



Expanding the Forecast Framework: Engage & Discuss December 3-5 and December 10-12, 2013 Focused Discussion Summaries

In December 2013, the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO) hosted a Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) virtual event entitled “Expanding the Forecast Framework: Engage & Discuss.” This participatory conference featured focused discussions, facilitated by members of the Depository Library Council, where participants were invited to share comments on topics related to the future of the FDLP. Focused discussions represent Phase 2 of the FLDP Forecast Study and were designed to obtain clarification or additional information on topics found in Forecast questionnaire responses.

A summary of each of the FDLP Forecast Focused Discussions is provided below.

Thursday, December 5, 2013

Focused Discussion: Depository Library Collaboration: Structure for the Digital Age, Part 1: Regional and Selective Depository Libraries

Expected Outcome of Discussion

- Identify options for flexibility within the current regional / selective structure. The options identified may or may not include changes to Title 44.

Summary of Discussion

This focused discussion, facilitated by Larry Romans, had 145 attendees.

QUESTIONS

1. How many regional depositories are needed?

There were 44 comments associated with this question.

Discussion did not lead to consensus on a specific number of regional depositories needed. However, a number of issues emerged that should be considered in any restructuring of the regional model. The most frequently cited considerations in restructuring regions were the geography covered, the population served in the area, and the responsibilities to be shouldered by the regional depositories in any new model. A less frequent, but related consideration, was the number of selective depositories to be served by each regional depository. An interest in sharing the regional collection among several libraries was frequently expressed, and a number of current models utilized in various regions were mentioned as possible models upon which to build a new structure. A couple examples of current models mentioned were the sub-regional model used in Missouri and the Centers of Excellence utilized by the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries (ASERL).

2. How large of an area or how many libraries should a regional cover?

There were 27 comments associated with this question.

The comments were grouped into eight topics; most had relatively the same frequency. As with Question 1, geography, population served, and responsibilities shouldered by regionals were among the most frequently cited considerations. A similar number expressed interest in the maps GPO provided in the handout for the session. The maps depicted multi-state regions used by a number of agencies, including Census regions, the Office of Management and Budget's model for standardized regions to be used by Federal agencies, and the regions used by GPO's Customer Service unit that serves other Federal agencies. A concern was raised about whether regionals in state libraries would be prohibited from serving areas outside their state due to state budget or regulatory restrictions.

3. What would be the responsibilities of regionals and selectives in an updated model?

There were 35 comments associated with this question.

Comments were grouped into 14 topics, reflecting a wide range of discussion on this question. There was a brief carry over discussion involving the maps GPO provided showing existing multi-state Federal regions and a question among participants of whether multi-state regional models would conceivably require users to cross state borders to use collection materials such as maps. While discussing potential multi-state models, a new model for the program, such as designating some libraries as "sub-regionals" and an example of a sub-regional model from Missouri, was discussed. Overall, most participants felt the responsibilities of regionals were to provide collection oversight, guidance

enforcement for FDLP rules, and lead efforts to catalog and provide metadata for collections. Most participants also felt that regions should provide training and coordinate the weeding of collection materials. Several participants noted that in a collaborative model, success depends on regionals and selectives cooperating, coordinating, and facilitating each other's work. Several participants noted the need to coordinate the weeding of collections to ensure that an appropriate number of tangible copies remained after digitization.

4. What retention and substitution guidelines would be needed in an updated model?

There were 45 comments associated with this question.

Comments were grouped into 10 topics that reflect not only retention and substitution guidelines, but a range of significant features that participants felt were necessary in an updated program model. Participants felt that a change to the retention period for selectives and the ability to substitute digital for tangible publications was a needed change to the program. As more digital content is created in this new model, participants noted the need for digital redundancy and preservation and the need to get both a wider variety and a larger volume of content into GPO's Federal Digital System (FDsys) for access and preservation. One participant suggested that participation in digital redundancy through membership in LOCKSS be a requirement for all libraries in the Program. Permanent public access was also discussed as the ultimate mission of the FDLP. However, in view of the recent Government shutdown, participants in this discussion expanded the meaning of permanent public access to mean access to Government information that is essentially "available and preserved (in a shutdown-proof place of access!)."

Outcome Achieved?

No definitive flexible models or preferences to be applied within the current regional/selective structure were identified during the focused discussion. While the expected outcome was not achieved, there was excellent discussion that revolved around the factors and issues to consider when developing a flexible and sustainable structure for the FDLP. Geography covered, population served, responsibilities to be shouldered by regional depositories, and multi-state shared collections should be considered.

Focused Discussion: Depository Library Collaboration: Structure for the Digital Age, Part 2: New Opportunities for Depository Libraries

Expected Outcomes of Discussion

- Ascertaining changing and new roles for depository library staff
- Ideas for Proofs of Concept for collaborative pilot projects for depository libraries

- Identifying areas where GPO can take on a supporting, coordinating, or leadership role

Summary of Discussion

This focused discussion, facilitated by Blane Dessy, had 145 attendees.

QUESTIONS

1. How are the roles of depository coordinators and depository staff changing?

This question generated 61 comments from attendees that were grouped into 18 topics. Of those comments, only two indicated their roles and responsibilities have remained the same. Twenty-one comments described having responsibilities in addition to Federal depository library tasks, i.e., wearing multiple hats. Separate but related, changes in library organization have affected depository library operations; tasks are dispersed and reference desks are integrated. The changing nature of providing reference services has changed, and this was conveyed in 13 comments.

Major areas of expanding or increased emphasis conveyed in comments include:

- Cataloging/metadata, often with a retrospective focus;
- Electronic collection development;
- Marketing/promotion; and
- Weeding tangible collections.

2. Describe any additional roles that are needed beyond the current regional and selective roles? What new opportunities are you facing?

There were 38 comments associated with these questions that were grouped into 14 topics. Roles and activities were not described as being the responsibility of a regional or selective depository library. Depository staff are doing familiar activities, but they are expanding to new audiences (non-depository colleagues, patrons of non-depositories), using new tools (Blackboard, for example), or including new content (eGovernment services, Congress.gov, and FDsys). New opportunities mentioned include:

- Conducting more instruction and training of new products or to new audiences;
- Providing GIS and other data services;
- Marketing and promotion, often to different constituencies;
- Providing eGovernment services;
- Looking for collaborative opportunities; and
- Participating in continuing education activities.

3. What is a regional or comprehensive collection in a non-tangible, digital age?

There were 39 comments in response to this question, grouped into 16 topics. The following four comments describe a comprehensive collection as:

- Separate libraries that together hold digital items;
- Everything on a .gov domain;
- Digital copies of all documents stored on local servers; and
- A national bibliography with links to multiple copies that "live" on different servers.

Distributed collections, digital redundancy, and permanent public access are attributes participants used to describe their “comprehensive collection.”

Eighteen percent of comments indicated a continuing need for tangible collections, even in a non-tangible, digital age. The importance of tangible collections was expressed in terms of the digital divide and inaccessible online publications or services. As one participant put it, “I used the shutdown to promote our physical collection...Make lemonade with lemons!”

One participant asserted that, “There is no FDLP who shouldn't also be offering E-govt services.” Another 14 comments, or 36% of all the comments, related to eGovernment services – different levels of service and types of libraries that are more conducive to providing eGovernment services.

4. Describe any ideas you have for collaborative models to provide Government information services or access to Federal depository collections.

The above statement generated 35 comments, grouped into 20 topics. It was suggested that GPO take advantage of existing consortia and local collaborations when developing models for the FDLP. Examples of current models mentioned specifically include:

- a. US Patent & Trademark Resource Centers;
- b. ASERL's Centers of Excellence;
- c. Expanded use of selective housing agreements; and
- d. Missouri's Sub-regional.

Multi-state regional collections across state lines, shared, or distributed collections were popular suggestions and accounted for 37% of the responses. Cooperative digitization projects, the need for digital redundancy, scan-on-demand, and ingest of library digitized titles into FDsys were also comments.

The need for cooperative cataloging/metadata projects was expressed in 23% of the comments. Many of these comments had a retrospective focus of pre-1976 cataloging. It was suggested that GPO should increase the number of cooperative cataloging partnerships and that, perhaps, lessons learned from the creation of *National Union Catalog of Pre-1956 Imprints* could serve to provide a national cooperative cataloging model.

In the area of reference services, it was suggested that a central location be created where LibGuides could be shared. The shared LibGuide collection for Florida and the Caribbean was given as an example. Interest in a tool to determine “what libraries are more likely to have what you need in a given area” was expressed.

5. What will GPO have to do to effectively support the new roles, opportunities, or models you have described?

This question generated 43 comments, grouped into 20 topical areas. Almost 25% of the comments suggest that GPO collaborate with 3rd parties, i.e., parties other than depository libraries or Federal agencies. The 3rd parties specifically identified by participants are:

- HathiTrust;
- Online Computer Library Center (OCLC);
- ASERL; and
- ProQuest.

Comments suggested that GPO improve relations with Federal publishing agencies to ensure their content is disseminated through the FDLP, ingested into FDsys, and preserved. A particular area of concern identified was the preservation and permanent public access to data sets and interactive databases such as American FactFinder, National Biological Information Infrastructure (NBII), decennial census data, and data.gov.

Those who participated in this discussion look to GPO to coordinate certain activities including:

- Awareness of Federal agency training opportunities;
- Identifying gaps in depository collections;
- Cataloging, particularly with a retrospective focus (using OCLC or MoCat records);
- Digitizing; and, more broadly,
- Managing the lifecycle of digital Government information.

Suggestions were made for GPO support that would help ease the funding burdens of depository libraries – some kind of funding (IMLS grant facilitated by GPO or other grant/funding mechanism) to be used by Federal depositories for:

- Shipping FDLP materials to other libraries as part of the disposition of materials process;
- Federal depository transformation efforts; and
- Digitizing projects.

The desire for increased ingest into FDsys was expressed, most descriptively with these two quotes, “The eventual goal should be for a digital copy of every document ever published to be in FDsys,” and “I would like to see FDsys to eventually include library digitized historical documents as well as the current materials.”

Outcome Achieved?

Excellent discussion resulted in achievement of the first and third expected outcomes. New ideas for proofs of concept did not emerge from the discussion. Existing collaborative models were identified, though reasons for their success were not discussed, nor were discreet tasks for GPO to investigate or undertake to build upon those models identified or discussed.

Tuesday, December 10, 2013

Focused Discussion: Building an Authoritative National Bibliography of U.S. Government Publications Summary

Expected Outcome of Discussion

- Obtain your thoughts, ideas, and strategies that will assist GPO in the development of a premiere comprehensive index of Government publications and information dissemination products.

Summary of Discussion

This focused discussion, facilitated by Chris Brown, had 123 attendees.

QUESTIONS

1. What factors do you consider most important in determining catalog priorities?

There were 42 comments associated with this question.

Responses indicated that historical material not currently cataloged should be a priority as well as current newsworthy material. Cataloging large sets (e.g., Congressional hearings, Serial Set, annual reports, etc.) and linking records for material with titles changes was also mentioned. Finally, it was suggested that the number of depository libraries selecting the material be used as a factor when determining priority.

Also, libraries were interested in a collaborative effort or partnership between HathiTrust and GPO. This effort would require additional investigation and has some legal implications. GPO only has authority to manage official U.S. Government publications and also may not compete with private industry in the creation of indexing.

2. How can we improve our cataloging practices to better meet library cataloging and metadata needs?

There were 29 comments associated with this question.

Most of the responses related to cooperative or collaborative cataloging between GPO and libraries, OCLC and agencies. Participants also indicated that a single record that contains the formats that are available would be less confusing to patrons but understood that separate records for each format complies with RDA. Finally, it was expressed that cataloging practices should be focused on material for which no records exist (in the Catalog of U.S. Government Publications (CGP), OCLC, etc.).

POLL

How do you currently obtain GPO bibliographic records for your OPAC or cataloging purposes?

There were 73 total votes.

- CGP – 0
- GPO's Z39.50 Gateway – 0
- GPO's Cataloging Records Distribution Program (CRDP) – 4 (5%)
- MARCIVE – 57 (78%)
- OCLC – 12 (16%)

However, respondents also indicated that they use multiple methods for obtaining GPO bibliographic records.

3. What delivery mechanism would be most beneficial for providing you GPO bibliographic records?

There were 47 comments associated with this question.

Common themes noted from this question were: 1) customizable loading of records (i.e., in batches, by year, subset for all records with 856 field, etc.), 2) a free delivery mechanism, and 3) move away from record loading and expand discovery or provide deduped records through the library discovery tools.

4. What are your minimum bibliographic record needs?

There were 27 comments associated with this question.

The majority of responses indicated the following as their minimum bibliographic record needs:

- OCLC Number;
- Title;
- Author;
- Date;
- Sudoc Number;
- URLs (856 field); and
- Subject.

5. What would a shared cataloging program include/look like?

There were 15 comments associated with this question.

In general, respondents indicated that a shared cataloging program would include or look like the ASERL Center of Excellence program or be similar to OCLC.

6. What are other ideas that could be implemented to assist in the development of an authoritative comprehensive index of Government information dissemination products?

There were 18 comments associated with this question.

Respondents primarily agreed that the content within the CGP should also be made available in WorldCat. Other popular ideas included a tool or service in which libraries or others can contribute records or data elements, and working with HathiTrust in their development of a registry of government publications.

7. What ideas do you have to make the index more accessible/utilized?

There were 46 comments associated with this question.

Most of the ideas shared related to incorporating the index into discovery tools or programs, or distributing it to discovery solutions. Other reoccurring ideas included adding or leveraging full-text search for the records in the CGP, an online version of the Monthly Catalog, adding CGP records to WorldCat, and adding HathiTrust and Internet Archive library catalogs to the index.

Outcome Achieved?

The expected outcomes of the discussion were achieved. Thoughts about accessibility and the bibliographic record needs of the community were discussed and ideas for current and potential collaborations and models were considered. Strategies such as sharing catalogs, delivering records from GPO to libraries, and setting cataloging priorities were also examined.

Focused Discussion: In the Public Eye: Increasing Federal Depository Library Relevance

Expected Outcome of Discussion

- Suggested actions for GPO and Federal depository libraries to undertake that will increase the relevance of Federal depository libraries and Government documents collections that are dispersed.

Summary of Discussion

This focused discussion, facilitated by Kate Irwin-Smiler, had 122 attendees.

QUESTIONS

1. How can GPO provide organization for electronic resources, beyond what FDsys currently does?

This question elicited 19 responses grouped in to 8 different topics. Of the 19 responses, 47% related to GPO-agency relations. The tenor of these comments was the need for more coordination and agency accountability to ensure their publications are disseminated through the FDLP and ingested into FDsys.

Cataloging/metadata-related suggestions were to:

- Catalog more online publications.
- Contribute cataloging records to national databases such as WorldCat.
- Provide cataloging records for and links to digitization projects of Federal depository libraries.
- Provide links to digital documents in the CGP, no matter where the documents reside.

Other suggestions made:

- Highlight digital documents that also live in physical libraries.
- Encourage agencies to better index their materials.
- Include a "Find in a Library" tool in FDsys, like the one in the CGP.
- Develop a one-stop piece level index of digital documents.

2. What can depository libraries do to assist in the organization of electronic resources for discoverability and accessibility?

There were 12 comments to this question that were grouped into 7 topics.

Discussion participants identified four major areas in which depository libraries could assist GPO to increase discoverability and accessibility to digital content within the scope of the FDLP. They are identifying fugitive documents (digital and tangible), cataloging them, sharing cataloging records, and reporting errors such as in FDsys (e.g. wrong Congress) and broken PURLs.

Suggested actions for GPO that would facilitate depository library include:

- Make it easier to report fugitives, including groups of fugitives.
- Make it easier to know what is in the GPO pipeline for cataloging.
- Encourage vendors to include Government information sources in their discovery services.
- Allow more cooperative cataloging.

3. Describe the features of an “easy to use” interface.

Seventy-seven comments, grouped into 15 topics, were generated by this question.

Participants identified features from having acronym descriptions in cataloging records to having static URLs to search histories. Features grouped as “Interface Design” had the most comments, with 17, and they include:

- Well-defined categories for sections;
- Not having to go into too many levels to find information;
- Field labels;
- Clear understanding of available content; and
- Use of “mouse over” for clarification.

Other features or themes identified for an easy-to-use interface, in topic frequency order, include:

- Use of facets (15);
- Availability of citation tools (10);
- Limited use of jargon, acronyms, and abbreviations (10);
- Multiple search options (7);
- Search accuracy (7);
- Ability to easily export or download content (6);
- Availability of good help (5);
- Full text searching and quick access to full text (5);
- Provision of sort options (4);
- Single search box (3);
- Trend awareness – GPO needing to know what’s familiar to users, e.g., “default to a keyword search (like everywhere else on the internet)” (3);
- Intuitive (1);
- Large text (1); and

- Quick results (1).

4. Besides cataloging and creating the Catalog of U.S .Government Publications, what other discovery roles do you envision for GPO?

This question garnered 37 comments for this question that were grouped into 11 topics. Comments expressed an interest in having GPO work with outside (non-GPO) entities to increase access to content through: adding content or indexing to commercial discovery services, adding content to 3rd parties like Google Scholar and HathiTrust, adding more content into FDsys, and finally, ensuring content is discoverable by search engines like Google, Bing, and Yahoo. Other entities specifically mentioned include USA.gov and data.gov. Several comments stemmed from people who want FDsys to accept content digitized by depository libraries. Some also want GPO to do more to acquire more content for inclusion in FDsys, such as congressional material. Other comments ranged from having GPO work with entities to improve interface designs through usage data collection, having GPO ensure interoperability of content on various GPO products and tools, and provision of a customizable search tool for Government information content. To a lesser extent in this question, preservation of the content in digital format and permanent links to it and to its bibliographic records were expressed. Preservation also entailed GPO reaching out to agencies to ensure their content remained stable or to have GPO capture the content or harvest it before it disappears.

5. In what third party activities that enhance discovery and accessibility of Government information are depositories currently engaged?

Seventy comments, grouped into 23 topics, were generated by this question. Many library staff participate in one or more form of social media, including blogs, Twitter, Pinterest, and Facebook. Other forms of enhancing discoverability and accessibility stem from the creation of guides; many specifically mention LibGuides; displays, including 'social media exhibits'; and Web pages. Many types of instruction were touched on, including the teaching of faculty and staff, patrons, and the public, through workshops, instruction sessions, webinars, and conferences. Other forms of enhancing discoverability come from the cataloging of Government information using vendor records, using a shared catalog, and working with entities like HathiTrust and TRAIL and their associated catalog records. There were several comments about commercial discovery services such as commercial databases. Interestingly, there were a few comments that mentioned the importance the libraries' roles in error reporting to GPO and the aforementioned 3rd party entities. Digitization of Government information content is seen as enhancing access, especially when integrated with HathiTrust or TRAIL repositories. Direct forms of marketing and promotion include partnering with agencies for specific tasks, like the IRS/VITA collaboration, giving interviews to local media, and distributing promotional materials about the FDLP. Some comments mentioned specific coordination roles like organizing the

Browse Topics site and agreeing to manage an ASERL Center of Excellence.

6. What partnerships, if any, do you envision for depository libraries and GPO that will increase discovery of Government information?

This question resulted in 61 comments covering 14 topics. A very large part of the comments (34%) received in this question related to the rebranding of the FDLP as service centers, service and collection centers, or otherwise changing the word 'depository' as it is conjures an archaic image. Another hot topic for this question was training and the continued need for it in a profession that has a high turnover rate. GPO was specifically called out as an entity that can help address the training needs of the Government information community. One comment specifically requested GPO to create a certification system to acknowledge, at a professional level, the value and skill set associated with the documents community. Numerous marketing and promotional efforts were also commented on as being a valuable avenue to increase discoverability of Government information. Partnerships, either GPO partnering with agencies, libraries partnering with agencies or 3rd party entities, or libraries partnering with other libraries, comprised the remaining comments. Stemming from these partnerships, libraries want to see more content now only found in commercial databases, more open access initiatives, awareness and deduplication of efforts, collaborative digitization and collaborative cataloging projects, and the development of a collective knowledgebase for Government information questions, to name a few.

POLL

Will a search for Government information originating in a popular search engine retrieve results that link back to your online catalog?

There were 82 attendees who participated in the poll. Of those, two (2%) responded "Yes," while 36 (43%) responded "No." The majority of respondents, 44 (53%) indicated they were "Not sure."

In addition to the poll responses, there were seven text chat comments. They were:

- "I'm not just not sure"
- "I have NO idea!"
- "Why would we want that to happen?"
- "Do you mean Google?"
- "Do you mean WorldCat?"
- "answered No but recall a very few rare instances where I did end up back in our records"
- "Now that I think about it I do see catalog records in google searches just haven't seen ours."

The remaining comment provided an example of a Google search for the title, "The U.S. national economy, 1916- unpublished documentary collections from the U.S. Department of the Treasury" [<https://www.google.com/#q=U.S.+national+economy%2C+1916-1981> +]. Among the search results were links to some library catalogs.

ONLINE COMMENT

One person seized the opportunity to review the focused discussion recording and provide a comment. She conveyed:



My conclusion is...

Instead of having FDsys and CGP, etc. consolidating everything into a one stop for government information, like usa.gov, would be the most useful. Searchers want to go to one place, and it now so scattered between these various databases and the records in our catalogs.

Have GPO create one master 'everything is in here' database.

Outcome Achieved?

The expected outcome of the focused discussion was achieved. Suggested actions to increase the relevance of depository libraries include: increasing dispersed access points FDLP content, rebranding of the FDLP, and increasing the acquisition of new content through enhanced relations with Federal agencies.

Wednesday, December 11, 2013

Focused Discussion: Resolving Anticipated Barriers to Digital Access

Expected Outcome of Discussion

- Determine options to resolve or minimize the anticipated barriers to accessing digital Federal Government information

Summary of Discussion

This focused discussion, facilitated by Marie Concannon, had 116 attendees.

The session attendees were asked to participate in five polls and respond to three questions to determine options for resolving or minimizing anticipated barriers to accessing digital Federal Government information. While the polls were underway, participants frequently made observations or comments on the topic. Their remarks are included below each poll's results.

Comments made by participants to the three questions were grouped into themes, when possible, for purposes of reporting. Each poll had a separate number of participants. The total number of participants is reported along with the number of participants who responded to each separate question within the poll.

POLLS

1. To what extent do you view access as a barrier to accessing digital Government information at your library?

There were 55 total votes.

- Major barrier to digital access – 9 (16%)
- Minor barrier to digital access – 43 (78%)
- Not a barrier to digital access – 3 (5%)

One participant commented that “Format influences (digital) access.” “Using a map on a tablet or computer would be harder than using the physical copy.”

2. To what extent do you view the digital divide as a barrier to accessing digital Government information at your library?

There were 58 total votes.

- Major barrier to digital access – 17 (29%)
- Minor barrier to digital access – 23 (39%)
- Not a barrier to digital access – 18 (31%)

Two participants observed that geography or one’s geographical location can be a barrier to digital access since rural areas of the country do not have the same bandwidth available as urban areas.

Seven participants observed that a lack of user competence and persistence is a barrier.

3. To what extent do you view technology as a barrier to accessing digital Government information at your library?

There were 68 total votes.

- Major barrier to digital access – 28 (41%)
- Minor barrier to digital access – 38 (55%)
- Not a barrier to digital access – 2 (2%)

Five participants in this poll commented that the forward migration of formats and platforms was a potential technology barrier. Four participants commented that

constantly changing software is a technology barrier. One participant noted that specialized software requirements to access information, such as specific “plug-ins” to view U.S. Patent drawings, are also technology barriers.

4. To what extent do you view funding as a barrier to accessing digital Government information at your library?

There were 63 total votes.

- Major barrier to digital access – 47 (74%)
- Minor barrier to digital access – 12 (19%)
- Not a barrier to digital access – 4 (6%)

During the poll on funding as a potential barrier, nine participants noted that a lack of funding is the main issue behind all of the other digital access barriers.

5. To what extent do you view preservation as a barrier to accessing digital Government information at your library?

There were 65 total votes.

- Major barrier to digital access – 56 (86%)
- Minor barrier to digital access – 9 (13%)
- Not a barrier to digital access – 0

During the poll on preservation as a potential barrier, one participant noted the need for locally distributed content, and two participants noted again that funding is the main source of all digital access barriers.

Among the results of the five polls, Preservation had the highest percentage of the total number of respondents for that question, with 56 respondents out of a total of 65 or 86% reporting that Preservation was a major barrier to digital access. Funding was viewed by 47 out of 63 or 74% of the respondents as a major barrier to digital access. Only 28 of 68 participants or 41% felt that Technology was a major barrier, followed by 17 of 58 or 29% who felt that the Digital Divide was a major barrier, and 9 of 55 respondents or 16% who felt that Access issues were a major barrier.

QUESTIONS

1. What can GPO do to mitigate each of these (access, digital divide, technology, funding, and preservation) anticipated barriers to digital access?

There were 39 comments associated with this question.

Of those 39 comments, 24 were preservation related. The common preservation themes were:

- Coordinate preservation efforts;
- Create adequate digitization guidelines;
- Create preservation mirror sites, LOCKSS in case of government shutdowns;
- Promote and explain Federal Agencies Digitization Guidelines Initiative (FADGI) guidelines;
- Assign priority to digitization registry projects;
- Web harvesting;
- Provide leadership to promote preservation among Federal agencies;
- Provide leadership to Federal agencies to promote software standards for digital resources;
- Digitize weeded materials by creating scanning centers in regionals;
- Develop preservation partnerships; and
- Support partnerships like TRAIL (Technical Report Archive & Image Library).

Other common themes in the discussion were:

- Access – PURL to live sites;
- Access – Strengthen the law to require agencies to submit publications to GPO;
- Access – Adequate funding to find fugitive publications; and
- Add appropriate content to Wikipedia “seed the cloud.” The expression “seed the cloud” is used to mean that agencies should add information about their history, work, constituent base, and scope of operation to Wikipedia or other wiki sites as a way of promoting their work to the general public.

2. What can depository libraries do to mitigate each of these (access, digital divide, technology, funding, and preservation) anticipated barriers to digital access?

There were 61 comments associated with this question.

The responses by participants focused on things that FDLs should take a leadership role in achieving as well as comments focused on Access, Advocacy, User Education, and Preservation. One participant observed that even though this question focused on what the depository libraries could do to mitigate anticipated barriers to digital access, that GPO would still be needed to “Provide coordination for FDL efforts.”

Access related comments:

- [Create] mirror sites;
- Crowd source metadata;
- Apply faceted searching to online catalog search results;
- Improve search results;
- Provide bibliographic records for fugitive documents;
- Update finding aids;

- Host digital content;
- Digital deposit; and
- FDLs work together – Digitize microfiche documents.

Advocacy related comments:

- Advocacy for technology issues;
- Access and technology advocacy with local congressional staff and Government representatives;
- Advocacy with [library] administration; and
- Advocate for all libraries to provide public access to the internet.

User Education related comments:

- Educate users;
- Educate users at Ask A Librarian: Government Information Online (GIO);
- Combat myths of online information, i.e. that everything is free and already online;
- Educate users – internal staff at FDLs;
- Educate users – provide internship opportunities with local library schools;
- Educate users – [Develop] library blog sites;
- Educate users – Use of online docs;
- FDLs – Educate “plaster access points with “for help call” signs”;
- Educate users – Outreach to non-documents libraries and teach document use;
- Educate users – Outreach to school librarians;
- Educate users - use Twitter to promote documents; and
- Educate Government agencies about the digital divide.

Preservation related comments:

- Preservation – Create mirror sites;
- Preservation – Digitize weeded materials;
- Create scanning centers in Regionals;
- FDLs work together – Archive-It and LOCKSS; and
- FDLs work together to identify unique documents and digitize through venues such as HathiTrust.

Other comments:

- Funding – Save money by avoiding duplication of cataloging;
- GPO – Provide coordination for FDL efforts;
- FDLs form formal partnerships (selective and regional) to solve these problems;
- FDLs – Partner with GPO on cataloging projects; and
- FDLs – Work together with Regionals.

3. Describe potential partnership opportunities between FDLs and GPO that would mitigate or resolve anticipated barriers.

There were 31 comments associated with this question.

The 31 comments made by participants comprise the following issues:

- FDLs and GPO (should) partner to raise the awareness among Federal agencies of the value and use of their publications;
- Access – Apply faceted searching;
- Crowd source cataloging to FDLs;
- GPO partner with ProQuest to acquire checklist records;
- GPO set minimum technical standards for FDL workstations for accessing Government information;
- Partner with consortia;
- GPO leadership for organizing collaboration;
- Partnerships linking Federal and state agencies;
- Preservation guidelines and standards for digitization;
- Preservation – Promote and explain FADGI guidelines;
- Expand CRDP to all libraries;
- FDLs and GPO collaborate on grants; and
- Consortia should work with commercial vendors for experience with licensing issues.

Outcome Achieved?

The objectives were met as participants suggested many things that GPO and libraries could do independently, or in partnership with one another, to help overcome the anticipated barriers to digital access. Suggestions for GPO action were related to providing leadership and preservation. Action suggested for libraries focused on providing leadership - in archiving, access, advocacy, and user education. The final question of what the libraries and GPO could do together in partnership to resolve anticipated barriers provided 31 specific suggestions. A significant point however was reached when the conversation turned to additional resources that would be required to execute these ideas. While resources include labor, money, and more, nine participants noted that funding underlay most of the barriers to digital access. Additional steps and prioritization of needs would be required for conclusive steps and actions.

Focused Discussion: Marketing

Expected Outcomes of Discussion

- Suggested ideas for continued development and refinement of the marketing efforts by GPO and FDLP member libraries
- Augmentation of the FDLP Promotion Plan with the goal of continuing and expanding use of Federal depository libraries

Summary of Discussion

This focused discussion, facilitated by Stephanie Braunstein, had 107 attendees.

QUESTIONS

- 1. When someone asks what you do as a Government Documents Librarian, how do you respond?**

There were 47 comments associated with this question.

The majority of responses referred to helping patrons find, access, and use Government information. The availability of primary resources also surfaced. Another major trend in the responses was the need to change the title of Government Documents Librarian or the name of the department in the library to reflect “information” instead of “documents.” Finally, the need to define “Government information” was expressed.

- 2. How do you describe the FDLP to your library's stakeholders?**

There were 44 comments associated with this question.

The strongest agreement that was discussed was the term “network” to describe the FDLP. It was also heavily discussed that the term “depository” causes confusion/needs explaining and clarification. Finally, the term “free” was discussed several times as a popular talking point in describing the FDLP to stakeholders.

- 3. What are the best resources to market the FDLP and its resources effectively to fellow library professionals and non-Government Information Librarians?**

There were 63 comments associated with this question.

Common themes that surfaced from this question were: 1) proactive outreach, both external to and internal to the FDLP via presentations and training to various audiences, 2) cataloging the collection with a focus to ensuring discoverability, 3) an emphasis on primary resources, and 4) a focus on anniversary celebrations and historical dates as a way to market and the source for marketing ideas.

Suggested resources were reiterations of data collected in the marketing Forecast questions, i.e. social media, training, promotional materials from GPO, and promotion through library web sites.

4. How can the FDLP be successfully marketed to Library Directors, Deans, and other administrators--of both current FDLP member and non-member libraries?

There were 44 comments associated with this question.

Major facets of the FDLP noted as being emphasized to administrators were: 1) the availability of primary resources, 2) the prestige of serving as a Federal depository, and 3) that the acquisition of the materials is free to the institution. (It was also recognized there is an associated cost with allocating library staff.)

Suggested methods were reiterations of data collected in the marketing Forecast questions, i.e. anniversaries, displays, GPO visits, etc. A popular comment suggested being in the FDLP affords libraries to have a stake in Government information publication policies. Another popular theme arose surrounding the use of the FDLP collection in published works.

5. How can GPO's marketing efforts/tools be improved to be sufficiently flexible for use in a variety of environments and with various approaches?

There were 52 comments associated with this question.

There was agreement that promotional tools need to be customizable for local audiences. A popular trend in the discussion was the need for materials in various languages. Specific languages suggested were numerous and varied. Another theme that surfaced was the need for the use of humorous or edgy materials. In addition, a need to refresh and update the materials more frequently was expressed.

6. What is the essential message that needs to be told about the FDLP?

There were 36 comments associated with this question.

The themes emphasized were: 1) free access to information and 2) the breadth of the resources/topics.

Participants also brainstormed a new slogan for the FDLP.

7. With whom do we want to share this message?

There were 37 comments associated with this question.

The responses were broad and varied and included: Congress, Library Directors, the public, schools, and more. Another popular response was, "everyone."

POLL

Do you have an elevator speech about the FDLP or your depository library?

There were 67 total votes.

- Yes – 30 (44%)
- No – 27 (55%)

There were 16 comments associated with the elevator speech poll. The comments did not add anything substantive to the poll results (mostly banter/off-topic).

Outcome Achieved?

The Marketing Focused Discussion confirmed a number of key ideas that first surfaced in the Library and State Forecast Questionnaire responses. The participants provided focused suggestions regarding current and future FDLP marketing efforts, such as the ability of libraries to customize promotional materials, the use of more contemporary language to describe the good work the libraries are doing, and major facets of the FDLP that should be highlighted. These ideas will be incorporated into the next iteration of the FDLP Promotion Plan. In light of these facts, the expected outcomes of the Marketing Focused Discussion were met.