

Depository Selection Mechanisms: Questions for the Community



June 5, 2006

During the Spring Depository Library Conference, Judy Russell, the Superintendent of Documents, explained the proposed new models for the selection of online and tangible publications, and asked conference participants for feedback. Those in the depository community who were unable to attend the conference were also given the opportunity to respond to the questionnaire.

The following represents the initial analysis of the results from the questionnaire on the proposed new models for the selection of online and tangible publications. The results are organized by all respondents and then by attendance at the plenary session on selection mechanisms at the Spring 2006 Federal Depository Library Conference.

A total of 177 out of 1,262, or 14%, of Federal depository libraries responded to the questionnaire. Respondents selected the response or responses that best reflected their answer to each of the 13 questions. Not all respondents answered every question. Respondents were also asked to share any additional comments with GPO.

While the response rate was not as high as GPO had hoped, the initial analysis of the data appears to validate the approach GPO has taken to revise the existing item number system. A total of 164, or 92.7%, of respondents agreed that online and tangible publications merit separate selection mechanisms. The response was similar when asked if the item numbers needs to be revised to reflect the increase in online publications and to increase flexibility when selecting tangible publications. A total of 147, or 83.1%, of respondents indicated they would use a combination of agency-based item numbers and collection development tools to select online publications. When asked if the additional work of reviewing some titles before receipt was an acceptable tradeoff to allow more specificity in selection of tangible items 157, or 88.7%, of respondents agreed.

GPO will utilize this data to finalize the new models for selecting online and tangible publications and to draft an implementation plan.

General Background

1. Do you agree that the requirements for distribution of tangible publications are different enough from the requirements for online dissemination to merit separate mechanisms for selection and distribution?

All Respondents
Yes 164 No 7

Attended Session
Yes 110 No 1

Did not Attend Session
Yes 54 No 6

2. Do you agree that the existing item number system needs to be revised to reflect the increasing number of online publications?

All Respondents
 Yes 160 No 13

Attended Session
 Yes 101 No 10

Did not Attend Session
 Yes 59 No 3

3. Do you agree that the system needs to be revised to allow more flexibility for tangible selection?

All Respondents
 Yes 173 No 3

Attended Session
 Yes 110 No 3

Did not Attend Session
 Yes 63 No 0

Selection of Online Publications

4. What type of collection development tools would assist you the most in selecting online publications? (Respondents were asked to circle all the tools they thought would be of assistance.)

All Respondents
 Bibliographies on specific topics and geographic regions 32
 New titles lists issued more frequently 22
 User defined searches that can be saved and run at the user's desired frequency 15
 Combination of bibliographies and new titles lists 24
 Combination of bibliographies and saved searches 16
 Combination of new lists and saved searches 5
 All 57

Attended Session
 Bibliographies on specific topics and geographic regions 15
 New titles lists issued more frequently 4
 User defined searches that can be saved and run at the user's desired frequency 5
 Combination of bibliographies and new titles lists 19
 Combination of bibliographies and saved searches 13
 Combination of new lists and saved searches 2
 All 52

Did not Attend Session
 Bibliographies on specific topics and geographic regions 17
 New titles lists issued more frequently 18
 User defined searches that can be saved and run at the user's desired frequency 10
 Combination of bibliographies and new titles lists 5
 Combination of bibliographies and saved searches 3
 Combination of new lists and saved searches 3
 All 5

5. If the proposed model for selection of online publications is implemented, which option will you consider using to select online publications?

All Respondents
Collection development tools 15
Agency-based item numbers 8
Combination of both 147

Attended Session
Collection development tools 4
Agency-based item numbers 4
Combination of both 101

Did not Attend Session
Collection development tools 11
Agency-based item numbers 4
Combination of both 46

6. Do you or your users use the “Locate Libraries” feature of the CGP for online publications?

All Respondents
Yes 44 No 123

Attended Session
Yes 26 No 80

Did not Attend Session
Yes 18 No 43

7. In the current system, GPO uses item numbers to record which online publications a depository library agrees to provide access to, i.e. assist users in locating and using that publication and others on that subject? Do you agree that this function should be maintained in any new model for online selection?

All Respondents
Yes 133 No 36

Attended Session
Yes 86 No 22

Did not Attend Session
Yes 47 No 14

8. If the proposed model were adopted, how much time would be needed to review the new collection development tools before implementing the proposed changes to item numbers?

All Respondents
30 days 19
60 days 63
90 days 87

Attended Session
30 days 13
60 days 32
90 days 63

Did not Attend Session
30 days 6
60 days 31
90 days 24

Selection of Tangible Publications

9. If the proposed model for selection of tangible publications were adopted, depository libraries will have a specified time period to review and select titles with items they have designated as "review." What is a reasonable time period for review and selection of these items?

All Respondents	
2 weeks	25
30 days	79
45 days	24
60 days	41

Attended Session	
2 weeks	18
30 days	57
45 days	12
60 days	20

Did not Attended Session	
2 weeks	7
30 days	22
45 days	12
60 days	21

10. If your library is not a regional, how would you use the review items?

All Respondents		
Only use the selected and non-selected items		14
Use the review items primarily for category classes, such as General Publications		58
Use the review items heavily to tailor my collection more closely to my users' needs		67

Attended Session		
Only use the selected and non-selected items		8
Use the review items primarily for category classes, such as General Publications		41
Use the review items heavily to tailor my collection more closely to my users' needs		36

Did not Attended Session		
Only use the selected and non-selected items		6
Use the review items primarily for category classes, such as General Publications		17
Use the review items heavily to tailor my collection more closely to my users' needs		31

11. Would you consider the additional workload of having to review some titles before receipt an acceptable tradeoff to allow more specificity in selection of tangible items and reduce unwanted items held for 5 years?

All Respondents		
Yes	157	No 11

Attended Session		
Yes	96	No 10

Did not Attend Session		
Yes	61	No 1

12. What is an appropriate claims period for selected items (similar to standing orders)? This period would begin at time of shipment.

All Respondents	
30 days	49
45 days	54
60 days	66

Attended Session	
30 days	38
45 days	28
60 days	36

Did not Attend Session	
30 days	11
45 days	20
60 days	30

13. What is an appropriate claims period for review items (similar to review copies)? This period would begin at time of shipment.

All Respondents	
30 days	63
45 days	45
60 days	61

Attended Session	
30 days	47
45 days	28
60 days	33

Did not Attend Session	
30 days	16
45 days	17
60 days	28