**Instructions**

PLEASE SUBMIT ONLY ONE FDLP STATE FORECAST PER STATE.

In order to obtain the critical viewpoints from the FDLP community at the state level that impact participation in the Program and to support these viewpoints with quantitative and qualitative data, we have designed the following questionnaire. This questionnaire contains open-ended questions and the time to complete it will vary based on your responses. The information gathered in this study is vitally important and it will be used to inform a National FDLP Plan and shape the future of the Program.

This FDLP State Forecast builds on the responses of individual FDLP libraries in your state. It represents a consensus of opinion at the state level of the FDLP libraries in a state and should be based on the responses to the FDLP Library Forecasts submitted by FDLP members in your state and discourse at the state level among FDLP members about plans or intentions that are designed to serve the state as a whole. Individuals with primary responsibility for FDLP collections within your state are encouraged to meet, discuss the state and library FDLP Forecast questionnaire answers, and collaborate to produce responses at the State level.

GPO recognizes that there are seven multistate regionals. We are asking for viewpoints and data to be collected at the state level. However, when information is asked about that is not strictly limited to occurring within the state or dealing only with those within the state, responses that represent relationships/agreements beyond the individual state should also be included if relevant. Please answer on behalf of the FDLP libraries in your state representing their collective experiences, their consensus on major issues when possible, and to the best of your knowledge.

Please join us in working together for a vibrant and shared vision of the future of the FDLP.

Note: Where mentioned, state represents state, district, or territory.

Respondents can print each survey page as they progress using their web browser's printing options. Before clicking the "Next" and "Done" buttons, a respondent can use the browser's printing options to print the current page of answers. However, language within text boxes that exceeds the size of the answer box will not appear in the printed page. It is suggested that respondents write their answers in a word processor and then cut and paste their answers into Survey Monkey’s text boxes.

\*1. State (Spell out name of state, district, or territory)

|  |
| --- |
| Missouri |

**Preservation Issues**

\*2. If FDLP libraries within your state digitize FDLP materials (in-house or outsourced), where do they store the master digital files? (Please mark all that apply.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Libraries within this state do not digitize |
|  | Local digital repository |
|  | Hathi Trust |
|  | Internet Archive |
|  | Other (Please identify) |
|  | LLMC Digital |

\*3. Do FDLP libraries in your state plan to digitize publications from the FDLP/Government documents collection within the next five years?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |
|  | Already digitizing FDLP publications |

\*4. Would it be useful for GPO to provide advice and guidance for libraries that want to digitize publications from the tangible collection?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Yes |
|  | No |

\*5. As Government information is increasingly produced and distributed in digital-only formats, what barriers to access, if any, do libraries in your state anticipate in the next five years?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Libraries in this state do not anticipate any barriers to access. |
|  | Libraries in this state anticipate barriers to access. (Please identify anticipated barriers) |
|  | 1. INTERNET SERVICE and BANDWIDTH Many Missouri libraries and educational institutions rely on MOREnet’s (Missouri Research & Education Network) internet backbone <http://www.more.net/>. MOREnet’s funding depends on state appropriations. Funds have been withheld for the last two years and we are not sure about the next five years: <http://www.more.net/content/fy13-morenet-state-appropriation-request>. Costs have been shifted to member institutions. Loss of the MOREnet internet backbone would most profoundly affect web access in rural areas. 2. AWARENESS of INFORMATION AVAILABILITY As one respondent stated, “One major problem with intangible products is that they can be invisible.” Librarians may try to mitigate the problem by cataloging online publications, but the cost to catalog web resources *and* keep links up to date is prohibitive. 3. USER SKILL and WEB INTERFACES A few library patrons will be unable to use computers – for example, some of the elderly and handicapped. Yet even confident computer users can be stymied by certain web sites. The federal government web is not always user-friendly and usability testing appears to be on the wane. We were surprised at the changes in American FactFinder which made the product more, not less, difficult to use.   Books have consistent elements: tables of contents, indexes, and prefatory matter which explain how to use the book. But there is little consistency from one government website to the next. It is time consuming to learn each agency’s site. On the other hand, a Google search or a query in Hathi Trust can bring up information from a previously unknown resource far more quickly now than the era when all government documents were in sent tangible form. And computer users seem to be finding more information on their own without having to consult librarians. Overall, as full-text digital libraries continue to grow, information discovery will become easier both for librarians and users.   1. INFORMATION LITERACY  Users may not be able to recognize the most authoritative sources for government information on the internet. 2. FEE-BASED ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT DATABASES If government information continues to move toward a fee-based model, libraries will not be able to afford the cost. 3. PASSWORDED GOVERNMENT DATABASES Whenever library staff must enter a password for the patron, this is a barrier to access. |

**Library Services and Content Management (LSCM) Projects**

\*6. Please rate the following current LSCM projects areas according to how users of Federal Government information in libraries within your state might benefit.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely beneficial | Moderately beneficial | Not beneficial |
| Projects to provide greater access to Government information such as: Simultaneous searching of FDsys and the Catalog of Government Publications; increasing access to United States Courts' opinions provided in partnership with the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts available on FDsys. |  |  |  |
| Projects to increase cataloging services such as: The Cataloging Record Distribution Project; Shelflist Transcription & Bibliographic Record Clean Up; Cooperative Cataloging Partnerships; enhancements to MetaLib. |  |  |  |
| Projects focusing on collection development and management tools such as: The National Bibliographic Inventory; Library Information System Transformation (LIST), PURL Referral Reports. |  |  |  |
| Projects focused on education and online communication with FDLP members such as: FDsys training sessions; acquiring an online tool for virtual meetings; scheduling online community forums to discuss current FDLP issues; communication through social media (blogs, twitter) |  |  |  |

\*7. Is there another area of service that FDLP libraries within your state would like LSCM to offer in the next five years? (Please describe.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No |
|  | Yes (please describe) |
|  | Reconsider the requirement to catalog all tangible items, especially in cases where the library provides a direct link to full text. |

**Education**

\*8. Would FDLP libraries in your state participate in GPO-facilitated virtual meetings or seminars on topics of interest to the FDLP community?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No |
|  | Yes (please tell us what topics would be most helpful to you) |
|  | Reference service for various subjects such as health, business, demographic or legal information; how to manage a FDL; cost-effective and efficient ways to cataloging print and electronic documents; how to market/promote the collection; digitization; refresher courses led by agency representatives; using GPO’s web-based collection management tools; FDSys; updates/training on significant new or revised government information resources on the web. |

**Affiliations and Community Marketing**

\*9. Do FDLP libraries in your state have formal or informal relationships/agreements with local non-FDLP libraries to provide Federal Government information?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No |
|  | Yes (Please describe these relationships) |
|  | Most FDLs in MOBIUS circulate their documents to non-FDLs within the network, and many of the libraries use ILL to send documents beyond the MOBIUS network. See complete member list at: <http://laurel.lso.missouri.edu:2083/screens/libinfo.html>. Sometimes local non-FDLP libraries will refer to their nearest FDL or to the Regional. |

\*10. Do FDLP libraries in your state market their FDLP collections and services to non-depository libraries or conduct other outreach activities that target the general public?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No |
|  | Yes (Please describe) |
|  | This is mainly accomplished by placing holdings in the MOBIUS union catalog and by having government information pages on our libraries’ websites. |

\*11. How can GPO assist in effectively marketing FDLP libraries and services?

|  |
| --- |
| Create marketing posters that could be edited and branded by the library. Provide clip art and advertisement graphics for us to use – topic-based graphics - not just the FDLP logo. Increase production of promotional items such as pens, bookmarks, paper pads, etc. and make it easier for libraries to get them, perhaps by sending a certain number automatically each year. Sponsor PSAs and run them on national media venues. Offer webinars on marketing and promotion. Dedicate a part of the FDLP website which is directed toward the general public rather than participant libraries; use it to explain what the FDLP does and how it can help them. |

\*12. Within the next five years, are FDLP libraries in your state planning to enter into new or additional relationships/agreements with non-FDLP libraries to provide Federal Government information?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No |
|  | Yes (Please describe these relationships) |
|  |  |

\*13. Are FDLP libraries in your state planning to enter into new or additional relationships/agreements with other FDLP libraries to provide Government information?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No |
|  | Yes (Please describe these relationships and with whom these relationships/agreements will be entered) |
|  | Six Selectives presently participate in Intrastate Regional agreements. Four of those six have been partners for less than a year. We will be rewriting the Missouri State Plan and monitoring the new arrangement to ensure that the new system works well for both the Regional partner libraries and for the other Selectives in our state. |

**Future Roles and Opportunities**

\*14. Within the next five years in your state, is there any discussion or plan to have FDLP libraries commit to hosting a permanent digital collection(s) of Federal Government information?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No |
|  | Yes (Please elaborate, providing details addressing the specifics of your discussions or plans to host a permanent digital collection(s) of Federal Government information) |
|  | We are unaware of formal discussions |

\*15. Within the next five years in your state, is there any discussion or plan to have FDLP libraries commit to preserving a permanent digital collection(s) of Federal Government information?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No |
|  | Yes (Please elaborate, providing details addressing the specifics of your discussions or plans to host a permanent digital collection(s) of Federal Government information) |
|  | We are unaware of formal discussions |

\*16. Within the next five years, would FDLP libraries in your state be willing to commit to the development of a specific collection area(s) and be willing to serve users beyond their local communities? (Your response to this question is not binding.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No |
|  | Yes (If yes, please describe these subject area(s)) |
|  | We are doing this through six Intrastate Regional partnerships. The topic areas are, generally: 1) Air Force, 2) Civil Rights, 3) Foreign Relations, 4) Native Americans, 5) Law, and 6) House Committee on Science. The partner libraries are committed to serving users within the Regional area – the state of Missouri. |

\*17. What leadership opportunities and roles do FDLP libraries in your state foresee for themselves in the next five years?

|  |
| --- |
| Of those who responded in the affirmative to this question, we have the following varieties of leadership:  1) INTRASTATE REGIONAL PARTNERSHIPS. The Regional and its new partners will continue to hone the Intrastate Regional agreements and revise the state disposal policy accordingly. Each new Intrastate Regional partner has become a leader in its own subject area.  2) ST. LOUIS METRO AREA SUB-REGIONAL SYSTEM.  With leadership and guidance from Washington University, FDLs in the St. Louis area are becoming organized into a sub-Regional zone and realizing benefits of cooperative collection development, easier disposals, etc. Washington University has long provided leadership in the St. Louis area, and has hosted educational and discussion meetings to which librarians from Illinois have also been invited.  3) MISSOURI LIBRARY ASSOCIATION. Some documents coordinators who are active in the Missouri Library Association (MLA) have helped plan and create programs for MLA’s annual conference.  4) SERVICE TO CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT CONSTITUENTS.  Some libraries are developing plans to step up government information services for residents of their Congressional districts.  5) CREATION OF WEB BASED RESOURCES.  Several libraries have government information web pages that are consulted by others outside their organization. One library is planning to develop an online training module which also will be available to non-affiliates. |

\*18. What would an ideal FDLP look like that met all of your current and anticipated needs for Federal Government information?

|  |
| --- |
| 1) SIMPLIFYthe FDLP**.**  The classification system for item numbers needs to be simpler. Disposal needs to be simpler. Finding items in Needs & Offers needs to be simpler. The manner of entering queries in the CGP needs to be simpler. All of the FDLP’s collection maintenance tools – List of Classes, WebTech Notes, shipping lists, CGP, DSIMS, etc. should be rolled into one…and put the functionality of Documents Data Miner into it as well. It should be easier for new depository coordinators to learn how to do their jobs.  2) COMPLETE DIGITAL COLLECTION ONLINE  Make all federal documents ever produced freely and permanently available online, in full text, in one easy-to-use website. Perhaps FDSys can serve this function. |

\*19. Thinking about the next five years, what specific things would you like GPO to do to help FDLP libraries in your state improve public access to Federal Government information?

|  |
| --- |
| 1) Remove the requirement to catalog all new tangible receipts.  2) Make the CGP, FDSys and other GPO collection management tools more user-friendly.  3) Add more full-text material to FDSys.  4) Find and bring together all of the organizations which seem to be digitizing gov docs and put them all under one user interface.  5) More promotional materials  6) Use the FDLP website market FDLP services to the general public. |

\*20. Is there anything else that you would like to tell us about the current and future vision of the FDLP?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | No |
|  | Yes (Please explain) |
|  | 1) TITLE 44  Title 44 needs to be updated for the current century. There have been some interesting ideas brought to the table: ASERL’s disposition database, the Kansas/Nebraska plan, LOCKSS. Although it is understood GPO cannot effect change unilaterally, we want to see some forward motion, especially in the area of digital access.  2) COMMERCIAL SALE OF GOVERNMENT INFORMATION Most libraries in our state will never have the money to subscribe to the big commercial databases – Proquest Congressional, Readex’ Serial Set, HeinOnline, etc. The full text available on American Memory and FDSys represents but a tiny fraction. We realize that GPO has neither the funds nor the actual documents to digitize, but if it could spearhead a collective effort to completely digitize the historic backfile of all government information, it would be a great service.  3) GOVERNMENTS’ DECISION TO NO LONGER PUBLISH INFORMATION  The demise of the *Statistical Abstract of the United States* concerns us. If one of the most important and highly-used publications issued by the federal government can be discontinued without regard to the response from the library community, it makes us wonder what is in store for other government publications.  4) ARTICULATING A UNIFIED GOAL  Finally, as one person responded, “We would like to know where the FDLP thinks the program is going so we can plan and support said vision.” |

**Certification**

\*21. We certify that the above FDLP State Forecast represents a group effort and is based on the responses to the FDLP Library Forecasts of FDLP members in this state. Individuals with primary responsibility for FDLP collections within our state have met, discussed our state and library FDLP Forecast questionnaire answers, and collaborated to produce these responses.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | The above statement is correct. |

\*22. The following individuals participated in the completion of this questionnaire.

|  |
| --- |
|  |