# The Future CGP and 21st Century Technical Services: What We Learned from You! – Transcript of audio

Hello, everyone. Welcome to the future CGP and 21st-century technical services: what we learn from you. Jennifer Morgan will now get us started. Take it away, Jennifer.

Thanks, Kelly. Hello, everybody. I'm Jennifer Morgan. I am the chair of the collection and discovery services. Working group. And presenting with me today are two of my fellow working group members, Stephen Kharfen and Mike Maben.

Last year, the collection working group held two open forums. To discuss issues affecting the federal depository laboratory community. A lot of information, ideas, and suggestions, were shared regarding technical service in the 21st century, the next generation CGP, and possible topics for the future work of the collection and discovery services working group. We would like to report what we learned from the federal depository library community at these open forms. On the slide here, you can see the working group charts. Would you can read. Basically, the collection and discovery service working group divides a forum where counsel, libraries, and GPO can explore opportunities and proposals for collaboration in multiple areas of the program, and management and development of the collection.

At the spring meeting in April of 2021, we asked a series of questions to get feedback from the depository community on issues expecting federal depository libraries in the areas of cataloging and metadata, technical service, collection development and management, and discovery services. We asked the community to share their ideas, suggestions, and cautions, per those discussion topics. Last month, the working group, we submitted our report to counsel on this form.

Council voted to accept the report and share with GPO at the business meeting today. We are going to share that with you right now.

So we open the forum with the poll questions about technical services and departments in depository liberties. We take the polls on the slide, just know we could be the overall response rate for each question. And then we show you the response rate for each answer. So, our first pole asks, if the library had a dedicated tech services department for government documents?

In the overall response rate was 37%. Out of 169 point responses, 42% responded no. But we have dedicated technical services staff for whatever documents. And the other 42% responded no.

Our second pole asks attendees if their library had recently reorganized their tech services department?

In the overall response rate was 53%. And over those 150 responses, 1% responded yes, there library had recently reorganized the tech services department. 11% responded no, but were considering it. And then the overall majority, 68% responded simply, no.

So we opened the discussion with the question, what should the ideal library technical services department look like in the 21st century? We wanted to find out how depository libraries might be reorganizing and renaming their technical services department, what kinds of skills were needed, and what kinds of roles and responsibilities would exist in the ideal technical services department. And a lot of the attendees responses focused on the desire for more education and training. Librarians stated

they wanted cross training between technical services and public services library staff. Reference librarians want to understand cataloging, and what resources for non-catalogers. Someone specifically mentioned a desire for a gov.docs webinar. To understand how their work impacts library users.

Some attendees commented that tech services involved a lot of electronic resource management, and so they want training on electronic materials, cataloging special formats, vendor negotiation, and software migration.

And other needs that were mentioned include training for public libraries on cataloging and collection development of FDLP documents. And training for new librarians. Someone specifically said docs for those who don't know how to tell what a good question is.

Additionally, some attendees stated that technical services department needed more staff. Especially for cataloging government information, digital, or special collections. And we noted that one attendee commented that it is important to communicate to the library administration that even though there might be less print acquisition, the roles of technical service librarians and staff are still necessary. Especially with new cataloging, ILS systems, BIBFrame, RDA Changes, ETC.

To wrap up the question, we also asked how the reorganized tech services department were being renamed. And we learned that the department's new name reflected a shift on emphasis. These new departments were named discovery and resource management, discovery services, cataloging and metadata services, and collection support services. So now, Mike is going to share the next discussion question with you.

This slide displays the challenges for issues that, the attendees stated, they wanted the collection and discovery service working group to address.

You would know that money, conversion tops the list. Other issues include comparing LC and NARA collections. RDA, ILS, duplicating records, SuDoc issues, and a lot of people mentioned minor. By noting that they are having discussions about possible options for libraries, the GPO also pointed out that they sponsored the MarcEdit webinar on using this highly rated record editing tool. In that webinar, it's available on the FDLP.gov website. Next slide.

Thanks, Mike. Stephen will now share the next poll with the discussion question.

Good afternoon, everyone. I just want to quickly say we greatly appreciate all of your wonderful work for your communities and or federal depository library programs. We want to think the staff of LCM and LTS for their great work.

Poll five, are you building your depository collections with or providing access to digitized historical content? Select all that apply.

148 of the 309 attendees are dissipated in the poll for a 48% response rate. And the 148 respondents gave a total of 280 answers. And I am going to obviously read off -- different than the slide, the order of the highest to lowest number of responses. Top in the list at 72% is yes, we provide access through links in cataloging records. Next at 39% was yes, we provide access to digital historical content. 20%, yes we are building a digital collection with historical content. 14%, no, but we are considering building a digital collection. The last 3%, no, my library is not interested in historical content.

The majority of responses demonstrated a level of interest in the digital collections of historical content. Only 3% of the respondents indicated that they are not interested in any aspect of this. Some respondent provided additional commentary on poll question in the chat. One attendee said that many libraries would be interested in historical content, as long as physical materials would not need to be housed. And another attendee commented that having links to digital documents and bibliographic records would not help the preservation of the national collection.

Next slide. Next was the fourth question. LSCM is exploring a new series of item numbers for historical publication. What you think of this idea? I will does provide some grief background information. Some of the digital historical content that we catalog predates the development of the item number system. Or the tangible version might not have been distributed through the FDLP. The records for this publications do not have item numbers. The new item numbers would be for these categories of materials. They would be online resources and of item numbers would be used in online version records. 18 out of the 29 responses were favorable. One attendee commented that a new series of item numbers for historical publications would help with consistency. Several attendees emphasized that individual item numbers should not be used for multiple formats. Of course, as I just mentioned, as a friendly reminder, these item numbers would be for online publications only.

Other suggestions included electronic historical publications by agency, and a whole new revision of the item number system. Several participants were less than enthusiastic commenting, don't we have enough item numbers? I understand the purpose of item numbers, but wonder if we need a whole new approach, and a few other comments included I love this idea, that would be great, I think that will be can using two users, they have enough trouble with SuDoc . So next slide, please.

Thanks, Stephen. For our last discussion question from the 2021 open form, we wanted to learn what new or changes to existing cataloging services and products in depository community would find useful. So attendees responded by commenting that there were several existing services and technologies, which should either continue as is, or continue with improvement. Additionally, there were a couple of requests from the FDL community for new tools. So the services and products that were noted for continuation or improvement are listed on the slide. Offer access to electronics, online historic publication or catalog records of online historic publications with issuing agency. Continue the catalog record distribution program. Improve DSIMS to include additional descriptive information associated with item numbers to make selection profile modifications easier. Ensure the continuation of the document data minor three, or create an equivalent federal document library management tool to replace DDM3. Create a tool or mechanism which allows libraries or link their LS to the GCP to find, display, and access electronic online titles. And modernizing the CGP to minimize the technical glitches and improve overall ease-of-use.

I would like to note that when that suggestion came up, that superintended of documents to Hall, responded right away. To comment about the CGP, that LSCM was requesting a budget for our next generation. So we knew about that early last year.

Our key findings from the open form are that federal depository libraries are actively involved with GPO and the FDLP. And that federal depository libraries desire continue training and educational programming to develop skills and expertise. And specific skills, such as cataloging, processing, effective management of electronic resources, are vital to providing permanent access to U.S. government information products. The depository community wants and improved catalog. Our CM has Artie

addressed the issues brought up in the form. New webinars and webcasts are continually offered in the FDLP Academy. But, a series of cataloging webinars is not within the scope of what LSCM can offer. However, LSCM is creating a new information resource, a LibGuide, listing cataloging resources. That will include major updates that would impact cataloging government documents. Again, LSCM is currently working on requirements and requesting a budget for a project for a next-generation CGP.

So, after a careful review of the spring 2021 open form data, the working group decided that it was not necessary for counsel to submit formal recommendations to GPO for several reasons.

GPO continually offers new webinars and webcasts on topics such as cataloging, maintenance, special projects, and specialized research, through the FDL C Academy. And GPO was already working on issues such as modernizing the CEP, and obtaining document data minor three. Was then discussed at the fall open form, and it's addressed in a separate report from the collection and discovery services working group.

In 2021, GPO's LCM received funding for the next generation CEP, and they moved forward with planning the modernization of the catalog. Which was launched on March 9th, 2006. And then, last October, during the fall meeting, the working group held an open form discussion to learn what features federal depository libraries wanted in their ideal online cataloging, and discovery tool, to best serve their patrons needs. We asked them to specially ask questions, and we had took polls, from attendees on the use of the CGP, the desired catalog functions and features, and what training materials and topics they would be interested in.

We asked for ideas and suggestions, and questions, related to the catalog of U.S. Government publications. And we submitted our report to counsel on this forum last week. And earlier today at the business meeting, Council voted to accept the report and share it with GPO.

As we review this report, Mike will begin by talking about the first pole in the discussion question.

Thank you, Jennifer. So this whole, this slide shows the stated primary responsibilities of the attendees, along with the usage of the catalog of government publications.

Such respondents could select more than one area of response ability, and obviously, most people did. The totals did not add up to 100%. The top four include government information librarian, as you can see, 67%. Cataloging and metadata services, 51%. Reference, 50%. And collection development, 42%. Concerning the frequency of usage in the CGP, the daily usage is 24%, and the weekly usage is 30%. So combining these two categories, shows that 54% of the respondents say that they use the CGP at least once a week. Next slide.

We then asked the attendees why they used the CGP. What did they wish to accomplish when accessing the catalog? The responses shown here run from finding items, acquisitions and general collection management, descriptive cataloging, and SuDoc management. New electronic titles, searching for PURLs and OCLC numbers. GPL's, Lori Hall, noted how uplifting it was to see such a response since, as she stated, Cindy Atkins and I were bringing in on this tool to the GPO in 2006. Next slide.

The next poll, how do you most often search the CGP? The response rate was 60% total number of answers was 300. The top two responses was title, 34%. Together, these answers represent 60% of the total. Only three other search types received more than 20 responses. Agency name, 10%. Subject at

9%, and item number at 7%. And these three responses combined represent 20 percent -- 26% of the total comic sees me. At rather low rates, OCLC number, 2%. Keywords, 1%. New title keywords, 1%. The predominance of the two search types, such title and SuDoc number, quite predicable. The prominence of SuDoc searches illustrates the obvious importance of this metadata elements in our work.

Next slide, please. Question two. How do you most often begin your search in the CGP? The response rate was 33%. The response rates of the five CGP search mode were advanced, 33%. Basic, 19%. Browse, 7%. Expert, 5%. And specialized catalogs, such as the historic serial searches, 3%. The advanced search received one third of the responses. The respondents selected the advanced and basic searches for more than half of the total. Titles were mentioned 11 times as a key factor at 18% and SuDoc numbers were mentioned several times as a key factor at 11%. The next most important reported key factors were OCLC numbers at 10%, keywords at 7%, and PURLs at 5%. One third of the responses were other answers. Or, were mentioned twice. Remember, you are asking librarians. You can revise your search field so I don't have to go back to the main search page, such as when searching multiple OCLC numbers. Usually use other databases that search across several indexes, when I use the CGP, it's because I didn't find it. Finally, usually use the CGP only four known items, such as PURLs and researching topics. Next slide, please.

That's you, Stephen.

Oh, I'm sorry. What current features and functionality of the CGP do you want to keep in the new CGP? The response rate was 38%. There were four major categories of answers. Searching, record displays, new features, and use of records. The most frequent answers were MARC view, search by SuDoc, advanced searching, browsing, search by PURLs . Some of the comments were, remember that librarians use CGP differently than the general public. Suggestions about using metadata elements such as the six fields in bibliographic records as much as possible. Thank you.

Thanks, Stephen. And Mike will now share what we learned from the next poll question.

So this poll, shows your current download CGP records into your catalog. And you can see there that the overall response rate was quite low. When you factor out the non-responses, the result is, it shows you how little the CGP is used to download records into local catalogs. Although, we did not ask what other methods are used, I expect that the overwhelming majority probably uses OCLC for the source of records to download. Since most of us already use OCLC for document records. For transferring already exist. Next slide, please.

So after this poll, we ask what functions and features are present in the individual's current libraries catalogs, that they would like to see in the CGP. This shows that there were many suggestions. We placed them in four broad categories. Downloading and export content were represented by the desire to download more than 20 records, export full results in .csv or Excel, or export for citation purposes. We broke down search result in a two category. One being general results and one being refining of those search results. Search result desires include most relevant at the top, or records like this, more viewed. And expansion with the number of results. Refining these results are many of the standard tools that are available in a number of library online catalogs. Including limiting by online, limiting by depth and by other factors, and searching within the results. Finally, there were a number of requests in the area of functionality. Including saving URLs, keeping a browse by SuDoc, item number or popular name searching, and variant or outdated SuDoc numbers. Next slide, please.

Thanks, Mike. For our last poll, we asked attendees what type of training they would like to see LSCM provide for the CGP? And the respondents could select as many options that they wanted. The overall response rate for this poll was 51%. And most of those respondents indicated that they desired some forum of CGP training. So the responses are listed in order of preference. And you can see the top two are pretty close in response rate. Live webinars at 88%, tutorials at 86%. 50% of those who responded indicated that they would like hands on training, either in person or virtual. And 4% chose other, and they could describe what they wanted in the chat. Some of these comments are for prerecorded webcasts, short video demos on specific tasks, short YouTube or tick-tock sale recordings of specific searching, or sorting downloading functionality. And then they suggested that these small videos could also be embedded in LibGuide. And then 2% of those who responded , indicated that they do not want CGP training.

Finally, we asked attendees to describe what they wanted LSCM to offer in the way of training materials. And we recite a lot of great ideas and suggestions. If you are listed here.

In addition to live webinars, tutorials, and hands-on training, there is interest in short focused training live videos and written instructions. Topics of interest include search options and examples, searching tips and tricks, advanced in expert searching, and refresh training. Attendees when asked, agreed that they would like training on the specialized catalogs. That is the catalog for the serial set, publication, serial, government e-books, and especially, the historic selfless. Attendees also asked for best practices to be provided in the help pages. For example, they would like to see in the help pages, suggested searches for finding digital documents for library displays, or for finding documents for various audiences and age groups. Attendees also commented that they would like training and downloading records from the CGP. [ Captioners transitioning ]

So we learned so much from the depository library community during this open forum. We really appreciate how prepared participants were in sharing their ideas and suggestions. Amenity feedback is instrumental to informing GPO when the working group how depository libraries use the catalog of U.S. Government publications and we heard during the open form that not only is the DCP divided government information products for our patrons, but librarians need to use it CUP to manage and collect and inform library communities stakeholders. We learned specifically about preferred CGP searches and searching methods. Reportedly, we took note that librarians do not want to lose the features and functionality that they rely upon to do the work and federal depository libraries.

The use of the CGP differently than the general public does. The community

Functionality that librarians that need and not to redesign the new CGP solely for the purposes of the general public. We also learned a lot about the types of training and training materials that librarians desire. The working group applauds LSCM for recent updates to the CGP, including new multimedia tutorials , redesigned and enhanced help and about pages, and a new CGP data dashboard. And we hope that these resources will continue to be updated and be included in future iterations of the catalog. I would also like to note that LSCM continues to to offer records in multiple formats and that GPO welcomes suggestions for the enhancements for the current or future CGP. You can land your feedback at ask GPO.gov are following the descriptions on the slide. And then also, keep an eye out for FDLP news and events which may contain related enhancements.

As a result of the success of the fall 2021 open forum, the depository library counsel transmitted a formal recommendation to director Hugh Halpern that they continue to involve the federal library

community in the development of the new CGP. Counsel believes that community involvement is critical to developing the new CGP that fully meets the needs of its users. Input from user groups through testing, focus groups, surveys, and other measures will ultimately help create a more functional resource. In the collection of discovery resources working group is eager to collaborate with GPO and delayed additional efforts to facilitate communication between LSCM and the quality -- depository library community. To elicit feedback and ideas and suggestions during the development of the new catalog of U.S. Government publications. I would like to thank the working group members for helping to put on the open for rooms in the last year and assisting with the drafting of the reports and putting together this program. And we would like to thank you very much for attending our presentation. If you have any questions or comments, you can type them into the chat. Note that the chat transcript will be saved, along with the recording, so that if we are able to answer your question now, we can always follow up with you after the meeting.

---

And additionally, if you think of something later that you would like to ask her share with the working group, you can ask GPO by following these directions. When you go to ask GPO, select the federal depository library program file, and then you fill out the form and select the category suggestion, metal lip resource. And then include follow-up to DLC -- Cindy is monitoring the chat. Cindy do you see any questions that the working group would be able to answer?

---

I don't see any questions, but I see some really good comments in there about having found the same -- remembering the need for searching differences between our library patrons and how libraries use the CGP.

---

Cindy, thanks for putting that into the report and the slides for this presentation.

---

Are there any plans to create a search widget that can be embedded into our website we I think our patrons would respond well to that, having a widget. And there are a couple of ones to that suggestion as well. Jenny asked, any plans for RIS export the wood work well with free citation managers like's Otero.

---

I will just say that those are great suggestions, and we will make sure to take note of that and share that with our colleagues. Thank you very much for the suggestions.

---

Well, I think we can and our program a little early. It didn't take as long as I thought it would. To cover everything. Kelly, what do you think?

---

Certainly. If there are no other questions, we can go to our break. Cindy, were there any other?

---

I am not seeing any questions. Some comments are trickling in. With the multiple iteration of digitized historical federal document severable, we need to rely on it CGP to identify the authorized or best versions. In response to Jenny, the previous open form, there were several citation recommendations included, and that these are being passed along to GPO.

---

Again, after we ended, if you continue to think of things, go through ask GPO and send us your feedback and comments.

Okay. Thank you everyone for connect program will begin at: 45 Eastern. That is the quest for persistence and overview of the challenges associated with ensuring digital content remains accessible. Take you.

---

Thank you.

---

[ The event is on a recess. The session will reconvene at 3:45 ET. Captioner on standby. ]