

Government Documents Roundtable (GODORT)

**Minutes of GODORT Committees & Task Forces
Annual Conference
June 26-29, 2015
San Francisco, California**

The Ad Hoc Committee reports on GODORT Reorganization and on Virtual Meetings are attached at the end of the minutes.

Awards Committee

Sun., June 28, 2015
MAR – Pacific Suite D
10:30-11:30 am

The committee's work culminated in the GODORT Reception & Award Ceremony, Sun., June 28, 2015 at the Cartoon Art Museum, 655 Mission St. from 6:30-8:30 p.m. They presented the following awards:

Recipients	Award
John A. Stevenson	James Bennett Childs Award
Free Government Information	ProQuest/GODORT/ALA "Documents to the People" Award
Steve Beleu	Bernadine Abbott Hoduski Founders Award
Professors Walter Clark Wilson and William Curtis Ellis	Margaret T. Lane/Virginia F. Saunders Memorial Research Award
Lynda Kellam	NewsBank/Readex/GODORT/ALA Catharine J. Reynolds Research Grant
Kelsey Cheshire and Shelly Gilliam	W David Rozkuszka Scholarship

Respectfully submitted,
Catherine Morse, Chair

Bylaws Committee

Fri., June 26, 2015
MCC- 220 (S)
3:00 - 4:00 pm

Bylaws met on Friday, June 26th at the Moscone Convention Center. The main topic of discussion was virtual meetings. In the short term, Bylaws will add a link to ALA's Open Meeting Policy, which virtual meetings fall under, in the GODORT PPM. In the long term, Bylaws will work with the ad-hoc re-organization committee and the ad-hoc virtual meetings committee to ensure that the PPM is updated to reflect any

future organizational changes. With the organizational changes, a more in-depth policy for virtual GODORT meetings will be developed. Also discussed was the transition between the incoming and outgoing Bylaws chairs.

Respectfully submitted,
Gretchen Gould

Cataloging Committee

Sun., June 28, 2015
MAR – Pacific Suite I
10:30 – 11:30 am

Six out of nine committee members attended. There were an additional thirteen guests.

The Cataloging committee heard several reports from vendors and liaisons. These included reports from GPO (Stacey Kinsel), MARCIVE (Jim Noel), Hathi Trust/Metadata Registry for U.S. Federal Documents (Valerie Glenn), the State/Local Documents Task Force (Simon Healey), and the Federal Documents Task Force (Marie Concannon).

The committee discussed a project to review/update/revise its mission and goals/tasks for the next five years. It will work on this project over the next six months and report to GODORT on the results by Midwinter 2016. In addition, it discussed plans to continue updating the Toolboxes for Processing and Cataloging Federal, International, and State/Local Government Documents on the GODORT wiki, as well as pursuing ideas for a possible program proposal for Annual 2017 on cataloging/metadata issues related to documents.

Respectfully submitted,
Ellen Caplan, Chair

Conference Committee - Not meeting.

Development Committee – No report

Education Committee – No report

Government Information for Children (GIC)

Sat., June 27, 2015

HIL - Sutter Room
8:30 – 10:00 am

Government Information for Children met 27 June and discussed the following:

- A. Expansion of the Constitution Day Poster Contest
<http://www.constitutionfacts.com/constitution-poster-design-contest/> to include land grant colleges and state library agencies as key 2015 population targets.
- B. Continuation and integration of 2015 Emerging Leaders Government Information for Children (GIC) Clearinghouse <http://govdocs4kids.weebly.com/> into the GIC Clearinghouse LibGuides platform, hosted by the University of Central Florida - <http://guides.ucf.edu/gic>.
- C. National History Day connection with John Shuler's Virtual Reference Desk - http://fcw.com/articles/2005/04/04/virtual-reference-desk-is-open.aspx?admgarea=TC_ExecTech and the NoodleTools Support Center's ticket system <http://www.noodletools.com/helpdesk/index.php?action=submit> whereby GODORT librarians could assist students / teachers with questions.
- D. News that Jane Canfield, Bibliotecaria/Librarian at Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Puerto Rico, *will be providing access to Spanish language Federal documents via the GIC Clearinghouse* - <http://guides.ucf.edu/gic>
- E. Heard reports from Library of Congress' Dwight Powell and Richard Yarnell on possible GIC / LC connections.
- F. Informed attendees that representatives of the Federal Citizen Information Center (FCIC) are interested in partnering with the GIC / GODORT to promote awareness of Kids.gov <https://kids.usa.gov/>.
- G. Discussed how the GIC would analyze and further refine its mission, vision, and values statements to contribute to the GODORT 5-year Strategic Plan Initiative led by incoming GODORT Chair Stephen Woods.
- H. Notable GODORT attendees included Stephen Woods, current GODORT Chair Helen Sheehy, and GODORT Founding Member Bernadine Abbott Hoduski.

Respectfully submitted,
Tom Adamich, Co-Chair

Legislation Committee

COL GIS

Sat., Jun. 27, 2015

NIKKO – NIKKO BR 3

1:00 – 2:30 pm

Welcome and Introductions

Competencies – 10 minutes

ALA core competencies - looking to add suggestions for govdocs competencies. LegComm and GIS agreed to accept the additions to ALA core competencies to include government information in the Information Sources, Organization of recorded knowledge and Reference and user services sections. Add new competencies to include the unique nature of government information.

Coalition Brainstorming meeting – 10 minutes

Planning to hold a brainstorming meeting. How to pull together diverse voices (particularly within ALA)? The thought is something like the Copyright alliance. How can we coordinate better within ALA?

The thought is to pick up the competencies thread, building on GPO's training work. This would bring in GODORT, RUSA, PLA, ACRL, ALCTS.

Reactions? "Great way to get started." "Education is a common thread." "GODORT is already reaching out to school librarians with GOVDOCS4KIDS." "Would like to also include a piece on advocacy."

Jessica will look for a space at midwinter.

LegComm and the Preservation Working Group are working on a message about the value of government info experts and preserving collections. Private sector reps on the working group are interested in both of these pieces – they see the value of government info specialists (who buy their products) and preservation of collections (they may need to go back and re-digitize so may need physical copies).

FDLP Education Brief – 15 minutes

FDLP information sheet – to be handed out by ALA WO to staffers on the hill. This originally came out of GODORT (Thanks Jill Vassilakos-Long!). Brought it to COL to have it adopted ALA wide.

COL deferred it to GIS.

Discussion ensued. Some editing occurred and Jill and others agreed to work on the document after the meeting. New title "Getting government information to your constituents: the Federal Depository Library Program".

GPO Update (Mary Alice Baish, GPO's Superintendent of Documents) – 15 minutes
Mary Alice Baish and Cindy Etkin. Announcements:

FIPnet came out of the 2012 FDLP survey. NAPA wrote report about all the business units within GPO. Staff are now working to ingest Panama Canal commission reports into Fdsys from UFL. They will have the GPO authentication symbol. After ingest, UFL will take down their copies and link instead to the authenticated versions in Fdsys.

LC almost finished digitizing bound historic Congressional Record. No timeframe yet.

LSCM is going to digitize the entire run of the Federal Register.

Cindy Etkin on FIPnet: What is FIPnet and how does it relate to the FDLP?
(www.gpo.gov/PreserveFedInfo)

David Wall: permanent public access doesn't happen without preservation, and preservation needs to happen in collaboration. Map the landscape to build a patchwork quilt of preservation

FIPnet is a strategic initiative. GPO is in the outreach phase.

Web harvesting is a top priority.

NTIS – 10 minutes

Pending legislation that would cause harm to NTIS. Those forces are quiet. Dept of Commerce has done an internal assessment and review that isn't public. NIST, NTIS' managing unit within Commerce. The hope is for the negative buzz to just stay quiet.

Discuss any current resolutions
Anything happening on this front?

James brought forward a draft ALA resolution on fugitive government publications. The resolution was tabled and sent back to LegComm for more discussion.

Respectfully submitted,
Bernadine Abbott Hoduski, Chair
James Jacobs, Recorder

Legislative Committee Meeting II

Sun., Jun. 28, 2015

MAR – Pacific Suite C

1:00 – 2:00 pm

Attendees: Bernadine Abbott Hoduski (chair), Frank Lester, Helen Sheehy, Kay Cassell, Brett Cloyd, James Jacobs

- Program for library school professors at midwinter 2016. Kay is working to put together a program for ALSC before ALA midwinter 2016. Debbie Rabina, Cass Hartnett and Helen Sheehy were suggested as possible people to present.
- Goals of committee
- National Preservation of Government Publications Plan
- Discussed a few issues that need to be added to the document. Still in draft stage and not ready for Steering.
- Papers on small depository libraries, staffing, and on processing government publications

- Discussed the idea to have a goals statement at the bottom of each so that the papers are not simply problem statements, but statements on goals and ideals surrounding each of these issues.

Respectfully submitted,
Bernadine Abbott Hoduski, Chair
James Jacobs, Recorder

Membership Committee

Sun., June 28, 2015

MAR – Pacific Suite H

3:00-4:00 pm

|

The GODORT Membership Committee held its inaugural orientation session, called the GODORT Kick-Off, on Friday June 26, 2015. It was well attended by folks who were new to GODORT as well as veterans. We shared personal stories of why we are active members of GODORT, what we get out of membership and how we got involved in government information librarianship. The informal session highlighted GODORT events at this conference including the programs and awards reception. Afterwards, we moved to the Press Club, a local restaurant, for the GODORT Happy Hour. Being successful in its first year, the orientation session will hopefully become an annual event.

Other Membership Committee activities included publishing a revised brochure and attending the ALA Membership Promotion Task Force meeting. One of the ideas for the next Kick-Off will be to create GODORT trading cards featuring pictures of GODORT members and some facts about them. These collectibles will help folks get to know key players as well as new members, sparking conversations and encouraging networking.

Membership Committee did not hold a business meeting at the conference.

Respectfully submitted,
Sara Erekson, Chair

Nominating Committee – No report

Program Committee

Sun., June 28, 2015

MAR – Pacific Suite D

1:00 – 2:00 pm

The committee discussed the pre-conference on data visualization that was approved provisionally by the Steering Committee in Steering 1. Incoming members of the Program Committee will work with MAGiRT to finalize budgets, presenters and content. Updates will be posted on the 2015 data visualization program site magirtgodortwordpress.com.

The committee considered four program proposals that were submitted. They will recommend two of the proposals to be approved at Steering 2. One of the proposals focuses on government data centers and the other on continuing education focusing on government information.

Respectfully submitted,
Stephen Woods, Chair

Publications Committee

Sun., June 28, 2015

MAR – Pacific Suite C

3:00 – 4:00 pm

Attending: Shari Laster, Vicki Tate, Stephen Woods, Jim Church, Mark Anderson, Valerie Glenn, Mike Smith, Elizabeth Psyck, Karen Hogenboom.

Committee transitions: Kevin McLure has resigned from the committee, leaving a vacancy at Chair. Valerie has agreed to serve as Chair immediately following this conference and will be Chair for the next two years. Marianne will serve as Immediate Past Chair this year, and Karen has agreed to stay on the committee as a member.

Treasurer's report: Mike indicated that the budget is on track as far as printing and subscriptions for DttP go. He's received \$560 in royalties from the Serial Set book, but has some question about our agreement with ProQuest. Karen will email Mike with contract details so he can investigate.

Notable documents: Mark will post the full report to the GODORT wiki. It will include the link to the Notable Documents article from the May 15, 2015 issue of Library Journal. This year there were 50 state and local documents nominees, and 30 each for federal and international documents. Next week Mark will send messages to the current panel members asking if they're willing to continue, and will then look to fill any vacancies. There will likely be at least two - Linda Johnson and David Griffith will be rotating off of the panel.

There were no action items from liaisons to FDTF, IDTF, and SLDTF.

DttP: Elizabeth has recruited several new columnists, and their columns will probably start appearing in 2016. GODORT members will soon have access to DttP through ALA Connect as soon as the electronic issues are available.

Vicki asked about sending DttP issues to the ALA archives. Elizabeth will contact Tim at ALA publishing to see if current issues are being sent. Karen will check with the archives.

Elizabeth will pursue opening up DttP issues in HathiTrust. She has verified that this can be an editor's decision but wanted to check with the committee. The committee approved.

Indexing of DttP: DttP is indexed by Wilson, but hasn't been indexed in the past year. Elizabeth will investigate further to find reasons for the delay.

Old business:

The committee approved changes to the PPM. The new language updates the PPM with the new committee leadership structure (Chair-elect, Chair, and Immediate Past Chair). These changes will be sent to the Bylaws committee.

There was also discussion about how to recruit submissions for the Occasional Papers - we've had several inquiries, but those haven't resulted in submissions. This turned into a broader discussion about recruiting for publications, and included some distinctions between DttP articles and Occasional Papers.

Respectfully submitted,
Marianne Ryan, Chair
Valerie Glenn, Recorder

Rare and Endangered Government Publications

Sat., June 27, 2015

HIL – Sutter Room)

10:30-11:30 am

The Rare & Endangered Government Publications committee (REGP) hosted a discussion focused on the newly-formed Federal Information Preservation Network (FIPnet), which is a component of the Government Publishing Office's National Plan for Access to U.S. Government Information. Cindy Etkin (GPO) and Robbie Sittel (University of North Texas Libraries) provided an overview of FIPnet, which was followed by a lively question-and-answer session.

REGP will hold a virtual business meeting on Tuesday, July 7th. Details are available on ALA Connect.

Respectfully submitted,
Shari Laster, Chair

Federal Documents Task Force

Sun., June 28, 2015
MCC, 200-212 (S)
8:30 – 10:00 am

Agenda acceptance moved by Mary Prophet, 2nd by Shari Laster.
Approval of Minutes from Midwinter 2015

- Moved by Jill Vassilakos-Long, 2nd by James Jacobs.

GPO Update

SuDoc's update

- Travel approved for 9 GPO members to attend
- Have booth 2104 in South building this year in exhibit hall
- Call for nominations for depository of the year (1 regional and 1 selective)
 - July 31st deadline
- Tribal college libraries coming into the FDLP
 - Handout on benefits of being a digital federal depository
- DePaul will be a digital FDLP library

Laurie Hall

- Working with Federal Register
 - 1936-1994 digitization project
- Panama Canal collection from UF
 - Getting ready to ingest into FDSys
- Bound Congressional Record
 - Additional metadata
- Cataloging partnership for forest service docs – completed
- Colorado & School of mines on USGS docs
- Providing CIP data
 - 200-300 publications per year
- New Ben's Guide
 - Worked with school librarians on lesson plans
- New marketing campaign “on the go and on the shelf”
- Digital projects registry

David Walls – preservation librarian

- Web archive
 - GPO reached out to NARA and LoC – no coordination of effort
 - Formed working group, working on understanding what archiving and why
 - Actually not much overlap in what harvesting
- GPO will have grant-funded resident grad student helping with the Trusted Digital Repository project
 - Working on internal audit

- FipNet (Federal Information Preservation Network)
 - Supports permanent public access to government info
 - Build peoples' local preservation activities into a national effort together

Cindy Etkin – FipNet preservation network

- Looking at naming a “national collection” that’s broader in scope than FDLP
- FipNet activities – harvesting, cataloging & indexing things that are within scope of the FDLP
 - Will grow the info available through the program

Jamie Huaman – FDLP coordinator certificate program

- Webinars “FDLP Academy”
- Certificate program
 - Program would help new coordinators understand rules & regs
 - 8 week program, totally virtual
 - Cohort-style (20-25 participants)

Liaison Reports

- Cataloging – meets after FDTF
- Education – no report
- Legislation –
 - Moving forward with one-page briefing doc to give to new members of congress
 - Working with preservation working group on doc to education people on value of docs librarians and why these collections are important
- Program – no report
- Publications –
 - Discussion of occasional papers series
- Rare & Endangered –
 - Business meeting will be held virtually
 - Hosted panel on FipNet here at ALA
- SLDTF –
 - Held business meeting last week
 - Identified their goals for the five-year plan

Fugitive Documents Project (James Jacobs)

- Workflow complications with Zotero
- Draft resolution on fugitive docs
 - Urge federal agencies to work with GPO to get their docs and data into FDSys, so all of their info can be in the national bibliography
 - Hoping ALA resolution could get more federal agencies interested in working with GPO
- Idea for FDTF
 - Re-institute liaison program with federal agencies
 - Reach out to agencies that GODORT is interested in working with to encourage them to get their docs to GPO
 - Bernadine Abbott Hoduski – ALA/COL would prefer that GODORT as a group not speak directly to government agencies – want us to go through ALA/COL
 - Suggestion that FDTF Chair should work on this

One-page briefing handout on FDLP for Legislators

- Suggestion – include URL for FDSys, CGP

Announcements

- Valerie Glenn – FDTF liaison to ad-hoc committee
 - Report on re-org will be discussed at membership meeting tomorrow
- Shari Laster – liaison to ad-hoc committee on virtual meetings
 - Report available

Five-Year Plan ideas

- Vision for FDTF over the next five years
 - Tim Dodge –
 - To further education/training of librarians and others who work with federal government information.
 - To continue to develop more effective measures of bibliographic control over federal government information sources including born-digital fugitive documents.
 - To broaden public knowledge of federal government information.
 - To devise more effective advocacy measures to Congress on behalf of FDLP, GPO, etc. that adhere to GODORT, ALA, and ALAWO requirements.
 - Lori Smith –
 - Attempt to catalog different series of documents-related webinars and training videos available and put with annotated list with links on GODORT Wiki.
 - Shari Laster – support the idea of FDTF having focused approach to advocacy
 - People could use support and guidance on how to reach out to legislators
 - Build advocacy program so we can speak on behalf of ourselves
 - Move forward on the fugitive docs problem (Jill)
 - Uniform statement for library directors on importance of government documents in their library (advocacy within our organizations)
 - GODORT has a Libguides account
 - Helen Sheehy is the administrator
 - Can use for GODORT information dissemination
 - Could be used for “Catalog of Webinars”
 - Spotlight on collections and repositories from government agencies (publicizing)

Respectfully submitted,
Tim Dodge, Coordinator
Justin Otto, Coordinator-Elect, Recorder

International Documents Task Force

Sun., Jun. 28, 2015
MAR – Pacific Suite I
4:30 – 5:30 pm

Jim Church completed his first term in IFLA and is up for a second five-year term. The next meeting is in Cape Town, South Africa. The IFLA Government Publication Section (GPS)

focuses on preservation of government information and documents. Church urged participation in the GPS.

Maritina Paniagua, Outreach and Professional Development, Dag Hammarskjöld Library, gave an overview of the framework of the new program for UN depositories. The mission is to ensure local access to UN information, documents and knowledge with the following goals:

- To share knowledge, information and data generated so it is easily available.
- To provide transparency for the activities of the UN.
- To ensure the security of UN documents (multiple copies to reduce the risk of loss or tampering). A LOCKSS model will be explored.

•

Components of the new program are:

- 1) A digital repository ("DAG Digital Library"). A pilot version was tested with a sample of 42 Depository libraries worldwide. The pilot was successful. The pilot will be extended to all members over the next 12-18 months. It should evolve to a full service within 2 years.
- 2) DSpace currently is being used. They are in the procurement process for a more robust system and are looking for a new system that will use MARC.
 - Stage I: provide digital access of materials that were received in print.
 - Stage II: expand access.Embargos may be enforced for some collections. Depository libraries will be granted access to full UN publications by IP or password. Metadata will be exposed to work with Zotero and other bibliographic citation managers. It will take time to implement all of the UI suggestions given by the UN Depository Library community.
- 3) Training – The value of depository librarians (local human guidance) is critical. One person will be required to be named as the UN information expert at each depository library. Continuing education will be provided on an ongoing basis. Workshops will be held for libraries in the tri-state area. A UN workshop will be held at IFLA in Cape Town.

Outreach: They want to raise awareness of UN depositories and will expand the directory of UN depositories on un.org.

Legal document re UN Depository Libraries (last updated in 1995) will be updated. The depository library website will be revamped. The name "UN Depository Libraries" will remain. Maritina will be retiring in August after 36 years of service!

Vendor Reports

World Bank did a webinar with Brett Cloyd. The recording is available via YouTube at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cgs_rlZNvw4. Also discussed was the review of the World Bank's eLibrary, "Against the Grain." World Bank has published the first volume of a disease control project that will be a 9-volume work.

Bernan gave a reminder that there are two sales going on now (a 35% off summer sale on all books; for IDTF a 20% discount for the rest of the year).

IMF discussed a new collaboration site as part of an energy and climate policy microsite. They will unroll a new data feature that will provide world maps for economic

indicators. Those should be out in the fall. There is a delay effecting Government Finance Statistics. IMF Data went free(!) in January. A new platform will be released before the end of 2015. A forthcoming title "Collapse and Revival", the first IMF multimedia book will be available in September.

OECD: Toby Green is visiting from Paris. In January they launched a new data portal with 250 indicators up already. It has open API for data rolling out. About 30% of the data sets are now available via API with most available via API by the end of 2015. They are updating the iLibrary platform at the end of 2016 (many more visualizations of data). Commonwealth and other IGOs are being loaded into the iLibrary platform.

UN Publications: They are going to lease the OECD iLibrary platform and will go live at Frankfort(?) with a small number of titles. There was also a presentation about an online exhibit celebrating the 70th Anniversary of the UN

Respectfully submitted,
Stephanie Braunstein, Coordinator
James Jacobs, Recorder

State and Local Documents Task Force

Program: State Government Information and the Copyright Conundrum

Mon., Jun. 29, 2015

MCC – 2000 W

1:00 – 2:30 pm

SLDTF Virtual Meeting Summary

June 16, 2015

Announcement

The State and Local Documents Task Force will be hosting a program at Annual in San Francisco entitled State Government Information and the Copyright Conundrum. The program will include a discussion of state government Information and copyright, issues that libraries, digital repositories and state agencies, specifically state libraries, face with copyright ambiguity and an overview of the work FSGI: Free State Government Information is doing to address this little discussed but major issue. Please join us Monday June 29th from 1-2:30pm in the Moscone Convention Center, Room 2000(W) for this great program. A short SLDTF business meeting will be held at the end of the program.

Brainstorming and Visioning

The group met to begin work on SLDTF's piece of GODORT's strategic planning initiative. Members collaborated to create 4 statements that capture the spirit of the task force's mission. The wording will be polished by a sub-committee, and a new mission statement will be posted for review in the near future.

The group selected three goals to focus on in our brainstorming session:

- Promote and speak for the interests of documents librarianship relating to state, regional and local information. Improve bibliographic control for these resources
- Identify, explore, foster communication and act on problems and issues facing librarians and state/local depositories, including interstate and intergovernmental agencies
- Sponsor and encourage opportunities for state and local documents librarians to update existing competencies, learn requisite new skills, and gain awareness of the state of the art, based on member needs assessment

A list of the action items proposed in the brainstorming session will be posted on the SLDTF wiki for review and then all members will be invited to vote on which 5 projects/tasks to pursue in the next five years.

[http://wikis.ala.org/godort/index.php/State %26 Local Documents](http://wikis.ala.org/godort/index.php/State_%26_Local_Documents)

Respectfully submitted,
Samantha Hager, Coordinator

Statistical Sources on the Web Guide Working Group Report

A working group was formed in fall 2014. Its mandate was to explore the feasibility of DIG, GODORT and/or LPSS to adopt, update and maintain Grace York's [Statistical Sources on the Web Guide](#).

Approaches

The working group discussed a variety of approaches that meet and expand the original mandate and are not seen as being mutually exclusive:

Utilization of a database for *Statistical Sources on the Web Guide* content

The working group identified two similar resources that are similar to the *Web Guide*, but focus on international statistics—the Norwegian Social Science Data Center's [MacroDataGuide](#) and the University of Auckland Library's [OFFSTATS](#). We also selected the ACRL Instruction Section's [Peer Reviewed Instructional Materials Online \(PRIMO\) Database](#) as a successful ALA-affiliated effort that utilized a database and committee structure to maintain a constantly updated product. We contacted the three efforts about their experiences and heard back from two. We asked about (1) selection criteria, (2) identification of new sources, (3) site maintenance, (4) if and how databases were utilized to present the information and (5) advice based on their experiences. To summarize the responses:

MacroDataGuide

- 1) Geographical focus was initially on Europe with comparable, high quality socioeconomic data; there was later expansion geographically and thematically.
- 2) Sources were identified primarily through examination of journal literature; approximately three to four were added on a quarterly basis.
- 3) Initially was a group of three to four people with a focus on the quarterly updates, but eventually diminished to one person.
- 4) Content is in an SQL database that was developed in-house.
- 5) They suggested limiting initial thematic scope and expanding gradually.

PRIMO

- 1) A [selection criteria](#) was developed by an initial task force.
- 2) A call is sent twice a year for nominations and submissions. Nominated/submitted projects are evaluated by PRIMO Committee members utilizing a selection criteria rubric.
- 3) Maintained by the PRIMO Committee.
- 4) The Committee received funding from the ACRL Board of Directors to have a site developed by a programmer utilizing MySQL.
- 5) The PRIMO Committee is not only tasked with coordinating the evaluation of submissions, it also has a substantial outreach component for attracting submissions and publicizing additions to the *Database*, including interviews with the Sites of the Month winners.

Custom Search Engine

Google provides a custom search engine tool to easily create a searchable index and search engine of specified websites—additional JavaScript snippets of code are also available to embed the search engine into other sites. The custom search engine is configured to limit the scope of a search to a particular set of websites that can be curated to represent a specific topic.

A group of librarians could build a list of websites and domains inspired by Grace York's work, and create a custom search engine for these sites. Alternately, a custom search engine could include LibGuides and other web finding aids in order to take advantage of the descriptions already developed and maintained by librarians. For examples of custom search engines, please see GODORT's [IGO/NGO custom search engines](#).

Topical LibGuides to Data and Statistical Sources

An efficient way to provide curated and updated access to government information on the web is through existing library guides, many of which are housed on the LibGuides platform. While the quality and currency of individual guides can vary widely based on the workload and dedication of individual librarians, there are outstanding guides curated by librarians that focus on government information sources as well as freely available data and statistical resources that include government data.

One option to leveraging this existing work is to use a centralized LibGuides site, possibly hosted by GODORT, to bring in modules already developed by librarians using Springshare's existing functionality. A small group could seek out exceptional content, request permission to bring it into the site, and then maintain or update it on a consistent basis.

Professional Development for Librarians

Librarians in public service roles would benefit from training and guidance related to locating government data. A few organizations provide free webinars and make recordings available, including GPO through the FDLP Academy and NCLA-GRS. These trainings are highly useful, but are not very efficient to use at the point of need, when a librarian is struggling to answer a specific reference question. A topical guide, custom search engine, or other web portal would allow librarians of all kinds a handy way to quickly access the government statistical information they are seeking.

Funding

The Working Group also identified possible sources of funding for future efforts:

Request funding from the ACRL Board of Directors

This approach worked successfully for the *PRIMO Database's* move to a more stable database platform. The ability to request funding is noted by ACRL Policy [3.8](#) and [6.12.b](#). According to ACRL Policy [6.8](#), by October, "ACRL units anticipating special funding needs should work with the ACRL staff to ensure that their budget requests are included in the budget development. The ACRL units must also submit a separate action item to the ACRL Board for approval of the special funding request."

Grant funding

[Carnegie-Whitney Grant](#) – Grants up to \$5,000 are awarded annually “for the preparation of popular or scholarly reading lists, webliographies, indexes and other guides to library resources that will be useful to users of all types of libraries in the United States.” Deadline for grant proposal is typically November.

[NewsBank/Readex/GODORT/ALA Catharine J. Reynolds Research Grant Award](#) – Grants up to \$2,000 are awarded annually to documents librarians to “support research in all areas of government information, U.S., foreign, international, state, regional, or local. The grant can be used to finance research costs, such as computer time or including travel. Recipients are selected on the basis of a well-defined proposal, potential ability to complete the project, promise of future contributions to the profession, financial need, and activity to the profession.” Deadline for grant proposal is typically December 1.

Recommendations

Proceed with an effort to adopt, update and maintain Grace York’s *Statistical Sources on the Web Guide*.

Create a time certain, working group/task force supported by DIG, GODORT and LPSS. The benefits of shared expertise, combined membership and multi-unit attractiveness to funding efforts will outweigh bureaucratic hurdles that may occur due to the coordination of multiple ALA-affiliated units. The task force would be tasked with the following efforts:

- Establish a relationship with Grace York.
- Develop the following:
 - Prepare a proposal for a custom Google search engine or a specially-designed database to contain the content of *the Web Guide* and new U.S. Government statistical sources.
 - Develop a process and timeline for updating and ingesting existing *Web Guide* content into the custom search engine/database, as well as a process for adding new content.
 - If needed, prepare funding proposals for fall submissions to the ACRL Board (October), Carnegie-Whitney Grant (November) and/or the Catharine J. Reynolds Grant (December). Funding could be utilized for technical assistance with database or other information technology-related needs; hosting fees; and/or preparation and transition costs.
 - Develop a custom search engine widget that will allow searching capabilities to the *Web Guide* to be easily integrated into LibGuides and other online sites.
 - Propose integration of these efforts into the GODORT LibGuides location. The LibGuide would be utilized to provide access to the database, provide information on how to utilize the customer search engine widget and publicize outreach efforts.
 - Work with ALA to create a multi-unit committee, based on the PRIMO Committee model, which would have permanent responsibility to

maintain the *Web Guide* database, the section on the GODORT LibGuide and develop outreach efforts, such as publicizing important additions to the database and highlighting exceptional data and statistical source LibGuides by librarians.

Respectfully submitted by the Statistical Sources on the Web Guide Working Group
on June 19, 2015

- Rebecca Hyde
- James Jacobs
- Chad Kahl, chair
- Lynda Kellam
- Shari Laster

GODORT Ad Hoc Committee on Reorganization
Preliminary Report for ALA Annual Conference 2015

CHARGES:

At ALA Midwinter, two Ad Hoc Committees were created to gather data for and study the possibilities of making some substantive changes to GODORT's structure. These two committees were the Ad Hoc Committee on Reorganization and the Ad Hoc Committee on Virtual Meetings. The following report is from the Ad Hoc Committee on Reorganization.

Ad Hoc Committee on GODORT Reorganization

MEMBERSHIP: The committee will be composed of [6] members. Each Task Force shall designate 1 member to represent their members, the current Chair of Nominating (Selby), the GODORT Councilor (Sudduth). The Current Chair (Sheehy), Chair elect (Woods) and incoming Chair elect (to be voted on this spring) of GODORT shall be ex-officio members.

Current members are: Stephanie Braunstein, Chair and IDTF designee; Barbie Selby, Nominating; Bill Sudduth, Councilor; Valerie Glenn, FDTF designee; Barbara Miller, SLDTF designee; Helen Sheehy, GODORT Chair; Stephen Woods, GODORT Chair-elect; Sarah Erikson, incoming Chair-Elect (will replace Helen Sheehy after Helen rotates off).

DURATION: The committee will dissolve at the close of ALA Midwinter 2016 unless extended by the GODORT Steering Committee.

MEETINGS: All meetings of the committee--in person or virtual--shall be held under ALA Open Meeting Rules.

PURPOSE: The committee is charged to specifically address the following questions, but it is not limited to these questions:

1. Review the history of GODORT organization and past proposals to restructure (See Appendix I).
2. Examine the current structure of GODORT and evaluate its effectiveness in meeting the mission and goals of the organization. Specifically the following questions should be addressed:
 - a. Given current membership levels is the current committee and task force organization sustainable?
 - b. Can the organizational structure be streamlined to require fewer elected and appointed positions, while still accomplishing the work needed?
 - c. Would a different organizational structure support more virtual membership and increase member participation in GODORT activities?
3. The committee will produce two reports. A preliminary report with recommendations for continuation of the current structure or alternative structure(s) to be considered by GODORT membership at Annual 2015. A

final report with recommendations and a draft implementation plan at Midwinter 2016.

OUTCOMES: The Committee shall present a preliminary report to GODORT Steering and the General Membership meeting at ALA Annual 2015 and a final report with recommendations at Midwinter 2016.

ACTIONS:

Major Reorganization Committee Actions as of June 21, 2015:

- Selected chair
- Discussed goals for committee (All)
- Looked at historical efforts to make changes to GODORT (All)
- Looked at organizational schemes of other ALA Round Tables (Glenn/Selby)
- Set up a survey (All)
 - ***Goal was to get more information on factors contributing to GODORT participation (as well as information on what members/potential members want from the GODORT experience) and to answer the three questions (2 a-c) in the charge.***
 - Began with original draft survey created by Bill Sudduth
 - Worked with other Ad Hoc Committee on developing and refining survey questions (All/Laster)
- Formatted survey as a Qualtrics Survey (Glenn)
- Sent survey out via Listservs and ALA Connect (Braunstein)
- Held two meetings via telephone (held in accordance with Open Meeting Policy)
- Communicated via telephone, email, and Google Drive to analyze survey responses and to draft Preliminary Report (All)

Overview of GODORT membership and structure (for full history, see Appendix I)

- Membership

“According to Lois Mills, GODORT reached membership of 1,000 in 1976. The apparent peak was 1,132 personal members in 1989 (This number excludes library and corporate members). Since then, GODORT has experienced a small but continuing decline of membership each year. On August 31, 2001, personal membership was 845 (p. [33]). A rough estimate based on the May 2014 GODORT membership roster puts the current membership at about 600 personal members.
- Analysis of the current GODORT Structure

(http://wikis.ala.org/godort/images/c/c6/GODORT_Structure-2015.pdf) shows that approximately 115 people are needed each year to fill all the offices, committee rosters, and specified liaison roles. Approximately one of every six members of GODORT must be “active” in this model.

- From an informal comparison between GODORT and other Round Tables, it appears that GODORT averages twice the number of elected positions as the other Round Tables.

SURVEY:

See Appendix II for Survey Instrument.

SURVEY RESULTS:

The results were calculated by the Qualtrics software and put into Excel spreadsheets by Valerie Glenn. See Appendices III and IV

PRELIMINARY REPORT SECTION I: SELECTED SURVEY INTERPRETATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

(The committee will produce two reports. A preliminary report with recommendations for continuation of the current structure or alternative structure(s) to be considered by GODORT membership at Annual 2015.)

Various responses were determined to be most useful in terms of how those specific responses might guide suggestions for changing/not changing GODORT. The listing of questions below does not reflect any judgment as to which questions are most important; instead, the list is presented in numerical order as corresponding to the survey instrument.

Question 6: Elected positions came out very marginally ahead of appointed ones in importance. Elected – 4.17, Appointed – 4.04. Presenting was rated higher than either – 4.32.

This response seems to indicate that service in terms of holding offices/positions, while important for Promotion/Tenure/Advancement at one's institution, are not as important as actually presenting at conferences. It is notable that the difference between whether the position was won by election or taken by appointment was not significant. Thus, comments made later by respondents to question 26 about having too many elected offices in GODORT could be addressed simply by having fewer offices *in toto* or by changing some of the offices to appointed positions rather than elected positions—or some combination of the above.

What this question does indicate, however, is that a position is not as important as a presentation. In terms of looking toward more virtual membership, that difference could possibly make virtual membership less attractive. While it is quite easy to hold positions on Virtual Committees/Task Forces, it is less easy to do presentations virtually. Of course, presentations can be made via Adobe Connect or a number of other software options; but having a full complement of presentations for a meeting held entirely online is a bit trickier. Being in a physical meeting/conference space allows members to go from one concurrent presentation to another if they so wish; and, truthfully, not all members have access to the technology required to present virtually (nor the comfort level/skills to do so).

Questions 13 & 14: While 13% of respondents reported that they had been asked to run for an office or asked to accept a committee appointment in the past two years and could not accept the nomination nor the appointment, 87% of the respondents reported that they had not had these experiences. The 13% represents

28/208 responses. Without comparable data from other ALA Roundtables, it is not possible to judge if 13% should be considered high. Nevertheless, it is important to note the reasons for that 13% to answer in the affirmative. The most common reason was simply “Too busy with my job” (58%). GODORT would not be able to solve that problem, of course; but the second most common reason could be addressed by GODORT, that reason being “Unable to travel to meetings/conferences” (42%). In this instance, then, it could be said that one possible remedy for the perceived problem of not finding enough people to take on responsible positions in GODORT (or possibly saying it differently as in “not finding enough NEW people to take on responsible positions”) is having a more virtual environment in which physical travel is not a necessity for involvement.

Question 15: 56% say GODORT has about the right number of committees, etc. 41% say maybe too many. 3% say we need more.

Out of 181 responses to the question of how many units/committees seemed appropriate, 101 (56%) indicated that the current number is the right number. Only 75 (41%) thought fewer units/committees would be better (as backed up by some of the narrative comments from Question 26). Six respondents (3%) actually wanted more units/committees. While this response does not scream out “make GODORT leaner” in terms of units/committees, it could be used to eliminate a few units/committees—but cautiously and with feedback from all membership.

Questions 16 & 17: 17% of respondents have served as an internal GODORT liaison. 27% think the internal liaisons are useful; 16% think not useful. 58% aren’t sure.

While it would be satisfying to assume that the 16% of respondents who think that internal liaisons are not useful corresponded to the 17% who have served as internal liaisons (thus proving that the experience was not particularly rewarding), that assumption cannot be proven with the results as we currently have them. It is tempting to go back and re-ask that question so that any correspondence could be tracked, but the fact that more than half of the respondents (58%) were not sure whether the internal liaisons were useful or not works against the entire notion of proving anything conclusive with this particular data. If, however, we were to follow some of the suggestions given in Question 26, and eliminate some committees/taskforces or merely combine some, there would then be fewer internal liaisons needed. Thus, if one is looking for instant simplification, combining would be a logical route.

Questions 20-25: For details on these questions, refer to the Preliminary Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Virtual Meetings.

Question 26: Barbie Selby created a categorical grid for the narrative responses to question 26 (If you could reorganize GODORT how would you do it?). Her categories implying suggestions for change/no change are as follows:

Category	Number of Responses
Stay the Same	3

Reduce Number of Committee Members	7
Streamline Number of Committees	27
Reduce Elected Committees/Positions/Offices	4
Do Away with/Simplify Internal Liaison Process	6
Rely on a More Virtual Version of GODORT Participation	17

NEXT STEPS:

The Committee has determined that in order to develop recommendations and a methodology to implement them, a process similar to the one started by incoming Chair Stephen Woods to determine strategic planning will be implemented during the six months between 2015 Annual and 2016 Mid-winter. This process will involve committee chairs and task force coordinators, requesting that the information reported to Chair Woods be utilized by the Ad Hoc Committee on Reorganization in such a way as to provide additional guidance to the Ad Hoc Reorganization Committee Members. Thus, two goals will hopefully be accomplished: first, the information on strategic planning at the individual unit levels will be used for dual, but very integrated, purposes; i.e., renewal/revision of mission and creation of a possible design for reorganization of architecture. The second goal will be to augment the information gleaned from the survey and give that information additional context. Supplementary questions may be asked, including those that attempt to determine more specifically what GODORT members want from their organization in the future.

Further information about timelines and specific events will be announced immediately after Annual in San Francisco. All information about the process will be made available to members via the wiki and ALA Connect.

Report Respectfully Submitted by the ALA GODORT Ad Hoc Committee on Reorganization, 2015-2016:

Stephanie Braunstein

Valerie Glenn

Barbara Miller

Barbie Selby

Bill Sudduth

& Ex Officio Members: Helen Sheehy and Stephen Woods

Appendix I: History of GODORT Organization and Past Proposals to Restructure

A very brief overview of GODORT organizational history based on http://www.ala.org/godort/sites/ala.org.godort/files/content/godortcommittees/godortpublications/GODORT_history_final.pdf and personal (Barbie Selby) knowledge:

- 1972 -- GODORT was officially formed. Its genesis was somewhat controversial:
 - “In response to this interest, [Margaret] Lane, then chair of the Public Documents Committee, arranged a “non-program” for the 1970 annual meeting of the Committee. She invited eighty-five documents librarians, including thirty-six regional librarians, to come to this meeting and group themselves for free-ranging discussions according to their particular documents interest.”
- 1984-5 -- “By the mid-1980s, task forces, work groups, and ad hoc and special committees had so proliferated and the meeting schedules were so busy that Carol Turner, 1984-85 GODORT chair, appointed an Ad Hoc Committee to Study GODORT Structure.”
 - “The recommendation that elicited the most discussion was to appoint, rather than elect, almost all members of both standing and special committees as well as the secretaries of the task forces.”
- 1985 -- Then there was a second Ad Hoc Committee to Study GODORT Structure.
 - “The second committee said that the original committee was directed to find ways to streamline the schedule of GODORT meetings and to cut down the number of volunteers needed to run for office. The second committee felt that the first committee had, indeed, found ways to accomplish these objectives, but that the membership had voted against them. The second committee explained that these membership votes did not mean the final defeat of the suggested amendments. That would occur only when the changes necessary to implement the recommendations were not approved when, and if, they did appear as amendments to the constitution and bylaws.” (p. [13])
- 1987 – Merged Constitution and Bylaws
 - “In 20 years GODORT has grown from an unstructured, free-wheeling group into a highly structured organization with many rules and a complex formula for terms of office, which assigns great powers to a handful of people.” (p.[14])
- 1992-1998 – Ad Hoc Committee on GODORT Organization
 - “The Committee proposed an organizational structure that included a Steering Committee, four main divisions (Education

and Training, Information Access, Information Policy and Government Relations, and Reference Services and Technology), and four special standing committees (Awards, Bylaws, Membership and Nominations). Following discussion at the 1993 Annual Conference, the proposal was further revised and published again.... The Ad Hoc Committee investigated the feasibility of becoming an ALA Division, but came to the conclusion that financially it was not an option.... The consensus reached at the conference was to postpone further discussion of reorganization until after some of the scheduling changes suggested at the forum had been implemented.” (p.[28])

- 1995 – Considered merger with Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies (ASCLA) “In a mail ballot to all GODORT members in 1998, the proposal failed by a vote of 86 percent opposed to 14 percent in favor.” (p.[29])
- 1999 – GODORT got an ALA Councilor

- Membership
 - “According to Lois Mills, GODORT reached membership of 1,000 in 1976. The apparent peak was 1,132 personal members in 1989. (This number excludes library and
 - Corporate members.) Since then GODORT has experienced a small but continuing decline of membership each year. On August 31, 2001, personal membership was 845.” (p. [33])
 - A rough estimate based on the May 2014 GODORT membership roster puts the current membership at about 600 personal members.
- Analysis of the current GODORT Structure (http://wikis.ala.org/godort/images/c/c6/GODORT_Structure-2015.pdf) shows that approximately 115 people are needed each year to fill all the officers, committee rosters, and specified liaison roles. Approximately one if every six members of GODORT must be “active” in this model.

APPENDIX II: Survey Instrument (note that this is formatted in Word and may have been slightly revised in order to work with the Qualtrics software before sending out).

PROPOSED SURVEY QUESTIONS FOR REORG AD HOC COMMITTEE (rev. 3 SGB
4/24/15)

- 1) Are you a member of ALA?
- 2) Are you, or have you ever been, a member of GODORT?
Yes _____
NO _____
- 3) If your answer to #2 was “yes,” how long have you been (were you) a member of GODORT?
 - a. < 5 years
 - b. 5-10 years
 - c. 10-20 years
 - d. > 20 years
- 4) What type of organization do you work in?
 - a. Academic (ARL)
 - b. Academic (Masters/Comprehensive)
 - c. Academic (4 year liberal arts)
 - d. Academic (Community/Technical/Junior College)
 - e. Public Library
 - f. Federal Agency
 - g. State Agency
 - h. Law Library
 - i. Other
- 5) If you work in an academic library, is your position tenure-track or professional with the possibility of promotion?
Yes _____
NO _____
- 6) If your answer to #5 was “yes,” rank the importance of the following requirements, with 1 being the least important and 4 being the most:

	Not Important				
Very Important		1	2	3	4
5					

 - a. General Publishing
 - b. Peer Reviewed Publishing
 - c. Participation in work groups/taskforces

- d. Participation in work groups/taskforces with published results
- e. Elected Leadership positions
- f. Appointed Leadership positions
- g. Presentations at conferences and other professional gatherings

7) Do any of the following collections fall under your supervision?

- a. U.S. Federal government information
- b. State and or local government information
- c. International governmental information (IGOs)
- d. Foreign government information
- e. Maps
- f. GIS
- g. Data
- h. Microforms
- i. Newspapers/Journals
- j. Other _____

8) What duties do you have within your organization (mark as many as apply)?

- a. General reference
- b. Library instruction
- c. Acquisitions
- d. Cataloging
- e. Digitization
- f. Preservation
- g. Supervision of professional staff
- h. Supervision of paraprofessional staff
- i. Supervision of student assistants, interns, or volunteers
- j. Administration
- k. Subject liaison
- l. Archives/Special Collections
- m. Other _____

9) Have you ever run for an office in GODORT?

10) Which elected GODORT offices have you run for or held?

- a. GODORT Chair
- b. GODORT Secretary
- c. GODORT Treasurer
- d. GODORT Councilor
- e. Publications Committee Chair
- f. Federal Documents Taskforce Coordinator
- g. State and Local Documents Taskforce Coordinator
- h. International Documents Taskforce Coordinator
- i. Awards Committee member
- j. Bylaws & Organization Committee member

- k. Nominating Committee member
- l. Other _____

11) Have you ever been appointed to a position in GODORT?

Yes _____
NO _____

12) If so, which one(s)?

- a. Cataloging Committee
- b. Conference Committee
- c. Development Committee
- d. Education Committee
- e. Government Information for Children Committee
- f. Legislation Committee
- g. Membership Committee
- h. Program Committee
- i. Publications Committee
- j. Rare & Endangered Committee
- k. Archivist
- l. Web Administrator
- m. Other _____

13) Have you been asked to run for a GODORT office or accept a committee appointment in the past two years and been unable to do so?

Yes _____
NO _____

14) If your answer to #13 was "yes," please tell us why you were unable to run or serve (Select as many as apply):

- a. Too busy with my job
- b. Government documents no longer my primary focus
- c. Already served on several GODORT committees
- d. More involved in other professional activities
- e. Not interested in proposed assignment or office
- f. Unable to travel to meetings/conferences
- g. Other _____

15) Looking at the GODORT Committee Structure Chart found at <http://wikis.ala.org/godort/index.php/PPM> (select chart #1 for pdf) do you think that GODORT:

- a. Has the right number of units and committees?
- b. Needs fewer committees and units?

c. Needs more committees?

16) GODORT has “internal” liaisons from the three taskforces to GODORT committees. Have you ever served as a taskforce liaison to a GODORT committee?

17) What is your opinion of the “internal” liaison model?

Useful _____

Not Useful _____

18) How frequently have you participated in virtual meetings or interactive training sessions for any organization during the past 2 years?

a. At least 1 per month

b. At least 1 per quarter

c. At least 1 per year

d. Rarely or never

19) What technology do you have available in your typical work environment to participate in virtual meetings? (check all that apply)

a. Headphones

b. Microphone

c. Webcam

d. Landline telephone

e. Mobile phone or smartphone

f. Other _____

20) Which of the following ALA conferences do you usually (i.e., all else being equal) plan to attend?

a. Annual

b. Midwinter

c. Both

d. Neither

e. Other _____

21) Which of the following factors most strongly affect your decision of whether or not to attend ALA conferences? (select all that apply)

a. Cost and/or funding available from supporting organization

b. Ability to travel (e.g., health or family reasons)

c. Ability to get away from the office (e.g., short staffed or travel approval process)

d. Opportunity to participate in committee meetings

e. Opportunity to participate in training sessions and workshops

f. Opportunity to participate in organizational governance (i.e., ALA or a subunit)

g. Opportunity to network with other professionals

h. Location of conference

i. Other _____

- 22) Would you participate in virtual GODORT meetings if they were offered?
- a. During Midwinter
 - b. During Annual
 - c. During Midwinter and Annual
 - d. None of the above
 - e. Not sure

- 23) If GODORT has more virtual committee participation options, how would this affect your interest in serving on a committee?
- a. More likely to serve
 - b. Less likely to serve
 - c. This would not change my current interest in committee service

- 24) If GODORT has more virtual committee participation options, how would this affect your interest in attending Midwinter?
- a. More likely to attend
 - b. Less likely to attend
 - c. This would not change my current interest in attending Midwinter

- 25) If GODORT has more virtual committee participation options, how would this affect your interest in attending Annual?
- a. More likely to attend
 - b. Less likely to attend
 - c. This would not change my current interest in attending Annual

- 26) If you could reorganize GODORT how would you do it?

APPENDIX III: Responses to Questions #1- #25 of Survey

1. Are you a member of the American Library Association (ALA)?	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes	0.68636364	151	69%
2	No	0.31363636	69	31%
	Total		220	100%
Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	2			
Mean	1.31			
Variance	0.22			
Standard Deviation	0.47			
Total Responses	220			

2. Are you, or have you ever been, a member of the ALA Government Documents Round Table (GODORT)?	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes	0.75909091	167	76%
2	No	0.24090909	53	24%
	Total		220	100%
Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	2			
Mean	1.24			
Variance	0.18			
Standard Deviation	0.43			
Total Responses	220			

3. How long have you been (were you) a member?	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1		0.29268293	48	29%
2	5-10 years	0.25	41	25%
3	10-20 years	0.29268293	48	29%
4	>20 years	0.16463415	27	16%

	Total		164	100 %
Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	4			
Mean	2.33			
Variance	1.14			
Standard Deviation	1.07			
Total Responses	164			

4. What type of organization do you work in?	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Academic Library (ARL)	0.3410138 2	74	34%
2	Academic Library (Masters/ Comprehensive)	0.2442396 3	53	24%
3	Academic Library (4 year liberal arts)	0.0783410 1	17	8%
4	Academic (Community/ Technical/Junior College)	0.0184331 8	4	2%
5	Public Library	0.0691244 2	15	7%
6	Federal Government Agency	0.0368663 6	8	4%
7	State Government Agency	0.0875576	19	9%
8	Law Library	0.0506912 4	11	5%
9	Other	0.0737327 2	16	7%
	Total		217	100 %
Other				
STATE LIBRARY				
Vendor				
Academic, nonARL, PhD granting				
retired				
Academic Doctoral/not ARL library member				
Regional Library System				
State established library consortium				
Retired librarian, working as online (virtual) library volunteer				
High School Library				

Law School Library AND Academic Library (ARL)				
Academic Law Library				
Research Institute				
Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	9			
Mean	3.39			
Variance	7.44			
Standard Deviation	2.73			
Total Responses	217			

5. If you work in an academic library, is your position a tenure-track or professional with the possibility of promotion?	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes	0.54418605	117	54%
2	No	0.20930233	45	21%
3	Do not work in an academic library	0.24651163	53	25%
	Total		215	100%
Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	3			
Mean	1.7			
Variance	0.71			
Standard Deviation	0.84			
Total Responses	215			

6. Rank the importance of the following tenure and/or promotion requirements:									
Question		Unimportant	Of Little Importance	Moderately Important	Important	Very Important	No opinion	Total and Mean	
1	Publishing in peer-reviewed publication	3	6	27	21	54	2	113	4.09
2	Elected leadership positions	0	1	19	53	38	1	112	4.17
3	Appointed leadership	0	3	26	50	31	3	113	4.04

	positions								
4	Participate in work groups or task forces	0	2	26	54	27	2	111	4.01
5	Publishing in non-peer-reviewed publication	2	18	48	26	15	3	112	3.38
6	Participate in work groups or task forces with published results	0	8	26	48	28	1	111	3.89
7	Present at conferences and other gatherings	1	3	11	42	56	0	113	4.32
Statistic	Publishing in peer-reviewed publication	Elected leadership position	Appointed leadership position	Participation in work groups or task forces	Publish in non-peer-reviewed publications	Participation in work groups or task forces with published results	Presentations at conferences and other professional gatherings		
Min Value	1	2	2	2	1	2	1		
Max Value	6	6	6	6	6	6	5		
Mean	4.09	4.17	4.04	4.01	3.38	3.89	4.32		
Variance	1.24	0.56	0.72	0.63	1.1	0.81	0.68		
Standard Deviation	1.11	0.75	0.85	0.79	1.05	0.9	0.83		
Total Respo	113	112	113	111	112	111	113		

nse									
-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

7. What duties are you responsible for within your organization? (Select all that apply.)	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	General Reference	0.60663507	128	61%
2	Library Instruction	0.54976303	116	55%
3	Subject Liaison	0.44075829	93	44%
4	Acquisitions	0.28909953	61	29%
5	Cataloging and/or Metadata	0.25592417	54	26%
6	Collection Management	0.58767773	124	59%
7	Digitization	0.10900474	23	11%
8	Preservation	0.08530806	18	9%
9	Supervision of professional staff	0.1943128	41	19%
10	Supervision of paraprofessional staff	0.41232227	87	41%
11	Supervision of student assistants, interns, and/or volunteers	0.37914692	80	38%
12	Administration	0.23222749	49	23%
13	Archives/Special Collections	0.07109005	15	7%
14	Other	0.08530806	18	9%
15	Government Information	0.8056872	170	81%
	Other			
	Web Services			
	consultant/trainer			
	Staff training			
	Multimedia			
	project management			
	public information, website maintenance			
	Periodicals			
	Information Technology			

emerging technologies				
Electronic Resources				
data services				
Retired, but collection management, G.R., G.I. and subject liaison				
Circulation				
unofficially I link to .gov sites				
web archiving, digital collection development				
Legal Reference Collection				
Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	15			
Total Responses	211			

8. Do any of the following collections fall under your supervision? (Select all that apply.)	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	U.S. Federal government information	0.855	171	86%
2	State and/or local government information	0.65	130	65%
3	International government information (IGOs)	0.265	53	27%
4	Foreign government information	0.185	37	19%
5	Maps	0.46	92	46%
6	GIS (Geographic Information Systems)	0.145	29	15%
7	Data	0.245	49	25%
8	Microforms	0.425	85	43%
9	Newspapers/Journals	0.265	53	27%
10	Other	0.125	25	13%
Other				
law				
Law, Genealogy				
none				
Not at this time				

Curriculum, video and CD collections				
no supervision responsibilities				
several others, actually				
Patents and Trademarks; Legal Reference				
subjects related to government information, like political science				
now retired, but U.S. federal government, Maps, federal microfiche were under my supervision				
business law, geography books.				
university archives				
Special Collections				
all collections				
Some subject collection responsibilities				
my tiny collection covers what is needed for teaching high school				
legal/legislative				
Subscription databases				
NA				
Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	10			
Total Responses	200			

9. Have you ever run for an office in GODORT?	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes	0.25714286	54	26%
2	No	0.74285714	156	74%
	Total		210	100%
Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	2			
Mean	1.74			
Variance	0.19			
Standard Deviation	0.44			
Total Responses	210			

10. Which elected GODORT offices have you run for and/or held? (Select all that apply.)	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	GODORT Chair	0.18518519	10	19%

2	GODORT Secretary	0.16666667	9	17%
3	GODORT Treasurer	0	0	0%
4	GODORT Councilor	0.05555556	3	6%
5	Publications Committee Chair	0.11111111	6	11%
6	Federal Documents Task Force Coordinator	0.12962963	7	13%
7	State and Local Documents Task Force Coordinator	0.2037037	11	20%
8	International Documents Task Force Coordinator	0.11111111	6	11%
9	Awards Committee member	0.22222222	12	22%
10	Bylaws & Organization Committee member	0.2962963	16	30%
11	Nominating Committee member	0.31481481	17	31%
12	Other	0.07407407	4	7%
	Other			
	Cataloging Committee member			
	Sect'y			
	Task force secretary			
	IDTF Secretary			
	Statistic	Value		
	Min Value	1		
	Max Value	12		
	Total Responses	54		

11. Have you ever been appointed to a position in GODORT?	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes	0.37914692	80	38%
2	No	0.62085308	131	62%
	Total		211	100%

Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	2			
Mean	1.62			
Variance	0.24			
Standard Deviation	0.49			
Total Responses	211			

12. Which position(s) have you been appointed to? (Select all that apply.)	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Cataloging Committee	0.20253165	16	20%
2	Conference Committee	0.17721519	14	18%
3	Development Committee	0.05063291	4	5%
4	Education Committee	0.36708861	29	37%
5	Government Information for Children Committee	0.02531646	2	3%
6	Legislation Committee	0.29113924	23	29%
7	Membership Committee	0.21518987	17	22%
8	Program Committee	0.17721519	14	18%
9	Publications Committee	0.17721519	14	18%
10	Rare & Endangered Government Publications Committee	0.18987342	15	19%
11	Other	0.24050633	19	24%
Other				
State & Local Documents recording secretary				
GODORT Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Committee				
GITCO				
GITCO				
early internet committee, gitco				
GITCO				

gitco; parliamentarian; several ad hoc committees				
Fed Docs Task Force				
GITCO				
webmaster				
dttp advertising manager				
GITCO				
Notable Documents				
small temporary task forces				
At the time, Membership did Conference also				
godort reorg				
GITCO				
Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	11			
Total Responses	79			

13. Have you been asked to run for a GODORT office or accept a committee appointment in the past two years and been unable to do so?	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes	0.13461538	28	13%
2	No	0.86538462	180	87%
	Total		208	100%
Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	2			
Mean	1.87			
Variance	0.12			
Standard Deviation	0.34			
Total Responses	208			

14. If you are comfortable doing so, tell us why you were unable to run or accept. (Select all that apply.)	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Too busy with my job	0.57692308	15	58%
2	Government documents is no	0.11538462	3	12%

	longer my primary focus				
3	Already served on several GODORT committees	0.30769231	8	31%	
4	More involved in other professional activities/organizations	0.11538462	3	12%	
5	Not interested in proposed assignment or office	0.15384615	4	15%	
6	Unable to travel to meetings/conferences	0.42307692	11	42%	
7	Other	0.23076923	6	23%	
Other					
GODORT is a huge time commitment (compared to work in ACRL committees or IASSIST). Travelling to 2 conferences is a huge burden for me. Also, I think GODORT focuses too much on discussions of print retention. GODORT's position against letting regionals discard even with GPO approval really made me question why I would put time into this organization? Why not focus on another committee that is doing more innovative work and is more highly valued by my colleagues?					
simultaneously nominated for DLC					
I paid out of pocket and take annual leave from work to attend the last 5 ALA conferences and decided not to continue that, at least for now.					
Too busy with job and personal life to accept/run for position with a lot of responsibility, but accepted a committee appointment instead. Not being sure if I will be able to attend both meeting was a factor.					
Statistic	Value				
Min Value	1				
Max Value	7				
Total Responses	26				

15. Looking at the GODORT Committee Structure, do you think that GODORT:	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Has the right number of units and committees?	0.55801105	101	56%
2	Needs fewer units and committees?	0.41436464	75	41%
3	Needs more committees?	0.02762431	5	3%
	Total		181	100%

Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	3			
Mean	1.47			
Variance	0.31			
Standard Deviation	0.55			
Total Responses	181			

16. GODORT has "internal" liaisons from the three task forces to GODORT committees. Have you ever served as a task force liaison to a GODORT committee?		Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes	0.171875	33	17%	
2	No	0.828125	159	83%	
	Total		192	100%	
Statistic	Value				
Min Value	1				
Max Value	2				
Mean	1.83				
Variance	0.14				
Standard Deviation	0.38				
Total Responses	192				

17. What is your opinion of the "internal" liaison model?		Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Useful	0.26701571	51	27%	
2	Not useful	0.15706806	30	16%	
3	Unsure	0.57591623	110	58%	
	Total		191	100%	
Statistic	Value				
Min Value	1				
Max Value	3				
Mean	2.31				
Variance	0.75				
Standard Deviation	0.87				
Total Responses	191				

18. How frequently have you participated in virtual meetings or interactive training		Answer	Bar	Response	%
---	--	--------	-----	----------	---

sessions for any organization during the past 2 years?				
1	At least 1 per month	0.28125	54	28%
2	At least 1 per quarter	0.40104167	77	40%
3	At least 1 per year	0.14583333	28	15%
4	Rarely or never	0.171875	33	17%
	Total		192	100%
Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	4			
Mean	2.21			
Variance	1.08			
Standard Deviation	1.04			
Total Responses	192			

19. What technology do you have available in your typical work environment to participate in virtual meetings? (Select all that apply.)	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Headphones	0.85340314	163	85%
2	Microphone	0.63874346	122	64%
3	Webcam	0.47643979	91	48%
4	Landline telephone	0.87958115	168	88%
5	Mobile phone or smartphone	0.38743455	74	39%
6	Other:	0.07329843	14	7%
Other:				
skype, bluejeans				
iPad				
PC				
PC				

WebEx				
Use my pc to participate in virtual meetings				
Computer using Microsoft works, but not MS Office, or open source office productivity software				
computer, speakerphone				
Computer				
computer with web meeting software				
use my personal MacBook because it's easier than work PC and bigger monitor				
No microphone and no speakerphone make long virtual meetings where participating by landline uncomfortable if not impossible				
computer software				
Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	6			
Total Responses	191			

20. Which ALA conferences do you usually (all else being equal) plan to attend?	Answer	Bar	Response	%
#				
1	Annual Conference	0.22513089	43	23%
2	Midwinter Meeting	0.0052356	1	1%
3	Both	0.23560209	45	24%
4	Neither	0.47120419	90	47%
5	Other:	0.06282723	12	6%
	Total		191	100%
Other:				
when I can--no funding if they are nearby				
Depends on location and if I will be presenting or have duties that require me to be present				
used to attend both				
Both if needed for a committee, otherwise just Annual				
Very unsure due to changing budget circumstances				
AALL				

Depends on if I am chairing committee or not				
ACRL				
ACRL				
Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	5			
Mean	3.14			
Variance	1.62			
Standard Deviation	1.27			
Total Responses	191			

21. Which of the following factors most strongly affect your decision as to whether or not to attend ALA conferences? (Select all that apply.)	Answer	Bar	Response	%
#				
1	Cost and/or funding available from supporting organization	0.81675393	156	82%
2	Ability to travel (eg, health or family reasons)	0.30366492	58	30%
3	Ability to get away from the office (eg, short-staffed or travel approval process)	0.34554974	66	35%
4	Opportunity to participate in committee meetings	0.2617801	50	26%
5	Opportunity to participate in training sessions and workshops	0.30366492	58	30%
6	Opportunity to participate in organizational governance (ie, ALA or a sub-unit)	0.15183246	29	15%
7	Opportunity to network with other professionals	0.31937173	61	32%
8	Location of conference	0.43979058	84	44%
9	Other:	0.08900524	17	9%
Other:				

opportunity to present				
We focus on several law library organizations				
Requirement to participate in committee meetings				
Midwinter timing is terrible in relation to campus schedule				
Our major association is AALL				
Low travel ROI for me. Besides the small GODORT, maps, and GIS pieces, I would have very little benefit by attending. I give and receive much more at local GIS events.				
Climatic conditions of conference site - won't go at hot humid times - not worth the money				
My opinion during my career that there was very little value in the overall ALA conference or midwinter meetings				
involvement not supported by library administration				
Subjects are relevant to my work.				
I do not like ALA				
relevant programming				
Positions ALA takes on library and non-library issues				
Not a member				
I attend SLA meetings; ALA is my secondary organization				
Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	9			
Total Responses	191			

22. Would you participate in virtual GODORT meetings if they were offered:	Answer	Bar	Response	%
#				
1	During Midwinter?	0.06806283	13	7%
2	During Annual?	0.03664921	7	4%
3	During Midwinter and Annual?	0.4921466	94	49%
4	None of	0.0837696	16	8%

	the above	3		
5	Not sure	0.31937173	61	32%
	Total		191	100%
Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	5			
Mean	3.55			
Variance	1.38			
Standard Deviation	1.17			
Total Responses	191			

23. If GODORT has more virtual committee participation options, how would this affect your interest in serving on a committee?	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	More likely to serve	0.53157895	101	53%
2	Less likely to serve	0.02631579	5	3%
3	This would not change my current interest in committee service	0.44210526	84	44%
	Total		190	100%
Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	3			
Mean	1.91			
Variance	0.97			
Standard Deviation	0.99			
Total Responses	190			

24. If GODORT has more virtual committee participation options, how would this affect your interest in attending Midwinter?	Answer	Bar	Response	%
#				
1	More likely to attend	0.24210526	46	24%
2	Less likely to attend	0.1894736	36	19%

		8		
3	This would not change my current interest in attending Midwinter	0.56842105	108	57%
	Total		190	100%
Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	3			
Mean	2.33			
Variance	0.71			
Standard Deviation	0.84			
Total Responses	190			

25. If GODORT has more virtual committee participation options, how would this affect your interest in attending the Annual Conference?	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	More likely to attend	0.22105263	42	22%
2	Less likely to attend	0.10526316	20	11%
3	This would not change my current interest in attending Annual	0.67368421	128	67%
	Total		190	100%
Statistic	Value			
Min Value	1			
Max Value	3			
Mean	2.45			
Variance	0.69			
Standard Deviation	0.83			
Total Responses	190			

Question #26—responses in free-text, can be found in Appendix IV

APPENDIX IV: Text Responses to Question #26 of Survey—If you could reorganize GODORT, how would you do it?

(Please note that the only editing done to these responses was a spell-check. Formatting was taken from the original spreadsheet)

26. If you could reorganize GODORT, how would you do it?								
Text Response								
I would definitely reduce the number of committees within GODORT and rely on the liaisons to other ALA units to avoid turf wars and duplication of effort. (For example, I don't see why there needs to be a cataloging committee, when other ALA units are focused on cataloging-- let a liaison from GODORT to those units provide our voice and expertise; similarly, I fail to see why GODORT needs a legislation committee, when there is an ALA legislation committee subcommittee on government information.)								
There are too many elected offices in GODORT. Award Committee and Nominating Committee already do much of their work virtually and are effective groups.								
Have committees meet less often at conferences - have more virtual meetings to get the work of the committee done before/between conferences. The problem is not the number of committees, but that they all have to meet and have a business meeting at every conference giving GODORT members less time to participate in and attend meetings and programs of other ALA units.								
Some committees with similar or overlapping charges could be combined, for instance education and programming.								
Combine some of the smaller committees that don't necessarily need to work year-round (Nominating and Awards are good candidates). Require ALL committees to meet virtually between conferences, and make an effort to hold some committee meetings virtually right before Midwinter and Annual so they don't have to meet in person. Most importantly, commit to moving towards a more virtual GODORT and don't let the technophobes, dinosaurs, and other naysayers keep GODORT from moving into the 21st century.								
Except for Chair, Secretary, Treasurer, and Councilor, change elected offices to appointed offices.								
Get rid of task force model ... use committee structure only. Create a single update slot during conference where all GPO folks and other liaisons can give their updates. That would allow committees to be more focused on committee work, rather than on so many liaison and other types of reports.								
Unsure								
For committees with 6 or more members, I would reduce, by 1/4 to 1/3rd the number of people on the committees (12 just seems like too many). I would try to clarify whether something is information sharing or is a committee to accomplish something (i.e. has a task and is working towards resolution). It strikes me that a lot of the non-administrative committees (e.g. Education, Cataloging, Rare & Endangered) don't actually have a task, but get together to share information. Occasionally there is something to do, but more often than not, it is sharing (which is also valuable, but maybe it doesn't take a committee to do that?). Maybe that could be replaced by a different kind of group with a convener, rather than an appointed committee. It could also be, though, that by making a change like that, GODORT loses membership because people don't feel as involved.								

<p>I would try very hard to have fewer elected positions. Electing committee members seems like overkill to me. Nominating could help the Chair find good appointees, and not have to try to find committee members. I might consider making Bylaws an advocate committee rather than a standing one. We can change the PPM by vote of Steering (not even sure it takes a vote). Now that the actual bylaws are a bit more straight forward it might not be necessary to have the committee. I'd make the large committees smaller - Educations, Cataloging, Publications, Legislation, gov Info for Children. I'd probably make 5 the max number on a committee. I'd do away with the internal liaisons. Since the Task forces don't really have "members" as such they just seem redundant. If people up who are interested in Fed docs are also interested in cataloging they should attend the meeting, read the minutes, etc. GODORT isn't so large that it needs internal liaison positions. Basically, I'd try to simplify the organization - a lot.</p> <p>That's about it. You can tell I wanted to vent just a bit. This is Barbie, so that what I've said as you will. I'll just tell you that Nominating is a tough committee - which does most of its business virtually and with only 4 members. Should be appointed, not elected! Thanks.</p>								
<p>Allow standing committees to be much smaller & encourage non-committee member participation in committee activities (like REGP); create an Advocacy committee to work with Legislation on issues that would benefit from mobilization; create a Born-Digital committee to look at format-related issues for collecting & preserving web content; require core committees to provide educational programming and in-depth discussions at Annual/Midwinter & conduct business before or after the meetings; have committee chairs serve as liaisons to the task forces rather than separately appointing people; eliminate the discussion group structure since it's not clear how to use it; require Steering to meet</p>								

virtually before the conference in addition to face to face since those meetings are brutal									
Hoo boy, I don't have enough experience really participating in GODORT to say. In the question about number of committees, etc., the org chart looks to me like a LOT of committees and units to me, yet it may be that they're all important.									
<p>I'm not sure at this time how to reorganize it. I know I've been a supporter of reworking the whole committee liaison aspect (perhaps a core group -- one person from each committee is responsible for making sure the other committees, task forces are made aware via email, connect, or in person, of the info that is most pertinent to that group. Rather than trying to have so many liaisons. Not sure if I described that very well... Ed Comm would have one liaison person whose job it is to reach out to, report, update to each of the other committees, task forces using whichever mode is most appropriate. After attending 1-2 meetings, liaison reports get to be redundant.</p> <p>Another issue I've thought about is the amount of process, procedure discussion that takes place every year at our meetings. Do we really need to do this? If the goal of GODORT is to provide our dues paying member with professional development support and tools, I'm not sure these discussions are of high value and meet that goal. I know a lot of people need to have professional level involvement for their promotion and tenure or peer review - but is this useful to them? I don't have any great suggestions for how to change this...just yet.</p>									
Fewer committees, reduce internal liaison program. Less meetings and more virtual.									
Greatly reduce the number of units by consolidating responsibilities among fewer units. I would also reduce the number of elected positions and fill needed positions by appointment and consider elimination of the task force liaison appointments to committees if they are seen as not to work. Making GODORT's structure smaller and less complicated will be									

difficult but is necessary.									
Please consider consolidation of standing committees if possible.									
Less meetings at Midwinter/Annual. Have the Steering Committee and business meeting held virtually before and after the Midwinter/Annual meetings so that more members can attend other programs of interest at the conferences and more members, who are not able to attend the in-person meetings can attend the meetings virtually. Do not have committee reports at business meeting-send synopsis out after Midwinter/Annual. Be less focused on procedures and more on processes. I have been a member of three ALA divisions and sections within these divisions and have never seen so much emphasis put on the rules of order that it disrupts the business as GODORT does. Also, liaisons are needed to ACRL, RUSA, and LLAMA and so many government information departments have been mainstreamed into reference and other service points.									
As an increasingly large part of my position deals with meeting the data needs of students and faculty, I would like to see GODORT place a greater emphasis on highlighting and promoting the availability of government data resources.									
<p>The task forces seem to function very similar to interest groups in other ALA units - why not call them that? I'd also turn cataloging, education, govinfo for kids, and regp into interest groups - fewer appointments to make & puts more onus on the Chair of the group to organize something worthwhile for conference. Some committee work seems like it could be folded into one charge - ie, conference and either program or membership.</p> <p>Re: virtual meetings: I would prefer to take part in virtual meetings outside of conference time, not during. If they were held during conferences, they'd likely conflict with in-person sessions I want to attend.</p>									
It would be nice to simplify things and cut some red tape, but a lot of that is required by being part of ALA. Until ALA becomes more streamlined, there's only so much change that									

GODORT can do on its own.							
Though some people (including me) might say that there are too many committees, I'm sure everyone wants their special interest represented. I hope you don't get rid of the Cataloging committee.							
We need to accept that many government documents librarians don't have the funding to attend every conference. Plus, many of us have multiple responsibilities (e.g. I'm the govdocs person, and a subject liaison). By committing to the GODORT offices I currently serve in, I've given up being able to attend any conferences other than Annual and Midwinter, which, quite frankly, is terrible for my personal professional development. It means I can't attend ACRL (where I've previously presented on GovDocs) or LOEX, where I've done a lot of outreach on govdocs. So let's switch to more virtual meetings, like many other groups within ALA have, which may allow more people to serve in various positions. If we have trouble getting enough people to volunteer, let's reduce the number of seats and reimagine what GODORT could be if it was starting over. There will be a few very loud/prominent voices who say we shouldn't change anything ever (just like there are in all of the discussions about how the government information ecosystem is changing), but we NEED to change before those people retire and leave us with no members.							
No opinion							
Not sure about reorganization, but I would change the committee meeting times. It seems, especially the membership meeting, should not conflict with ALA Council Meetings which are scheduled Sunday, Monday and Tuesday mornings.							
I would do away with internal liaisons. I would combine Bylaws, Membership and Nominating. I would combine Program and Conference. I would change Cataloging, Education, Gov Docs for Kids and REGP to interest groups. And I would try to establish a formal relationship with Numeric and Geospatial Data Services in Academic Libraries Interest Group							
No comment at this time.							
Readjust the number of conference attendance requirements for all but the top 4 offices so more people can participate and chair committees. Budgets today do not allow travel and we are not exactly in the best paying field to use our own personal money.							
I think more virtual opportunities to participate in committees and attend committee and task force meetings would mean the current organization of GODORT would work better (i.e., allowing more members opportunities to participate) and so could stand as is. The current organization is good, allowing for many member participation opportunities (even more likely if virtual participation is worked out), and allowing for collaboration with the task forces, ALA committees, and other organizations. That reaching out and involvement is important - I would hate to see reorganization take that away. Granted, you need a lot of people to fill those slots, but virtual participation should help with that. My view - work on the virtual opportunities and leave the organizational structure as is for now.							
Usually committee chairs serve one or two terms. If a chair is willing to serve longer, it could help with continuity of projects to do so.							
I would have the Government Information for Children committee duties be a part of the Education committee. I was also wondering if you could make GITCO and the Rare and Endangered combined to create a new access/preservation committee. I feel it is important to still have committees that are elected for people who are in jobs that require a service element for promotion, but we have so many committees and task forces that it is hard to find people willing to run, especially for the leadership positions. Our membership is also growing smaller, so that makes it harder to fill out committees. It would be nice to maybe							

<p>have task forces or committees that are temporary in nature to answer needs of the community. I would also like to see the occasional papers peer-reviewed, I would like to publish in this discipline but non peer-reviewed publications are not considered much at my institution. I know the DTTP journal does have some editing, but if they would move to a true peer-review format for the main articles, I am sure you could get volunteers for peer-reviewing and it would help out those individuals need to publish.</p>								
<p>I don't know enough about the organization to comment.</p>								
<p>Continue to focus on GODORT's core mission as Government. Information oversight and value as a collection in academic libraries continues to metamorphosize. GODORT needs to continue to reach out to non-government information specialist librarians, stressing the value and historical significance of government information.</p>								
<p>Do not have suggestions.</p>								
<p>I do not have enough experience with the organization to make any suggestions.</p>								
<p>Have a promotion/marketing committee dedicated to helping libraries increase use of documents, to advocating for govdoc services and collections, and to helping library administrators see the worth of govdocs.</p>								
<p>The Christmas spirit might never last all year long, but the government document spirit can. Fewer standing committees, less focus on conferences- they certainly shouldn't be mandatory, and feeling like they are is alienating. What is the philosophy of GODORT? Go ahead and ask the question to yourself. It should have one. "Government documents" is an inherently normative concept, and people who need it the most know that only too well. It is a grass roots idea, so maybe return to your roots:) Develop thematically defined and project oriented online groups. More spotlighting of good and bad government information access for online communities, e.g. information behavior research orientation with the goal of assisting communities to protect and enhance their reliance on quality government information.</p>								

I wouldn't organize by International/State/Federal, but maybe by type of information (i.e. statistical, legislative and regulatory, etc...									
I would remove it from ALA, so I did not need ALA membership.									
No changes at this time.									
flatten the organization, shrink the committees. FDTF should be a committee, not a task force--task force implies short term. Remove internal liaisons as the chairs of the committees should be hearing the big news through steering. Create a list of duties the chair should perform.									
Fewer committees whose only job is to self-perpetuate the organization (Bylaws & Organization; Conference; Membership; Nominating; Program)--surely some of those could be combined (Bylaws, Membership, and Nominating; Conference and Program)? And I'd make all MW activity virtual.									
simplify									
<p>I have often thought that GODORT would be better breaking away from the American Library Association and operating on its own. I regularly attended the Government Printing Office Federal Depository Library Conferences and skipped the ALA midwinter meeting and Annual Conference because there was FAR MORE VALUE for my dollar to attending the FDLC meetings than having to pay the BEYOND BLOATED level costs of ALA registration fees, and the BEYOND BLOATED cost of basic American Library Association membership.</p> <p>I renewed my ALA membership for a year after retirement, but chose to only receive the basic American Libraries magazine. I concluded that for me, it was not worth spending the money as either a retired library employee or as a working library employee to pay money for the magazine.</p>									
Since I have not been involved in over eight years I don't feel qualified to answer this.									
I don't know that I'd reorganize as much as I'd help new members understand the structure.									

I recall being confused by task forces, committees, liaisons, Steering. The bylaws also seem extremely complicated.									
I would not									
Unable to answer due to unfamiliarity									
Not sure.									
Keep same number of committees, but have reduce number of participants to 5									
Separate from ALA.									
I've never been a member of ALA GODORT, so I don't know how well the current structure works. But the Steering Committee must have 25+ members. That seems too big to be agile, which is undoubtedly why the Executive Committee is empowered to make fast decisions. The Steering Committee just seems like an unnecessary extra layer. You could go with a slightly expanded Executive Committee, similar to the NASIG model, with the current exec positions and a few elected members to represent the various units (each member representing multiple units).									
Assign lots of Ad-Hoc committees for specific tasks: draft vision of future of gov info; develop plan for working within ALA so that they will lobby on our issues; develop network to lobby for our issues if ALA seems unable or unwilling to do so; develop mechanism to provide feedback to GPO on web training (course by course and program as a whole); conduct research on promoting government information resources and publish whitepaper with results; create recommended LibGuides list of LibGuides that provide access to government information in a particularly useful manner; etc. Ad-hoc committees should complete their work before annual conference and send in a report to be included in the Membership Meeting Minutes Package. Maybe there could be some virtual meeting during conference with the committee chairs in case people have questions.									
More of an ability for creators and disseminators of Government Information (those who work in government agencies and offices) to participate in discussion and activities. Current focus seems almost entirely on DOCUMENTS (instead of information) and those who work in FDLP or academic libraries with government documents collections.									
Frankly, I haven't a clue. I would probably like to be involved before I could answer that question.									
focus on outreach and recruiting, then, when new members come, ask THEM what they want.									
not sure									
I would have a more simplified structure to GODORT. I would not spend valuable meeting time on administrative matters (such as the wording of a letter, etc.). The time and expense of attending a GODORT meeting at a remote location should be rewarded with meetings that provide valuable information and/or networking opportunities.									
Merge/collapse some of the standing committees that already work closely together like Development, Conference, and Program committees. Determine which committees, liaisons, etc. are absolutely critical to the success and mission of GODORT. Perhaps outsource things like planning the annual GODORT reception.									
Cap the number of groups (committees, task forces, interest groups) and their composition to require the participation of a maximum number of positions (e.g., 75), or a percentage of total members (e.g., 10%). I am no longer active in GODORT, but when I was -- more than ten years ago -- there was some duplication among the groups but mostly there were meetings with little output.									
Not sure									

<p>Not just GODORT, but ALA in general, seems to have too many committees that are redundant to similar committees carrying out the same work in other parts of the organization. If the purpose of these committees is to give as many people as possible the opportunity to serve on a committee, the current structure does accommodate that purpose. However, if the purpose of committees is to complete meaningful work, there are way too many committees, often with conflicting goals, so I would analyze the charge of each committee and try to get rid of the overlapping charges as much as possible.</p>								
<p>I would think some of the committees could be combined or the membership pared down. For example 12 on Education? Government Information for children -- 8.</p>								
<p>oh my--now you have opened the box again...less committees, more adhoc--works well for virtual. Need to relate to other groups outside of Godot more effectively. actively work with PLA and other groups to be more visible and collaborate more effectively outside of just COL.</p>								
<p>GODORT should understand the financial limits on government agencies and not uncritically support throwing more money at government programs as a way of resolving public policy problems. GODORT has been absolutely silent on restrictions to government information access occurring under Democratic administrations but hypocritically denounces such actions when they occur under Republican administrations.</p>								
<p>I think it is organized well enough but it would be nice to have additional "birds of feather" options where like-minded docs librarians could discuss concerns by subject areas (for instance, working with legacy documents, docs digitization projects, teaching undergrads/grad with docs primary sources).</p>								
<p>I would make it more project-based instead of standing committees only. Have fewer defined member committees and more discussion groups and projects that groups will accomplish.</p>								
<p>Not sure--should be renamed.</p>								
<p>More diverse focus than primarily federal. More outreach to other ALA units and beyond while continue to develop high level of expertise.</p>								
<p>Align with other Round Tables, MAGIRT and FAFLRT, in a new governance structure that reduces the number of officer positions needed. GODORT could retain the 3 Task Forces but other committees could be merged with those of other Round Tables. Given how my colleagues tell me all the time that GODORT is ineffective and a waste of time and money, I think there could be greater strength in a larger organization with similar interests. Of the last 3 committees I served on recently, only one was active where all members did some work. On the other two committees, almost all members did not work, so I don't think reducing positions would affect work output. The new organization could create a five-year plan with concrete goals that will result in helpful work products for librarians involved with government information. Also, having an active Web or wiki presence with current, useful information would be extremely helpful.</p>								

<p>Reduce or streamline the number of committees; it's too many moving parts to organize & manage effectively. For example, the committee on legislation - seems like the fact that it already coordinates with ALA's legislative committee on gov info is enough. Their functions, while important, seem duplicative. Gov Info for Children seems like something that should be a subset of the Education committee. The task force structure isn't clear to me, so I can't comment on it other than to say I don't understand their purpose.</p> <p>I'm glad to see movement on alternatives to midwinter. I can barely afford one conference so am unable to participate on committees that require meeting at Midwinter. A virtual meeting or conference call held around the time of Midwinter makes more sense.</p>									
Perhaps change come committees to interest groups, fewer internal liaisons, more interaction with other round tables									
unsure - I am at the retirement stage of life and do not see myself participating at this stage.									
more virtual, fewer committee, more streamlined									
Keep the task forces. Combine some committees. Have a virtual membership meeting before midwinter to gather opinions and input but keep membership meeting at the ALA midwinter and annual meeting so resolutions and other issues can be voted on. Docs people still need face to face meetings. Some work can be done before the meetings with work on the net and over the phone. Some committees have been very successful as long as members know that when they come to the face to face meeting they have met their obligations as members in doing some work ahead of time.									
(1) Drastically simplify the complex system of liaisons (both internal and, especially, external). (2) Reduce the number of standing committees and the size of individual committees. (3) Rely more on purposed (and dynamic) "working groups" (such as the ones conducting this survey) in place of standing committees, which seem to go on and on, and never "sunset." (4) Rely more on the Steering Committee to directly manage this dynamics.									

(5) Utilize the general membership meetings and task force meetings to fill in resulting lacunae.								
Alas, in the last 15 (!!!) years, my other commitments within ALA combined with the fact that I have not been a government information librarian during that time have made it all but completely impossible to maintain even the lightest possible amount of involvement in GODORT. I have never let my membership lapse, though, and never will. In any case, I simply do not feel qualified to argue for or against the reorganization of GODORT--though I believe its existence is crucial.								
I think the biggest think that needs to change is the way the committees operate rather than how many there are. There should be less committee meetings at conferences, with more work going on between conferences. If committees meet at conferences, it would be better if they provided short programs or discussions. I think REGP is a good model, because so much of the work is done via virtual meetings. Education is another good model because they so often provide a discussion or program during their meeting time. I think in person conferences are important, and I get a lot out of them, but I'd rather spend more of my time at a conference doing things that I can't do virtually, as well as attending programs and meetings of other organizations that I'm not as involved in, but have something interesting going on at the conference. It's hard to get involved in anything else and still be involved in GODORT - on top of that if you're on Steering you need to arrive earlier and stay later than most people. Less meetings might mean Steering can happen earlier on Monday, or even on Sunday!								
Simplify it. Reduce duplication/overlap with other ALA units.								
More virtual meetings								
I'm sorry, but I am not familiar enough with the current organization structure to offer any suggestions that would be useful.								
Statistic		Value						
Total Responses		81						

Ad Hoc Committee on GODORT Virtual Meetings Preliminary Report to GODORT Steering and General Membership: ALA Annual Conference 2015

Charge:

MEMBERSHIP: The committee will be composed of 6 members. Each Task Force shall designate 1 person to represent their members, three additional members will be appointed by the Chair. These members will be chosen for their experience with organizing virtual meetings and expertise in the technologies that might be used.

DURATION: The committee will dissolve at the close of ALA Midwinter 2016 unless extended by the GODORT Steering Committee.

MEETINGS: All meetings of this committee--in person or virtual--shall be held under ALA Open Meeting Rules.

PURPOSE: The committee is charged to:

1. Survey GODORT membership on usefulness and challenges in holding virtual meetings
2. Benchmark the use of virtual meetings by other ALA organizations
3. Consult with Committee Chairs and Task Force Coordinators on opportunities and challenges with conducting virtual meetings in their committee or task force.
4. Examine challenges that exist in ensuring that the maximum number of GODORT members can participate, and recommend the platform(s) and training that would be necessary.
5. Recommend which officers, committees, and task forces must, by virtue of their work and or interactions with other ALA units, be present for face-to-face meetings at both Annual and Midwinter.
6. Determine budgetary impacts of moving to virtual meetings (e.g. additional technology costs at conferences to stream steering or general membership meetings)

OUTCOMES: The Committee shall present a preliminary report to GODORT Steering and the General Membership meeting at ALA Annual 2015 and a final report with recommendations for implementation at Midwinter 2016.

Roster:

Shari Laster, convener

Timothy Franklin

Lynda Kellam

Lori Driver (FDTF)

Brett Cloyd (IDTF)

Karen Cook (SLDTF)

Accomplishments:

The Committee received its charge from GODORT Chair Helen Sheehy in March 2015, and conducted two open virtual meetings, one in April and one in June, in order to discuss policy and technological issues related to virtual meetings. The Committee identified three primary policy and guidance resources for virtual meetings within ALA:

1. ALA Policy Manual A.7.4.1 (Meeting): “A meeting is an official assembly, for any length of time following a designated starting time, of the members of any board, committee, taskforce, commission, etc., during which the members do not separate except for a recess and in which the assembly has the capacity to formalize decisions. Conference calls, Internet chat sessions (and their equivalents), and in-person meetings are recognized as meeting subject to the open meetings policy (ALA Policy 7.4.4). (Asynchronous electronic discussions by electronic mail or other asynchronous communication methods do not constitute meetings because they are not an official assembly with a designated starting time.)”
2. ACRL’s “FAQ for Virtual Meetings”:
<http://www.ala.org/acrl/resources/policies/virtualfaq>
3. RUSA’s “Virtual Participation Guide”:
<http://www.ala.org/rusa/virtualmeetings>

While only the first of these is binding on GODORT as an organized unit within ALA, the Committee found that both ACRL and RUSA provide thoughtful guidance to their membership in interpreting the ALA Policy and serving the needs of both convenors and participants.

It was agreed that GODORT has at least four potential uses for synchronous virtual meetings: committee business meetings, general membership meetings, webinars or training sessions, and webcasts of live face-to-face events. Because of the Steering Committee’s decision to simultaneously charge an Ad Hoc Committee on GODORT Reorganization to examine GODORT’s structure, much of the Committee’s discussion focused on the benefits and drawbacks for GODORT committee and task force activities.

In collaboration with the Ad Hoc Committee on GODORT Reorganization, the Committee conducted a survey of members and potential members of GODORT. The full survey is included in an appendix to the preliminary report of the Reorganization Committee. In brief, the questions pertaining to virtual meetings explored four themes:

- whether respondents are already using virtual meeting platforms and technologies;

- factors affecting the decision to attend a face-to-face meeting;
- the potential effect of virtual meetings on attendance at Midwinter and Annual; and
- the potential effect of virtual meetings on GODORT committee participation.

Based on the 194 completed surveys, 68% of respondents report attending virtual meetings or interactive training sessions at least once per quarter, with 28% reporting attendance once a month or more frequently. The primary virtual meeting technologies available to respondents are landline telephone (88%) and headphones (85%), with 64% of respondents reporting that they have access to a microphone. Almost half of the respondents have access to a webcam.

When presented with factors that most strongly affect their decision of whether attend a face-to-face conference, 84% of respondents selected “Cost and/or funding available from supporting organization.” The next most popular responses were “Location of conference,” selected by 44% of respondents; “Ability to get away from the office (eg., short-staffed or travel approval process),” selected by 35% of respondents; and “Opportunity to network with other professionals,” selected by 32% of respondents.

About a quarter of the respondents typically plan to attend ALA’s Annual Conference, and nearly a quarter typically plan to attend both the Annual Conference and the Midwinter Meeting. Nearly half of the respondents do not plan to attend either event. Although the two questions were not linked, about half of the respondents indicated they would participate in virtual events held during both Annual and Midwinter.

In terms of the effect of virtual meetings on committee participation, results were mixed. 53% of respondents agreed that more virtual committee service options would make them likelier to serve on a committee, while 44% indicated these opportunities would not change their current level of interest. This may be due to other commitments or an already high level of interest in committee service. Also, when asked whether virtual committee service would change their level of interest in attending face-to-face meetings, only 19% (Midwinter) and 11% (Annual) reported that they would be less likely to attend. In fact, 24% (Midwinter) and 22% (Annual) reported that they would be *more* likely to attend.

From a technological perspective, educational events can already be hosted with the existing ALA infrastructure, and general membership meetings outside of conferences could also be conducted using ALA’s existing virtual meeting platform, Adobe Connect. For smaller bodies such as committees and task forces that may be conducting virtual meetings, ALA’s subscription is impractical due to logistical issues. Additionally, the platform is not designed to support webcasting. The Committee has developed a preliminary list of tools and functions that should be easily available for meeting organizers:

1. For virtual committee meetings:
 - a. Required: VOIP, telephone call-in capability, text chat, document sharing
 - b. Preferred: Webcam support, whiteboard, recording functionality
 - c. Must be able to schedule and host meetings without ALA assistance
2. For webcasts:
 - a. Required: Audio and presentation streaming, text chat, registration support
 - b. Preferred: Streaming live video, recording functionality
 - c. Must incorporate strategy to address wireless connectivity limitations at ALA conferences and meetings, whether through purchase of a hotspot or scheduling of events at the primary conference venue.

Additionally, it should be noted that adding official webcasts may present additional scheduling challenges: while an all-virtual event can be scheduled to accommodate participants in all four major U.S. time zones, conference events are scheduled based on room availability and conflicts with other meetings in one time zone, and frequently take place on a weekend.

Next Steps:

The Committee expects to take the following steps prior to ALA Midwinter 2016:

1. Communicate directly with GODORT committee and task force chairs in order to identify current virtual meeting practices and member expectations;
2. Further evaluate the needs of virtual participants and audiences in order to identify criteria for the nature of work that can be conducted in a virtual environment;
3. Based on the GODORT budget and vendor price quotes, propose a potential list of platform options for meeting convenors; and
4. Develop a proposed initial approach for GODORT to take with respect to virtual meetings, and suggest future directions.

While the Committee anticipates preparing recommendations for GODORT policy in the form of a draft PPM chapter on virtual meetings and webcasts, additional conversation may be appropriate prior to the development of policy language, including coordination with the Bylaws and Organization Committee. Therefore, it is not included as a Committee action item for the next six-month period.

Report submitted by Shari Laster

