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The University of Kentucky (UK) is participating as a Center of Excellence (COE) for the Works Progress Administration (WPA), the Smithsonian Institution, and the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) in the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries' (ASERL) Collaborative Federal Depository Program (CFDP). This collaborative effort is designed to distribute collection development for all Federal agencies across the entire Southeast as Judy has described.

I will describe how UK has focused its depository collection development efforts on non-COE agencies, and reduced its retrospective collection development for other institutions’ COE agencies.
Focusing Collection Development at a Regional Depository

• Identify agencies collected by other COEs in the Southeast that our institution no longer needs to collect retrospectively, in consultation with our Collections Advisory Committee (CAC), and:
  --borrow materials from COE via ILL or link to digital copies of publications
  --edit offers submitted to ASERL Documents Disposition Database by other depositories in Kentucky to eliminate any offers from these agencies; reduces number of offers to review
• Continue to collect agencies important to UK even if there is another COE in the Southeast, e.g., US Geological Survey; CAC made these decisions
• Continue to collect agencies for which there is not a COE in the Southeast
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Consulting with UK Libraries’ Collections Advisory Committee

Data included:

- SuDoc stem
- Circulation statistics
- ILL statistics
- COE institution
- Publication status
- Comments

Recommendations to the UK Libraries’ Collections Advisory Committee for ceasing or continuing retrospective development in SuDoc collection

Federal Government agencies that have been adopted by someone else in ASERL as a Center of Excellence that are recommended for no further collection development here at UK are:

**NOTE**: Data in red is ILL volume for past two FYs; data in blue is circulation volume for the past two FYs. COE institution is in purple after dead/alive status.

- Forest Service (A 13) [alive—Clemson]
- Forest Service (C 21) [alive—Georgia Tech]
- Economic Analysis Bureau (C 59) [alive—Duke]
- Environmental Protection Agency (EP [14] [9]) [alive—Georgia Tech]
- Federal Security Agency/Civilian Conservation Corps (FS 4) [dead—UT/K]
- Homeland Security (HS 1) [alive—VCU]
- Women’s Bureau (L 13, L 36.100) [one dead, one alive—Duke]
- Copyright Office (LC 3) [alive—NKU]
- National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (LC 19) [alive—Tenn. State Library and Archives]
- American Folklore Center (LC 39) [alive—NKU & Tenn. State Library and Archives]
- NASA (NAS [21] [5]) [alive—Georgia Tech]
- Cuba Department (W 25) [dead—Univ. of Miami]
- Cuban Census Office (W 47) [dead—Univ. of Miami]
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Consulting with UK Libraries’ Collections Advisory Committee (cont.)

Agencies identified for continued local development to be reviewed periodically to assess:

- Continued local value of tangible format
- Cost vs. benefit of continued development efforts
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Evaluating Process and Results

Data collected for COE SuDoc stems we continue to collect retrospectively:

• Offers/needs matches claimed from other institutions’ COE agencies selected for continued development represented 36% of both the 2012 and 2013 total items claimed from Kentucky depositories*

• No offers/needs matches were claimed for 42% of other institutions’ COE agencies selected for continued development in 2012; this decreased to 32% in 2013, i.e., we acquired more materials in 2013 from the 19 COE agencies that we had elected to continue collecting than we did in 2012*

*due to an increase in the number of other institutions’ COE agencies selected for continued development in 2014 (now 35), and incomplete data on needs matches for 2014 and 2015, we can’t update this data for comparison purposes until the end of 2017
Evaluating Process and Results (cont.)

Data collected for COE SuDoc stems we no longer collect retrospectively:

- Offers ignored from other institutions’ COE agencies, i.e., NOT selected for continued retrospective development (69 SuDoc stems in 2012, 101 in 2013), represented 8% of 2012 total offers, 22% of 2013 total offers--increasing the number we ignore saves us time.

- Offers ignored from other institutions’ COE agencies increased to 104 SuDoc stems in 2014, but represented only 16% of 2015 total offers and 15% of 2016 total offers, indicating that this time-saving benefit has leveled off and/or most of our depositories have discarded what they don’t want in these stems.

- The other institutions’ COE agencies we have chosen to ignore have been eliminated from our needs list, so needs matches never occur for these agencies, thus reducing the number of items to evaluate for claiming.
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Additional Observations

• Needs list match process through ASERL Disposition Database either costs or saves additional resources according to collection decisions

• Agency-specific statistics will inform future Federal Depository Unit recommendations and CAC decisions

• Cost-benefit results of ignoring other institutions’ COEs in our offers process are heavily dependent on discard patterns within our state
Aligning with UK Libraries’ Strategic Plan

Objective 4.1: UK Libraries will develop strategic partnerships to inform, educate, and improve the health and well-being of the citizens of the Commonwealth

   Strategy 4.1.1 - Develop mutually beneficial partnerships with external organizations to expand the research enterprise and promote academic excellence

Objective 4.2: UK Libraries will strengthen access to unique UK Libraries’ resources in general and specifically to research on and about the Commonwealth

   Strategy 4.2.3 – Develop and sustain the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries’ Collaborative Federal Depository Program's Centers of Excellence for all agencies to which UK Libraries has committed in order to provide perpetual access to the publications