

(unedited transcripts from the ...)

SPRING DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL MEETING  
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI  
APRIL 2, 2008

P R O C E E D I N G S

[snip...]

**FUTURE OF THE FDLP:**

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. Thank you all for staying around this last session. I appreciate it very much, and I know you all did it because planning so fun. And I'm really glad that you're here so you can be part of it.

Let me you that we had to switch some of our slides around because Denise has to leave early so there's a little bit of a switch, but not much.

The reason we're here today is because one of the fall recommendations was that Council would like to work with did GPO to prepare depository libraries for a digital federal depository library system that not centered on collections. Then I skipped out some stuff so it would all fit on a screen, and said the purpose of the discussion at the spring meeting is to begin the process of coordinating the strategic planning of GPO with that of depository libraries as all move forward into the digital age. So we're responding by being here today to start that process. And I really like this quote from Peter Drucker who says, The best way to predict is future is to create it. So thank you again for being here to help us create it.

So today's agenda, again, we switched it around. We're going to a little bit of SWOT analysis first and then go into the vision mission and assumptions. I don't think we're going to have have time to do the whole SWOT analysis, but we're going to do the internal strengths and the external threats. And if we have time at the end, then we'll go back and do the others. So at this point I'm going to turn it over to Denise.

DENISE STEPHENS: Okay. Can you hear me? As Cindy mentioned, we are facing a situation in which we have enough of external influences and drivers that are forcing us, essentially, to reexamine our mission and our goals. And as consequence SWOT analysis makes very good sense. Normally you look at strengths, weaknesses,

opportunities and threats. Were going to condense that into strengths and threats because when you think about it, you want to have a sense of what we do well or what our internal resources or capacities are as well as those external threats that are forcing us to react.

That being the case, this is going to be fairly informal and there are no right answers or wrong answers. We're going to start with input from Council and then I will turn it over to the floor. And what I'm going to ask is that as you think about those two issues, what within this program and its participating member libraries are our internal strengths, the things that make us successful, they give us the potential for success, potential for effective and meaningful change. Think about that for a second. And I'm going to ask Council, first, to offer any its thoughts about that question, what our strengths.

GEOFF SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells, Northwestern University.

-- the opening of preparing for a world without collections, but I think it's important to understand that many of our strengths come out of our ability to manage collections, and how the translate those strengths into distributing collections, digital collections and all of those types of things may be an area that we really need to look at and see how to translate those traditional strengths into new areas, and we're already doing some of that.

MS. STEPHENS: Tory? TORY TROTTA: Tory Trotta, Arizona State University. One of the big strengths I think that we have are the members of the depository program, the staff, staffs that are involved in this collections, it's really sort of a true believer deal. We have expertise, we have knowledge base and we believe in government information and making it available to the public and to our users. And I think that's a huge strength, whether we're talking about managing collections or enhancing service, anything.

DENISE STEPHENS: Any other thoughts from the Council? Okay, I'll turn it over to those of you on the floor. What are our external strengths.

BARBARA MILLER: Barbara Miller, Oklahoma State. I think one of the depository librarian strengths are the ability to know who are our users and how the users are going to use the material, and I'm speaking of the collections here today, too, but also the website so we know how to make the websites usable.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Katrina Stierholz, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. I actually that community is a -- that this community is a strength -- were talking about their expertise. But just the whole groupness of it. They're really quite a group.

MARK SANDLER: This is Mark Sandler from CIC. I'd like to add to what Katrina said because I agree that the fact that there's this community of, really, hundreds of active participants who are willing to come together twice a year and meet face to face and do this work is just a huge asset. But if you think about our libraries, some of the larger libraries, you know, that are represented in the room, you know, you're probably working with something on the order of \$40 million annual operating budgets, and you know there might be 50 or 75 of those and then it starts to trail off a little bit. But if you even think beyond the libraries to the universities, to the kinds of technology resources that are represented in the universities, that actual are aware of and value their FDLR role. There are just literally billions of dollars in resources and some of the most gifted and talented people on the face of the earth to do development and build systems and think through problems. So I guess I continue to think -- and I know there libraries here and state libraries and others, but I continue to think it's just a tremendous resource base that could be tapped.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. I think that one of our biggest strengths as a group, with the exception of our colleagues who are -- who belong to federal libraries is that we are not part of the federal government. That we see information resources produced by the federal government in a different way than the federal government sees those resources. And we all know the spectrum of ways that we see information different. I don't need to go into that. But I think that we need to step back and realize that relationship with the creators of information that we have, and so it's a unique relationship. And I think it gives us a great deal of power and it gives our users power through us.

BETH HARPER: Beth Harper, University of Wisconsin-Madison. I'm having a little trouble with this discussion because I feel like this is kind of a big recommendation, and it wasn't discussed this morning. And we're not discussing -- like the idea that this -- it's a system that's not based on collections, that's kind of a big leap. And I'm curious, you know, was that a GPO initiative, Council -- and it's hard for me to kind of sort out so what is GPO's role, are we just talking about the depository libraries. And I'm sure there are various circumstances. We spent a lot of time on the first three recommendations and the morning session. But, you know, I just feel there's not enough context to just jump in and start doing this.

GEOFF SWINDELLS: Do liaisons for that want to talk a little bit about the genesis of that recommendation?

DENISE STEPHENS: I can offer a few thoughts. Denise Stephens, University of Kansas. The underlying premise is here is that we're moving toward a predominantly electronic program. And I think that's been something that we've been well aware of for many years. So the context for the conversation this afternoon is saying that if that is true, then what are some of the issues we need to examine about ourselves as a collaborative program toward facilitating that effectively. Looking at our strengths and our weaknesses is one way of determining the extent to which that premises can be proven or not proven.

Having been at a depository librarian some years ago, we were talking about this fact in the mid to late '90s. So while there hasn't been a lot conversation in the context of this morning's conversation, the has been a topic in the community for a good number of years. But I think your point is well taken. It may be we'll need to discuss whether the premise itself is actually valid. And one way to get there might be to discuss some of these issues that we're trying to address today.

TIM BYRNE: Tim Byrne. I think one of the things we're trying to do is that there are many smaller depositories that we very heavily when their collection gets -- when the material gets to be five years old, they try to keep the current collection. And right now they don't have a current collection because they're really not receiving anything, much of anything in intangible format. There is an electronic quality program for that. And they're still operating as if they have a tangible program. Their process and procedures that they've employed has not really changed that much. And what we want to try to do is look at how their day-to-day function might change, what is different about being electronic depository after being a depository that gets -- every day they open a box and process it and put it on the shelf.

DENISE STEPHENS: Are think any other clarifying questions or comments about that issue, Council or from the floor? Please come up.

EMILY SELOF (ph): Emily Selof, Colorado College. For me it's sort of the foundation, and I don't think it matters what format we move to, as Tim was just pointing out. But for me the strength of this program is the belief -- the bedrock belief, I think, that all of us agreed with that citizens should be informed of what the government's doing. And so it doesn't matter what format that comes in, and I think that's why people are willing to struggle with all these issues, you know, and why we're in such a quandary of what to do. And that goes back to the expertise of the people who are -- who have been -- government documents librarians a long time. They're saying, wait, we've got to think about the paper, we've got

to think about the Legacy collection -- well, wait we need to go to an electronic only environment. And I think it comes back to that bedrock philosophy that that's the theory that we believe in and that's the strength overall that drives, I think, every sort of discussion that we have.

MARTHA CHILDERS: Martha Childers, Johnson County Library. As I mention yesterday, we're an affluent suburban public library, and we totally embrace the electronic movement. I believe and our management believes that people have better access, but we do have the luxury of having way over a hundred computers in our building, plus 13 branches that have computers. So people can sit there all day on the computer, if they want to. The struggle we have, of course, is directing people to those resources. A lot of them are cataloged in our catalog. I would love -- the problem we're running into is I would love to download the cataloging records from archive for all of these electronic documents, but we use CERCI. So when a patron does a search the records that come up are the newest ones that have been added. So they're not able -- we haven't figured out a technology yet for sorting those out so that patrons can select paper or electronic documents, because some people don't want those and some people do. So the thing I like about electronic is if you have a computer and you have Internet access, you can get that document. And we don't have to store it, we don't have to weed it. We still need to catalog it. We do need to provide access to it that way and have an informed staff who can help our patrons. I don't know, does that help, Tim? You had mentioned that issue. I was suggesting that. Sorry, I didn't mean to put you on the spot.

DENISE STEPHENS: Well, thank you. You may have provided us with a natural segue into that next conversation about threats or challenges. Are we ready to move?

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin from Connecticut. I think that libraries, no matter what type they are, are seen as a trusted resource by our communities. While we may be dealing with government information, I think people are often reluctant to go to a government agency to get information. So it was a real strength in being -- that local touch and that trusted environment that I think comes through lots of these reports that we see today. Even though a lot of information is available online, people are going back to the libraries for help accessing it or understanding. So there's a real strength in that sort of demarcation between the government and its information and local entities providing that access.

DENISE STEPHENS: One question from the floor and then we'll --

MARY MALLORY: Thank you. Mary Mallory, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. When I read that the program will not be

centered on collections that sends chills up my spine. And I would rather than that sort of attitude being in the forefront that you reframed a definition of what collections is. We live in a consumer society, and I think that people want something if they're part of the depository program. And at some level and in some way we have to be sent information, and we have to maintain and preserve those collections. So I think that it would be fairly easy, in our smart profession, to broaden the definition of what collections actually means at this point in time. Thank you.

TIM BYRNE: I think the great strengths of the program is tradition and this tradition of cooperation, cooperating with GOP, cooperating with federal agencies, cooperating with Government Printing Office, cooperating with other agencies, cooperating with other libraries. And then sharing of the information, sharing resources, sharing of expertise.

DENISE STEPHENS: I'll have to move on to our next topic, gotta add strength. Okay. Let's ask ourselves -- just take another look from the other side of our head to why we're having this conversation, those external forces that are driving us toward change. What are some of the threats or some people may think of them as risks or adverse challenges, but what are some of the threats that we face in trying to address this movement towards, Hey, I'm going to say a predominantly electronic future because we clearly are there. But what are some of the threats we face. And some of these have been in alluded to -- Council, what are some of your observations about that?

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. For me, would be complacency, just simply because it's too complex or it's too involved in negotiating with our home institutions, our respective futures. We sort of go with the flow, and agree that it is time, the media has struck, our species is dying, there's nothing we can do. I think that's a bigger danger. Associated with that would be one of confusion, I guess, is the best way to put it, of what do we do now. We have all these things we have to do, where do we begin. And I think that's a leadership issue as much as anything. And when everything seems important, it's a hard to know where to begin. And I think that as a group, we sometimes have a tendency to veer in either direction at times when things get tough. And I guess I'll say electronic government is a big threat too.

DENISE STEPHENS: Other comments from Council? Tory. TORY TROTTER: Tory Trotta, Arizona State University, College of Law. The nature of information resource that we're trying to control has really outgrown the bounds of the current way that we're trying to -- through the federal depository program, trying to harness the

bibliographic information and make the information available. I'm not saying this very well, but it just seems to me that that's a huge threat because where it's making us think in different ways, we want to provide the service, but just with the web harvesting situation that we have, the one way to try and harvest information gleaned, so many documents it was unmanageable. So I think that whole dynamic is a huge threat, not only from a depository library service program, but a managing collections, as well as finding this information and making it available to the public.

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Kentucky State Library. I'm not sure of just where it fits. I think our threat or weakness is that we need to better understand that we're trying to serve a growing number of none English speakers that are approaching all of us in different service levels, and we need to better understand that and be able to provide information in formats and in languages that meet their needs. And I know that's a whole controversial issue in this country, but, you know, how do we guide people who don't speak English through this wealth of predominantly English language documents that we have? How do we facilitate their access? I think there's real, possibly, an opportunity there, but it's also a threat that -- about understanding the government or how to get at the information.

DENISE STEPHENS: Other comments from Council?

TIM BYRNE: Tim Byrne, Department of Energy. I think one of the real serious threats is that library administrators don't seem to think that electronic documents require the same amount of staff as printed documents. The processing has to do with getting a document from a box to a shelf that does require staff, but they don't see that there's still a lot that has to be done with making sure electronic information is accessible to the public also.

DENISE STEPHENS: I think we're ready to open this up to the floor.

KATHY HALE: Kathy Hale, State Library of Pennsylvania. I think one of the threats that we have is was the elephant in the room that was mentioned earlier this morning and the downsizing of staffing and making those documents librarians that are out there now wear multiple hats and not be able to devote as much time as they would like in order to push the program forward, both electronically and tangibly.

ESTHER CRAWFORD: Esther Crawford, Rice University, Houston, Texas. Mary Mallory already touched on this, but I think you need to hear it as many of us as possible. I ask myself regularly what the value of being a depository library is to my institution, and I ask that for all three depository programs that we participate in because I

anticipate that some day someone is going to ask me that question, and I'm going to need to be ready to answer it. And I want to know where my carrots are, I guess. I guess Steve Hayes isn't here so I'll say that. We need collections. We need them to be in electronic format, but we still need collections. I think one of the great strengths of the depository program has been the distributive nature of the collections, has been the copies all over the country so we make certain that we always have access to those. I think at the same time, that's the biggest threat that we're facing currently.

MARY HEADY: Hi. Mary Heady, University of Arkansas at Monticello. And I was actually -- the point I was going to make is in the strength of the -- having the physical collection that there's multiple copies in multiple locations, so one disaster isn't going to completely wipe out a copy. But if all the copies are on one server in one location, and a hurricane comes through or whatever, then those -- you know, those documents may be gone. So that is definitely an issue.

SCHUYLER COOK: Schuyler Cook from Cleveland State university. A threat, jee, where to start. First of all, talk about self-introspection, I think I've been coming to these far longer than any of my administrators want to believe. And they've been very generous in spending me, and I go back to them and they said, Well, they have vague notions of what it is that's going on with this, because I find it safer to keep them somewhat in the dark. We're working on it, you know, phrase such as that go a long way to -- okay, they see I have less boxes so I've less tangible documents.

What they don't always see is that I have, you know, a monthly list of electronic -- new electronics titles that I want to make sure I either have URLs onto, you know, things that aren't in tangible format or that I have the electronic only titles available. And I rely on that cataloging. And I really don't want to see that go away. I'm in a law library -- and I know I'm in bouncing around -- I'm in a law library and I think there's a threat when we talk about giving up a controlled vocabulary that this profession has been creating for, what is it, a hundred, 200 years? And I think to just, say, Well, it's ephemeral, lots of conclusory statements. You know, I don't pretend to know what's ephemeral. I look at who my patrons are and I try to come up with item selection that's going to represent what I think they'll need, and all that's a guess. But, again, going back to being here at so many of meetings, I heard a former public printer talk in terms of cataloging for everything prior to 1976. I heard about -- I went from two offsite dark, dark places where stuff would be preserved to I didn't hear anything more about that at the time. I haven't seen any e-mails saying, Gosh, send your stuff here when, you know, you want to get



rid of it. I'm not trying to get rid of anything. Some people are going through and reading their collections because of lack of space. I'm fighting desperately to keep the space that I have with the few tangible documents I'm still receiving because I don't know, when the electronic comes out, whether it's going to have that appendix that's at the end of the print version, but isn't there in electronic. I don't know that it's a straight one for one. I rely -- I find myself that I'm threatened that I can't rely on someone with the experts at the Government Printing Office to tell me, Here's this electronic title and it's exactly a replication of what it is you have in print. Feel free to unload that. Because I'll hearing so many mixed messages, and now I read in thing that the future is getting rid of collections. You know, if we don't like -- let's not use that word. You know, let's define it somewhere else. Gosh, if we haven't heard anything in seven years, it's the ability of the folks that are in power now to redefine things, it just goes away. You know waterboarding isn't torture. But I'm going far afield.

The point I'm trying to make is the threat is there, in that if we don't back up a little bit and decide we don't even know what the collection is, we haven't defined what collection is. We have in our heads that's it's either tangible or intangible or combination of the two. But until we get some sort of inventory about what those things are, and when we identify it, and are able to provide good access to it through a controlled vocabulary, the earliest form of meta data being the descriptions involved in cataloging, then I think we can talk about what it is that we want to do with this. I think we all have cradle-to-grave job security. Okay, I'll stop.

ANTOINETTE SATTERFIELD: Antoinette Satterfield, Kansas State University. What I was thinking, actually, is nothing new, but I just wanted to reiterate a couple of things on my mind. One, is so much information is online today. As we've heard before now every library is a depository. We have librarians, particularly in small communities, that are dealing with government information and they never have before. And some of us in that session this morning about government documents in the 21st Century training the trainer, I think that's a challenge we all have to help other librarians, who previously and are not officially in the federal depository program, how to navigate through the websites. One thing that, as we all know, I don't think any two agencies have the same interface, the search boxes in the same spot, the menus not in the same spot. So for me it's job security. I feel like I'll be needed for a long time. But we do need to pull together, not only with the GPO, but with each other. I also wanted to make a comment, you're right, it is difficult to discuss situations that are controversial, such as some Poppel do not have a good handle on the

English language and have you help people like that. Another similar problem, one we've had for even longer -- is that early under-educated. And lately with -- and I've seen this in a personal type situation. You're out of work, you go for unemployment, you fill out everything online. I know in a previous institution where there was a large unemployment community I was forever helping out people who had previously been housekeepers and construction workers who had never spent time on a computer, yet, they had the fill this job application online. They wouldn't use the computer in the job, but they needed to know how to use it to apply, whether they're applying for a job or the unemployment benefits. So that I see is not necessarily a new problem, but it's a growing problem. Thank you.

MICHELE MCKNELLY: Michele McKnelly, University of Wisconsin - River Falls. I think one of the greatest threats that we face as government information professionals is thinking that these threats are unique to ourselves. Throughout our libraries we are under siege in a multitude of ways from outside forces, our administrations and academic libraries, our city and state governments to save money, to cut costs, to reduce service -- well, not to reduce services, to keeps services the same, but to do it with less human -- which is at great expense. Our strength is the people that we bring. It is also the threat because it's a great cost. We keep talking about, you know, the cost of housing collections, but in the end that's really pretty key for our institutions, they want those spaces, but they also -- they want to change the nature of the work we do. As librarians, as information professionals, if we sit back and we continuously tell the public that they have to do it our way, we're dead. We are dead in the water. And, I'm sorry, that the lady who was just speaking was talking about helping people fill out, you know, applications and forms. This is the wave that is about to roll over us. Most of us sitting here are from academic libraries, so I'm not sure that we're going to understand what's going to happen to our colleagues in public libraries and more of an academic institution. Because, once again, the federal government is pushing a cost down onto the libraries. They've pushed the cost of the depository program back onto housing institutions, the libraries. We pay for our cataloging, we pay to house it. We pay the professionals. We have wonderful staff here, they pay them. They go out and they do certain things and then they want us to partner with them so we can pay some more. But -- and that's okay, these are good partnerships, but these costs we are set to bear, our colleagues in public libraries may not be prepared to bear these costs of -- government. And I think that we need to get out and be ready to go out and help those who have a lesser understanding of the federal government and the state government in many ways to deal with this multiplicity of stuff that we have some knowledge about. But we're no different

than any other types of collections within our institutions.

BARBARA MILLER: Barbara Miller, Oklahoma State. I think one of our grievances is that we've done too good of a job trying to project to our management that we're an electronic environment. We are not an electronic environment, we are an environment in transition. And we're probably going to be in transition for 20 years because we're going to have partial paper and partial electronic. And a corollary of this is we don't know exactly what the electronic environment is going to look like because the generations regenerate in technology about every eight months. So at the end of this years, when we may be talking about a total electronic environment, we can plan all we want, but we don't really know what it's going to be like out there.

BARBIE SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia. And I was going to use this as a strength and then I got to thinking about it -- I didn't say then -- but our diversity, our diversity of library types I think is a strength. I think it's also a weakness. We would never be able -- the community is never going to be able to talk with one voice, but I think when we -- sometimes happens we talk over one another against one another to those in power, we show mixed messages and we don't get what we need. And I think underlying all that, we need a lot of the same things. All of our libraries and communities. So I think that's both a strength and a weakness.

EMILY SELOF: Emily Selof, Colorado College. I think one of our biggest weaknesses is -- we live in a one-box search world, and we're not in that box. If I'm not in a meeting when we talk about stuff like our journal finder and the resources we have, then no one thinks like, Oh, none of our document journals, our internal finder. When we talk about institutional repositories, no one is saying, Oh, but let's make a section there for the government documents to be in there too. So like the Z-39 stuff is amazing, but I think that's one of our biggest problems is we've kept ourselves separate. And so we are seen as a separate collection, we're seen as the government documents in the basement or in the attic or wherever you probably are on the fringes of things. And I think that's one of our biggest weaknesses, we're not integrated.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. Quite properly, we've been talking about threats to our organizations. I'd like to remind everybody that there's a little bit larger meta threat to us, which is our threat to our basic product, our basic resource, which is information itself. If you think of a city on a river, and the municipal water system there delivers water to its customers that comes downstream, and then you

think of a situation where that water is being polluted or damned farther upstream so that not as much water comes down, and the quality of that water degrades, then that's somewhat similar to the situation that we're facing here, in that more and more government information is being privatized -- and embargoed or classified. And there's also a situation where government owns its information now and owns the delivery of information in a way that it never did before. And so just -- I know this has been talked into the ground, but it's something I think we need to remember as a threat that is just as important as the threat to our institutions and our organizational structures.

TIM BYRNE: Tim Byrne, Department of Energy. Speaking as a former regional, I think the message I got from many of my selectives was that our biggest threat was the space crisis that many libraries are facing. And they're library administrators looking at the need to get more space for more highly used collections, enforcing the depositories to reduce their footprint in the library. In many cases getting rid of up to 80 to 90 percent of the collection that they had been maintaining and working and keeping as a really good collection -- read it, but that's no longer valued because that's based -- needed for something else.

SANDEE McANINCH: Sandee McAninch, University of Kentucky Library. I think -- I don't think I've heard anyone say this, but I think a major threat is a loss of the Legacy collections. Not that anyone is throwing them away, but they're disintegrating, falling apart. Finding funding to preserve them is nearly impossible. Digitization, of course, is a possibility, it's not cheap either. So I really see those Legacy collections being at great peril right now. So...

GEOFF SWINDELLS: Any more threats from Council or audience?

TIM BYRNE: Okay. Going back to what really was supposed to be the start of this presentation, is talk about what the vision of the deposit library program should be. And in terms of a vision, it should be a description of what an organization would like to aspire to or achieve in the midterm or long-term future. Should be short, it should be verifiable, understandable to all and -- future courses of action. So this is a draft that we have come up with to put government information at your fingertips. So have at it. What do you think of something of that short and to the point?

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. What I love about this is it doesn't presumably libraries at all. It presumes a statement that could be delivered by any organization, if they can figure out how to put the pieces together. So the assumption of what libraries would bring to this problem is an

open-ended question. So there it is both an opportunity and a threat.

GEOFF SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells, Northwestern University. This seems to leave out most of what I do everyday and what the librarians in my department do everyday. I mean, certainly this is part of it, but they sit down and analyze and repackage and consult and help folks understand and help folks put stuff together, and a variety of things that I'm not quite sure this gets at. This is certainly part of it, but there's the next step that certainly takes up a lot of the time of the folks around me so...

RICH GAUSE: Rich Gause, University of Central Florida. That's exactly what I was thinking, is that the purpose of, I guess, the Government Printing Office is to do this. And out in the libraries we're doing a lot of other parts of this that when it's not at your fingertips is when we're getting involved in working with people. And there's a huge part of what we're doing is the access to what people should be able to find easily, but particularly in an academic setting, where a scholarship is taking place and the research, a huge portion of that takes place on the fringes where information is hidden and information has not been looked at in a certain way. And so the availability of that less useful for the majority of information, but the opportunity for scholarships to take place is another part of what we're doing in the program.

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. Thanks. We've got to remember what we're trying to create a vision of. It's not of a depository library. It's not of a vision of what our staff is doing. It's a vision of what the collective program is and where it's going and what is the underlying foundation of what we're trying to do as a program, if that helps focus a little better.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. Let me rephrase my Zen-like statement. I don't see this -- actually, I embrace this, I think it's a great statement for what we do. I just point out the opportunity it's what a lot of other people do as well in different ways. So the challenge that we have is why we do it better, that's what the competition is. And I think this is as fine a draft statement of vision for the program as any that I've seen. It's fewer than six words. No. Yeah. It's fewer than six words, I think that's great. With the understanding we're not going to be the only life force out there on the environment attempting to do this thing, and that's what we're in competition with, is to attract the attention of consumers, if you will, on they should go to us. It's a problem that cable TV, satellite TV -- with broadcast TV, why would you choose one form over another? They all deliver the same basically. But people choose them for different reasons, and I think that's the kind of competition here we're in now.

TIM BYRNE: Tim Byrne. I think a lot of the statements that were just made are all things that fit into this vision. And we're talking about -- but still even if we're working with things that are not easy to find, we're putting them -- our users fingertips. That's parts -

MICHELE McKNELLY: Michele McKnelly, University of Wisconsin - River Falls. I feel so stupid because I do not understand this is a vision. This a slogan to me. This is like an ad campaign. I mean, if I were to take this back and say, This is the vision of the FDLP, they would -- I think people would look at me and say, What are they talking about? They don't understand what at your fingertips means. We want to be able to deliver services to people. And it's not -- if it's the vision of the FDLP there's a library program, if it's a vision of something else, then you would want to articulate that. But I don't understand the statement at all. And I mean I'm really feeling like, you know, I'm having another worldly experience here. I would have to explain the vision so maybe I wouldn't, you know. But, you know, if you were trying to communicate this to people who outside of the fold, I'm not sure that they're going to understand what you're talking about.

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin. I like vision statements that have some verb in there that means it look like we're trying to do something. To me it's more about enhancing access to government information. I mean no matter how you cut it, whether it's preserving or cataloging or having depository libraries, or whatever, but it's about enhancing -- talk to John -- what makes us different -- maybe we need an action verb that really sets this apart. This is was nice, but whose fingertips.

MARK SANDLER: Mark Sander, CIC. I'm sitting a bar last night being boring and really talking about this very -- very kind of statement and increasing my discomfort with libraries focusing on the idea that they give people stuff, that they hand people during -- or they hand people monographs or a printout of an article, and encourage some of the libraries I work with to put -- higher in addressing people's sort of higher aspirations. They want to get a grant. They want to get a Ph.D. They want to get a good grade in a class, that's the kinds of things that get people excited and really builds loyalty and a base of support have more to do with people's sort of life's ambitions and dreams than they do this kind of stuff that's sort of part of the process, but not the end point. And I guess I think here, you know, that the big win is really the sort of reenforcing Democratic particular principles of an informed citizenry. You know, that's the big end, and the big vision has to do with America's Democratic pretenses. And I guess I would like to see more -- lean more in that direction than the idea of sort of

making the widgets along the way more accessible. But, you know again, I know this is a very hard thing to come up with a vision statement like this.

MARY: Mary -- University Library, Ohio. I see this statement, and immediately about 15 different questions pop into my mind. And a vision statement has to be little bit more clear than that. One of my questions, it says to put government information at your fingertips, okay. What am I going to do with it at my fingertips? Another thing is, is it the right government information? Is the government information I actually need? I can put all kinds of government information at people's fingertips, but it might not be what they need. It might not be what they want. It might not be what they can use. And all those are concepts that have to be worked into this vision statement. It's not only that we want put government information where they get it. We not only want to make it accessible to them, but we want to make what's useful to them accessible to them or what they need accessible to them. Sometimes they don't really know what they need, but then we have to help them figure that out too. But so there's so much buried here that isn't stated in this vision statement, that anybody who reads this statement is going to say, what? What government information? What do you mean, at my fingertips? Where is it going to go? It's a nice slogan, but it's not a vision statement, I agree with Michele on that one. It is not a vision statement. It's a slogan. And it's a great slogan. It's a great slogan. But if you're going to do a vision statement, you've got to be a lot more clear. Thank you.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. I agree with Michele that it's a slogan and not a vision statement. However, I'm troubled by the syntax of what is not a complete sentence up there. How about a saying, We put government information at your fingertips, instead of that amorphous to up there. And I'm also a little troubled by those Martians on the other side of the cabinet there. Who are they? Why are they green, and are they jealous because they're on the other side of the computer monitor? I don't know who they are.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. It makes you wonder why -- even works. So, I mean, if -- you're actually right, we're talking about marketing as much as anything else. But I think there's something to be said for brevity, too, and if we can catch it into a very brief phrase, I think we should be praised. So we can study the hell out of the syntax, but I think -- I think the group that came up with this deserves service more credit than we seem to be giving them because they had a huge task to try to condense sense a hundred years of tradition in just a few words. And if you want slogan, they'll just say one back at you, documents to the bloody people. Come on. Part of our DNA. How is

this any different from that bloody slogan?

TIM BYRNE: Anyone have a moment of inspiration and has their idea of what the vision statement would be?

BILL OLBRICH: I'm Bill Olbrich. I'm from St. Louis Public Library. It's not even a sentence, it's just a phrase, and leaves out too much. How about something like, You will understand the government information we put at your fingertips. Now, great, that's 15 words, John, but it was seven not six, to begin with. We have to personalize it, like -- and we have to let them know what we're going to do with the stuff. We're going to help you understand it, because that's what the library program does. It makes it available and makes you understand it. Handing somebody a -- is a waste of time until you teach them the geography of column header and demographic variable is the row header, and where the two meet might is the number you want. So we have to have both in there. It's just not just government information. It's understanding the government information.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler. Okay. How to put government information in your palms, give it context.

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin. You know, you know we can have slogans. I think -- real thing, I don't think it's the vision statement for the company. I think if you went and looked at -- I mean the library's read a lot vision statements. And I think to be able to focus where we want to go, we have to more than a slogan. So while it is catchy, it isn't leading us to some new level, which is what a vision statement should really lay out where you want to be. I would like to think we're already doing all of this.

TIM BYRNE: This really is the beginning of the process. So we've thrown something out, we've heard your comments and we will take that under consideration, certainly. The next step will be the mission statement, the mission, the declaration of the core purpose and focus usually does not change. It serves as a filter to determine what is important and what is not. It states who will be served and how and it communicates a sense of intended direction. So here is our proposed mission of the FDLP. The mission of the Federal Depository Library Program is to provide for the perpetual, free and ready public access to the printed and electronic publications and other published information and dissemination of products of the federal government through the partnership between the U.S. Government Printing Office and the designated libraries.

GEOFF SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells, Northwestern University. I actually come back to Mark's point. I mean, I think that's fine and important and is what we do, but is that helping America become



informed? That part of it which might be the broadest vision of sort of helping people meet their needs and aspirations needs to somehow be in there too.

TIM BYRNE: Shot all your -- vision statement. We can move on to -

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut. I do think the vision statement lacks sort of the audience for this, for the American people. I mean it may be implied in there, but who are we doing this for?

GWEN SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair, University of Hawaii. I just wanted to respond to what Ken said. I think our target audience is really broader than citizens or Americans. It's, you know, our -- we serve whoever walks in our door. If it's somebody from Canada, somebody from Japan, somebody from Mars, you know, we're going to help them too. So I don't want to limit it to -- the audience to a particular group, geographically based group.

TIM BYRNE: I'll expect people who -- we have a website that Peggy Jobe right there created for us that is used all over the world.

PEGGY JOBE: Thanks for that lead-in, Tim. Peggy Jobe, University of Colorado at Boulder. I think these short -- I think we need a little more inspiration in everything. And I'm wondering if we could, you know, look at, say, the constitution or something for ways to make it more real and sustainable. I mean, was joking back there, but I said, you know, what if we're fighting to preserve the right to keep and bear knowledge, or, you know, about our government or, you know, just something a little more -- not info at you fingertips. Just, you know, why we do we want to do it? I think you need the why in there and all that more.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Back when we talked about this originally, one of our -- I remember Chris -- bringing it up and I thought it was so interesting. The original bargain between depository and libraries and GPO was libraries get stuff, but they have to comply with these rules. And now libraries really don't get much stuff. And so I'm having some like fundamental questions about even this whole mission and having designated libraries. Why we don't want perpetual free and ready access to these materials just for everyone, and then maybe the partnership is more about the services or these aspirational things that Mark is talking about, helping people get, you know, to where they want to be as some sort of program. But I'm struggling with this on a really fundamental basis about the designated library piece when, you know, GPO is not really giving out stuff anymore so the partnership somewhat alludes me.

GEOFF SWINDELLS: How about, Be all you can be?

ESTHER CRAWFORD: Esther Crawford. I'm not really here to touch on the vision statement, but I just wanted to say something positive for a change. I understand this mission statement and I really like it. I'm not sure about the designated word, but this just makes sense to me so...

TIM BYRNE: I'm sorry, could you repeat that? Well, let's move on to assumptions. So what we're about to present are a list of assumptions that have been drawn from a number of different documents that have been put together over the years. And, of course, we're assuming that the basic assumptions should be challenged. Developments in the larger library -- in the FDLP in federal resources.

Regional depository libraries must be allowed to adapt to technological and program changes to perform their roles.

Competencies to lead and manage the federal depository library of the future will differ than those of the traditional depository library.

Collaboration and cooperation are essential.

JOHN SHULER: What did Cindy point out? I didn't hear that.

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. When Denise and Tim and I were working on this, we did come up with some new assumptions and they're on this first screen. And what follows on the next screens are assumptions that we had in other documents that looked at the future of the depository program and the transition in all -- we reviewed all those and still found some of those to be valid. But this first screen are new ones that we came up with.

TIM BYRNE: More assumptions.

Depository libraries will not be able to individually preserve electronic publications for PPA in the way that they have for print-based publications.

Government agencies and the private sector will continue to independently develop tools and resources to locate government information.

Partnerships between the government and the private sector will continue to develop and increase.

GPO needs to promote depositories as resources and tools outside of

the FDLP.

Online is the preferred medium for distribution of and access to government information dissemination products through the FDLP, although distribution of paper or microfiche will continue when appropriate.

An enhanced system is needed to ensure the persistent identification and description of government information products available via the government electronic information services.

A primary electronic FDLP offers opportunities to make more information locally available to the public with enhanced functionality.

And one more. As an unintended consequence of technology, the trend to shift cost from agencies to users or to libraries will continue to occur.

Any assumptions here, anyone questions?

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Katrina Stierholz, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. It seems to me that one you didn't state, but is implicit in everything I've read is that the federal depository library program will continue.

ELIZABETH COWELL: Hi. This is Elizabeth Cowell from Stanford University. What, Katrina, you were saying before, this part -- and I actually kind of agreed with -- I'm kind of struggling a little bit with this discussion in a way because the direction it's going is kind of post FDLP in a lot of ways. I think what libraries and what libraries are a key part of the FDLP and should be -- and what we do, like many people have been saying, are how you provide access and preservation to collections. So without that component, while I would agree that we will not be able to individually preserve electronic publications for the EPA in the way that do with print, we can do it in a different way and we should. And the GPO should enable that.

MICHELE McKNELLY: Michele McKnelly, University of Wisconsin - River Falls. I would like to speak to the point further that online is the preferred yesterday median for distribution. And I mean, I guess we need to talk who prefers that. Because for distribution where I am, many people still prefer paper. They would prefer to take a tangible product away in many cases. But government agencies prefer to have it be electronic for the cost savings. And I think that it's important for us to understand that on my end, when I'm doing distribution to the end user, that's not what they necessarily want. In some cases is it, but not in every case. And

so I don't see that it's the preferred median.

TIM BYRNE: I'm teaching a course at -- government information sources, and I think I'm halfway through the semester now. And maybe two-thirds of the class have yet to touch a text document. And that's their choice.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. To echo Tim's experience, I just had a class to complete a legislative history of the Military Commissions Act, and not one of them -- I asked them at the last class, How many of you went into the library to complete the legislative history 20 to 30 pages long? Not one of them stepped into the library to finish the task. Did they all do an acceptable outstanding job with their legislative histories? Yes.

MICHELE McKNELLY: I work in a non-research, non-ARL institution, and we have many users who prefer a tangible medium. And I think that by just saying at large institutions where you're teaching high-level classes, that that's the case, that that is not -- I'm challenging your assumption here.

JOHN SHULER: Dominican is not a large research institution. Many of the people that go -

MICHELE McKNELLY: The library -

JOHN SHULER: The library -- many of the people are -- coming through into another career, and many of them are youngins who prefer the digital life.

MICHELE McKNELLY: Many people do prefer it, but not everyone does. Many people prefer the tangible content. We still receive our hearings paper, and I find that people prefer them that way. They vastly prefer them over the microfiche. And using a hearing -- you know, a 2, 300-page hearing electronically -- a PDF file is a really burdensome thing.

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. Not just a preference issue, but representing at least the public library sector, not every American has electronic access. They don't all have computers at home, they all don't have high-quality Internet access where you should forget that while the agencies may want to distribute things in an electronic format, the ability to access it is not in every individual's home.

GEOFF SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells, Northwestern. Sorry, Mary. Again, I think we have to deal with the fact of the preferred method of distribution by the agencies. And we need to allow for the fact

that use may be needed in other formats beside the method of distribution, which raises, once again, the issue of print on demand and other technologies like that so that we can, when needed, convert to another format.

MARY MALLORY: Mary Mallory, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. I just had a quick question for John, and I couldn't resist asking this. If you gave them some restriction as to how old the public law -- whether it could be only five years old or had to be within the last ten years, because it would be much easier to do an online only legislative history, if there were restriction about that.

JOHN SHULER: I agree, but I've done this with laws that are older and -

MARY MALLORY: Okay. It was just really a chance to needle you a bit. Bring some humor into this discussion. And if Rich doesn't mind, I think that people are -- these days, they're looking for testimony for individuals. So it's very convenient to go online and just find one or two people, experts, that you're looking for their testimony. And what I'm wondering is if 50 to a hundred years now from now, when people are looking for legislative histories, will they want the entire testimony? And so they're going to end up printing out the entire testimony, rather than looking at one or two people's testimony. And I haven't seen any research on that, but it's just as I, you know, pass -- 800-page energy hearings pass through my desk, I just wonder dear about that. That's a question I have about the future. Thank you.

RICH GAUSE: Rich Gause, University of Central Florida. I think it was the first page, the assumption on fewer will be steeped. And I don't disagree with it. This is going the next step in terms of so what does that mean. We've done a lot of talking at different sessions in terms of expanding the number of non-specialists that have a greater familiarity with the information. Our colleagues that don't specialize in documents, and so maybe this goes the next -- okay, that's the assumption, that you will be steeped in it, but will we have more people that have a greater familiarity than they currently have?

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut. The first assumption, developments in the library world are forming the future of FDLP, I would also suggest that they're impacting, not necessarily railway informing.

MARTHA CHILDERS: Martha Childers, Johnson County Library. As a public librarian, I would like to address the issue of who asks for tangible documents. And it's generally pretty easy for me to tell

when the patron walks in the door which ones. And you can kind of tell it by how much gray hair they, typically. I don't know if any of you are familiar with Age Page. It's put out by the Department of Aging. They have a wonderful little three-fold publications that are easy to read, have all kinds of useful information for the general public. And they have this preparing for your will, preparing for your death kind of thing. And it's electronic. And I'm going what? Because the people who are needing this want it in paper. So it's real -- as those of us who are older, go away and younger people come along, there's going to be less and less need for the paper because the young people, they really like electronics.

BETH ROWE: Beth Rowe, UNC-Chapel Hill. I'm at -- a huge research library. Our youngins want both, it's not an either/or. They want to print because it's too much to read online and they want the online to cut and paste and put into their papers.

BILL OLBRICH: Bill Olbrich, St. Louis Public Library. Online is the preferred medium of distribution. Then what? What happens when the agency decides it no longer has room on its server for the stuff they put up last week and it goes away? Is Al Gore's Commission on Airport Security that he did just before the end of the Clinton administration, it was gone on January 21st. It was no longer online. When you ask where to go to get it, Oh, try the Clinton white house. If we don't preserve the online stuff somehow, it's going to go away and nobody is going to have it.

BARBARA MILLER: Barbara Miller, Oklahoma State. I think you need to work on assumptions one and two that are up on your screen. And maybe it should be rephrased that the assumption is that the depository library will be a system in transition from paper to electronic probably for a generation, and maybe that should be the assumption, that we to have focus on both, not just one.

TIM BYRNE: Anything more from Council?

SANDEE McANINCH: Sandee McAninch, University of Kentucky. Your last assumption, unintended consequences, I suspect there's also another -- well, maybe it wasn't -- but unintended consequence or a problem consequence of technology is some cost shift back to the federal agencies. Bill's comment just now. Huge technology costs, huge storage costs, huge conversion control cost, huge management and preservation costs. Maybe they'd see that coming when they started down this road.

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. Thanks so much for all of your comments, all of your suggestions. And, you know, some of the comments that you all have made during this

assumption portion of this program can then very nicely lead into objectives and things we can build on and aim for to go into this strategic plan. So we're looking at what's next and we'll be analyzing all of the comments that you all made on the vision statement, on the assumptions, on the strengths and on the threats. You can look for providing more input as we develop this piece. We still have to go back and look at the weaknesses and the opportunities, and the ultimate plan that is to have a draft for Council to look at in the fall. Look for stuff on FDLP-L on the new desktop and we'll offering some opportunity for input maybe through oval sessions or similar kinds of things, maybe -- or something. But we absolutely want your input and really value what you all are saying. We understand. But we still have to move forward. It goes back to the recommendation that Council gave us at the beginning, and that's where we were moving from to create this session. But we have heard loud and clear the whole thing about not having collections. Thank you.

[snip ...]