

**Institute of Museum and Library Services National Leadership Grant
Final Performance Report -- Part One
Narrative
December 2012**

1. Project Title: ASERL Collaborative Federal Depository Project (CFDP)

2. Partners

- **The University of Florida.** Administrative contact: Chelsea Dinsmore, Marston Science Library, Bldg. #043, Newell Drive, Box 117011, Gainesville, FL 32611-7011
- **The University of Kentucky.** Administrative contact: Sandra McAninch, William T. Young Library, 401 Hilltop Ave., Lexington KY 40506-0456
- **The University of South Carolina.** Administrative contact: William Sudduth III, Cooper Library, 1322 Greene Street, Columbia SC 29208-0103

3. Overview

Working within the legal mandate and policies of the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP), the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries (ASERL) established a model of subject-based Centers of Excellence (COEs) among regional and selective depository libraries in the Southeast to increase completeness of holdings, improve access to these holdings, and improve services that support the use of federal government publications. The model is supported by two complementary software components that facilitate collection analysis and streamline the disposition process for federal documents - improving preservation, intellectual control, and access while reducing staff time. The IMLS grant called for establishment of COEs at two partner libraries, which quickly grew to three when the University of Florida joined the project in August 2009. Support for the model was so strong within the community that COEs are now under development at 31 libraries in the region, with an additional 5 under consideration.

4. Project activities

Centers of Excellence Collections: Inventory, Cataloging, Collection Management. ASERL has established "Centers of Excellence" that ensure multiple, complete retrospective collections of federal publications by agency. Centers of Excellence inventory holdings, ensure accurate cataloging and holdings records for the extant collections at each site, and seek to improve identification and preservation of these collections.

ASERL COE Database (formerly known as the "Masterlist"): Collection Analysis and Acquisition. Centers of Excellence create master lists of all titles in the ED, FW, Y 3.W 89/2, CZ 1, Y 4.M 53, PaC 1, W 79, and D 113 classes (Department of Education, the Work Projects Administration/Works Progress Administration and the Panama Canal) and check "Center of Excellence" holdings against the compiled master lists to identify gaps, and seek to fill gaps in their collections as they are identified.

Reference Expertise. Centers of Excellence identify subject expertise to facilitate use of the “centers of excellence” collections.

Program Assessment and Promotion. Centers of Excellence develop outreach activities to improve public knowledge of how to access federal government information. ASERL conducted a survey of depository libraries in the Southeast (regional and selective) in the final year of the project to obtain feedback and assessment of the test model. The survey provided information for the CFDP Steering Committee to assess the scalability and broad adoptability of the model.

5. Project audience –

Libraries and universities operating under the framework defined by Title 44 of the U.S. Code §§ 1901-1916 participated in the establishment of the model programs and services. The users of these libraries have derived the benefits of these efforts.

6. Project Analysis

When IMLS awarded this grant to ASERL in September 2009, significant program planning to establish the first centers of Excellence was well underway. There was already great interest in the COE model among library deans/directors and documents librarians, as it offered a new vision for managing federal documents collections that focused on local needs and interests while also supporting FDLP collections as a regional asset. This grant provided critical resources for staffing and implementation costs that permitted the rapid deployment of the COE model, and galvanized support for cooperative management of federal documents collections at a time of dwindling resources and potential risk.

As a result, in April 2011, ASERL members unanimously approved the [**Guidelines for Management and Disposition of Federal Depository Library Collections in the Southeast — Implementation Plan**](#). This plan is the culmination of more than 5 years of collaborative discussions among ASERL library deans/directors, documents librarians, and a review by GPO counsel. The document describes a common set of collection management and disposition policies and procedures, and documents best practices that form the CFDP model. This document was further updated and again reaffirmed in April 2012.

Upon initial approval of the plan in 2011, all ASERL members who are FDLP libraries agreed to identify at least one agency / topic / format within their collections as a Center of Excellence, and many have been willing to select more. By the end of September 2012, 28 additional depository libraries joined the ranks of the three grant libraries by registering their commitment to serve as a Center of Excellence, covering approximately 180 SuDoc classifications, with six agencies having a second Center of Excellence identified – an important step in assuring an appropriate level of redundancy for these collections.

Following the installation of a new administration at GPO, the program came under new scrutiny. In July 2011, GPO requested some changes in the disposition processes developed by ASERL. A copy of this request, and other GPO correspondence, is available on the [ASERL website](#). After much discussion, the modifications requested by GPO were made to the Implementation Plan in May 2012 and subsequent changes were implemented in the ASERL Disposition database in September 2012. While this year-long deliberation slowed the progress in testing some aspects of the CFDP model, it did indeed test the basic tenets of the model, which held up to the scrutiny.

Collection inventories by the three initial Center of Excellence partners were completed in 2010. As expected, cataloging of these collections is ongoing. Each institution has significantly expanded the presence of their COE collection in OCLC's WorldCat, thereby enhancing discoverability and public access to the publications:

- The University of Kentucky added 2083 holdings to OCLC WorldCat during the grant period. Prior to the start of this project, they had approximately 408 WPA titles cataloged. At the end of September 2012, they have 2491 titles in their local catalog. According to their research, this figure represents approximately 40% of the known universe of WPA titles published.
- At the conclusion of their inventory in 2010, the University of South Carolina identified 5383 items in their collection, of which 4230 were represented in their local catalog. This expanded to 25,962 by October 2011 with the purchase of ERIC microfiche that provided enhanced access to electronic records and items that had been digitized since their original release. USC added an additional 137 items during the last year of the grant.
- The University of Florida reported 174 items in their collection at the completion of their inventory in 2010; this grew to 1641 items by the end of the grant. They added approximately 150 item records to the catalog this year, as they acquired a complete run of the Panama Canal Spillways newspaper.

Of the 31 libraries that have committed to creating one or more Centers of Excellence, 22 have begun inventorying their COE collection and 11 have completed the inventory as of August 2012. And of these 31 libraries, 21 have initiated the cataloging of the collection, and 10 have completed the cataloging. Additionally, while digitization was not a grant-funded activity, some digital preservation action was taken in conjunction with grant-funded activities. Several libraries have digitized portions of their COE collections, as have the grant partners. The University of Kentucky digitized 315 items. The University of Florida committed to digitizing their entire COE collection; at the conclusion of the grant they had digitized 1641 items representing approximately 84,672 pages (approximately 90% of the COE collection.) The University of South Carolina did not digitize their collection during the grant period though they intend to digitize parts of it in the future.

As a result of the IMLS grant, there is strong documentation of the processes and best practices needed to implement the COE model. Participating libraries are directed to the web page containing the best practices documentation created by the CFDP Steering Committee. This documentation strongly encourages the use of item condition statements (MARC field 583) and preservation statements in local notes (MARC field 590,\$a). The best practices documentation is available on the ASERL website at http://www.aserl.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/BestPractices-Update_2012_05.pdf

In April 2010, the project's Masterlist database began accepting uploads of records from the three grant partners and testing of the gap reporting functionality began. At the same time, records for the Department of Education, Works Progress Administration and the Panama Canal Commission from four other FDLP libraries were added to further populate the database. As part of ASERL's move from Atlanta to North Carolina in July 2011, the Masterlist database was retooled and re-hosted on servers at the University of Florida. During this transition, several enhancements were implemented to the functionality of the reports features making them more intuitive and user friendly. This transition slowed the testing and growth of the Masterlist database; however the transition turned out to be fortuitous in the long run and positioned the database well for ongoing maintenance, support and general oversight. The University of Florida is actively engaged in testing the CFDP model and they are keen supporters of the desired outcomes for the program. The database now includes a number of enhancements that make it much more functional. In addition, the University of Florida has independently developed a database to streamline the disposition process for FDLP libraries. This database incorporates a "needs/offers" functionality which supports the important collection management processes in the CFDP model. CFDP Committee members will work to merge the two databases into a single point of access in the future.

Libraries were designated as regional depositories at different times, and prior to their designation, they collected and retained federal publications with varying degrees of completeness based on their needs. As such, the CFDP model recognizes that no federal government publications collection is 100% complete. Additionally, holdings obtained after designation as a regional depository are incomplete due to loss from disaster, wear-and-tear, theft, etc. One of the more difficult tasks in building comprehensive-as-possible collections is in defining "comprehensive" - being able to identify the unknown when the FDLP corpus is not fully cataloged or inventoried. Gap Reports created by the ASERL Masterlist database allow a library to compare their holdings against the holdings of other libraries that have contributed records to the database, identifying missing items as well as identical items which may be in better condition. This provides a greater level of assurance of "completeness" than is available via any other means.

At the end of the grant period, the Masterlist database contained 154,216 records from seven contributing institutions. Content published by 132 federal agencies is represented in the

database, with the largest number of records attributed to the Department of Education (55,807) followed by the US Geological Survey (39,235).

Each of the grant partner libraries has generated Gap Reports for their collections, and each has identified materials that are missing from their COE collection:

To date the University of Kentucky has identified and acquired 164 items for their COE collection, many of which were donated by the Library of Virginia. They have completed their search of all known WPA titles and have identified a universe of 6,209 titles, of which they now own 40% – many in duplicate. Their bibliography of known but not owned items includes 3718 titles. These titles are represented in the Masterlist database and are reflected on their “Needs” list in the ASERL Disposition database. The University of Kentucky is now working with Auburn University to obtain digital surrogates for a number of items held at Auburn. Similarly, the University of South Carolina has identified 162 needed items, and the University of Florida has identified 53 needed items. At this time, each has opted to add the items to their needs list in the Disposition database (seeking the donation of a tangible copy) rather than contacting an owning library to obtain a digital surrogate.

Below is a representation of the partner libraries use of the ASERL Disposition database to date:

Institution	Total Claims	Claims Matching a Need	Claims Matching a COE Need
UF	449	148	29
USC	773	88	10
UK	1088	517	202

One of the “lessons learned” in using the Masterlist database is the presence of false-positive matches in the Gap Reports. This is caused by variations in local cataloging practices; for example, an identical item cataloged under a different OCLC number, or serials that have monographic records. It has been GPO’s practice to give the first issue of a serial a monographic record; later a serial record is created when another issue in the series is distributed – but the early monograph record remains, creating some confusion when comparing the data. Therefore, a second level of analysis of the report is needed to weed out the duplicated materials. Partner libraries felt that the opportunity to identify unique/unknown items for their COE collection far outweighed the inconvenience of conducting the second level of analysis.

A second lesson learned is the difficulty experienced in obtaining records for the Masterlist database. Libraries have been hesitant to contribute records without first conducting a physical inventory of the collection to ensure the accuracy of their holdings. COE libraries are required to conduct an inventory of their COE collection when uploading records to the Masterlist database, however this is not a requirement for non-COE collections. In an ideal world, libraries

would be able to inventory all their FDLP collections and contribute records to the COE database with confidence; however this is unfeasible. The potential to discover a unique item lacking in a COE collection through use of the database outweighs the risk that an item may be temporarily misidentified in a contributing library's catalog. The project Steering Committee reasoned that if the record was valid enough to be present in a library's catalog, it is valid for inclusion in the Masterlist database. Each library signs a Memorandum of Understanding when they agree to participate in the CFDP effort; the MOU addresses the expectation for contributing records to the Masterlist database. However, ensuring libraries meet this obligation will be a matter of renewed accountability efforts over time.

The CFDP model acknowledges that in addition to providing collaborative solutions to ensure public access to complete historic and current federal publications, correlated subject expertise is needed to facilitate use of the collection.

As a Center of Excellence, a library accepts the role of "regional expert" for their chosen agency or subject matter. The CFDP defines "expertise" at the Center of Excellence as gathering a collection that is as complete as possible, creating access to that collection, and providing service to the collection by the staff of the library. A library's collection historically supports the user needs of its parent institution; as a result, the agency or subject matter chosen by a Center of Excellence most often reflects a curricular strength of its parent institution -- for example, the Department of Education for the University of South Carolina, the Civil Rights Commission for the University of Mississippi, the Civil Aeronautics Commission for Auburn University or NASA for Georgia Tech. In this regard, the COE collection is no different than any other valued service point in the library – the expectation is that the library will maintain staffing levels and expertise, as well as discovery tools necessary to support the collection and make it accessible. Providing online resources such as LibGuides and program web pages enhances the visibility of the collection.

In addition, each COE provides training activities to promote the use of the COE collection as well as to facilitate cooperative training initiatives to share expertise within the depository community. Each COE is encouraged to participate in public awareness and outreach campaigns to promote federal government publications to libraries within the region. A listing of the training and promotion activities initiated at each COE is documented in the Appendix.

Each of the partner libraries indicated an increase in the number and complexity of reference transactions over the grant period, although the raw numbers belie the qualitative aspects of this finding.

- From October 2010 through September 2012, the University of South Carolina reported 79 reference questions. This reflects a 63% increase in the number of total questions during this period, with a 200% increase in number of advanced research or consultations (see

attachment). This is reflected better in the length of time spent on the questions which indicates a 220% increase in the questions involving more than 10 minutes.

- The University of Kentucky reported 9 reference transactions. Reference staff observed that any WPA question tended to involve a high level of complexity and required considerable research skills and perseverance on the part of library staff. In part this is true of any work with historical government publications, but with the WPA it's a particular factor. For example, do you search "WPA" or must you always spell it out? Is it "Work" or "Works"? Is it "Projects" or "Progress"? Staff indicated that they might not have answered a large number of WPA questions but the ones they did answer required a significant amount of time: true in-depth research by any definition.
- The University of Florida reported 22 reference requests. Eight of those were simple questions about location of materials. Four were questions that only required a basic search to answer, i.e., the date a given ship passed through the canal. The final two were complex questions that were part of larger research projects.

We found it difficult to attribute the increase in reference interactions to a specific component of the model – whether it is the increased cataloging activity that puts items where users can find them, program promotion and training sessions targeted to user groups, or program specific websites and LibGuides that increase online exposure – or a combination of all of the above. Whatever the cause, it is clear that the Centers of Excellence contribute to the collaborative process that identifies, coordinates, and connects resources and people in assisting the user/researcher in their search for information. This was demonstrated when one participating librarian noted simply, *"We were able to refer a question to the WPA collection at UK,"* highlighting the value of the COE model and the collaboration among librarians across the region. Another example: Librarians at the University of Florida were contacted by researchers for the PBS show "History Detectives" specifically because UF was identified as a Center of Excellence for Panama Canal materials.

The increased use of COE collections was also documented:

- The University of Kentucky has seen a steady increase in the use of the collection (circulation and ILL requests). For the period of 2008-2009, they reported 2 items circulated from the collection. In 2010 they reported 15 transactions, in 2011 this rose to 24 and in 2012 they reported 18 items had circulated.
- The University of Florida circulation of items in the government documents collection for the Panama Canal Zone has been practically zero. The same can be said of the Inter-Library loan requests. However, this is largely because UF has digitized approximately 90% of their holdings. The University of Florida also indicates steady use of their materials posted on Internet Archive (<http://archive.org/details/ufpancan>). For example, the 1907 issue of the Panama Canal Record has been downloaded 951 times since it was uploaded, and the 1973 volume has been viewed 473 times.

- The University of South Carolina was unable to provide baseline circulation counts from 2008-2009, however they reported a circulation count of 114 items in 2011 and in 2012 their count was 104. This collection represents approximately 10% of their Government Documents circulation.

Program Survey

Between June and August 2012, ASERL conducted a survey of the FDLP library community (regional and selective) to obtain feedback and assess the long-term scalability and broad adoptability of the CFDP model. A copy of the survey questions and the results are attached.

Each state in the ASERL region was reflected in the results, plus one response from New Mexico. Responses were submitted by both ASERL member libraries as well as non-ASERL libraries. Both selective and regional depositories are represented – 78% of the responders were from selective libraries, 14% were from regionals. Responses were primarily from the Documents Coordinator at the institution, though responses also were submitted by Deans/Directors as well as Cataloging/Technical Support staff. Of those responding, 86% of the regional libraries had committed to becoming a Center of Excellence, while 29% of the selectives indicated such. Responses overwhelmingly indicate a belief that the CFDP model is sustainable. In addition, the majority of both regional and selective libraries indicated that regional depository services to the selectives in their state/region had improved because of the CFDP. A comment worth noting from a selective: *“This is an extremely valuable program and an excellent model that can be adopted (with appropriate customization) to other regions.”* The ASERL Disposition Database – though not developed as part of this grant – is described by one responder as *“Incredibly, wonderfully, amazingly, exceedingly helpful.”*

There were few true negative/disagree responses received. A few indicated it was *“too soon to tell.”* Some indicated a concern regarding ASERL membership (e.g., *“Libraries that are not members of ASERL should not be required or pressured to participate or contribute”*) or expressed a misunderstanding about access to the collections (*“... If we give up parts of our collection to large COEs, will we still have access to the material?”*) It is important to note that participation in the CFDP is voluntary, and libraries are not required to relinquish any items from their FDLP collection to COEs. By law, publications distributed through the FDLP sent to regional depositories must be permanently retained unless superseded; selective depositories must retain FDLP material for five years but may then dispose of it with approval from their regional depository. Centers of Excellence fill gaps in their collections by claiming offers through this disposition process, or by obtaining surrogates of the item.

Survey results indicated that states where the regional depository had a strong interest in the CFDP model resulted in greater knowledge of, and participation in, the CFDP by the selective depositories within that state. For example, the top four states responding were Virginia (Chair of the CFDP Steering Committee, Mary Clark, Library of Virginia) and the regional Documents

Coordinator - Barbie Selby - from the University of Virginia is an advocate of the program), followed by Kentucky, Florida and South Carolina – all partner libraries in this IMLS grant.

Project Impact

As noted above, COE collections have been inventoried and cataloging is under way at the three grant partners. Dozens more libraries are inventorying and/or cataloging portions of their FDLP collections as a result of their participation in the CFDP program in an attempt to better define what constitutes a comprehensive collection for their chosen agency/subject. Many participants reported that participation in the CFDP has improved the value of their collection, improved access to the collection, and increased awareness of the collection and services among library administration, library faculty and library users.

As of the close of the grant period, 154,216 records had been contributed to the Masterlist database. Participating FDLP libraries are actively assisting grant partner libraries in filling known gaps. To date, 241 items have been claimed from discards posted in the ASERL database which meet a COE collection need. As a result, the COE collections at the grant partner libraries are far more complete.

The CFDP model has been featured in several presentations at GPO's Depository Library Council (DLC) meetings during the grant period, and has garnered great interest among Council members. At the most recent DLC meeting (October 2012), GPO staff attended a demonstration of the Disposition database and later met with members of ASERL's CFDP Steering Committee and the Database Programmer from the University of Florida to further discuss the model and how it might be adopted on a wider level within the FDLP.

This program has received national recognition within the FDLP community as recipient of the GODORT "Documents to the People" award in June 2012. This award is presented to an individual or organization that has most effectively encouraged the use of government documents in support of library service.

And as further evidence of the lasting impact of this program, ASERL members agreed to tax themselves to continue the staffing to support the ongoing operation of this program for the foreseeable future.

8. What's next

An ASERL FDLP Steering Committee has been created for the long-term oversight and governance of this initiative and to lead the effort in identifying Centers of Excellence necessary to meet the goal of establishing two comprehensive FDLP collections in the Southeast region. The FDLP Steering Committee includes library deans and directors from Regional and Selective Depository Libraries in the Southeast Region and works closely with the CFDP Steering Committee, which is expected to continue to serve an advisory role.

A collaborative effort is under way for the libraries of the land grant universities in the southeast to become Centers of Excellence for the U.S. Department of Agriculture and its related agencies as part of the CFDP. Auburn University, the University of Florida, the University of Kentucky, Mississippi State University, North Carolina State University, Clemson University and Virginia Tech have already committed to, or indicated an interest in, serving as Centers of Excellence for one or more USDA stems. A few additional libraries that are not in land grant institutions have also agreed to serve as Centers of Excellence for USDA agencies.

The Masterlist database continues to be used and enhanced by participating libraries. As can be seen by survey responses, FDLP libraries are already looking ahead to expanding the capabilities of the database beyond the assessment of print collections to that of their digital collections:

- *“I believe it will also be very helpful as a tool to identify gaps between print and digitized/digital collections.”*
- *“We are also looking at the use of the gap analysis database to match the availability of digital copies of government documents with the print collections in order to work toward a comprehensive digital collection to complement the comprehensive print collections.”*

To this end, the University of Florida has developed a proposal to compare records from Vanderbilt University and the University of Virginia (both Centers of Excellence for the U.S. State Department) with records from the Library of Virginia (a selective with a fully cataloged federal documents collection), the University of Florida, the University of Minnesota, University of California at Berkeley, Utah State University, LLMC Digital, Internet Archive, HathiTrust, and the library at the U.S. State Department. The goal is to identify a “comprehensive collection” for this agency, drawing from large, well-documented sources of content. Once this compilation is complete, Vanderbilt and the University of Virginia will generate Gap Reports to complete the inventory of their physical holdings and create needs lists to build their collections of State Department documents. As Vanderbilt and the University of Virginia conduct their inventory, they will also contribute any additional records for items they hold but that are not identified through the initial gap analysis, thereby improving the definition of the “comprehensive” collection for the State Department. In addition, ASERL will use the records from LLMC Digital, Internet Archive and HathiTrust to document the percentage of the State Department collection that has been digitized. Ultimately, this could lead to a “needs list” for publications that still need to be digitized, which would support further actions to digitize the FDLP corpus.

9. Grant Products

[List of Current and Pending Centers of Excellence - Sorted by SuDoc stem](#)

[Guidelines for Management and Disposition of Federal Depository Library Collections in the Southeast — Implementation Plan](#) (Revised July 2012).

[ASERL Correspondence on GPO Related Issues](#)

[Becoming a Center of Excellence – Best Practices](#) (revised 5/23/12)

[Centers of Excellence – LibGuides](#)

[ASERL COE \(Masterlist\) LibGuide](#)

[ASERL Disposition Database LibGuide](#)

[CFDP Program Supporting Documentation Created by Centers of Excellence Libraries](#)

[ASERL COE Database \(Masterlist\) Sign-in Page](#)

[ASERL Disposition Database Sign-in Page](#)

ASERL FDLP Survey:

- Regional survey - <http://www.aserl.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Regionalsurvey.pdf>
- Selective survey – <http://www.aserl.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/ASERLSelectivesurvey.pdf>
- Non-ASERL Selective survey - <http://www.aserl.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Non-ASERLSelectivesurvey.pdf>
- Survey Results (attachment)
- University of South Carolina, Analysis of Reference Requests (attachment)

IMLS FINAL PERFORMANCE REPORT – PART TWO

December 2012

Institution Name: Association of Southeastern Research Libraries

Grant #: LG-07-09-0095-09

A. PROJECT ACTIVITY: Collaborative Federal Depository Program: Centers of Excellence Collections

1. Est. 5,998 Total # of collection items conserved, relocated to protective storage, rehoused, or for which other preservation-appropriate physical action was taken.

During their inventory process, the University of Kentucky did a physical assessment of each item in their WPA collection, adding conditions statements to the MARC field 583. During this process many items were placed in protective archival envelopes. All items are designated with a local note in MARC field 590 indicating they hold “the archival copy for ASERL Collaborative Federal Depository Program.” The CFDP adopted the UK model as a cataloging best practice, the documentation for which is shared with all COE libraries.

Improved storage, as detailed above, was not a part of the grant but rather a related activity that occurred in conjunction with grant-funded activities.

2. N/A Total # of collection items digitized, scanned, reformatted, or for which other electronic or digital preservation action was taken.

3. 20,579 Total # of collection items with new or enhanced accessibility (include items that were cataloged or for which finding aids or other records were created or computerized) includes 20,579 items made accessible to users other than grantee staff for the first time, items with new or enhanced access for staff only].

4. Total # of lectures, symposia, demonstrations, exhibits, readings, performances, concerts, broadcasts, Webcasts, workshops, multi-media packages, or other learning opportunities provided for the public (do not include PSAs or other promotional activities) [includes out-of-school or after-school programs, exhibits].

5. 2 Total # of tools created, improved, or produced for searching, information management, or information analysis by users other than or in addition to grantee staff.

1. The ASERL COE (Masterlist) database - <http://apps.uflib.ufl.edu/CFDP>

2. Though not funded under the grant, the University of Florida designed and hosts the ASERL Disposition database – <http://apps.uflib.ufl.edu/GovDocs>. This database, too, uses a Google OpenID session to identify the user.

In addition, each institution has created LibGuides for their collections locally. A link to each guide is posted on the ASERL website at

<http://www.aserl.org/programs/gov-doc/>. Additional information is provided in question #12 below.

6. 31 Total # of conferences, programs, workshops, training sessions, institutes, classes, courses, or other structured educational events provided.

See attachment.

7. N/A Total # of internships, apprenticeships, mentoring opportunities, or other extended educational opportunities provided.

8. N/A Total # of degrees/certificates earned as a result of the grant [includes _____ Master's, _____ Ph.D. degrees, _____ other (specify): _____].

9. N/A Total # technology upgrades or improvements (specify):
_____.

10. If your grant engaged in other activities not covered by the categories above, please briefly identify and quantify them here. Attach another sheet if necessary.

By the end of the grant period, 31 depository libraries within the ASERL region had signed a memorandum of understanding to serve as a Center of Excellence covering 180 SuDoc classifications. An additional 5 libraries had indicated an interest in serving as a COE but have yet to sign the agreement

The CFDP model envisions at least two centers of excellence for each agency to ensure an appropriate level of redundancy within the Southeast for both quick delivery and preservation. By the end of the grant, a second COE had been identified for 6 agencies.

Additionally, the University of South Carolina enhanced their collection with the purchase of ERIC microfiche (over 20,500 items) that provided enhanced access to electronic records and items that had been digitized since their original release.

B. PORTABLE PRODUCTS (relating to the activity named in section A.)

11. 7 Total # of research reports, papers, books, reprints, or other publications generated.
See attachment.

12. 7 Total # of Web sites developed or improved [include URLs/addresses]:

1. Department of Education, http://guides.library.sc.edu/ASERL_ED, University of South Carolina
2. National Recovery Administration, <http://guides.uflib.ufl.edu/coe>, University of Florida
3. Panama Canal Zone, <http://guides.uflib.ufl.edu/coe>, University of Florida
4. Works Progress Administration, <http://libguides.uky.edu/content.php?mode=preview&pid=158153&sid=1338599>, University of Kentucky.
5. Collaborative Federal Depository Program (CFDP): ASERL's Plan for Managing FDLP Collections in the Southeast, <http://www.aserl.org/programs/gov-doc/>, Association of Southeastern Research Libraries (ASERL).

6. ASERL COE Database LibGuide - <http://guides.uflib.ufl.edu/ASERL-COEDB>. This resource documented 358 page views since it was created in May 2012.
7. ASERL Documents Disposition Database LibGuide - <http://guides.uflib.ufl.edu/content.php?pid=169679&sid=1429057>. This resource documented 5569 page views in FY 2012.

13. N/A Total # of learning resources produced [includes _____ oral histories, _____ curriculum resources, _____ curriculums, _____ Web-based learning tools, or _____ other (specify): _____].

14. 5 Total # of key management documents created [includes _____ emergency plans, _____ conservation surveys, _____ strategic plans, X other (specify): _____].

1. ***“Best Practices Documentation: Becoming a Center of Excellence for ASERL’s Collaborative Federal Depository Program”*** - created to ensure FDLP libraries had a thorough understanding of the nature and scope of the commitment undertaken by becoming a Center of Excellence. http://www.aserl.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/BestPractices-Update_2012_05.pdf
2. **A Memorandum of Understanding** - developed to detail a library’s roles and responsibilities as a Center of Excellence under the CFDP program. <http://www.aserl.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/Sample-MOU.pdf>
3. **Workflow Processes** – documentation from the University of Kentucky and the University of Florida. <http://www.aserl.org/aserl-coe-database-shared-documents/>
4. ***“Guidelines for Management and Disposition of Federal Depository Library Collections in the Southeast — Implementation Plan”*** - consensus on policies and best practices for disposition of federal documents in the Southeast. http://www.aserl.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/FINAL_ASERL_FDLP_GUIDELINES_Revised_07-2012.pdf
5. **A number of libraries that have contributed records to the ASERL COE database have also contributed supporting documentation on the process for formatting and uploading records specific to their library’s ILS, for example Voyager, Aleph and III Millennium.** <http://www.aserl.org/aserl-coe-database-shared-documents/>

15. If your grant created one or more quantifiable products not covered by the categories above, please briefly identify and quantify them here. Attach another sheet if necessary.

C. PARTICIPANTS/VISITORS/USERS/AUDIENCE (relating to the activity named in section A.)

16. 31 Total # of **community organization partners** [includes _____ informal partners, _____ formal partners].

17. N/A Total # of **schools** (pre-K through grade 12) that used services provided by your grant (include only schools that actively participated, not those to which material was simply distributed or made available) [includes _____ students participating in field trips].

18. N/A Total # of **teachers** supported, trained, or otherwise provided with resources to strengthen classroom teaching or learning.

19. N/A Total # of **pre-K through grade-12 students** served [includes ____ youth 9-19 who used, participated, visited, or otherwise interacted with activities, experiences, resources, or products offered by your grant].

20. N/A Total # of **viewers and listeners** for radio, television, and cable broadcasts (for series, include total actual audience for all broadcasts; do not include audience for PSAs or other promotional activities or Webcasts; do not report potential audience).

21. 16918 Total # of **users of Web-based resources** provided by your grant (include all individuals the project served). Choose the measure that best represents your use rate (choose only one): X visits (hits), ____ unique visitors, ____ registered users, ____ other measure (specify): _____.

The University of Kentucky reported 631 visits to their program website.

The University of South Carolina reported 60 visits.

The University of Florida reported 16227 visits, representing 1,528,291 item views.

The ASERL Program Page reported 2311 page views.

ASERL COE Database LibGuide documented 358 page views since it was created in May 2012.

ASERL Documents Disposition Database LibGuide -documented 5569 page views in FY 2012.

Use statistics are not available for the number of visits for the ASERL Program Page or the LibGuides.

22. 265 Total # of **individuals** benefiting from your grant (include all those from questions 18-21 plus others the project served, including staff or others in your field). Only include those who actually participated or used your project services in some way.

Ostensibly the general public benefits from this grant since the goal is to improve overall public access to FDLP materials. Unfortunately we are unable to measure all use, such as walk-in users.

†The number above is the number of reference questions answered plus the number of subscribers to the listservs, noted as "professionals" below.

23. This number includes: 155 **professionals**, _____ **non-professionals or pre-professionals**, _____ **docents or interpreters**, _____ **volunteers**, _____ **staff** that received services provided by your grant.

24. If your grant served one or more quantifiable audiences not covered by the categories above, please briefly identify and quantify them here. Attach another sheet if necessary.

Directions for submitting this report are available at <http://www.ims.gov/recipients/administration.shtm>. For assistance or questions contact your Program Officer.

Burden Estimate and Request for Public Comments: Public reporting burden for this collection of information (Final Report, Parts 1 and 2) is estimated to average eight to thirteen hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comment regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Institute of Museum and Library Services, Chief Information Officer, 1800 M Street, NW, 9th Floor, Washington, DC 20036-5802, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 3137-0029, Washington, DC 20503.