this is a good way to raise awareness and use of the materials and your depositories.

MS. BAYER: Kathy Bayer, GPO.

You'll see network for reference and consultation on the slide. And of course there are already some existing services out there that provide some of these things.

Government information online certainly is something you may already participate in. And I don't know how many know, but if you go into the FDLP Community website right now, you can go onto the advance search option and use the drop-down box and identify those who - in the FDLP community who have self-identified themselves with certain subject expertise.

And then you can refine that with an additional field and, say, find all the experts within your state, for example. So, we're just thinking about expanding some of those services out there and promoting them to a wider audience.

Put on here FAQ for library staff use and identify subject matter experts. I went to the Cooperative Extension Service presentation, and I was just thinking it would

had a model be cool if we like cooperative extension service, or I'm sure you already have a lot of virtual reference models, service models already in your organization or within your consortia where you can identify some of the subject matter experts very easily, and then connect those with the patrons.

So, we're just looking at ways to expand this, obviously, with the goal of taking advantage of the staff, expertise in libraries which - and if we formalize this somehow - gives you a little bit more cache that you are the subject matter expert, say, in your part of the geographic region. And it also supports staff development.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I may not know anything about engineering, but I know how I can find my closest colleague who is an engineering expert and meet up with that person and learn more. Then I need to know how to make proper referrals back and forth between different libraries.

So, shared service agreements has already been discussed, actually, by a few of us up here. First of all, think about the selective housing agreement template that is out there now. And this is something where we would formalize more of these services that folks offer.

think this So, about beyond agreements that relate just to collections, and services just to those collections. regionals mentioned, our have as the responsibility to provide service the selectives. It could be that a regional may wish to set up an agreement on a temporary basis or even in a definite period of time, because the regional is going through a move may have suffered a disaster or and is currently not able to provide all of services.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So, another institution, maybe an institution where they have a very strong education program in the library, takes on the responsibility of the regional to perform

education and consultation to the selectives out there. It's sharing the responsibility and the expertise that way.

And certainly this isn't necessarily just between libraries, but it could also share the responsibility. Any cooperative arrangement could be focused on service to patrons as well.

So, as you look at the elements of the risks and anticipated impacts that are described in your state forecast and you think of the initiatives for your action plan, consider all the cooperative initiatives that you could take on which you believe would support and enhance the continued access to U.S. government information now and into the future.

So, you've heard about or been reminded about the current existing models for the regional-selective arrangements, but you may come up with new ones. It's going to be really interesting and exciting to see what you come up with June 30th.

And you've heard a few ideas about possible projects. And if you think back to all the discussions during the conference and over the years about some out-of-the-box ideas or new ideas, it will be really interesting to see what you come up with in the action plan for your state.

We definitely need you to participate at the state or at the level of the regional depository to contribute to the national strategy, which will be the next topic after a short break.

But before that, do you have any questions or any ideas that you have been thinking about that you'd really like to share that you think others may be able to wish to discuss or that you'd like to get feedback about?

MS. MALLORY: Mary Mallory, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Sorry, everyone. This is unheard of that I'd even come up to the mic once during a DLC meeting, but would it be feasible

to create a database of speakers both from GPO and also from agencies who would be willing to come and do training onsite?

And it would be useful to know if there are fees and those kinds of details not to make a cumbersome development of such a database, but I know in Illinois we're able to attract a much larger audience throughout the library system when we bring people from outside as opposed if one of the librarians are doing the training.

As sad as that is, people like to come and hear new people. So, that would be really, really useful, I think.

MS. BAYER: Kathy Bayer, GPO.

I think that's a great idea. Building upon reference subject expertise, having that list.

We started creating a list in GPO's education and outreach trying to identify the current federal agency training programs.

If anybody has already done that, we'd be very interested in knowing that so we

can collaborate on creation of that list.

I think there's been a lot of changes to federal agencies lately, too. So, we want to make sure we've got the latest and greatest. But I think that's a great idea, Mary, that you just had.

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia, not unheard of for me to come to the mic.

I guess I was just thinking as you were talking about this that because this is state-based right now, I mean, I just want to put in a plug for states to think beyond our state borders and to think about we're talking about cooperative, collaborative initiatives.

And even though these are statelaced plans and there will be fifty of them, I'm certainly going to be hoping that Virginia is also looking outside of our borders and thinking about participating nationally, and also regionally as in region beyond stateborder region.

MS. BAYER: Kathy Bayer, GPO.

23

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Thank you, Barbie, because that is exactly what we're looking for. We don't want to tell you what to do, but that is exactly what we're looking for.

Again, 49 states cannot all collaborate with Hawaii, although, as much as some of us may like to.

But if you believe your desired outcome is a collaboration with five neighboring states or whatever number that is, that's great. That's exactly the kind of thing that we're looking for.

Whatever model of service fits that, that's exactly what we're looking for. So, obviously that would make communication with the folks creating the forecast and action plan in those other states.

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. It would be downright unusual if I didn't get up to the mic a time or two.

One thing that I do in Louisiana, we have a state library association that has a

general listserv. Everybody in the association is on this listserv.

Once a week I post a blurb about a government resource, usually a website, or I'll pick a topic. For Halloween, I'll do bats and pumpkins or whatever.

And I post the same thing in my Facebook group, Gov-Stuff 4U. That's four, dash, U, the number.

And I've reached the school librarians and the public librarians, because everybody is on that same list. And it's unobtrusive. I think it's a little enough that it doesn't annoy people.

But because I have been doing that,
I now get reference questions a lot from the
public library people and the school. They
know me as the government person just because
I'm the one who's posting those things so that
I think if you have that kind of listserv,
anybody could be doing that.

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Stephanie Braunstein, LSU.

That's one of the things that we love most about Lori, is that she has that little feature that she sends out to what we have that's called Bayou Doc. That's also where we put our needs and offers at the very end of the process after the regional has decided what can be discarded and what cannot, what is allowed to be discarded at that point. Then, it goes up on this Bayou Doc. So, people have to look at that, assuming they're complying.

(Laughter.)

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: But, yes, this is something that Lori is like famous for this. I want you all to know that.

MS. BAYER: Kathy Bayer, GPO. I'm just going to follow up on that real quick.

So, taking that back to the forecast and action plan, if you have a risk or anticipated impact that shows that you may not be reaching a certain audience, and then your action plan is set up in a way that you can develop an initiative perhaps taking

advantage of social media or other avenues that reach that audience, that would be great. And an example of that is what Lori just described, if that is one of the desired outcomes.

MS. HODUSKI: Bernadine Abbott Hoduski.

I hope that when the explanation goes out to the library community and to others about the purpose of this data gathering, it is more than just to change Title 44 because there are a lot of interim actions that could be taken.

Because I went to work for the Joint Committee on Printing in December of 1974 with the goal of getting electronic government information to all depository libraries. Didn't happen until 1993. That's 19 years it took to get that bill passed with all the other efforts.

So, I'm not optimistic that you're going to get something done in less than four or five years, if you get it done at all. So,

I think that we need to include in there some short-term goals.

For example, if libraries are being stressed for space for their physical collections, GPO has a lot of empty space. The House Appropriations Committee has already pointed that out in the big, red building. They also have a facility in the very safe state of Colorado in Pueblo where it doesn't have earthquakes and floods and so on.

It may be contaminated, but it's not going to destroy the paper.

(Laughter.)

MS. HODUSKI: So, anyway, I'm saying that if libraries are very desperate - shush, Mr. Barkley.

(Laughter.)

MS. HODUSKI: If there are libraries that feel that they need to get rid of their paper collections and are going to go some other way for whatever reason, I think the GPO should be - is under the obligation to protect those collections because they are the

government's property.

They have a lot of space where they could store it until people come to an understanding they may need it back, or the digital infrastructure of this country may crash, all kinds of things can happen.

All of my techie friends keep warning me about what could happen. And so if - that's an interim step that could be taken to take those collections.

And so, there are other kinds of immediate goals like that that could be thought of and included. So, I hope that the focus is not just on trying to do what I think will be very, very difficult to do. Change the law.

MR. AMES: Okay. Those concerns are duly noted.

Is there anyone else who's going to have any questions at this time? We've got about five more minutes.

MS. SMITH: This isn't actually a question. Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana

University.

And I don't know if this is the appropriate time to share this, but I've been sitting on this idea since yesterday. And before I forget, I just want to make sure, I wondered if perhaps GPO could work with the Institute of Museum and Library Services to set up a grant program for only federal depository libraries to digitize the legacy collection.

And that somehow if the library would work, get the grant, send it off to be digitized, the files would go to GPO for ingestion into FDsys or their permanent server, and then the print would go to GPO.

And the library would thereby get the print out of their collection and it could be authenticated and cataloged and it would be digital. And the library would get money, but GPO wouldn't have to give it to them. And the library directors like when they get money. So, the library directors might like that and then get rid of print. And it might make

everybody happen and it would be collaborative and we'd all live happily ever after.

(Laughter.)

MS. BAYER: Kathy Bayer, GPO. Thank you, Lori, for following along the theme of collaboration. And I see Robin Haun-Mohamed writing.

MS. WEIBLE: Arlene Weible from the Oregon State Library.

I think I wanted to pick up a little bit on something Bernadine said in terms of we've got this big goal, but we've also got the ability to achieve little goals.

And I think this opportunity, and let's think of it as an opportunity that GPO is providing us, is to think both at a high level and our local level.

So, if the one thing you get out of this process is a small, little program like what Lori was describing, that's great. And I think we are achieving something and using the process that GPO is putting in place to help us kind of focus our thinking, but again I

really want to urge kind of the think smaller kind of approach as well.

What happened in Oregon was because of grassroots at our local level. And I think that that's where the greatest ideas are going to come. GPO is not going to give them to us. They're not going to give them to us. They're not ever even - they can do all the scans they want. They're never going to know exactly what's going to work in our states. That's our job.

And I really, really encourage those of you who are going to be participating in this process, to think of the small things that can be done to improve the access and improve our lives as working documents librarians. And then some of that can feed into Title 44 reform.

MS. BAYER: Kathy Bayer. Thank you, Arlene. That was perfect. Perfect summary.

We're always encouraging the folks who call us in thinking about changes in their depository, to update the local collection

development policy. The goal being that you want a policy and procedures related to it that meet the needs of your users at the library.

So, this is just thinking between interdepository and interlibrary level as you work on the forecast and state plans. You know your users best, and that's definitely an information gap that we need to fill in order to build the national strategy.

So, it's going to be really fascinating to see all of the action plans come back and the various initiatives. Thank you, everyone, for all of your comments.

And this was extremely short, but we just wanted to throw out some ideas and to get everybody on the same page in terms of the current arrangements and to remind you of other models out there and ideas for any initiatives.

You could build off a current service that we have in place for reference.

You could develop a new idea, or develop -

expand on programs you already have within your state, or any consortia, or other collaborations that you're already in.

So, just keep those ideas flowing, talk with your colleagues in your state and in your neighboring states or region. It's hard to say the word "region" without confusing that with regional depository, but in your geographic area. And we're really looking forward to seeing what's in the action plans.

Okay. At this point, we're going to take a short break. Blane Dessy will be back at 2:30. And we're going to then talk about GPO's national action plan. I got the name slightly wrong.

(Applause.)

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 2:18 p.m. and resumed at 2:37 p.m.)

MR. DESSY: I'm back. If any of you would care to move closer to the front, it seems this morning you were closer. Now, it seems like you're further away, but maybe it's

just my failing eyesight. I don't know.

I hope you all had a very, very pleasant lunch. We're ready to begin the afternoon program. It's going to be Cherie and I are going to be sort of walking you through some things related to a strategic plan, but I want to recap a little bit of what we talked about this morning.

And first of all, let me start off by saying thank you all for your attention this morning, and for your comments. They were all very graciously received. And they will become part of the record.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And we do have a court reporter here. So, the transcripts will be up very shortly on the websites so you can see them.

I also want to let you know that once the GPO staff have your feedback on the forms and the feedback, they will be bringing in an expert to help them finalize the plans before you actually begin to do the work.

So, everything that you've contributed so far or that you will be

contributing in the very near future, is all working together to make this a much more successful effort.

So, I hope you're all feeling somewhat empowered by that. I hope you feel like you really have a vested interest in making this a really exciting time for the FDLP, okay?

Did I cover everything, Cherie?

DR. GIVENS: And the expert is going

to help us number crunch.

MR. DESSY: And the expert is going to help them number crunch.

Questions or comments before we get started?

(No response.)

MR. DESSY: Okay. So, this morning we talked about how we want to begin to think about revising Title 44. And that was to have the libraries complete these documents, and then to have state plans that would then become part of a national plan, which leads us to the next logical thing is a strategic plan

for FDLP.

And so, that's a trickier thing to talk about. And when I first began talking to Mary Alice and her staff, I wanted to get a sense of what had happened in the past regarding strategic planning within the FDLP, how the things we talked about this morning are going to roll into a larger strategic plan process.

I wanted to make sure that I knew the map, because that's something that you're all going to want to know about, and that's information that you're going to want to convey to your administrators or to your colleagues or to your clients.

And so, we want to use this afternoon to put up a straw man for how we think a strategic planning process might look.

And then we're going to do just like we did this morning where you come up to the microphones and tell us your deepest thoughts about what we're doing here.

Does that make sense?

Okay. So, we're all - and this is a collaborative. So, why don't - so, you can see the first one is the strategic plan for GPO's future. And by GPO, we mean the Federal Depository Library System future. We'll make that little distinction. 2012 to 2017.

And, again, in talking to Mary Alice and the folks, I said, well, what have you done already about strategic planning?

Just like good managers everywhere, you want to know what's gone before you.

And so, I was provided with a draft plan, I believe, that was 2009 to 2014. And I read that. And my question was, all right, what are we doing with this?

We have to make a conscious decision. Either we're going to use it or we're not going to use it. What makes sense?

And being a good manager, but also a slightly lazy manager, I believe in recycling everything I possibly can.

So, the first thing that was in that previous plan and something that we

thought we wanted to bring to your attention right away, is the vision of the FDLP. And maybe this is the most fundamental question of all that we need to be addressing.

Right now there is a draft statement floating out there, and I underline the word "draft," but it's out there, that says the Federal Depository Library Program will provide government information when and where it is needed in order to create an informed citizenry and an improved quality of life. That's in draft.

What we want to share with you is that you have the ability to comment on this and to help the GPO staff shape this for the future. And this and everything else that we're going to be talking about over the next sixty minutes, is going to be up on the webpage for you to comment upon.

So, nothing is off the table. Everything is on the table waiting for you to have a go at it.

But I would just like to see what

is your initial reaction to this type of a vision? Does it make sense to you? Do you think it's ambitious enough? Do you think it's future forward enough? Is it too broad? Is it too narrow? Is it that you're all falling asleep because it's after lunch?

Okay. I knew if I threw some bait

Okay. I knew if I threw some bait out, you would rise to it. Let's start with the lady to my left, and then we'll go to the gentleman on my right.

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

MR. DESSY: Yes.

MS. HARPER: This is just to get conversation going.

MR. DESSY: This is we're among friends.

MS. HARPER: I like the vision. I notice it doesn't mean that GPO has to be the one supporting the Federal Depository Library Program. Just something to point out.

MR. DESSY: Interesting distinction.
Okay. Thank you. Yes, sir.

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University Library.

I think this is a great starting point. But when I think of providing no-fee public access to government information in all formats from all three branches of government now and into the future -

(Laughter.)

MS. DESSY: Yes.

MR. O'MAHONY: -- the piece of what I think could be elaborated on a little bit is into the future.

I think one of the unique valueadded things that the program brings to our
society is that permanent public access
component.

And maybe it's in there and it's just maybe not enhanced of accentuated to the extent I would like to see it, but that's a point I would like to be sure that is there.

MR. DESSY: Okay. I mean, this is your vision. You all have to help us craft it. Yes, and then we'll get to you in just a

second.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Kate Irwin-Smiler, Wake Forest University Professional Center Library.

This may be just that this is the first time I'm seeing this and I haven't had a chance to really kind of parse it out and play with it and chew on it, but it sounds to me almost so vague as to be meaningless.

MR. DESSY: Okay.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Like, yes, but it's like a politician saying they're for education. Like, really? Okay. Great. Who isn't?

And maybe I just need to kind of play with it more, but it may be a really low bar, which may be a fine place to start.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Well, this is just a place to start. This is a draft vision statement that was done several years ago.

But as we were talking about this at lunch, it's always easier to have people react to something.

And so, I thought if I were to get up here and say, give me a vision statement, I would be just met with blank stares.

So, it's easier to put something up and have you react, but that's a very good point.

Yes, ma'am, your turn.

MS. MALLORY: Mary Mallory,
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

I think we live in a knowledge society. Maybe that's been quoted too frequently. And I think we live in a knowledge global society.

And I think that the information that comes out of the government is fundamental in doing research in this country.

And I think that that should be noted in the vision statement, something to the effect that it provides the - I don't have the phrase.

There's a lot of people in this room who could articulate this better than me, but something about the information is fundamental or part of the foundation for facilitating research in

this country.

MR. DESSY: Okay.

MS. MALLORY: And I think that's a very important component of the vision statement for government information.

And also, I really like what Michele said about the schools and involving the schools. I think that's so important.

MR. DESSY: Okay.

MS. MALLORY: And so, I think that we're educating our citizenry, too, and it's a more active word than informed. So, maybe it could be something like informed educated citizenry.

MR. DESSY: Okay.

MS. MALLORY: Thank you.

MR. DESSY: No, thank you. And we're going to be going through other pieces of this. And so, it may not be possible to get every word or phrase into the vision statement, but that doesn't mean that we can't take those ideas and populate them elsewhere in the long-range plan. So, no idea is going

unnoted.

Who was next? Sir.

MR. BAKER: Hi. Gavin Baker, OMB Watch.

I actually just echo on that comment. I was thinking the same thing. Maybe something like informed engaged citizenry hitting on that theme of civic engagement that Mary Alice said was going to be so important to the program going forward.

I think that this vision statement makes a lot of sense to me. The only major aspect that I think should be a little stronger is that "provide information" seems a little passive like here's the information, it's in this book.

And so, maybe something a bit more proactive that gets to actually helping people to use the information like we will support the use of government information, or meet the public's information needs.

MR. DESSY: Okay. I like more assertive. I think that's the direction you

want to go in as information professionals.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University.

Back in library school, Dr. David
Kazer told my management class that the role
of libraries in society is to acquire,
organize, preserve and deliver the human
record.

I think as federal depository libraries, we acquire, organize and preserve and deliver the U.S. public record.

So, I'd like to see something loftier with more of those components in it to say that it is supposed to be comprehensive and it is supposed to be forever, and it's not just that we each have a copy of the 1984 statistical abstract, which we could meet that goal, you know, if that was all we had.

We would have some government information. We would hand it to people when they needed it. That does seem a little vague.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Thank you. I have to tell you I was just amazed when I learned the other week that they're not going to do the statistical abstract anymore. I mean, I'm sorry to share that with you. But when I read that, I just thought, what? So, anyway, I'm sorry. That was just me as a librarian venting for a seconds with you. Yes, ma'am. MS.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

McKNELLY: Michele McKnelly, University of Wisconsin, River Falls, and I think that this statement needs to explicitly say that this is a no-fee program and that we will not be in the cost recovery business.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Thank you very much. An important idea.

(Applause.)

MR. DESSY: Yes, ma'am.

MS. HARTNETT: Cass Hartnett, University of Washington Libraries.

There is just kind of an unformed

thought, but there's a part about anticipating. Somebody used the word "proactive." And I guess that might be part of it.

But what we're having to do in the information world now is not just sort of stay on top of it and react, but look forward and anticipate and help build.

I don't know how to wordsmith it, but if that concept could be captured.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Well, don't forget this is going to be on the website and you'll have plenty of opportunity to think about it and make suggestions.

Yes, sir.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, University of Notre Dame, Mahaffey Business Information Center, so you know where I'm coming from. Thank you, Michele. I was going to mention that. I think that's explicit.

Having gone through this process before of developing a vision statement, it's supposed to be short, iffy, broad. We all

should be able to memorize it and say it within one breath.

And I have mentioned earlier that much as I'm all for an informed citizenry, I am more informed a business who really has some leverage where it counts.

So, I'm glad I could read into the improved quality of life. The business sector are huge consumers of government information.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Thank you very much. And, yes, ma'am.

MEMBER LYONS: Sue Lyons, Records Law Library.

There's nothing about this vision statement that captures what is distinctive, I think, about the FDLP. I mean, we are a geographically just diverse group. We're a grassroots method of providing government information.

The Library of Congress provides information, any government agency provides government information, but that statement doesn't capture what we do and the value that

we add.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Yes, the GPO, I've decided I'll let the GPO staff speak during this session. But just keep it short, Mary Alice.

(Laughter.)

MS. BAISH: I was going to ask for permission. I've been wanting to get up here all day, but I think we're here to listen and learn from all of you. But I really appreciate Sue's comments and others.

I've been through this process for other organizations for many years -

PARTICIPANT: Who are you?

(Laughter.)

MS. BAISH: Oh, sorry. Mary Alice Baish, U.S. Government Printing Office.

I'd like you all to think about as a vision statement for me, and the experience I've had with strategic planning, you don't have as a vision statement that you will do this or you will do that.

The vision statement is, in part,

23

22

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

aspirational in the sense that you want it to capture what you are. And so, could we please as you think, because we want your input, just don't put a verb like will provide.

The FDLP is the, and then what are we? Okay. If you would think about that, I would appreciate it very much. Thank you.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Thank you.

Yes, ma'am, and then we're going to be moving on - oh, two comments.

MS. McKNELLY: Michele McKnelly, University of Wisconsin, River Falls.

MR. DESSY: Yes.

MS. McKNELLY: I would just like to quote Sheila McGarr. We want it all, we want it now, we want it free. We are the FDLP.

(Laughter.)

MR. DESSY: And it rhymes.

MS. WALSH: Geez, and I've got to follow that. Mary Jane Walsh, Colgate University, but you did steal part of my thunder.

The FDLP is the librarians and we

23

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

need access to all government information.

And perhaps it is not - perhaps it was a

Freudian oversight that GPO isn't mentioned,

because they are a legislative body.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Excellent.

Again, all these comments have been taken

down. I also see Mary Alice frantically

writing all these ideas down.

It will be on the website. When you go back, you'll be able to add even more of your thoughts then. So, let's move on to the mission.

There was a vision statement. I also discovered a mission statement in that previous draft plant, that says the mission - this is maybe where some of this language comes up that we heard about just a moment ago - to provide for no-fee, ready and permanent public access to federal government information now and for future generations.

I mean, I personally always have a little difficulty separating vision and mission statements, but that's just my own

limited thinking.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Does this give you any thoughts? I mean, I can see where some of this touches on points made earlier, but are there new ideas or new reactions to this?

Yes, ma'am. Don't forget to identify yourself.

MS. JARRETT: I will. Don't worry.

MR. DESSY: Okay.

MS. JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library.

I like this. The only thing I would add is that the mission of the FDLP is to cooperatively provide for no-fee blah, blah, blah.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Thank you very much.

Are there any other comments on that particular statement? And, again, I don't want to say that this will appear or this will not appear.

Again, these are straw men that are being put here for the sake of provoking

conversation this afternoon.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. LASTER: Shari Laster, University of Akron.

I hope it's implicit, maybe it should be explicit, that providing access is - there is an educational component to it. Once again as someone said earlier, there's a difference between handing over a book and handing over a book with a glossary and an index.

MR. DESSY: Okay. So, right.

Ma'am, can you elaborate on that just for a

moment, please, for our sakes?

MS. LASTER: Sure. Well, speaking personally, I think that the mission that I have as a government documents librarian, is to provide the tools for interpretation of the information.

That's not to say that I read the information for them, but I think there's more to it than access. Although, access you can't have interpretation and you can't have

understanding without access.

At the same time, I think that our mission goes a little further than just putting it out there.

MR. DESSY: Okay.

MS. LASTER: It can extend to training, supporting and another good verb for users of the information.

MR. DESSY: Okay. And it's that thing we hear about all the time now. What is the value added, right? What value do we bring to this enterprise other than data?

I think we're ready to move on. I see empty microphones. So, again, this is material that we found in the record.

So, the mission that we just talked about is to be achieved through organizing processes that enable desire, information to be identified and located, expert assistance, collections of publications at a network, archived online information, dissemination products from GPO access, which I guess would be FDsys now, federal agency websites and

partner websites.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Thoughts? Criticisms? I see someone coming to a microphone. Yes, sir.

MR. WRAY: Tanner Wray, University of Maryland.

On the last two slides, I was thinking about this also and -

MR. DESSY: Do you want us to go back?

MR. WRAY: No.

MR. DESSY: Okay.

MR. WRAY: Federal government information, here you're talking about information being identified and located. I'm wondering about adding and manipulated.

And where my brain is going is I'm in an ARL/DLF E-Science Institute which is talking about data sets and how libraries are going to get involved in managing or helping campuses manage data sets.

So, my idea of information is also going to data sets. And I don't know if this is the right venue to talk about it, but I

wanted to park it. Thank you.

MR. DESSY: That's good. And we do have a parking lot somewhere in the area that we will put those issues, but you're exactly right.

I go to many meetings now where this whole idea of data sets and manipulating big data is becoming more and more and more commonplace.

Yes, ma'am.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Bernadine Abbott MS. HODUSKI: Hoduski. In order for the library community to do the organizational work to make it possible for the users to get to the information, they also have to recognize and support what the government itself does.

For example, in the initial draft the Committee on House Administration is considering in revising Title 44, they would eliminate the Congressional Directory, which really presents you the organization of the Congress and all the information that we need to know in order to help our citizens deal

with the Congress, and help the Congress to deal with itself. They also wanted to eliminate the Index to the Congressional Record.

Those are two tools that are very essential to the library community and everyone else in order to provide this assistance.

So, if we don't think of this as a wider group, it's not just what the libraries are doing. It's to re-support procedures.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

For example, in the '70s when we insisted that GPO use MARC AACR2 LC subject headings and go electronic, that was a way of helping organize and provide us information to our public. And that's not been totally completed because even though 1710 and 1711 U.S. Code require everything be cataloged and identified and so on, is not happening.

So, we have to think broader than just what the members of the Federal Depository Library Program are doing. And

that includes other nondepository libraries who are also organizing and supporting and preserving and so on.

So, it's got to be a much broader thing, I think, than just specifically to FDLP.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Okay. And I think there's a lot of support for that as well.

Yes, sir.

MR. SUDDUTH: Bill Sudduth,
University of South Carolina.

What I found interesting is in the last bullet, is the first time you used the word "partner" or "partnership." And I think that if there were ways that it was incorporated at a higher level, that would convey what a lot of this program is about, too. It's a partnership between the libraries and the federal and GPO and -

MR. DESSY: So, talk to me a little bit more. What would you like when we - how do you envision that partnership working?

I want to massage that idea for a

the

the

а

couple of minutes. MR. SUDDUTH: I envision it working every day. MR. DESSY: Okay. SUDDUTH: I don't understand MR. what you're saying. MR. DESSY: Well, I mean, so you're talking about just much stronger collaboration between the libraries and the headquarters here in Washington and other types libraries? SUDDUTH: Well, a partnership MR. conveys the idea that as we all know, there is -- the physical support for this program, comes from the partners of the program. MR. DESSY: Okay. MR. SUDDUTH: And all that libraries receive is materials and guidelines to be the partners. MR. DESSY: Okay. MR. SUDDUTH: So, it's

collaboration, but the word "partnership" is

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

just as strong.

MR. DESSY: Okay. And so, you would like to see that emphasized more strongly.

MR. SUDDUTH: Somewhere. I mean, again, I don't believe in making these huge, you know, whoever got up earlier and said the mission statements and visions need to be short, roll off the tongue and whatever, but "partnership" is a good word, I think.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Thank you very much. Yes, ma'am.

MS. JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library.

I respectfully disagree a little bit about the partnership. I like collaborative. And I know we're not supposed to be wordsmithing here, but just as an - I think a partnership is being so much more formal and the FDLP is collaborative not just between GPO and the libraries, but formally among the libraries, and informally.

My colleague across campus, Cass Hartnett, and I collaborate all the time. I wouldn't say that we're partners in providing

government information at the University of Washington, but we are certainly collaborative about it.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Well, there can be different levels and different types of collaboration and partnership, and I think they can all play a role.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. McKNELLY: Michele McKnelly,
University of Wisconsin, River Falls.

The very last bullet point actually concerns me a good deal, because I see that actually as part of the GPO's mission and not the Federal Depository Library Program's.

Now, in the future, that could change. But as we sit right now, I don't know that depository libraries, it is their mission to archive GPO access and FDsys.

Some may choose to do that. But as a core basis of the program, many will not be able to do that, nor have the technical ability. So, that may need to go, in my opinion, someplace else.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Thank you for that. This gentleman, and then this gentleman.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.

Michele, would you come speak to me afterwards? Because I have a little tool for you that can do it very easily, and many libraries should be archiving online digital content and can do it very easily. It's not difficult.

MR. DESSY: Oh my, look, this is collaboration playing out in front of your very eyes. Thank you.

Sir.

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University Library. I too want to collaborate with Michele.

And just offer sort of a friendly interpretation of that last bullet point in that I read it as getting back to the collaborative and partnership point that was discussed just previously, that this is part

of the mission of the program.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

There lots of different are partners in that program. Some partners may do some of these things. Other partners may be doing other parts of it. But the program's responsibility, I think, is indeed the permanent public access of all those kinds of information products.

MR. DESSY: Thank you. Yes, to my left, ma'am.

MS. HARTNETT: I can't think fast enough. Cass Hartnett, University of Washington Libraries.

I want something that captures a potential different data delivery system. I mean, we've got publications are mentioned in four, and then websites are mentioned in five. And when we're thinking about data, there's probably a different delivery system than websites. It may even be one in that five-year period going up to 2017 that we can't anticipate now. Holographic data, etcetera.

MR. DESSY: Right. So, we need to

think expansively.

MS. HARTNETT: Right.

MR. DESSY: Yes, ma'am, and then we need to move on to our next -

MS. WALSH: Very short. Mary Jane Walsh, Colgate University. Ditto.

MR. DESSY: Take your time. Take your time.

MS. WALSH: No, she said what I was going to say. The final bullet is too specific in its type of format. It should just be information whatever format.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. Can we go to the next one? Values.

These are the values that were articulated in that earlier draft strategic plan that are meant to provide the foundation for the FDLP.

One, no-fee access for anyone from anywhere to use materials. And I've heard that - I mean, I've only been here a few hours and I must have heard that eight times

already, right? No fees ever, okay.

Collections. Tangible and online collections built to support user and community needs.

Collaboration and communication, or we might say partnership in this case. A strong depository library network built on transparent open communication.

Can you just click to the next one real quick, because there are more values. Expertise and professionalism, dedicated and knowledgeable staff enrich one's library experience by providing quality user-centric services, being good stewards of the resources entrusted to us by the American people.

Is that all of them? Okay. So, we had six values that were articulated in an earlier document.

Do these values represent you? Do these values represent the FDLP? Do these values represent where you want the FDLP to go?

Yes, ma'am.

MS. HODUSKI: Bernadine Abbott Hoduski.

I think the values have to include not just depository libraries' interaction with other depository libraries, but many former depository libraries are no longer depository libraries, but they still have government documents and they still provide services and they still need support. They are part of the user community.

Then you have the broader user community of special libraries and all kind of libraries that were never depository libraries who are also the users. And then you have the general public.

And there's nothing in here about collaborating with the users of depository libraries. And that's been something that we've talked about over the years, and some libraries are doing that working with their users in a more formal way, but that needs to be in this as a value.

MR. DESSY: Okay. For example,

under the third bullet we talk about collaboration between the libraries, the agencies, but you're saying collaboration between the libraries and their users. MS. HODUSKI: Yes. The nondepository libraries are not even mentioned. MR. DESSY: Okay. MS. HODUSKI: And the users are not 10 mentioned. MR. DESSY: Okay. So, nondepository 11 libraries and users -12 13 MS. HODUSKI: Correct. DESSY: -- need to be 14 MR. calculated in there somehow. 15 16 MS. HODUSKI: There needs to be collaboration among them. 17 MR. DESSY: Okay. 18 19 MS. HODUSKI: I mean, public libraries have Friends of Libraries. 20 MR. DESSY: Right. 21 MS. HODUSKI: Some universities even 22

have Friends of Libraries.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Okay. Yes, sir.

MR. BAKER: Gavin Baker, OMB Watch, not a federal depository library. So, I can't tell you what your values are, but I would like to submit this suggestion.

It seems to me that these values pretty well capture how people want the program to operate, but I don't know if they speak to the values that the program is for.

So, I would suggest adding open government as a value of the FDLP. The FDLP believes in and is for open government, and that's at its heart and what it is, why it exists and what it values.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Very good point. Thank you. Yes, ma'am.

MS. HARTNETT: Cass Hartnett,
University of Washington Libraries.

Is this a place where we could capture the movement towards collaboration between libraries, archives and museums? Do we want to use language like cultural heritage organizations, one of the things we hear a lot

now, or additional educational organizations?

Just a thought.

MR. DESSY: Right. Well, as we were talking about partnerships with libraries that are no longer depository libraries. They're other types of, I mean, why not think about that particular issue?

Yes, ma'am.

MS. ORTH-ALFIE: It kind of -

MR. DESSY: Your name?

MS. ORTH-ALFIE: Oh, I'm sorry.

Carmen Orth-Alfie, University of Kansas.

Kind of building a little bit on what Cass is saying, I think that in the values of collections it's not so much that I value tangible or online, but I value collections that are authenticated and trustworthy.

And I think you could not even worry about what format it is, but that it's - Google can have tangible, I mean, online collections of official, but that doesn't mean they're authenticated and trustworthy.

MR. DESSY: Okay. So, you think that should be built into the value statement somewhere, okay. Thank you very much.

Yes, sir.

MR. MEYER: Larry Meyer, Law Library for San Bernardino County.

I'm also wondering if this might be a good place to work something in about - there's an expectation that you use resources beyond what are available through the depository system be they state depository items or, you know, for pay services or whatever, but to somehow work that in, in addition to what's already mentioned there.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Thank you.

Are there any values that may have struck you that aren't mentioned here? Yes, ma'am - I'm sorry, that was just as much a rhetorical question as anything else, but go ahead. Yes, ma'am.

MS. FELTREN: Hi. I'm Emily Feltren, American Association of Law Libraries.

MR. DESSY: Yes.

MS. FELTREN: I wanted to agree with what Gavin said about open government, and also build on that a little bit. I see collaboration and transparency. I also like participation or participatory. These are words I've heard Mary Alice mention, and also were some of the Obama Administration's key words.

And also add no-fee permanent public access to the access statement, I think, would be even stronger.

MR. DESSY: No-fee permanent access?

MS. FELTREN: Permanent public access.

MR. DESSY: Permanent public access.

Thank you. Let me switch over to this side for a quick moment.

MS. CONCANNON: I'm Marie Concannon, University of Missouri Library, and I'm with a regional.

And one thing I've been chewing on

during this whole discussion probably fits in right here. And that is when I walk through my stacks, I can tell you what I value when I see the things.

What I really value is when I see some old item. Like, for example, just last week I was waking through my stacks and I saw an 1867 book titled The Condition of the American Tribes commissioned in 1865. 350 pages with verbatim testimony telling what the government agents found when they went out to these places.

My eyes fell on one sentence and it said, do they have enough ponies? They said, no, sir, they don't have enough food.

And I thought, you know, all of this is going - more and more of it is going online and it's going to open it up fabulously to our users. And I really like that, but I value that first edition objection, that tangible piece that I hold in my hand that somehow made its way from Washington, D.C. to Missouri sometime in the year 1868, maybe.

I know that a few years ago one person came to the microphone and said, you're going to turn us into a museum. Are we supposed to be a museum?

And I thought to myself, gosh, maybe the things I value most about my collection really are museum items. Maybe they do belong in my special collections department.

So, maybe somewhere - I don't know if this belongs here or not. I'll leave it to the group to decide. But I value the history, I value that original object, and I value the way the FDLP preserves the whole history of our American government of everything we've ever done back to the beginning.

MR. DESSY: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. DESSY: That was very eloquent. Thank you. Yes, ma'am.

MS. MALLORY: Mary Mallory,
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. I
think there's one other word that's crucial,

and that's "equitable."

We want equitable access because there are digital products and systems being created that are no fee, but they are not equitably accessible to everyone.

MR. DESSY: Okay.

MS. MALLORY: Thank you.

MR. DESSY: Thank you, and, yes, sir.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: Tom Fischlschweiger, Broward County Main Library.

One of the things that strikes me coming from a public library is that since we are, to some degree, representative of a government agency, one of the things I notice especially when people are trying to get e-Government services, etcetera, is there is a lot of, for lack of a better term, mistrust of the government, various government agencies, frustration with the government and so on.

And I think one of the values that we have that we seem to take so for granted as

librarians that needs to be more explicitly stated for the people who are not librarians who may look at these documents, is that we are indeed value neutral.

We provide the information, but we do not provide a point of view. We are here to provide the information for the interpretation for the people that use it. We don't have an agenda other than to be good stewards of the stuff that's been entrusted to us.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Thank you very much. Anything else? Maybe it's because I teach sometimes in a library school, but one of the things that we spend a fair amount of time on is the whole issue of ethics and information ethics.

And I don't know how I want to express that other than to say perhaps as you all think about this, more and more organizations are filling the need to be very explicit about their support for information ethics and what that means.

So, I'm just going to throw that out there as an unsolicited facilitator's comment.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. RAWAN: Atifa Rawan, University of Arizona, Tucson.

I see in the value statement, something about train staff, but I think we also in these days of the electronic environment, we need tools. I'm not advocating Google, but look what Google has done.

So, if we develop tools that's a means to provide access to government information, wider access, that's something we should also be focusing on tools, is what I was thinking.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Thank you very much, and we need to move on. So, here are some more straw men.

We have identified four goals that we think could be points of discussion as you move into this process in the near future.

The first, and I want to be very clear about this, is to make sure that at least I understood where the state plans and the state and the focused action plans fit into this other strategic plan. There has to be a coherence to it, at least to my way of thinking.

So, what I was suggesting to Cherie and to Mary Alice, is that what we've talked about this morning is, in fact, part of a larger strategic process.

Now, we know that what we talked about this morning is really focused on getting some information to help inform discussions about changes to Title 44, but that can't exist separately than this broader strategic plan.

So, the first goal as I envision it, and again this is just out there for debate, is to develop recommendations for the possible revision of Title 44.

You can see we mentioned the state forecasts and the state-focused action plans,

the focused interviews because we talked a lot about technical assistance and focused interviews, and also collaborations with other organizations and associations.

This morning the gentleman was suggesting that we work with ALA and SLA and ARL and those other types of associations to make this come to pass. So, that was, in my thinking, one of the major goals of your strategic planning process.

Thoughts? Comments? I mean, this is the world according to Blane at this point.

So, if it makes sense to you, gee, I'm really happy. If it doesn't, you can say.

Go ahead. Yes, ma'am.

MS. HODUSKI: Well, I'm Bernadine Abbott Hoduski.

I'd like to see develop recommendations for the possible revision of Title 44 and interim steps to improve the program.

MR. DESSY: Okay.

MS. HODUSKI: And I don't really

understand Bullet 3. Who's collaborating with these other organizations and associations?

MR. DESSY: Oh, I'm sorry. FDLP.

It would be FDLP working with its partners and collaborators to move towards the revisions to Title 44.

This is very badly written at this point.

MS. HODUSKI: Who's really going to provide the leadership? Are you saying that is really the Government Printing Office, or the Joint Committee on Printing, or House administration, or Senate rules?

I mean, that could work out, I mean, some other leadership other than it just is nebulous kind of collaborating.

MR. DESSY: Okay. I mean, I would say I think that FDLP provides the leadership in this effort.

Do you disagree with that?

MS. HODUSKI: I don't think that it - that the only thing in Title 44 in order to make the program work, is necessarily just

confine the Federal Depository Library Program. MR. DESSY: Right. MS. HODUSKI: Because Chapter 17 of Title 44, 1710 and 11 which require the cataloging and total identification of every document, is essential to the operation of the Federal Depository Library Program and every other library throughout the world, for that 10 matter. So, actually I see - I think it's 11 the leadership of the Public Printer of the 12 United States. 13 MR. DESSY: Okay. 14 MS. HODUSKI: That's who should be 15 16 the leadership. MR. DESSY: Okay. 17 HODUSKI: And that the buck 18 MS.

MS. HODUSKI: And that the buck stops there.

19

20

21

22

23

MR. DESSY: Okay. I think that's very helpful in terms of defining who you think should be in that leadership position.

You're saying it's the Public

Printer.

MS. HODUSKI: Yes.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Thank you very much. Yes, ma'am.

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University.

Based on the conversation this morning I think that came from, I had the impression it was more input solicited from organizations and associations.

Rather than really collaboration, it was just we were going to consult with them and get their input -

MR. DESSY: Okay.

MS. SMITH: -- like we're getting input from the depositories themselves.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Again, I'll take responsibility for this. I was trying to put words on paper that I could use as a jumping off point to begin this conversation with you. So, there's plenty of corrective writing that needs to go on before this is even close to being ready for prime time, if it's ever ready

for prime time.

Yes, Mary.

MS. WALSH: Mary Jane Walsh, Colgate University.

MR. DESSY: Right.

MS. WALSH: I'm looking for someone to help me make the leap between the state forecasts and the state-focused action plans and revision of Title 44.

I sort of understand you need to gather more information. That's what the state forecast is.

But the fact that my state might decide to do X, Y or Z, how does that feed into revision of Title 44?

MR. DESSY: Okay. I can take a stab at that, or one of the GPO staff can.

I would think it would feed at least to my way of thinking, and I'm just the facilitator, I would think it could feed into thinking about Title 44 in terms of trends or issues that you've brought to the attention of the larger group that might need to be

considered as part of those revisions.

If you're creating an initiative that's so new, so fresh, so unthought of before, it could impact my thinking about how I might want to suggest any revisions to Title 44. That's my own thinking.

Cherie is going to comment as well.

DR. GIVENS: Sure. Cherie Givens,

GPO.

One of the things particularly when we're looking at the state forecast, is that when we look at the burdens that libraries are under now, part of that may well be feeding into the constraints within Title 44, particularly Chapter 19.

And what our hope is, is to take a look at the forecasts and look at the action plans that stem from them, and then map those to the current Title 44 Chapter 19 provisions and see where there might be flexibility where we can either work it as we have it through our own regulations and reinterpretations, or whether or not something actually needs to

change at the legal level in order to make those things happen.

And if what we see is that there is a dire situation going on and that this provision needs to be changed in order for that to happen, I see that if these plans are carried out as we envision them, that this would provide us with proof, concrete proof in a quantitative manner that this needs to happen, this is the current situation.

So, that's, I think, the stream that I'm on.

MR. DESSY: Okay. Ma'am, before you walk away, I'm not letting you off the hook that easily. Did that help explain anything to you or -

MS. WALSH: Mary Jane Walsh, Colgate University.

The very last bit made the - helps with the connection between the plans. The forecasts I understand.

MR. DESSY: Right.

MS. WALSH: Because there are

libraries drowning under the requirements of being a depository right now.

MR. DESSY: Right.

MS. WALSH: So, I understood the forecasts. I'll take it on faith on the plans, which you just - your last statement sort of helped.

MR. DESSY: I would suggest that you keep asking that question. I mean, there's going to be a lot of time for comments and talking. So -

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

DR. GIVENS: Can I make just one?

MR. DESSY: Sure, Cherie.

DR. GIVENS: Cherie Givens, GPO.

I see what you're saying. And for me when I think about it, I think that when we're looking at the forecast, the forecast is going to tell us what the major problems are.

When we're looking at the focused action plan, it's going to tell us what things you can do at the grassroots level in your state and/or region. But when we compare the two, we can still see the area where GPO may

need to step in, right?

Because each state cannot necessarily do all the things that can be this set of things that are dire situation, but you can only handle A and B, who is going to handle C and D?

And this, to me, is how I see those two things related and then tying into the analysis of what changes may be needed.

MR. DESSY: Okay.

DR. GIVENS: Does that make it a little clearer?

MR. DESSY: Very good exchange. I think you were perhaps first, and then we'll come back to my right.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. CHILDS: Miriam Childs, Law Library of Louisiana.

I'm a fairly new depository librarian. So, forgive my ignorance, but I'm kind of confused about which entity would actually revise Title 44. Like, who would actually do the text to get it in to the CFR?

that.

I'm just confused about Thanks. DESSY: I'm assuming it would MR. have to be, I mean, if we're speaking purely bureaucratically, I think it would have to be done by the Government Printing Office. Am I correct on that, Mary Alice? And for something to be submitted for the CFR, it has to be done by a federal agency. Am I answering your question, or not? Okay. Don't let me get away from that issue. Yes, ma'am, and then, sir. MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia. And I may be in answer to a little bit, but it seems that Depository to me Library Council needs to be there as -MR. DESSY: Yes. MS.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

SELBY: -- maybe in the - I would hope that state plans those and forecasts, that looking at those, which isn't anybody recommending changes to Title 44, it's

the situation in the plans, but it seems to me that the Council to the Public Printer is a good group to start looking at that information -

MR. DESSY: Right.

MS. SELBY: -- and very much partnering, collaborating with the Government Printing Office about looking at what title changes.

And I guess my only other thought is this process, I mean, I want us to think outside the box, and this process seems a little inside the box to me.

MR. DESSY: Okay, that's fine. Yes, sir, and then we need to move on because I've already used up all of our time. I'm going to beg for five more minutes, but go ahead, sir.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, University of Notre Dame.

Civics 101 says Congress will modify the language of the statutes that will subsequently follow on. The real Civics lesson is there are any number of contributing

suggesting bodies that will give Congress potential wording that they may feel reflects what they actually want to do.

So that in the past, we have had lobbyists that have written legislation and hand it over and it's been enacted pretty much verbatim.

In other cases, it is the depository community going through its various organizations, ALA, SLA, AALL and ARL working in union saying, yes, this wording works for us. We would not object to it. And the then legislative body of the House or the Senate would take it forward.

MR. DESSY: Yes, it can be a very complicated and very confusing process. Okay. We need to move on because I've already overstayed my welcome.

Goal B is something that existed in a previous draft - I'm just going to fly through these because I'm going to mess up the rest of this agenda if I keep talking - was to develop new models for federal depository

collections, investigate current processes for the disposition of materials and offer alternatives, develop a collection plan for GPO to manage the FDLP online collection.

One of my questions is, are we really just talking about revisions to Title 44 in this case? I think we're not, but these are just straw men.

Let's keep moving. As part of Goal B, develop a comprehensive collection of online authenticated federal publications, that asterisk means that work is already underway. That's the FD system.

Digitize and support digitization of federal government publications and preserve and support preservation of federal government publications, all somewhere in progress, right?

Goal C, develop new models for federal depository services, create a comprehensive online catalog of federal publications, increase access to and usability of federal information and develop a registry

of experts.

And D, new models for the federal depository community, share resources and provide collaborative services, and conduct outcome-based assessments of depository libraries.

That's the straw man that Cherie and I came up with. It will be on the website. It is there for you to take apart and put back together again. It's there for you to add language. It's there for you to object or suggest things. Or if we want to think more outside the box, this is your time to start giving us those outside-the-box ideas.

This is just a framework. So, this is not meant to be what the FDLP is going forward with at this time. This is meant to give you a structure to start some conversations about the next five years and how to think strategically about the program.

Okay. So, you'll have time to comment on this, and I'm done. Thank you all.

(Applause.)

MR. DESSY: I believe that we have a 15-minute break, which means that you need to be back here a little bit before 10 minutes of 4:00.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 3:32 p.m. and resumed at 3:51 p.m.)

MR. DESSY: Well, here we are at the end of four days of interesting talk, collaboration, thinking, dreaming about the Federal Depository Library Program and what is going to be done in the future.

Mary Alice asked me if I would just do a tiny recap of today, and I'm happy to do that.

Today was all about the future. It was all about the future of the Federal Depository Library Program and where you, as a community, want to take this program.

Obviously, it's rooted in legislation, it's managed by a federal agency, but FDLP is truly driven by the community of

people who work in it every day, and that's you.

And so, the conversations today that we had about the future are really the conversations about yourself and how you want to think about the program. But perhaps just as importantly, how you want to think about yourself as information professionals as you move into the future.

In listening to everything that we talked about today, I want to underscore just a few things. One is I was very impressed by your participation in the conversations.

As a facilitator, my worst nightmare is that everyone is going to be quiet. And I just don't have seven hours of amusing anecdotes to share with you. Maybe five hours of amusing anecdotes.

So, I was really thrilled that so many of you were here and made very, very thoughtful comments about this program. To me, that's the most important takeaway and I hope that you all were very aware of how

energizing it was to have a room full of people who really wanted to talk about this program and how to make it better.

So, as an outsider, as someone who gets to leave today at 4:30 and not have to worry about the big FDLP issues, I think you should all be very proud of yourselves for being so engaged and for being so committed to the future and to the improvement of the FDLP program.

So, I think you should give yourselves a round of applause.

(Applause.)

MR. DESSY: I think the FDLP program from where I sit, is in very good hands. I think you're going to do some amazing things, and I think it's just a matter of you all working together being the kind of team that you need to be, and doing some really great stuff.

And I think I will turn it over to James.

MR. JACOBS: Okay. Thanks, Blane.

I'm James Jacobs, Stanford University and Chair of the Depository Library Council.

So, Mary Alice asked me to just sort of have some reflections of the day. Some of these reflections of the day include sort of a reflection of the whole week because things kind of bleed together sometimes in my mind.

So, I was scrolling through the Twitter feed. I don't know if folks have been following that. Thank you, Kate, for all those Tweets. She's been doing a yeoman's job at that.

And so, I just wanted to highlight some of the things that came to my mind. It's really clear that GPO is doing a lot of projects in collaboration with or for the community both listed today, as well as throughout the conference; web harvesting and PACER project and court opinions, PURL referral tolls, MetaLib, the list goes on and on and on.

It's really amazing what GPO staff

is doing with very little funding and mostly with blood, sweat and tears. So, I really appreciate GPO staff for that.

It's also clear that the community remains active and passionate about government publications. And that's clear not only from today's process, but for the whole conference. Three days of educational programs is really proof that we're doing a lot in the community, and really interested in doing more. And we're also looking for ways to collaborate, to work together. And I think that's a positive thing.

The process, I think, that it's clear to me, also, that GPO is looking for help and looking to work together on forecasting and planning towards a sustainable FDLP future.

Whether that's Title 44 change or Title 44 edits or however it is that this process works itself out, it's clear that GPO is interested and a willing partner with the community on doing that.

And that at least form my perspective, GPO has mapped out a clear - a fairly clear and concise process to gather information from all of us, as well information from those outside of the community.

I think we're all free to sort of leverage our connections and our networks whether they be FDLP related or not, to gather information, pull that information together, move it forward, and I think that's a good thing.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

It's also clear that there's passion in the community both towards this process, as well as towards the process of serving the public towards government information.

Librarians have lots of ideas. We love and want clear process that's also very clear, and we could probably fill up three days of strategic planning.

I don't know if Blane would want to stay here for three days, but -

MR. DESSY: Sure.

MR. JACOBS: I haven't asked him yet.

I guess that last piece on the discussion on the mission statement, the values and the goals, I'll wrap that up here.

Feels to me like the people in this room, depositories in general, are really affirming their commitment to working in the FDLP and assuring that the FDLP continues to be a sustainable program in the future for both access to and preservation of government information.

And for that, I thank everyone in this room and anyone in the Twitter verse that's following along as well. Thanks.

MR. O'MAHONY: Hi. Again, I'm Dan O'Mahony from Brown University, and Mary Alice wondered if I had any more photos of Halloween costumes to share with folks. So, that's why I'm here.

Just reflecting back on today, I think, first, I really want to commend GPO for

being bold and taking the initiative to launch this effort.

It's been really exciting to participate today and to see the energy and the ideas that are being generated already.

I think this bodes very well for what will come forth from the states and from the individual library forecasts and the state action plans.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And I think it's especially important for at least two reasons. the most recent major Title 44 revision effort of which I was intimately familiar, it was really initiated and coordinated, to a large extent, by the associations, library associations, and that wonderful was а undertaking by those groups working collaboratively together.

But I think one of the things that was missing was this kind of far-reaching, grassroots, bottom-up, data-driven, if you will, approach that truly involved every federal depository library and reached beyond

even just the depository community.

I think the other really important reason for this is echoing back on Bernadine's reality check reminder to us in that nothing is guaranteed in the world of legislative reform.

So, all of this work will feed into an effort to reform and restructure the program at the national level. A lot of good work will also help inform some immediate outcomes at the ground level in the event, hopefully not, that the law does not get revised.

And finally, I guess I'd just like to reiterate one of the points that I tried to make this morning. And that is that when we come together as a community, we are capable of great things.

And I'm excited about the discussion and the commitment that's been evident here today. And I'm confident that through the hard work of all of us and all of our colleagues out there, great things are

ahead for the Federal Depository Library Program. Thanks.

MS. BAISH: Mary Alice Baish, U.S. Government Printing Office.

I think Dan and I have worked together for too many years. He just took my entire script, but let me just reiterate a few points.

In San Antonio, for those of you who were able to attend or who read the transcript of that meeting, I announced what my goals were as brand new, at the time, Superintendent of Documents. And that was transparency.

And I'm going to give a shameless plug. Those of you who have not read the FDLP connection, please find it on the desktop and subscribe. That is leading to my second goal, which is more collaboration and more partnerships.

And those of you in the room who have contributed articles to the FDLP Connection, thank you so much. And those of

you who have not yet written, we will either come patting you on the shoulder or please use our easy form and suggest an article.

We just really want to make this as powerful as we can, and we cannot do it without you.

And the third goal is education and training. And I've talked on Monday about our full curriculum in FDsys training with our 33 modules. And then I sent staff a note after I attended Wendell Skidgel's wonderful hands-on session on the new United States Courts Opinions collection. So, now we have another module to quickly put together for helping our users best use that content.

Earlier today I believe this morning someone mentioned, so, what are the carrots for me to get involved and to do all of this work?

Well, I'm trying to be creatively coming up with some carrots for you thinking maybe since we don't have funding to give you all rewards, maybe we could have three times

the number of chocolate chips in the cookies next year or something like that to give us more energy.

Not that you have not been energetic. I think one of the things that has excited and thrilled me about today for those of you who have been able to stay through the end of the day and so many people were here until way after lunch, had to run to catch their flights, we've seen an enormous amount of energy in this room today. And that is exactly what we need to move forward.

I'm an action-oriented person and I'm going to depend upon all of you to take our discussions today. And when we begin to build up on the conversations on the FDLP communications, that you will help energize and engage others who could not be with us today.

I also wanted to mention as Cherie Givens did earlier, that we are bringing in an outside consultant who is a professional data analyst, to assist us not just on the new data

that we're going to be getting from you or helping us define all the data points that we need from you, but we have since 2002 biennial surveys.

All of those are available electronically. So, there's a long history of data that we need to have examined. A number of reports, there was a regional report with interviews of regional librarians. There was a GPO report on possible new models for the program.

We've got a lot of data there. We just haven't had either the time or the expertise to help us put all that together.

So, matched along with that with what we get from you from these new state and library forecasting plans will be very helpful.

On Sunday, I'm flying out to New Mexico to attend the COSLA fall meeting. I have a lunch planned with the 13 state librarians who are regional librarians. And I'm also going to be giving a report at their

concluding business meeting, and I'm really looking forward to that opportunity.

I want to thank Gavin for coming to the conference this week. We've worked closely together for many, many years. And I think his earlier comment at the microphone reminded us all that really the FDLP with antecedents back to 1813, is the original open government and transparency program, and remains that today.

Like Dan, I'm very optimistic about our future together. And I want to thank Blane, number one, for his excellent work helping us move things along.

(Applause.)

MS. BAISH: It will be payback time for me, I know, but thank you. You just have pulled everything together for us so nicely.

James, once again, I want to thank you and every member of the Depository Library Council for your constant support and collaboration.

This is not a GPO - well, some of

the energy and impetus will be coming from us.

We work closely with council and will

continue through the coming two years, to work

even more closely together.

I want to thank my friend Dan for his eloquent remarks and reminding me so vividly of all the time and effort we've put. And many of you were here in the room at our last effort to revise Title 44, and reminding us of the key points that are going to be needed to make this happen.

Today is just the beginning of the conversation. So, in a way, you are all our first focus group. We need you to go out and tell your colleagues about what we've done today.

This is just the beginning of our discussion, and we will be continuing it virtually.

I have said often that to me the documents librarians are the heart of the program. And I think I've just been reminded of that so effectively all week. And I want

to thank all of you for what you do every day to help GPO run this magnificent public access program.

For those of you who have any questions or comments, would like more clarification, I'll be out in that recreation room behind us for a little bit of time. I think I've heard from many people that they're tired of sitting and they need to stretch. So, we can take the conversation outside.

I also want to lastly invite each and every one of you to communicate directly with me at any point in time. You can reach me at mabaish@gpo.gov or (202) 512-1313.

I would welcome a break in my day, and we'll try to get back to you, but I really think that what we've done all this week, and especially today, is bring together a dialog and improved communications and energy.

And I want to thank each and every one of you for making that possible. Thank you.

(Applause.)

10 12

MR. JACOBS: I also want to thank Mary Alice for helping to put this together I really think that you did a great today. job, as well as GPO staff. So, thank you, Mary Alice.

(Applause.)

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 4:09 p.m.)

13 14 15

11

16

17

18

19

20

21