“Everything changed in the fall of 2008,” writes John Hussey to open the first of nine articles in this issue of Against the Grain devoted to the intersection of publishing by academic libraries and by university presses. John, now my Ingram colleague but who was then at the University Press of Kentucky, relates how the economic crash made a ruin of Kentucky’s plans for the publishing season. At the same time, the crisis forced the Press to analyze “every facet of the business” to survive in a harsher financial climate. One thing that eventually changed at Kentucky was that the Press and the library were merged organizationally and these two campus units who until then had had little to do with one another “were now sharing office spaces,” as John puts it in “Academic Publishing is Not in Crisis — It’s Just Changing.”

That was the same year, 2008, when Against the Grain commissioned an earlier special issue on this same topic (December 2008-January 2009). Patrick Alexander, then and now at the Penn State University Press, is a special issue contributor then and now as well. “Then,” Patrick described the assets university presses might bring to a joint enterprise between organizations so culturally different. He confessed to having “no secret recipe” for success in these unions, which were in the early stages of taking shape at places like the University of California, New York University, Cornell, Duke, and North Carolina. Six years later, Patrick finds that best practices “continue to be in relatively short supply” and that cultural differences are as strong as ever. But he suggests that libraries and presses might evolve to complement one another, invoking in his suggestion the biologist E.O. Wilson. Read about it and even watch an E.O. Wilson video in, “The Ant, the University Press, and the Librarian: Reflections on the Evolution of Scholarly Communication.”

Maria Bonn once referred to those early projects from 2008 as the “usual suspects,” pioneers who often found themselves drafted for panels as spokespersons for the young...continued on page 12

If Rumors Were Horses

Happy 2015! Lots of news to report so far! Where to begin?

McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers’ founder Robert Franklin announced that he has passed the job and title of President to the awesomely deserving Rhonda Herman. Franklin will assume the new title of Founder and Editor-in-Chief. Founded in 1979, McFarland is an independent publisher of academic and nonfiction books. I remember reading about Franklin in the Wall Street Journal many years ago — it’s a great article. “Publishing: Niche Publisher Prospers — Without Grishams or Kings,” by Eleena de Lisser, Wall Street Journal, eastern edition, 12 March 1998, B1. Located in the beautiful mountain town of Jefferson, North Carolina, the publisher offers 5,100 books in print, offers nearly 3,000 eBooks through online booksellers, operates its own printing facility, and employs 53 people. Rhonda Herman joined the company in 1982 as Business Manager. She was promoted to Vice President in 1991 and to Executive Vice President in 2004. While she has worked at various times in her McFarland career in every corner of the operations, continued on page 6
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Hmmm. So many people expect it to be warm year-round in Charleston. Come again. It gets cold down here! Okay, cold for us. Temperatures have been as low as 19 degrees Fahrenheit. And that’s cold in most anybody’s book, right? Plus we have had non-stop rain for the six weeks just after the Charleston Conference ended. Whew!

This issue is a stellar one. Bob Nardini has put together papers on the topic of librarianship (JAL—400 a year). She spearheaded the initiative to establish an in-house printing facility and has focused on designing information systems in the last decade. She planned and implemented their eBook strategy during the last five years. Most recently, she revamped technology relating to cover design and book production (400 a year).
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<tr>
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<tr>
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Toni Nix <justwrite@lowcountry.com>; Phone: 843-835-8604; Fax: 843-835-5892; USPS Address: P.O. Box 412, Cottageville, SC 29435; FedEx/UPS ship to: 398 Crab Apple Lane, Ridgeville, SC 29472.

**From Your (weathering the storm) Editor:**

Against the Grain, MSC 98, The Citadel, Charleston, SC 29409. You can also send a letter to the editor from the ATG Homepage against-the-grain.com.

Happy New Year, y’all. Love, Yr. Ed. ♒

**Letters to the Editor**

Send letters to <kstrauch@comcast.net>, phone or fax 843-723-3536, or snail mail: Against the Grain, MSC 98, The Citadel, Charleston, SC 29409. You can also send a letter to the editor from the ATG Homepage at http://www.against-the-grain.com.

**Dear Editor:**

I really enjoyed the Charleston Conference. It’s my favorite conference to attend, and I’m already looking forward to next year.

Debra Hargett, MLIS
Ethel K. Smith Library, Wingate University
<dhargett@wingate.edu>

Dear Editor:

It was a wonderful conference as always, and we thank you and your colleagues for all your work and for having the good fortune to be located in such a pleasant place. I hope you all have had a chance to rest up after the very hectic few days of all those visiting librarians and vendors and that you enjoy a peaceful and happy Thanksgiving just around the corner.

Best regards,
Robert Robbins, Representative
AMALIVRE (formerly Aux Amateurs de Livres/Librarie Touzot Internationale, 34 Orr Road, Jericho, VT 05465)
<robbins@together.net> ♒

**Rumors**

from page 1

she spearheaded the initiative to establish an in-house printing facility and has focused on designing information systems in the last decade. She planned and implemented their eBook strategy during the last five years. Most recently, she revamped technology relating to cover design and book production (400 a year).

http://search.proquest.com.nunice.coac.edu/ nationalnewscore/docview/398618568/fulltext/ A6717E54235B4032PQ/7?accountid=9959 (pay wall)

http://www.mcfarlandbooks.com/

PS — Rhonda will contribute a chapter to the upcoming Ebooks in Academic Libraries: Stepping Up to the Challenge, edited by Robert S. Freeman, Suzanne M. Ward and Judith M. Nixon, representing the perspective of a commercial publisher. This title is to be published in 2015 by Purdue University Press’ Charleston Insights in Library, Archival, and Information Sciences series that has a long-time collaboration with the Charleston Conference!

http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/series/ charleston-insights-library-archival-and-information-sciences

Just read that the energetically focused Beth Blakesley, associate dean of libraries at Washington State University, is the new editor-in-chief of the Journal of Academic Librarianship (JAL), one of the top publications in the academic libraries field.


Moving right along. Holtzbrinck Publishing Group and BC Partners have announced an agreement to merge the majority of Macmillan Science and Education with Springer Science+Business Media (owned by funds advised by BCP) in its entirety with the majority of Holtzbrinck-owned Macmillan Science and Education (MSE), namely Nature Publishing Group, Palgrave Macmillan and the global businesses of Macmillan Education. The joint venture will create a leading publish-

continued on page 8
Source materials and your thoughts in one place.

Help your students organize their research findings with HIGHLIGHTING and NOTE-TAKING in GVRL.
opportunities amidst turbulence and recession.

Partners has completed 85 acquisitions with totaling over €12 billion. Since inception, for its investors and is currently advising funds focusing on the best balance of risk and reward identify attractive investment opportunities by and New York.

BC Partners network of offices in London, Hamburg, Paris ly in North America through its established

into a leader in buy-outs, principally investing (Holtzbrinck).

Schwanewedel Brockhaus Walgenbach Michael (Vice-Chairman/BCP), Holtzbrinck Stefan von sory board will be composed of Mos (Chief Operating Officer) and Ulrich (Chief Financial Officer). The supervi-

sion and research. Librarians now dedicated to collabora-

tion and research. Librarians need to decide what materials to keep, what can be shared among groups of libraries and what can be recycled. OCLC’s WorldCat is the largest aggregation of library data in the world, as well as the world’s largest library resource sharing network. SCS is a leader in analyzing print collection data to help libraries manage and share their materials. SCS services leverage WorldCat data and analytics to show individual libraries and library consortia which titles should be kept locally, which can be discarded, and which are the best candidates for shared collections. “OCLC and SCS have worked as strategic partners to help libraries manage print materials since 2011,” said Skip Prichard, OCLC President and CEO. “By bringing together the innovative

organizational structure will be disclosed once the businesses are combined. The transaction is subject to approval by various competition authorities, and this is expected during the first half of 2015.


Still more is happening! Listen up! OCLC has acquired Sustainable Collection Services (SCS). Library collections are moving from print to digital, and spaces once used to house books are now dedicated to collaboration and research. Librarians need to decide what materials to keep, what can be shared among groups of libraries and what can be recycled. OCLC’s WorldCat is the largest aggregation of library data in the world, as well as the world’s largest library resource sharing network. SCS is a leader in analyzing print collection data to help libraries manage and share their materials. SCS services leverage WorldCat data and analytics to show individual libraries and library consortia which titles should be kept locally, which can be discarded, and which are the best candidates for shared collections. “OCLC and SCS have worked as strategic partners to help libraries manage print materials since 2011,” said Skip Prichard, OCLC President and CEO. “By bringing together the innovative services of SCS, the power of WorldCat and the thought leadership of OCLC Research, we can move quickly to build services to address this critical need for libraries.” “Our partnership with OCLC has been vital to SCS since our first day of operation,” said Rick Lugg, Executive Director, SCS. “We rely on WorldCat to provide libraries the holdings data that is critical to intelligent collection management decisions. As part of OCLC, we will expand and extend our analytics capabilities, develop new products, and serve more libraries than we could ever reach on our own.” All four SCS staff members will join OCLC as employees. The team will participate in the ALA Midwinter Meeting in Chicago, January 30-February 2 at Booth #1916, adjacent to the OCLC Booth #1818. Staff there will be available to provide more information.


Speaking of which, have y’all seen the video that John Riley took during the last day of the Charleston 2014 Conference? There are lines and lines of young people holding print books for autographs and readings during YALFest in Charleston.


More pertinent. Matthew Goddard has a tongue-in-cheek Op Ed about trends to watch — print books. Reminiscent of Ned Kraft who kept us entertained in earlier ATGs for ten wonderful years. Trying to persuade Matthew to do the same! Did you meet Matthew in Charleston? He had a poster that described a project to develop a simple automated way of analyzing the overlap between a library’s current holdings and any given list of titles (such as an eBook collection). It also presented a case study on the use of student workers.

http://2014charlestonconference.sched.org/event/959353e6e1f1bee807a933cc2f3d22b2#.VLw0IuVIp

This issue will have the last Back Talk by the incomparable Tony Ferguson — maybe! Unbelievably Tony has written Back Talk for 20 years! Where does the time go? I have told Tony that he can come back and tell us what’s on his mind any time he feels like it. And I am trying to talk him into coming to the 2015 Charleston Conference with his lovely wife Cheryl. Time will tell.

continued on page 12
Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press announces the launch of a new monthly online publication, *Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Medicine*. Covering everything from the molecular and cellular bases of disease to translational medicine and new therapeutic strategies, each issue offers reviews on different aspects of a variety of diseases and the tissues they affect. The contributions are written by experts in each field and commissioned as Subject Collections by a board of eminent scientists and physicians. These Subject Collections gradually accumulate articles as new issues of the journal are published and, when complete, each Subject Collection represents a comprehensive survey of the field it covers. *Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Medicine* is thus unmatched for its depth of coverage and represents an essential source for informed surveys and critical discussion of advances in molecular medicine.

**Scope:** Translational Medicine, Molecular Pathology, Cancer Therapy, Genetics, Infectious Disease, Immunology, Molecular Cell Biology

**Frequency:** Monthly, online

**ISSN:** 2157-1422

Subject coverage includes:

- Addiction
- Aging
- Alzheimer Disease
- Anemia
- Antibiotic Resistance
- Bacterial Pathogens
- Bone Disease
- Cancer
- Cystic Fibrosis
- Diabetes
- Heart Disease
- Hemoglobin
- HIV
- Influenza
- Malaria
- Multiple Sclerosis
- Muscular Dystrophy
- Parkinson's Disease
- Prion Diseases
- Skin Diseases
- Schizophrenia
DAMES WHO DARE
by Bruce Strauch (The Citadel)


DEATH OF GOLDEN OLDIES
by Bruce Strauch (The Citadel)

Leonard Maltin began publishing TV Movies in 1969. A fat paperback with 8,000 movies and reviews. It grew into Leonard Maltin’s Movie Guide of 1,632 pages and 16,000 entries. And with an alphabetical guide, there’s the joy of skipping about and seeing how one lead to the auteur’s next. And it was utterly comprehensive with no fads, no agenda.

But by the 1990s it was ground into the dust by IMDb link-sharing. And soon will be no more.


THE BESPOKE WOLFE
by Bruce Strauch (The Citadel)

Mr. New Journalism, Mr. Bonfire of the Vanities, Mr. Bauhaus to Our House, Mr. Ever Dressed in a White Suit Tom Wolfe was determined his papers would not end up with everything else in the literary world at the Harry Ransom Center in UT-Austin. It would stay in New York at the Public Library. Of course, they did have to pony up $2.15 million. And in exchange got a meticulously labeled 165 linear feet.

It even has annotated fabric samples from his tailor. Clothing is prominent in his writing.


Future Dates for Charleston Conferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preconferences and Vendor Showcase</th>
<th>Main Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 Conference</td>
<td>4 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Conference</td>
<td>2 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Conference</td>
<td>8 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Conference</td>
<td>7 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Conference</td>
<td>6 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 November</td>
<td>3-5 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11 November</td>
<td>8-10 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AH, POSTWAR PULPS WITH LURID COVERS
by Bruce Strauch (The Citadel)

(1) John Hersey, Hiroshima (1946) (Book-of-the-Month Club selection following simple people who survived the bomb by chance); (2) Philip Wylie, Tomorrow! (1954) (nuclear attack on the U.S.); (3) Ira Wolfert, The Underworld (1943) (Bantam giant of crime in the boardroom and the back alleys); (4) Arthur Koestler, Darkness at Noon (1940) (Stalin purges the old Bolsheviks); (5) Mary McCarthy, The Company She Keeps (1943) (Mary’s first, allegedly written when her husband Edmund Wilson locked her in a room with a typewriter. Good girl plunging headlong into going bad. Made Mary’s rep as intellectual high priestess of the New York left.)


BIRTH OF THE PAPERBACK
by Bruce Strauch (The Citadel)

During WWII, the War Department and publishers printed the Armed Services Edition paperbacks that were shipped to all the battle zones. Soldiers couldn’t write home about where they were or their experiences, but they could talk about books.

Sex and nostalgia for home were of course popular. And there were many ironies. When published, The Great Gatsby had poor reviews and didn’t sell. 155,000 copies of it were shipped overseas, and it became the classic of today.

Post war, the 25-cent paperback was born.


Adam Matthew

Adam Matthew publishes unique primary source collections from archives around the world.

Our award-winning digital titles span the social sciences and humanities and cover a multitude of topics ranging from medieval manuscripts and Victorian moving images, to ephemera from the 1960s and confidential government documents.

New for 2014

- American Consumer Culture, 1935-1965
- American History, 1493-1859
- Apartheid South Africa, 1948-1966
- The First World War: Visual Perspectives and Narratives
- Foreign Office Files for China, 1919-1948
- Mass Observation - final release completes the collection
Library Publishing ...  
from page 1

movement. Maria was then director of the University of Michigan’s Scholarly Publishing Office. She recalls that publisher audience members ranged from “curious to skeptical to downright antagonistic” toward aspiring library publishers. Now, Maria teaches at the Graduate School of Library and Information Science at the University of Illinois, where, a pioneer again, she is busy creating a program to train the “pubrarians” who, she hopes, will make careers in bridging the two cultures which, like Patrick Alexander, she sees as complementary. “Publishing, Libraries, Publishers, and Librarians: Shared Passions and Complementary Skill Sets to Ensure the Viability of the Scholarly Record” is her account of pioneering then, and pioneering now.

Timely advice comes from Charles Watson in “Three Challenges of Pubrarianship.” Charles should know. He is a member of the library management team and also director of both library publishing and university press publishing at the University of Michigan, where he started in 2014 after holding a similar position at Purdue University for the prior five years. Pubrarians, he says, will need to find ways to convince librarians of the value of publishing, while shaping a merged publishing program in a way that protects the university press brand, and at the same time explores the new opportunities that he believes are “worth minting a new word for.”

At the University of Georgia, it has never been “a question of why or how, but why not and how often” the library and the press, which Lisa Bayer directs, should collaborate with one another. Libraries and university presses are not the only constituencies with a stake in new academic publishing ventures, though. That’s one message from Lisa in “You Complete Me: On Building a Vertically Integrated Digital Humanities Program at the University of Georgia.” In her contribution, Lisa interviews a UGA historian, editor-in-chief at UGA Press, and the university librarian about Georgia’s faculty-led and library-housed digital humanities lab, scheduled to open soon, and Georgia’s plans to create new forms of scholarship there that will be both transformational and sustainable.

Georgia isn’t alone in having located a new collaborative venture inside library walls. In “From University Press to the University’s Press: Building a One-Stop Resource for Scholarly Publishing,” Gary Dunham and Carolyn Walters, of Indiana University, record how IU’s Office of Scholarly Publishing was created in 2012 to move “content dissemination on campus from the university press to the university itself.” One highly visible outcome from the merged organization has been a “Scholars Commons,” housed in the library, where publishing consultation services are offered by staff from the library, the press, IT, and other campus groups, and where attendance at panels and workshops about book proposals, book contracts, and publishing a first book have forced the OSP, in effect today the “University’s press,” to find larger rooms for these oversubscribed events.

What if there is no local university press? That’s the case at Oregon’s Pacific University, whose Isaac Gilman believes that libraries of all kinds need to consider making publishing a core service, even to the point of prioritizing it over “legacy services.” Isaac, himself the Publishing Services Librarian at Pacific, describes in some detail the philosophical as well as practical barriers publishing libraries will need to overcome, in addition to the skepticism they will face from both within their own profession and from without. “Adjunct No More: Promoting Scholarly Publishing as a Core Service of Academic Libraries” presents Isaac’s case.

“How did we get into this mess?” asks Kevin S. Hawkins, of the University of North Texas, referring to today’s “dysfunctional” scholarly publishing system where library budgets and the cost of scholarly and scientific works so often head in different directions. Kevin doesn’t see “small-scale collaborations” between libraries and presses as the answer. Instead, in “How We Pay for Publishing,” he argues the need to “reimagine” an entirely new system for production of and access to scholarship.

Kevin isn’t alone in believing the current system is broken. Wait till you read Paul Royster, of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Paul, in “A Library Publishing Manifesto,” explains exactly why he thinks library publishing is needed to atone for the “sins” of commercial publishers and what he counts as the failings of university presses. If readers find his contribution “overly rhetorical” or “hypberbolic,” as he admits they might, they’ll be clear on where Paul stands. They’ll also find as vigorous an argument for the value of library publishing as they’re likely to encounter anywhere, as well as some practical advice for library publishers, all of it based in part upon what Paul has learned directing Zea Books, Nebraska’s own program.

Last spring I heard Paul deliver a version of his article at the Library Publishing Forum, a meeting mentioned by several contributors. Library publishers and university press publishers were side-by-side for the first time at a national meeting like this one, and when they met in Kansas City there was an extraordinary level of energy. Sometimes it was energy over what libraries and university presses could do together. Sometimes it was energy over what libraries should do on their own. Sometimes the mood was friendly. Sometimes it was not. If there was a consensus at all, it was that everyone experienced a degree of creative tension that’s rare at any conference.

This issue captures some of that same energy, and some of that same tension. Libraries and university presses are different but complementary. Libraries and university presses can work together to reinvent scholarship. Libraries should go it alone. Scholarship belongs to the university, not to the university press. University presses are essential and will respond to any challenge. The whole thing is broken; let’s start over. Readers of Against the Grain will find all these points of view here.

“Everything changed,” John Hussey wrote to open things up, and in many ways it has. Organizationally, more libraries and university presses face mandates to work together. Fiscally, nothing has been the same since the crash. Some of those same “usual suspects” from 2008 are still with us, but this issue wasn’t intended to check up on them. Then and now, what hasn’t changed is that we are still not sure how to answer this question: What’s the best relationship between library publishing and university press publishing? Is there an answer? Read the issue, get a taste of our contributors’ energy, and enjoy the discussion they offer to the Against the Grain community. 🌟

Rumors
from page 8

But — great news!! Ann Okerson and Jim O’Donnell will be teaming up on Back Talk beginning with the February issue. We are very excited!

I remember when Susan Spilka was Vice-President, Corporate Communications at John Wiley and Sons. Now the bam-zowie Susan is Marketing and Communications Director at CHORUS. Remember the panel in 2014 Charleston by Scott Plutchak (University of Alabama Birmingham), Greg Tananbaum (ScholarNext), John Vaughn (Association of American Universities), and Howard Ratner (CHORUS). The Panel was about the OSTP directive (2/22/13) to make peer reviewed articles and data resulting from research funded by federal agencies publicly accessible which has inspired several new initiatives, most notably the SHARE project being developed by university and library groups; and the publishing community-offered CHORUS project. There’s a lot of info online. http://www.katina.info/conference/conference-info/program/

Speaking of which, watch the videos from the 2014 Against the Grain Penthouse Suite Interviews that are now available! See our chats with Dr. Sheila Corrall, from Pittsburgh University, Cheryl LaGuardia, from Harvard University, Scott Plutchak, from University of Alabama Birmingham, John Rennie, from Access Science, and Dr. James West, from Penn State University.

The Library Lantern, the librarians’ newsletter from Taylor & Francis had a great write continued on page 18
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by John Hussey (Key Accounts Sales Manager, Ingram Content Group) <john.hussey@ingramcontent.com>

Everything changed in the fall of 2008, when I was a sales manager for the University Press of Kentucky and we had one of the most ambitious lists in our history. At my seasonal meeting at Barnes & Noble, I received “large” trade buys, for a university press, including more than 500 copies of several of our titles. Additionally, we had a regional coffee table trade book with amazing comparable sales figures, a $45 price tag, and a 10,000 unit print run.

By the end of October, though, I could see that dramatic change was underway. While our daily sales figures were strong, sell-through at major retailers and wholesalers was disastrous. I warned my staff that in January or February of 2009 most of the stock we had pushed out so heavily into the distribution channels would come flying back at us and we would have to bear the expense. Soon, it was evident — we weren’t alone.

University presses, like every other book publisher, fell victim to the economic crash. At Kentucky, we quickly went into triage mode where we analyzed every facet of the business. The status quo was no longer accepted; rather, personnel had to defend decisions in a manner that made us better employees who were more aware of the business we were in. Thanks to strong management, Kentucky was able to reframe our business in months, instead of years.

But it wasn’t just publishers who were forced to examine costs and practices. Federal, state, and municipal budgets were under intense scrutiny, and as a result money was cut that had previously been earmarked for acquisitions at public libraries. State universities had tough decisions to make as enrollment numbers dipped and funding decreased. Library budgets, unfortunately, were one of the places they could trim.

For university presses, this meant three simultaneous hits: their retail sales were down as a result of a sagging economy; their university subsidies were decreasing; and their most trusted revenue stream, libraries, weren’t buying at the same rate. Ultimately, this was unsustainable.

Over the next few years, university presses devoted enormous resources to stabilize their businesses. With Amazon’s Kindle emerging as the first legitimate eBook retailer and with the new iPad showing the potential of what enhanced content could look like, publishers had to revolutionize their internal workflow and develop new ways to distribute their books. From contracts and royalty structures to data management systems and book design, this was no small undertaking.

Additionally, an eBook market in the library space also began to take shape. Agglomerators such as ebrary, NetLibrary, MyLibrary, and University Press Scholarship Online were first to market. The University Press Content Consortium powered by Project Muse and Books at JSTOR were quick to follow. All of these platforms attempted to provide an economical solution for both the publishers and the libraries. With models such as demand-driven acquisition as an option, no longer would publishers have to print 10,000 units on comparable sales histories and libraries could analyze what should be bought according to actual usage.

One of the benefits of the economic collapse and the model interrogation for both libraries and university press publishers was a higher level of communication between these two siloed groups. Prior to 2008, university presses, especially within marketing and sales departments, generally didn’t understand library purchasing and, to be quite frank, had no interest in learning about it. Sales managers took their approval plan numbers from Blackwells, Coutts, and YBP for granted. There was an assumption that putting stock in the hands of the approval teams was where their job ended.

After the collapse, however, a dialogue between the two parties became necessary. At a Charleston Library Conference roundtable in 2010, I was astounded at how poor the information exchange had been. For example, many of the acquisition librarians assumed that most university presses were selling 1,000 monographs (by then monograph sales for a medium-sized university press were in the 400-500 range, now down to 200-300), and many of the presses had never even seen the OASIS or GOBI library portals.

This digital interrogation wasn’t just limited to eBooks. As the eBook market was providing an economic bubble to help curb expenses and increase margin, another technology began to explode. It was a new way of printing that would eliminate the need to overprint, ship to a warehouse, ship to a customer, and then ship back to a warehouse. This new solution to a gigantic economical publishing problem was POD.

Print-on-demand (POD) technology had existed since the late 1990s when Lightning Source first burst onto the scene, but only after the economic crash did its value proposition really make sense for university presses. Because POD didn’t quite match its offset competition from a quality perspective, publishers often overlooked POD and continued with printing large quantities for better unit cost and better quality. However, as overprinting and obsolescence became a larger problem with publishers who hadn’t adjusted their business models and sales expectations quickly enough, finance teams began cost-benefit analyses of what a shift to POD might mean for their companies.

As publishers continued to work on their publishing programs at a high level, university administrators and state governments began some evaluations of their own. For universities, this often meant a change in internal structure in terms of who university presses should report to, or who would control their subsidies. Within a few years, presses such as Arizona, Indiana, Georgia, and Kentucky were either folded into the library or saw the library control their funding. Claiming there were synergies within these two generally distinct operating units, administrators attempted to both maximize efficiency and reduce costs. As a result, publishers and librarians, who for years didn’t co-mingle, were now sharing office spaces.

One of the unfortunate by-products of the economic crash was an overall increase in prices for monographs. When publishers began looking at internal profit/loss statements, the obvious choice to help offset the decrease in copies sold was to raise prices by $5 or $10 per book. Some of these decisions, as well as increased prices across major textbook and journal publishers, caused state governments to take note.

Large states with major budgetary problems stemming from the crash asserted there was a crisis at hand: book costs were out of control for their college students.

What for decades was a relatively stable and rather staid industry faced a convergence of events. Simultaneously, university presses had to account for decreased net sales, an eBook technological shift, a change in printing technology, a reduction in subsidies, a movement toward library-university press partnerships, and a mandate from state governments to make books more affordable. Articles in the press, as they seem to do every year or two, announced forthcoming doom for academic publishing.

U unequivocally, however, university presses have responded to these challenges. Rather than relying on pre-2008 publishing models, university presses continue to experiment as a means to respond to all of the various economic factors facing them. This year, for example, the University of North Carolina Press launched a series of open access monographs, which exist for free in digital form and for a small cost in a POD print format. As a way to foster a closer relationship with its library, the University Press of Kentucky made its entire out-of-print library available in a digital repository for free. In Florida, The University Press of Florida helps offset high costs for its college students with its open access textbook program, Orange Grove. The University of California Press has a position open for a marketing manager whose responsibility is to help lead an open access initiative, and even the largest university presses, such as Princeton, have experimented with one-off OA projects.

There’s no going back to the days of large seasonal buys at Barnes & Noble and standing continued on page 16
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Although presses range widely in terms of size, audience, and mission — University of Chicago Press is not like the University of Oklahoma Press, and University of Michigan Press is not like Kent State University Press — most generally face outward to scholarly associations, researchers, and society writ large, rather than inward toward their campus. Libraries, however, are typically inward, locally, toward their faculty and students. Understandably, that means libraries, comparatively, have enviable influence and power inside the university. They have solid networks and access to campus resources. They have the ear of the provost, may have contact with the president, and have a deep institutional history. Plus, people — donors — give libraries money. In contrast presses construct networks with societies, researchers, institutes, and authors, often in subject areas only loosely connected with the university. Consequently, presses historically built few if any powerful allies inside the university. Moreover, presses only rarely receive significant capital support. Once a press was moved under a library, for good or for ill, it quickly learned what a difference a library could make vis à vis recognition and access on one’s own campus. For the first time, a few presses found institutional support and political cover in their relationship with the library.

Presses operate on the basis of a (theoretically) revenue-generating, cost-recovery market model; libraries operate on a subsidized, expenditure-based budget. As I have said often, libraries are given a pot of money out of which they must control their expenditures and operate successfully. Presses, in contrast, are given a largely empty pot (an average allocation applied to operating expenses is 8%–13%) and are told to fill it with money. While neither is easy, those two approaches to managing finances are wildly different. Understanding existentially the difference between the two approaches is nearly impossible for either side and is the source for ongoing misunderstanding.

A third difference is linked both to the inward/outward and to the difference in how finances operate. On the one hand, libraries are service-oriented; their “performance” does not depend on generating revenue to pay for costs. Although they obviously need money to offer services, the work that libraries do does not itself typically generate that revenue. Presses, on the other hand, are product-driven, and they are product-driven precisely because their product’s sales performance determines their financial outcome. They’re not spending from a pot of money, but are trying to fill that pot. But presses do more than cover operating costs when they sell a book or article. They are also generating a positive return (Tenure and Promotion) for their authors, societies, universities, and other partners, and they squirrel away money for the future. Libraries acquire their enormous clout and influence on campus precisely because they are so good at serving the campus community with the resources they receive. A library accomplishes its mission by serving its campus. Presses, however, facing outward and being output- or product-driven, are not a service culture (though they serve their university in other ways, e.g., in representing the university). This crucial distinction dictates that libraries say yes far more than they say no. Presses are exactly the opposite. Presses say no far more than they say yes. Presses simply cannot afford to say yes to every local or external publishing opportunity, even when their mission begs for them to do so, because measured use of resources is directly tied to their ability to meet their goal of output (=revenue). And their survival depends on achieving their goal.

What has transpired since the first Against the Grain article appeared? Are there any lessons to be learned about how presses and libraries can better cooperate, collaborate, and survive? Evidence from the AAUP report on press-library collaborations and from the Library Publishing Coalition confirm that library-press collaborations have evolved and remain here to stay. It seems fairly certain, too, that “best practices” continue to be in relatively short supply. There are as many models in the relationship as there are presses and libraries. The differences, for example, among Penn State, Michigan, Indiana, and Temple, are legion. Press-library partnerships remain in ferment, and no single template for how these partnerships work exists.

Over time, both presses and libraries have evolved. Cultural differences shaped that evolution, motivating presses and libraries to adapt. Some early players, like California Digital Library, which is specifically designed to “support the University of California community’s pursuit of scholarship” have an established reputation and a decidedly local focus. Others, like MPublishing, serve a broader community, including outside the campus. Despite initiatives like the 2012 Amherst Col-
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Russell Sage Foundation. Libraries seem to be drifting away from traditional publishing (monographs and journals) and are instead applying their digital expertise to original campus-based, and journals) and are instead applying their from traditional publishing (monographs repression, we librarians add value to the learning experience. 1. Patrick H. Alexander. “Publisher–Library Relations: What Assets Does a University Press Bring to the Partnership?” Against the Grain, Dec. 2008–Jan. 2009, p. 40–42. One of the great things about the partnership at Penn State was the chance to work with Mike. While we did not always agree, we always talked. 2. Somewhat anecdotal, but pretty reliable. 3. http://www.aaupnet.org/news-a-publication/news/1094-library-press-collaboration-report—for-the-LPC; see: http://www.librarypublishing.org/ 4. http://www.calllib.org/about/mission.html. 5. http://www.publishing.umich.edu/. 6. The University of Pittsburgh’s Office of Scholarly Communication and Publishing publishes an impressive number of open access journals. It is unclear, however, what financial model supports their operation. Many of its journals have a campus component, which makes sense; others do not. 7. http://leverinitiative.wordpress.com/. 8. Listen to E. O. Wilson talk about the leaf-cutter ants and mutualistic symbiosis: http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/evolution/library/01/2/013_05.html. E.O. Wilson, Ants and Ecosystems. All rights reserved. 2001 WGBH Educational Foundation and Clear Blue Sky Productions, Inc.

by Maria Bonn (Senior Lecturer, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Illinois) <mbonn@illinois.edu>

As I note in the forthcoming book on academic libraries and scholarly publishing (Getting The Word Out: Academic Libraries and Scholarly Publishing, Maria Bonn and Mike Furlough, editors, ACRL, forthcoming, 2015), in recent years library publishing activities have drawn increasing attention within the professional world of academic libraries, from the scholars those libraries serve and from established scholarly publishers who seek to assess both opportunities and threats presented by this activity. This work goes by a number of names, with varying connotative values: library publishing, publishing libraries, library publishing services, library publishing support services, and even just publishing. Whatever this work is called, a sufficient number of libraries are engaged in it that when the Library Publishing Coalition (LPC), a collaborative effort to “support the emerging field of library publishing” was formed in 2012, more than fifty college and university libraries paid their membership fees and added their names to the directory. LPC’s first Library Publishing Forum, in March 2014, was filled with people engaged with publishing and libraries, eager to share their experiences and their challenges. The 2015 edition of the directory, just released as of this writing, contains 124 entries and represents 56 member libraries. This evidences significant growth in library publishing support activities (both activity and interest) since its emergent years in around the turn of the millennium.

As director of the University of Michigan’s Scholarly Publishing Office, founded in 2000, this author was an early entrant into the field of library publishing. In 2001, I organized a panel for the Digital Library Federation (DLF) Forum entitled “Library Approaches to Scholarly Publishing.” The panel was the first of its kind for DLF, and was populated by what I came to call the usual suspects, a group of pioneers, individuals from the institutions that were investing substantially in library publishing (at the time, representatives from Cornell’s Project Euclid, California’s E-scholarship, and Columbia’s CIAO, along with myself from Michigan), a group whose members soon found themselves presenting together on many similar panels in a variety of venues. While library publishing raised many interested eyebrows, at the time there were only a handful of libraries actively engaged in and committing resources to publishing. Thirteen years later, at the 2014 DLF forum, we see a panel on “Publishing in Your Library: Defining Purpose, Policies, and Practices” and its description leads with: “Publishing in libraries seems to be everywhere (emphasis mine) these days — from university press collaborations to public libraries providing self-publishing services.” Similarly, but in a different context, this author spoke, again with those same pioneers, at a 2004 Society of Scholarly Publishing (SSP) meeting on “What Are Those Librarians Up To and Should We Care?” The room was full, and the audience members, mostly publishers, ranged from curious to skeptical to downright antagonistic about libraries “claiming” to be publishers. In recent years, SSP and similar venues, such as the AAUP annual meeting, regularly feature sessions on publishing in and from libraries, sessions attended by those eager to learn about and assess both the challenges and the opportunities posed by this growth area of library activity. Indeed, one individual well-placed in SSP observed to this author that libraries that publish have become an area of special focus for SSP as representing an area of significant potential for membership growth.

At this juncture, it is not difficult to amass evidence that publishing is an area of interest and often investment for many academic libraries (and, in other forms, becoming so for public libraries as well). So it is natural to ask why we see so many libraries entering this space. There are multiple answers to that question, answers that often must be combined to come close to a complete answer. Libraries have, of course, long been intimately connected to publishers and publishing, existing in a relationship of symbiotic need. While the importance to libraries of publisher-as-supplier is evident, what is less often remembered or discussed is the long role of libraries as publisher. Many of the earliest U.S. academic presses got their start in university libraries in the decades surrounding 1900 (see Paul Courant and Elisabeth Jones, “Scholarly Publishing as an Economic Public Good” forthcoming in Getting The Word Out: Academic Libraries and Scholarly Publishing, ACRL, 2015). As most of those presses spun off into their own businesses and onto their own recognition, libraries continued predominantly as consumers rather than producers of publications. But in the last years of the twentieth century, several factors came together to change that. While library publishing certainly has arisen from a mission and service imperative (more on that in a moment), it also comes out of frustrations and dissatisfaction. Certainly libraries are dissatisfied with the high cost of commercial publications and have begun to ask if it might be cheaper to produce publications themselves. Libraries are also frustrated by the intellectual property constraints placed on scholarship by its publishers, constraints that make it difficult to carry out both the work of libraries and the work of the scholars and teachers they serve. But library publishing is driven by opportunity as much as anxiety. The rise of readily available technology and tools to support publishing, as well as easily accessible business services, has lowered the barrier to entry for many academic libraries and made stepping into the publishing space less daunting than it once appeared. Finally, there has been an increase in user demand and need on academic campuses, demand that service-driven librarians are often eager to meet. Scholars want to publish differently, for economic, principled, and functional reasons. Indeed, much of what scholars are driven to do is communicate, and the marketplace is poorly designed to support this essential function. So they turn to their libraries for help, and libraries are nothing if not eager to help.

Established scholarly publishers of all sorts — commercial, society, and university press — have watched this rise of library publishing with curiosity and consideration, wondering if it represents a new form of competition or new possibilities for collaboration and support. This author once attended a conference session where she heard a highly placed publishing executive assert that publishers exist to “connect users and information,” a sentiment she heard, at a different conference, expressed by the dean of a major research library in exactly those words, substituting libraries for publishers. As one who has spent much time in both libraries and publishing houses and has great fondness and respect for both, I would encourage libraries and publishers not to contend for the role of primary connector and instead recognize their shared interests, passions, and mission and see how they might best work together to further those. Publishing libraries need to learn from publishers, and publishers need to learn from librarians in order to adapt and thrive in a rapidly changing information environment. The collocation and institutional alignment of university libraries and university presses poses a particularly rich opportunity for this exchange of expertise and experience. Both will benefit from exchanging and mutually nurturing their skill sets and experience in training. It is this belief that has given rise to my nascent efforts at the Graduate School of Library and Information Science at the University of Illinois to create a program on “publishing as an information profession” and to develop a cadre of what we at the School informally call “pubrarians.” These pubrarians will be well-placed for employment in the swelling ranks of libraries that are publishing...
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and offering publishing services, but they will also be poised and ready to make valuable additions to the staff of other scholarly publishing organizations. Although the ranks of pubarians to come through my classes are still thin, many of the members look with interest to university presses as a possible place of rewarding employment.

There are a number of things that librarians already do and understand, and that are often a part of a library school education, that prepare them for work in publishing and to fill areas of real need in publishing enterprises. For instance, librarians understand metadata and discoverability tools and methods, an understanding that is increasingly necessary in publishing. Resources must be found to be used (and even purchased). While librarians are often not comfortable with the notion of, and activities associated with, marketing, they do understand how to promote resources and services to users, promotion that could stand publishers in good stead. University presses might particularly benefit from librarian expertise in campus outreach. Librarians have also, as have publishers, taken quickly to the use of social media as an awareness tool for reaching readers and other information resource users.

Librarians pay attention to information economics (cash and otherwise), an attention that could result in valuable conversations with publishers on how to create the most mutually sustainable economic models for publishing. Librarians and presses might particularly enter into dialogue about the alternative, sometimes complementary, economics of mission alignment and market alignment and how both might shape the ecosystem of scholarly communication.

Librarians are attentive to intellectual property laws and their implications, again fodder for cross-conversation with publishers about rights management that meets the needs of authors, publishers, and consumers. In the academic context this conversation can and should focus on how best to advance the production, distribution, and use of scholarship.

Librarians think about system design and usability for the optimal information experience, a perspective that could increase the value of the publisher products to which it is applied, particularly as publishers immerse themselves ever more deeply in electronic and online delivery of their products.

Librarians pay attention to standards, standards that matter to publishers, ranging from the requirements for archival paper to the more au courant topics of EPUB and XML specifications. Part and parcel of knowing and applying standards is attention to the implications of publication decisions for long-term preservation (which, indeed has been one driver of library publishing). Attending to those implications from the earliest publication stages will position publishers well in creating products with a competitive advantage while ensuring their long-term viability.

It may appear trite to observe that librarians are well trained in conducting what they call the reference interview, but that training stands them in good stead in conversations with authors and editors, in eliciting their goals and needs and matching those to available resources and methods. In many academic libraries, librarians are also experts in subject areas, including the publishing environment of the disciplines for which they are responsible, an expertise that positions them well to offer authors and other creators editorial guidance. Such guidance might profitably be offered as an alternative to or in support of the work of a university press developmental editor.

Finally, librarians are often veteran project managers. Any publisher who has spent time managing authors, working to publication deadlines, and wrangling with the special combination of authors, production staff, and distribution services can testify that every publication is a project in its own right, requiring both attention and expertise to manage to a successful launch and an established place in the scholarly world.

One can easily imagine (and given space enough and time, this author could easily produce) an inventory of complementary skills that experienced publishers would bring to libraries. Certainly such skills would help ensure the success of publishing libraries. One can even imagine how expertise in such things as marketing, attractive design, and rights agreements (to name just a few areas in which publishers are often conversant) could benefit many areas of library work beyond the emerging work of publishing in libraries.

While this essay intends to underscore the growing scope and range of library publishing activity and suggest the kinds of skills needed for its success, I am also arguing for a productive exchange between libraries and other kinds of scholarly publishers, particularly those from the close academic cousins of libraries in university presses. Through conscious and deliberate sharing and exchange, and through recognition of shared purpose, the two can and will contribute to building an environment that ensures the viability, in the moment and over time, of the scholarly record.

Three Challenges of Pubarianship

by Charles Watkinson  (Associate University Librarian for Publishing, University of Michigan, and Director, U-M Press)  
<watkinc@umich.edu>

S

can the “positions vacant” advertisements from the last year and it is clear that an interesting new type of job is emerging in libraries — combining directorship of a university press with senior responsibilities for other scholarly communication activity on campus. Such titles include Executive Director of Temple University Press and the Library Officer for Scholarly Communication, Director of Purdue University Press and Head of Scholarly Publishing Services (Purdue Libraries), Director of Indiana University Press and Digital Publishing, and Director of University of Michigan Press and Associate University Librarian for Publishing. In an extreme example (not from the jobs list), the University Librarian at Oregon State University has for a number of years also been Director of Oregon State University Press.

What these new positions exemplify is a movement not only toward more university presses reporting to libraries (from 14 AAUP members in 2009 to 21 in 2014), but also a trend toward increasing integration of the two entities. Physical collocation of staff with both library and press backgrounds, joint strategic planning exercises, and shared support infrastructure are other characteristics of the most integrated press/library collaborations.

Even where the heads of university presses exploring these opportunities for integration do not hold the sort of joint titles listed above (as at Northwestern, North Texas, Georgia, and Arizona, for example), their roles are changing as they assume greater responsibilities in library administration.

Such integration presents great opportunities (as described elsewhere in this issue of Against the Grain), but it also creates challenges for the leaders of these merged entities — exemplars of the new role of “pubarian” so named by John Unsworth (now occupying the equally merged role of Vice Provost, University Librarian, and CIO at Brandeis University). Having occupied two of the positions above over the last few years, first at Purdue University and now at the University of Michigan, three particular areas of challenge have emerged for me.
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Three Challenges of Pubrarianship from page 22

Challenge 1: Articulating the Value of Publishing to Library Colleagues

You must know the scene, whether it’s the red carpet on the night of the Academy Awards or Market Street in the Palmetto City as dusk falls. An apparently mismatched couple walks by, one short one tall, one ugly one beautiful, one nicely dressed one a mess, and we wonder… “What’s (s)he getting out of that relationship?”

As both a university press director and a member of the library leadership team, I often sense that my colleagues in libraries may be having the same question about press/library collaborations. It is pretty obvious to them what university presses are getting out of the relationship because the benefits are so tangible. The more integrated presses benefit from greater financial security, nicer space, access to better technology, and higher profiles in their parent institutions. But what benefits does a close collaboration with a university press bring to the library, financially at least, usually the better endowed party in the match?

In addressing this question, it helps to examine the ways in which press publishers can help academic librarians collaborate in, firstly, the research and, secondly, the teaching activities of disciplinary faculty.

On the research side, having a university press “in house” promises a library enriched opportunities to engage with, and understand, the needs of faculty members as authors, as well as users of information. We all know that there are real asymmetries in the ways that the same scholars behave when they are creators rather than consumers. For example, an advocate for the value of reusable open data may become peculiarly cagy when it comes to sharing her own research findings. University presses understand the care and feeding of authors, contributing perspectives and skills that early on can provide an advantage to libraries that identify the similarities between imbedded subject liaisons and acquisitions editors, and are willing to explore them further. Publishers also appreciate the systems of reward and prestige that motivate authors, and if given the opportunity to do so can usefully inform the design of services and systems, such as data repositories or author identification schema, that rely on enthusiastic academic opt-in rather than grudging conformity to really take off.

On the learning and teaching side, university presses offer libraries new opportunities for demonstrating relevance with administrations that are increasingly focused on creating an undergraduate student experience that is both more engaging and affordable. Most well-publicized are several initiatives to create open or inexpensive textbooks based on library/press collaboration, although the particular conventions of that complex type of publishing make success elusive. Textbook authors still generally expect a level of silver-platter service and gourmet financial incentive that is difficult to deliver economically. Emerging opportunities to engage students in the publishing process, as authors and editors, seem more promising. As our parent institutions move to more engaged, experiential styles of teaching and learning, the press in the library offers the opportunity for students to not only research a real-world topic but also publish about it, whether in an undergraduate research journal or edited book. That is a rich way to incen- tivize student engagement, combining several high impact learning practices and offering a tangible outcome from the experience for them to use in graduate school and job interviews. By working together to leverage publishing as pedagogy, presses and libraries may also help educate the next generation of scholars in more progressive attitudes to scholarly commu- nication — a worthwhile long-term play in changing reactionary academic cultures that will benefit us all.

Challenge 2: Shaping the Merged Publishing Program

University presses without the scale of the multinationals are often advised to focus their attentions on a few types of publication rather than trying to be generalists. Such targeted strategies allow presses to maximize the use of their limited resources. A press publishing in a few subject areas can send acquisitions editors to almost all the relevant conferences, can reuse mailing lists for almost every book produced, and can adopt efficient, template-driven approaches to design and production since most products geared for a particular discipline are similar to each other. Oriented toward a manageable number of areas of study, the editors will generally have a clear idea of what manuscripts to pursue and what topics to commission in. The processes of selection that are essential to university press publishing provide an additional filter, while the need to recover revenue from sales imposes the discipline of the market on the whole process.

Broaden the mission to require relevance to the parent institution as well as key disci- plines, and the question of what to prioritize becomes more complex. A publishing director challenged to provide services to the entire campus community may initially feel flush with opportunities to publish, especially if situated in a large comprehensive university. But facing such choice can feel like drinking from the fire hose, with the risks of ending up flailing in a large pool of freezing water all too real. Where does one even start in building a publishing program that is relevant across a large research university as well as trans-institutionally valuable to a few key disciplines?

The reality, of course, is that most potential projects suggested by institutional stakeholders are unrealistic in terms of the types of capacity needed to accomplish them well. The skills and resources needed to launch a major scientific journal, for example, are different from those used to create excellent books. Also, while technology has leveled the playing field to a certain extent, the design and marketing of a major introductory textbook requires an infra-structure and Web of relationships that takes years to develop. This is why most library publishers (working either with or without a university press partner) currently focus on the production of niche open access journals, conference proceedings, technical reports, and upper-level course companions. In these areas they can meet important areas of faculty and student needs which may have dropped through the cracks, without having to engage in unwinnable competition with established and better funded specialist publishers outside the institution.

And, while the university might boast comprehensive coverage, it is usually fairly clear internally where the areas of institutional pride and attention lie. Those are also often the places where there is the most money available to support publication, relieving the library of sole financial responsibility for open access publishing strategies. Even if initially not apparent, these sweet spots can be identified through trial and error. As products appear and gain less or more recognition, the broad spray of solutions gradually narrows to a more focused and powerful stream. And opportu- nities may emerge for working up the value chain from areas where trust has been achieved in servicing informal needs to create more formal, university press, products. Achieving disciplinary and institutional alignment are not necessarily contradictory goals.

Challenge 3: Protecting Existing Brands While Embracing New Opportunities

Most university presses rely on well-established credentialing processes to build their brands as book publishers: First, a promising manuscript is identified by an acquisitions or series editor and developed into a product that can be reviewed. Second, paid reviewers provide detailed reports. Third, an editorial board discusses and decides whether to pursue the project (and after how much further author revision). Fourth, a copyeditor works through the manuscript looking for errors of consistency and fact and the book is designed in a way that maximizes the look of authority. Fifth, the book is promoted to external reviewers so that other expert opinions confirm its excellence. These processes are immensely time and resource intensive, and the end product represents an extreme of formality and elegance; top hat, tails, shined shoes, and crisp white shirt.

For someone from a university press tradi- tion, whose publishing focus has usually been on producing top-end books, this is something very freeing in being able to operate in a campus environment where not every project needs such formal treatment. If visualized as a spectrum from informal to formal, the formal book (or journal) occupies a narrow space at the right-hand end of the continuum. To its left lie the many other types of publishing and dissemination needs that a campus community may have. There may be the proceedings of a symposium, for example, with papers already selected by the organizing committee. This needs moderate clean-up and speedy dissemination rather than a formal review process,
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Pursuing projects characterized by a range of formality presents a risk for a publisher whose responsibilities still include the university press imprint. How does one avoid undermining the hard-earned university press brand through association with lighter-weight publishing products? How might the publication of student scholarship affect the willingness of their professors to be published by the same organization? How can titles that have undergone careful peer review be distinguished from those that have been selected through less formal processes?

Reserving the university press ISBN prefix and colophon for traditional, formal books and distinguishing the appearance of non-press books both physically and online contributes to preserving the distinction. A faculty governance mechanism separate from the university press’s editorial board helps preserve a degree of oversight for publications that are still going to be associated with the university, but avoids confusion. Using different production and distribution workflows can relieve staff concerns about pressure of work as well as help to maintain the separation. All these are strategies for ring-fencing the university press brand, and many are already familiar to university presses that publish regional or trade books. They don’t remove all the possibilities for confusion, but they reduce them.

Despite the importance of protecting the brand, constant attention must be paid to the risk of keeping it too separate and reducing the opportunities for innovation and efficiency that the mixing of different types of publishing can bring. One thinks particularly of opportunities to more economically publish the revised dissertations which may start a scholar’s academic progression, in a way that is informed by streamlined journal workflows. And the dangers of fossilizing the “university press” brand so that it remains associated with print books and their electronic facsimiles rather than becoming the home of innovative digital scholarship that an increasing number of scholars are searching for.

Managing Two Identities
The word “pubrarian” may conjure up images of OPACs in an English bar rather than a merger of two great information professions. And traveling with two different business cards, one for the university press and another for the library, can make for a fat wallet. However, as libraries move to engage with the inputs as well as outputs of scholarship, and as publishers migrate from processing content to also providing the tools through which it is created, our joint capacity to serve the needs of scholars at all stages of their professional lives grows exponentially. The new pubrarians, whether they arrive in their roles through press/library collaboration or the organic growth of library publishing, may be at the forefront of creating such solutions. And that’s an opportunity worth minting a new word for. 🎉
You Complete Me: On Building a Vertically Integrated Digital Humanities Program at the University of Georgia

by Lisa Bayer (Director, University of Georgia Press) <lbayer@uga.edu>

“The means of knowledge dissemination may be different in an electronic age, but the mission remains the same.” — Robert Harington, “Reasons To Be Cheerful, Part 3,” The Scholarly Kitchen, October 31, 2014.

The opportunities for collaboration between the University of Georgia Press and the UGA Libraries, to whom it has reported for over five years, have not been a question of why or how, but why not and how often. Ours is one of approximately 25 U.S. and Canadian university presses reporting to their campus libraries. Refreshingly, the relationship was not a result of financial distress, and we have found that our commonalities, for the most part, outweigh our differences. The Press and the Libraries are currently working together with campus partners on DiGA (Digital Georgia), an interconnected, vertically integrated program intended to support new forms of digital humanities (DH) scholarship through teaching, research, publication, and infrastructure.

Faculty-driven by historians Stephen Berry and Claudio Saunt (whose Center for Virtual History was recently profiled in the Chronicle of Higher Education), DiGA’s key achievements thus far include a DH-focused faculty hire, a planned “di” rubric for course designation, and a Digital Humanities Lab, located in the main library next to the press, opening in the coming year. With crucial support from the Willson Center for the Arts and Humanities at UGA, we are working with funders both internally and externally on startup costs for infrastructure, staffing, planning, and other needs. Focusing on comparative advantages, Stephen Berry, Assistant Press Director and Editor-in-Chief Mick Gusinde-Duffy, and University Librarian and Associate Provost Toby Graham consider DiGA’s promise for generating and sustaining new forms of interpretive scholarship.

The project at Georgia involves a faculty-run digital humanities lab, the UGA Press, and the UGA Libraries. Why these partners? What sets this project apart from the many other DH projects that have preceded it? How are we different?

Steve: DH is an inherently collaborative discipline, but strangely few DH centers are set up to offer “end-to-end” support for large, born-digital, scholarly projects. We see any number of collaborations that involve multiple libraries, or multiple presses, or multiple faculty members, but this kind of “horizontal integration” has some limitations. For instance, it tends to reproduce and multiply the same culture — the culture of the Library, the Press, or the Faculty — and it does not result in true “end-to-end” support. We wanted something that would join these three cultures so we could all learn from each other.

Mick: A university press supports the overarching goals and mission of its parent institution. Those goals are typically built around three overlapping activities: teaching, research, and public service or outreach. As we think about the research aspect of our mission — helping develop scholarship and making ideas accessible to as many readers as possible — it makes sense to combine these three partners in the process. In fact, we are really only supplementing established areas of strength and responsibility: faculty do the research; presses review, refine, promote, disseminate (and monetize) the research; libraries collect, curate, and assure longevity and presentation standards for the scholarship. Those “responsibilities” overlap and interact in interesting ways in a mostly-digital environment, leading to shifting responsibilities and shared areas of expertise. This is a process we need to refine and learn more about, but the mission remains the same.

Toby: We know from the 2014 Ithaka S+R report on sustaining the digital humanities that even on campuses with DH centers, there is rarely a comprehensive solution in place to support faculty in all stages in the project’s life cycle. Programs most often lack sustainable sources of support. Also, there is a lack of clarity about how to establish the “value” of a project or output for the academy and society. We are advancing a vertical integration concept in which the institution will provide support for digital scholarship from origination through dissemination, including determining the scholarly merit of related outputs.

What are the possibilities of the Georgia project for bringing DH scholarship in line with more traditional monographic work in the humanities, e.g., implications for peer review, tenure and promotion, and channels of dissemination?

Steve: I think I am more sanguine about these hurdles than most. Technology makes peer review easier, not harder. Technology makes dissemination easier, not harder. Sure, evaluating a collaboratively-built, born-digital project is different than evaluating a single-author monograph, but we’re smart people, and really our standards don’t need to change: Does the project have scholarly value? Does it contribute to the scholarly conversation? What kind of contribution does it make? Those are the same questions we’d ask of a book or an article; we’re just asking them of a different scholarly form. Already the American Historical Association has drafted new guidelines to aid history departments in making exactly those kinds of evaluations. So I think we need to ready ourselves for a world in which these problems are actually solved, a world in which the ideas and arguments of scholars are free to live in the world in multiple forms simultaneously, some digital, some not.

Mick: I’m not sure it is a question of bringing DH scholarship in line with traditional monographic work. We are proposing the “deconstructed monograph” as part of our publishing program, after all. The Press certainly expects our DiGA program to be a rigorous, trusted resource for humanities scholars and their learned societies in general, and DH scholars in particular. Notions of what constitutes “tenure-worthy” intellectual accomplishment, scholarly contribution, impact, and even time invested in digital scholarship are still very much in flux. This is an instance where a Kuhnian paradigm shift is truly underway. DiGA’s role (and the Press’s in particular) is first to have a seat at the table as scholars and institutions work through these questions. And second to be as transparent and open as possible about our evolving peer review and dissemination process.

Toby: A viable future for DH publishing depends on the academy’s ability to evaluate the non-traditional manifestations of digital scholarship. Scholars must determine value for the most part, but there should be structure to the process. Publishers, and university presses in particular, have a long history of organizing, synthesizing, and adding value to the academic review of scholarship. We look to the University of Georgia Press to help us explore ways in which digital works might be vetted and credentialed through expert review.

What are the most significant challenges to the project? What are potential pitfalls that you wish to avoid?

Steve: Cost-recovery is a problem for anything that exists on the Web. But there are other (related) problems as well. The earliest DH projects were essentially primary source archives that, while lacking in analysis, effectively democratized the process of scholarship. Teaching faculty at a far remove from archives could now get to their sources while in their bathrobes. Next-generation DH projects, however, do not merely revolutionize how we store and access information but how we collect, sift, render, layer, visualize, and analyze it. (To be sure, there has been some backlash against digital humanists who con-
flate the coolness of their tools with the sophistication of their results. But we all know that we move toward an era in which DH will find its appropriate level — where the new tools will not replace traditional scholarship but extend and catalyze it.) This all sounds salutary, but also expensive, and therefore undemocratic. What we will be trying to do with this new project at Georgia is to come up with new, reproducible, extensible forms of DH scholarship where each iteration of the form is a little cheaper and easier to produce and where the aggregation of those iterations creates a resource that is more than the sum of its parts. This may sound a little vague, but it’s easier to think of in the case of the book. Each time we publish a book we don’t reinvent the book; the book as a form has rules and expectations — a table of contents, margins, an index — and it has a process and an infrastructure that once established makes it relatively easier to produce other books. But in the early days of DH a lot of the projects were expensive one-offs; they offered models for other projects, perhaps, but they didn’t create new forms. We think that is today’s challenge: to create the new forms and platforms that broad academic communities will agree to use.

Mick: Time, institutional commitment/support, and money, sadly. For an initiative of this scale to truly find its feet and become self-sustaining, we need the freedom to experiment (and the freedom to fail on some levels). We also need time to build momentum. A conventional publishing program typically needs five plus years to launch a new list, and this digital environment needs longer still. Take a look at some of the early instances of DH institutes and publishing collaborations related to those institutes, and you see the paradox of time in the hurry-up digital era. As for money, really the key challenge is financial sustainability. The DiGA collaboration will be trying a range of strategies to recover costs and fund future work: figuring out what we can, in good faith, sell (or license or rent); experimenting with “flipped” (producer pays) cost recovery models; focusing our home institution and external agency fundraising efforts. There are secondary challenges related to ever-changing technology and the desire to create a reproducible (open source, ideally) infrastructure.

Toby: As with most new efforts, sustainability is a key challenge. We want to generate excellent short-term results, but more importantly to create the longer-term organizational changes that will integrate digital scholarship support into the mainstream of our operations.

What benefits will the project bring to the institution, its faculty, its students, and other stakeholders? How will the project contribute to the scholarly record and to the missions of university presses and research libraries?

Steve: Well, I am perhaps most excited about the project’s potential to transform my teaching and the student experience here at Georgia. As professors, we are always talking about how our teaching and research should be integrated, and my whole career I worked hard to ensure they were — I was always teaching courses on whatever my next book project was, I always brought documents I had found at the archive into class — but the truth was I always felt like I was leading two lives. Since we have begun building our classes around our digital projects, however, I have that true sense of integration. Bringing students into the process of building digital projects — treating them as true collaborators — is enormously satisfying; you are finally modeling your passion not merely for a subject but for an investigative process, and you’re sharing the twists and turns and ups and downs of that process together. I think ultimately this will also help students better understand the value of the humanities because they will actually have participated in creating humanistic knowledge they cared about in a process that they loved.

Mick: The scholarship has already brought visibility to the institution, with the two directors of the DH initiative being named as ACLS digital fellows. As the DiGA project takes shape, the scholarship will be more broadly accessed and disseminated. There will be learning opportunities for faculty and students, working at various stages of the workflow from born-digital scholarship, through coding and technological skills, to opportunities further along the path from idea to fully-realized publication. Much of the research we want to cultivate and publish will have global impact, as it relates to Atlantic World Slavery, the Civil War Era, contemporary histories, and capitalism.

You Complete Me ...
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noted above, a project like this aligns very well with the missions of university presses and research libraries. By constructing a sustainable publishing infrastructure and workflow, we expect to support the research, teaching, and outreach of our parent institution while providing an example and expertise to the broader academic publishing community.

Toby: I am particularly excited about the prospects for undergraduate and graduate research and creative activity at our university. Through teaching and research services, academic libraries contribute significantly to students’ success in finding, evaluating, and using recorded knowledge. Our support of digital scholarship as a teaching method, however, allows us to go beyond this by expanding the opportunities for our students to contribute to the creation of new knowledge rather than just to consume it.

Potential funders like Mellon are increasingly looking to sustainability in terms of both infrastructure and institutional or other support when evaluating fundable projects. What are your thoughts on sustainability for the Georgia project, both short- and long-term?

Steve: The whole point of our new project is to weave it into broad, established infrastructures — the Lab, the Press, the Library — and into every aspect of university life — research, teaching, and service. This helps ensure long-term sustainability because it means our constituencies and audiences are truly broad, including university administrators, an interdisciplinary faculty, librarians and Press personnel, and a diverse range of students from both the humanities and STEM disciplines. Once something is stitched into the fabric of university life and into the university’s mission, sustainability becomes a little easier.

Mick: Faculty, university presses, and research libraries all require institutional support (infrastructure and funding) to do their work, and our work supports the core activities and mission of the university while extending the reach and visibility of the university’s accomplishments. This project is no different. University presses, as the publishing component of this venture, are unique to the extent they can cover portions of their expenses through business expertise (selling content). But there is also high interest in new digital publications being made available at little or no cost to consumers (faculty, students, a broader reading community). With that open access expectation, costs need to be recovered at other stages of the process. Variations of this “flipped” cost recovery model are part of what we hope to explore with DiGA. So, for DiGA, support will need to come from the university and outside funding agencies for the initial phase. If the project is given time to develop, the goal would be to see how much of the operating cost could be recovered through alternate funding and monetizing options.

From University Press to the University’s Press: Building a One-Stop Campus Resource for Scholarly Publishing

The Office of Scholarly Publishing (OSP) was established in 2012 by Indiana University in order to strengthen its central missions of scholarship and teaching, and to create a model of effective, sustainable 21st-century academic publishing. Units of the OSP include Indiana University Press (IU Press), its premier imprint, and IUScholarWorks (IUSW), the open access publishing program of the IU Libraries.

The creation of the OSP is an important step in the evolution of scholarly publishing, as it shifts the engine of content dissemination on campus from the university press to the university itself. It signals the University’s strong and ongoing commitment to academic publishing during a time when the sustainability and even relevance of the traditional university press are questioned frequently.

The Office of Scholarly Publishing also reflects the University’s recognition of scholarly publishing in all the forms and processes emerging from rapidly changing digital communication technologies. As a centralizing publishing portal, the OSP supports a model of academic publishing that is intrinsically holistic and singular — many campus stakeholders participate in an integrated process of content development, enrichment, dissemination, curation, and knowledge transfer. Indiana University Press is playing a key role in bringing to fruition this new model by realigning with the mandate, goals, and areas of strength of the university; building partnerships with vital campus stakeholders to optimize efficiencies, economies, and the scalability of the publishing process; and becoming a key fulcrum in the leveraging of scholarly content in ways that both effectively disseminate and showcase faculty research and other content providers at Indiana University. As a showcase of campus research, the OSP helps to reinforce the brand of the University.

In addition to disseminating content, the Office of Scholarly Publishing — in effect, the University’s press — provides a complementary service as a one-stop resource for graduate students and faculty concerning the process of academic publishing itself. This includes programs and individual consultations on copyright, author rights, publishing options, and marketing and social media strategies; and overall becoming a more visible presence in the scholarly life of the campus.

Origins of the OSP

The Office of Scholarly Publishing was formed at the request of IU Bloomington Provost and Executive Vice President Lauren Robel, who sought to broaden and deepen research dissemination on campus and align that process strategically with the mandate and interests of the University. At its creation, she stated, “The landscape of academic publishing is rapidly changing, and traditional presses, including university presses, continue to be impacted by new technologies and financial challenges. Within this environment, it has become increasingly vital that we continue to build upon the considerable capabilities of our press while aggressively seeking new efficiencies, maximizing our use of new technologies and increasing collaborations among presses, libraries, and other potential partners.”

Robel appointed the OSP Scholarly Publishing Advisory Committee to advise the executive director, represent the faculty, and gather information on issues of importance to stakeholders. The committee, chaired by the associate vice-provost for arts and humanities in the Office of the Vice Provost for Research, included faculty from the humanities, the director of IU Press (ex-officio), and the library’s associate dean for collection development and scholarly communication (ex-officio).

The Scholarly Publishing Advisory Committee began the process of gathering information from stakeholders with an all-campus forum, led by the Provost, which kicked-off a series of three disciplined-focused salons (arts and humanities, sciences, and social and historical sciences) attended by faculty, press staff, library staff, and graduate students. Discussions focused on the present and future state of academic publishing in the context of the campus mission “to create, disseminate, preserve, and apply knowledge.”

In its report to the Provost the committee stated that based on salon discussions
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its recommendations “point to some basic rethinking of what constitutes publication, as well as a reconceptualization of how scholarly publishing is accomplished within the university.” Of particular interest to the OSP were recommendations three and four that dealt with providing advice, support, and workshops for graduate students and faculty on scholarly communication in the digital age. Workshops that focused on the publication process and useful tools in the production, dissemination, and publicizing of scholarly research were suggested. Faculty also expressed interest in learning about strategies to promote and market their books, developing successful book proposals, altmetrics, copyright, and open access.

**The OSP in Action**

In March 2013, IU Press moved to Herman B Wells Library from a location in downtown Bloomington. The move provided both a central campus location visited by faculty and graduate students as well as convenient access to seminar and classroom spaces.

Strategic planning for the alignment of IU Press with the University began in earnest in October 2014, with the appointment of Gary Dunham as Director of IU Press and Digital Publishing. A key first step in the strategic planning process is an assessment of all facets of the press’s book and journal programs so as to then

1. establish sustainable content deliverables and publishing services;
2. ensure industry best practices in day-to-day operations; and
3. align those deliverables and services with the strengths and interests of the University.

Significant demonstrations of the OSP as a publishing resource have already taken place. In late October 2014, the IU Libraries opened the Scholars’ Commons located on the first floor of the Wells Library. Both the move and the opening of the Scholars’ Commons provide the OSP with a unique opportunity to design and deliver workshops tailored to the recommendations in the advisory committee report and known needs of faculty and graduate students.

Designed to support the journey from curiosity to discovery to publication, the Scholars’ Commons offers space which includes individual and collaborative workspaces, a digitization lab, state-of-the-art technology, an interactive visualization or IQ wall, a lecture hall, and exhibit space. Experts from across campus, including from the OSP, are available to consult with and advise faculty and students.

In this environment, OSP held the first of two panel discussions on publishing your first book. The response was overwhelming. The first panel had over 90 registrations for 50 seats. The second was moved to a larger room and over 140 registered. The IUP marketing director and a senior editor as well as two faculty members who published with IU Press participated on the panel. In fall 2014, workshops on book proposals (50 registrants) and book contracts (45) were held. Before each workshop, attendees are emailed and asked what questions they would like to see answered. Examples from the book proposal session included:

- How long should a proposal be?
- What are the key elements in a good proposal?
- At what stage in the preparation of the book manuscript should I start writing the proposal?
- What supplementary materials should I send along with the book proposal?
- What is the best way to get in touch with an editor?

A survey was sent to the attendees of the “Publish Your First Book” sessions, and a majority of the respondents wanted the session broken down into more focused topics such as
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turning your dissertation into a book, writing a proposal (the most requested topic), what you need to know before signing a contract, manuscript preparation, getting permissions, how to create an index, and marketing your book. Other feedback recommended clearly defining the intended audience for all workshops as well as the discipline focus. Many appreciated the expert advice but wanted to hear directly from faculty who had recently published their first book. Samples of good proposals were also requested. All of these ideas will be incorporated into planning future events.

The robust workshop program offered in the Scholars’ Commons is divided into four tracks. OSP programs are offered in the “Surviving and Thriving in Academia” and “Tools in Context” tracks. Attendees at workshops, including those offered by OSP staff, are from a wide variety of disciplines. Attendees at the session on publishing a first book were from education, telecommunications, Jewish studies, religious studies, theatre, communication and culture, law, music, informatics, fine arts, political science, applied health science, speech and hearing, English, and more. “Before Signing a Book Contract” (waitlisted) and “Getting Permissions for Your Book” have been added to the workshop series based on feedback and the faculty advisory committee report. Programs on open access publishing and using Open Journal Systems for peer review are also popular. OSP staff also participated in Open Access Week programs on student publishing and the basics of publishing agreements.

IU Press staff (alternating among marketing, editorial, and journals), the copyright program librarian, and the open access publishing manager offer weekly consultation services in the Scholars’ Commons for two hour blocks of time for a total of six hours a week. In addition to OSP, partners in providing consultation services include University Information Technology Services, Center for Survey Research, Office of Research Administration, Office of Vice-Provost for Research, HathiTrust Research Center, and Indiana Statistical Consulting Services.

Consultations services and workshops are publicized through faculty newsletters, blogs, Websites, departmental listserves, email to Graduate and Professional Student organization members, and via email to previous workshop attendees. So far, IU Press has amassed a mailing list of close to 300 previous workshop attendees to use when announcing new programs.

In today’s increasingly complex publishing environment, it is difficult for experienced faculty, and even more difficult for recently appointed tenure-track faculty, to determine the best publication option for their research. Sharing publishing knowledge and expertise within our own institution is an invaluable service OSP staff can provide and one that is greatly appreciated by administrators, faculty, and graduate students.

By developing the Office of Scholarly Publishing, Indiana University seeks to offer a more encompassing, sustainable, and relevant model of academic publishing on campus. Leveraging the strengths of the Libraries and Office of Scholarly Publishing visibly demonstrates the important roles that each have in supporting the research process. In doing so, both will be stronger for working together to fulfill the campus mission to “create, disseminate, preserve, and apply knowledge” and be active participants in the intellectual life of the university.

The founding of the Library Publishing Coalition (LPC) in 2013 appears to substantiate earlier claims from the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) that “[t]here is an emerging consensus that some sort of basic publishing services will become a core service for research libraries.” However, even with a growing LPC membership — and calls for digital publishing to be considered a new “core competency” for librarians — complete consensus among library leaders about publishing has not yet been reached.

The lack of agreement is hardly surprising: if publishing services do become part of the core identity of academic libraries, it will represent a fundamental shift in the role of libraries within the scholarly community. Beyond this philosophical transition, it also presents a practical challenge for library administrators; as noted in Mike Furlough’s discussion of library publishing, “library budgets [...] are not infinitely flexible, and it can also be difficult to continually absorb new services with existing staff.” Despite these challenges to both tradition and resources, however, it is becoming increasingly evident that for academic libraries — both large and small — to continue to provide unique value to our local and global communities, publishing must become an integral part of our identity.

From Commercial Collections to Unique Creations

While some libraries have been engaged as publishers for well over a decade, there are two recent arguments that point to the necessity of a profession-wide shift towards library-as-publisher. Both arguments recognize that the traditional focal point for libraries — our commercially purchased collections — no longer provide the distinct value that they once did. As Scott Walter notes, “when access to content is no longer scarce,” the ability of a library to provide access to books and journals is less “distinctive” than the services (teaching, research support, publishing, et al.) that the library provides to its community. Similarly, Rick Anderson observes that “[a] small and fast-shrinking number [of the purchased books in his library’s circulating collection] is checked out or even consulted by students and faculty in any given year, and yet their acquisition and management absorbs roughly 25% of our library’s total fund of staff time.” In light of this disparity between committed resources and observed value to the community, Anderson calls on libraries to pivot from “commodity documents” (commercially available works) to dedicate resources toward “provid[ing] broad and easy access to the intellectual content of rare and unique non-commodity documents that would otherwise remain unfindable and unusable.”

Although he is speaking specifically about rare and special collections, it is reasonable to apply the same logic to the publication of unique and valuable scholarship — which, for lack of a publisher (because it was deemed commercially unviable or too niche), would remain “unfindable” to other scholars (and for which, if simply shared online, the author could...
not receive the formal recognition obtained through peer-reviewed publication). Walter and Anderson point to an increasingly shared conclusion: in a world of seamless resource sharing and collaborative library consortia, in which dozens (and sometimes hundreds) of libraries hold the same titles and subscribe to the same journal and eBook packages, it is easy to see that there is unnecessary duplication of resources and effort within our community. This needless duplication is occurring at the same time that there is a demonstrated need for additional resources to be dedicated to university-based publishing programs (as of 2009, there were fewer than 100 university presses in the United States to support faculty scholarship from 2,719 colleges and universities). Academic libraries are well-positioned — and even compelled by our mission to disseminate knowledge — to shift resources and effort away from traditional, less valuable services, and to meet the need of authors and the broader scholarly community for quality, scholar-driven, non-commercial publishing venues.

Addressing Quality Concerns by Committing Resources

As libraries explore this shift, however, there is some skepticism that library-based publishing services will offer the same quality and value as those provided by traditional university presses (leaving aside the group of libraries in which independent presses have been organizationally located). Such skepticism (both external and internal to the library community) is likely due in part to the perception — and in many cases, the reality — that library publishing services are being tasked on as extensions of digital library or institutional repository programs; that, in effect, the focus for libraries is on providing access to as much information as possible rather than providing the services necessary to create a quality scholarly product. This perception has doubtless been exacerbated by statements from the library community such as those found in ARL’s Research Library Publishing Services report, which observes that it “could be a short step” from “repository services” to “managing publication of works like journals and monographs.”

While skepticism from within the scholarly publishing community is frustrating for libraries that are making significant attempts to respect traditional publishing processes, such doubt is merited in cases where libraries are not able or willing to commit the resources needed to engage in the meaningful review, editing, and production of scholarly products (e.g., books). Although additional financial commitments from university administrators are ultimately necessary to grow and validate library publishing, libraries must demonstrate the importance of the shift from solely collecting “commodity documents” to publishing original works by rethinking our internal priorities for staffing and financial resources. Especially for smaller libraries, a commitment to a new identity as scholarly publisher may require significant restructuring and evaluation of legacy services that no longer provide the value they once did — particularly in the face of the value that can be provided through publishing services.

Open Questions for Library Publishers

For small academic libraries, which are largely absent from ARL-dominated literature on library publishing (with some notable exceptions4), the decision to pivot towards publishing services leads to several key questions: What skills and resources are needed in order to ensure quality and avoid Daniel Coit Gilman’s disdained practice of “printing without publishing”?5 In what ways should the traditional work of the library change in order to accommodate this shift in focus? At the same time, in what ways can the work of publication be connected with traditional work and skills found within the library? I will attempt to begin to address these questions here — first by focusing specifically on the necessary skills and resources, and then by speaking to the remaining questions of what a library transformed to focus on publishing as a core service area might look like. While my focus is on smaller academic libraries — which are presumed to have less room for flexibility with staffing and resources, and so present a unique challenge — it is my hope that some of the ideas presented will be relevant for any library.

Before moving forward, it is important to explicitly state several assumptions and limitations that underlie this exploration. This discussion:

- Focuses on the requirements for monograph publishing. Journal publishing has a lower threshold to entry and different considerations.
- Focuses on traditional, comprehensive publishing services. There is a continuum of library publishing services, which range from simple dissemination to comprehensive peer-reviewed publication. While less than comprehensive publishing services do provide value, there have been fewer questions about this “complementarian” role for libraries (in relation to university presses). This piece assumes “egalitarian” aspirations for library publishers/presses (in relation to traditional university presses).
- Assumes that a library is at an institution without an existing university press. Much has been written on library-university press partnerships, and those dynamics are beyond the scope of this piece.
- Assumes that universities recognize the value and importance of supporting scholarly publishing on campus (whether through an independent press or through a library-based press); this is not necessarily a given.

Monograph Publishing Requirements

Traditional monograph publishers (whether focused on print or digital books) address seven
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Without properly packaging, promoting, and selecting manuscripts for processes are concerned with identifying, substantive and copy editing services to functions of the press. While libraries can the collections to respond to local research of potential works. Selectors seek to deepen collection building: "Editors narrow the field antithetical to librarians' inclusive approach to editorial filtering process is, to a certain extent, editorial and the production and distribution of the published work that may the importance of these tasks and the library’s commitment to quality — rather than attempting to perform them in-house with subpar results. (Outsourcing some tasks may still require the library to revisit or sunset existing practices in order to make resources available). The following recommendations address possible strategies — whether library reorganization or outsourcing — for supporting press functions.

Acquisitions and Editorial — In order for a library press to maintain the editorial independence and academic freedom that are hallmarks of university presses, it is recommended that the editorial leadership of the press be located outside of the library. While the library director should function as press director and serve important management functions, an external (to the library) editorial board and experienced editors should be appointed to oversee manuscript selection, peer review, and any necessary developmental editing with authors. Engaging faculty (both internal and external to the institution) in these roles not only ensures appropriate scholarly expertise to guide authors, but also addresses a concern expressed regarding university presses that “active scholarly leadership” has been “considerably weakened” by a diminished role for scholars.

One model from a library-based press that creates an explicit delineation between editorial and production processes is seen at the Australian National University Press (ANU Press). The ANU Press uses over 20 disciplinary editorial boards (composed of faculty and scholars both internal and external to the university) to solicit manuscripts, oversee peer review, and ensure the final quality of accepted manuscripts before they are delivered to the press for production and distribution. While it may not be necessary to compensate editorial board members, faculty engaged in more direct editorial functions will require compensation. For example, Pacific University is currently considering a library press plan that, in addition to a volunteer editorial board, proposes stipends or course release for faculty with relevant expertise to serve as developmental editors. The proposed editorial structure also encourages release from additional university service for faculty who volunteer as acquisitions editors for the press (working in conjunction with the board to solicit and review manuscripts/proposals).

By investing greater control in faculty and scholars who are engaged with the press as board members or editors, a library is able to commit more resources to — and restructure responsibilities to — support of these functions — the management, production, distribution, and marketing of press titles. Creating Space for Management, Production, Distribution, and Marketing — Restructuring and reallocation of resources should not be primarily based on identifying discrete tasks or areas for efficiency in order to make room for the additional work of publishing. Instead, it should be driven by a philosophical commitment to the shift described earlier: from commercial collections to unique publications; from performing redundant processes to offering valuable scholarly services. A commitment to this shift will result in the identification of resources and personnel that are available to support the work of the press.

Fortunately, academic libraries have been considering — and experimenting with — a shift away from hand-picked collections “bought largely for the potential that they might someday be used” for quite some time. Realizing the resources and selectors’ time being devoted to building collections that were largely unused, many libraries have instituted patron-driven acquisition (PDA) programs (for e- and/or print books), and libraries like those at the University of North Texas and Oregon State University have declared a commitment to “access-based, JIT [just-in-time] service” and “a preference for access rather than ownership” that focus on meeting — rather than speculatively predicting — user needs. Although there is some debate as to the wisdom of PDA replacing item-by-item selection, carefully-constructed PDA programs for books, used in conjunction with approval plans, show considerable promise as a means of efficiently using (and saving) a library’s resources. This is especially true for undergraduate institutions, which don’t require the same type of collection focus or face the same accreditation requirements as graduate and professional programs.
Committing to a less speculative model of collection development is a fundamental step in reducing our emphasis on collecting widely available materials — however, it is not the only way in which libraries can refocus our work. For commercial materials that are purchased for library collections, reducing the amount of internal work needed to process these items is also important. For example, purchasing shelf-ready materials and catalog records from vendors can reduce unnecessary work in acquisitions and cataloging units. Efficiencies can also be found outside of individual institutions through collaborative efforts at the consortium level that eliminate the need for individual libraries to perform redundant tasks (as an example, consider the work of the Collaborative Technical Services Team in the Orbis Cascade Alliance)\(^1\).

Reducing the amount of time and resources spent by library staff on selecting, acquiring, and processing commercial content — and the above strategies are certainly not comprehensive — will create time for the library to engage in the uniquely valuable work of publishing original work. The units and personnel who will be most impacted by this shift are liaison librarians (subject specialists) and technical services — and, appropriately, these are the library staff who are most likely to have the skills and knowledge to support the press functions of management, production, distribution, and marketing.

**Management:** While production and distribution workflows may be integrated across different library units or positions, as will be discussed shortly, it is essential for the press to have a dedicated manager to supervise all processes. Assuming that it is not possible to create a new position, a reasonable solution is to reassign the most interested and qualified liaison librarian to this role (most likely one already involved in scholarly communication initiatives). If the librarian has existing collection development duties, these should be reassigned without much difficulty due to the decreased amount of time spent by each liaison on item-by-item ordering. Aside from collection development, changes to other traditional liaison roles may also be considered; there is a growing body of literature that calls for liaisons to transform their work in support of new services.\(^2\)

**Production:** While the press manager will coordinate production processes, the majority of the workflows should be integrated into technical services — or outsourced, as appropriate — with support from the systems librarian or unit. There is precedent for integrating scholarly production tasks within technical services (primarily within the context of institutional repository management)\(^3\) and for a shifting focus in technical services towards support for local collections/content.\(^4\)

For the purposes of the press, the production workflow should be understood to encompass everything from copyediting of the final manuscript to creation of eBook or print-ready files for distribution. Professional copyediting is outside of the expected scope of technical services staff, and should ideally be contracted to freelance copyeditors. However, library staff can perform initial checks on the manuscript for internal consistency of word choice, abbreviations, hyphenation, and similar items, as well as ensuring all references are correctly cited. Affordable tools such as PerfectIt and ReferenceChecker (both used by Sydney University Press) work seamlessly with Microsoft Word and can reduce the time needed by a professional copyeditor. These types of checks can even be performed by a student employee or publishing program intern.

Although not as common as metadata creation, there is evidence that technical services staff are already involved in formatting and editing content for digital publishing projects.\(^5\) Though the industry standard for monograph design and formatting has long been Adobe InDesign, the learning curve necessary to master the software — and the difficulty in exporting multiple formats to different digital distribution — normally makes using it untenable for inexperienced library staff. Fortunately, there are several platforms — both well-tested and emerging — that accommodate the single-source creation of print-ready PDFs and multiple formats of eBooks. IGP-Digital Publisher (Infogrid Pacific) is a full-featured platform used by Sydney University Press (who partnered with IGP on the development of the indexing module)\(^6\) and other scholarly publishers, and is available as a hosted portal or for local installation. Two newer offerings, Atlas O’Reilly and PressBooks, offer simpler interfaces and functionality, but still allow publishers to create attractive and user-friendly single-source book files for print and digital distribution. Because an enhanced WordPress plug-in is available for textbook authoring, PressBooks may be of particular interest to libraries interested in publishing open textbooks.\(^7\) Although use of any of these platforms would require library staff to become proficient with them, the efficiencies they bring over traditional desktop publishing programs should ultimately result in better use of staff time.

**Distribution:** Although certain aspects of distribution, such as negotiation of contracts with aggregators (e.g., JSTOR), discovery services (e.g., Google Books or OAPEN Library), or distributors (e.g., Amazon or Ingram), should be handled by the press manager, creating metadata for press works and delivering required metadata and files to distributors is well within the scope of technical services workflows. Registration and assignment of standard numbers (ISBNs, DOIs) or the creation of original MARC records (as seen at Australian National University in a workflow arranged between ANU Press and ANU Library cataloging staff) are basic components of the workflow, which may also include uploading records to WorldCat, placing requests for cataloging-in-publication data, and creating Excel spreadsheets or XML metadata files for delivery to aggregators. (It should be noted that these limited distribution tasks assume a common model among library publishers of digital and/or print-on-demand distribution, which removes the need to coordinate printing and distribution to wholesalers, retailers, or direct to consumers).

**Marketing:** While some library publishers of open access or print-on-demand titles may assume that easy availability and online access create enough visibility for a title, there is every reason to actively promote published works. Launch events (easily coordinated by library administrative staff or by liaison librarians) are opportunities to get news coverage and to raise the local visibility of the press. Promotional materials for launch events or materials like postcards or email/social media announcements can be designed by library staff, or in conjunction with university design personnel. Liaison librarians who specialize in the subject area of a specific published title are well-suited to suggest possible review sources (realizing the irony, of course, of having discouraged the use of library review sources by curtiling item-by-item selecting); the audience for such reviews would be other scholars in relevant disciplines or even the general public.

Although the focus here has been on scholarly monograph publishing, it is important to note that this restructuring and integration of publishing workflows can easily — and should — support a complete continuum of library publishing services, many of which may exist outside of a formal press structure. For example, the formatting and distribution of non-peer-reviewed content or the production of works from within the university community are common value-added services. Zera Books (University of Nebraska-Lincoln), Maize Books (University of Michigan), and Purdue University’s Scholarly Publishing Services are all examples of valuable publishing services provided by the library outside of the context of a traditional press.

**Sustaining Publishing as a Core Service**

Whether a library engages solely in traditional scholarly publishing — peer-reviewed monographs and/or journals — or expands its program to meet a wider spectrum of scholars’ needs, there must be a consistent focus on how best to sustain these services. Integrating them into the work of the library and connecting them to the library’s (and broader institution’s) strategic goals and priorities is a vital first step. However, it is not enough for the library to commit to publishing through reorganization and reallocating of finite resources. Library leaders must strike a balance by prioritizing publishing over legacy services and demonstrating the value of doing so, while also advocating with university administrators for new resources and personnel — in essence, demanding visible institutional recognition of that value. While other avenues for funding scholarly publishing exist — external funding from foundations (or governments, in the case of Canada)\(^8\) may be available, and author subventions are a recognized cost-recovery method — these cannot and should not substitute for an ongoing institutional commitment.
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Adjunct No More ... from page 33

The recent proposal from the Association of American Universities (AAU) and ARL for a “first-book subvention” explicitly recognizes the need for institutional subsidy of scholarly publishing. Actively affirming the evolution of libraries into scholarly publishers by dedicating additional funds to library presses is an equally important way for administrators to acknowledge the importance of scholarship and for universities to contribute unique and valuable knowledge to our scholarly community.

Acknowledgements: My thanks to the Australian Department of Education Endeavour Fellowships, Susan Murray-Smith and Agata Mrva-Montoya at Sydney University Press, and Lorena Kanellopoulos at ANU Press and Roxanne Missingham at ANU Library for supporting my exploration of library press publishing in Australia — and thanks also to Korey Jackson in Australia — and thanks also to Karla L. Hahn.

Rumors from page 25

And the truly incredible Leah Hinds (Charleston Conference) (how in the world does she keep up with it all?) was talking to Kimberly Lutz (ITHAKA) the other day only to learn that poor Kimberly has broken her elbow! Ouch!

One of the well established traditions of the Charleston Conference is the presentation of the Vicky Speck ABC-CLIO Leadership Award, which honors the late Vicky Speck, who was Editorial Director at ABC-CLIO until 2005. The award is given each year at the Charleston Conference to a leader who has made a lasting contribution to the Conference’s mission. It consists of a plaque and a cash award. This year’s recipient is Leah Hinds, Assistant Conference Director, and is very richly deserved. Vincent Burns, Vice President, Editorial at ABC-CLIO presented the award. http://www.against-the-grain.com/2014/11/the-vicky-speck-abc-clio-award/

As we go to press, we have just learned that Gerald T. Curtis of Scituate died peacefully on continued on page 47

20. Michael J. Furlough, p. 204.
24. Kevin Williams.
33. In a similar vein, pay-per-view (PPV) programs for articles in lieu of subscriptions offer another patron-driven, cost-saving option. See, for example, Clint Chadburner and Barbara MacAlpine, “Pay-per-view article access: A viable replacement for subscriptions!” Serials 21 (1, March 2008).
35. See https://www.orphicscascade.org/.
41. See https://wordpress.org/plugins/presbooks-textbook/.
42. See the Awards to Scholarly Publications Program, Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, http://www.ideas-
43. AAU and ARL, Prospects for an Institutionally Funded First-book Subvention (June 12, 2014). http://www.carl.org/publications-

http://www.against-the-grain.com/
How We Pay for Publishing

by Kevin S. Hawkins (Director of Library Publishing, University of North Texas Libraries) <Kevin.Hawkins@unt.edu>

How Did We Get into this Mess?

Higher education administrators, funding bodies, and librarians are unhappy with the cost to acquire and access scholarly literature, especially subscription-based journals from commercial publishers, whose price increases far outstrip the growth in library budgets. An outsider might ask how it can cost so much to get access to many leading scholarly publications in an age when it costs so little to produce copies of documents. After all, the retail prices of print books have been largely flat, despite inflation, and Amazon and Apple have driven down the prices for digital books and music.

Readers and authors are increasingly feeling the system’s dysfunction as well, finding that they are unable to get access through their institution to the publications that they need for their work and that acquiring their own copy is ridiculously expensive. While the problem has been created by commercial publishers skimming the cream of academic publications and then charging handsomely for access to these prestige brands, it has been difficult to effect change in the system because scholars are the consumers of the content but only rarely the purchasers of it; as with health care and prescription drugs, the true costs of market consolidation and intellectual property protection are not borne by the consumers of the services and products.

How Might We Get Out?

Many stakeholders in scholarly publishing want not only to see a more efficient market but also to make scholarly literature free to read and reproduce at the same time. The argument for this is strongest in the case of government-funded research, whether produced with support from a research grant or simply by virtue of the author’s employment at a publicly supported or mission-driven non-profit institution (such as a state or private university, respectively) — which frankly covers nearly all authors of scholarly publications.

Proposed interventions in the system aimed at increasing open access to scholarly literature are, broadly speaking, of two types:

a. Publishers claim that if they made their publications free to read, their sales or subscriptions would no longer cover their costs. Therefore, the academy could find money to give subsidies to the publishers beyond what they already pay for subscriptions to cover the “first copy” costs (what it costs the publisher to select, edit, and design the publication before producing copies to sell). This would free the publishers from the need to recover their investment through sale or subscription prices, allowing them to make their publications open access.

b. The academy could find a way to redirect the money that libraries pay for subscriptions towards covering the first-copy costs for open access. Proposals vary in the extent to which they propose publishers remain involved in this reimagined system of scholarly communication, but this action would in any case

continued on page 36
come at the expense of the profit margins currently made by many publishers.

The most notable version of (a) is the use of grant or institutional funding to pay an article processing charge (APC), a fee charged by a publisher to make open access an article that would normally be available only to subscribers. (This is sometimes referred to as “gold open access,” though “gold” can also refer to a journal whose content is entirely open access, rather than containing a hybrid of open access and non-open access articles.) But librarians and administrators are wary of paying such fees to publishers without a guarantee that they would save a corresponding amount on their existing purchases and subscriptions with these publishers. In our era of permanent fiscal austerity, there isn’t extra money for this sort of thing. Some efforts, like the Compact for Open-Access Publishing Equity (COPE), are designed to keep APCs from going to hybrid OA journals, thereby preventing “double-dipping” by a publisher receiving both subscription revenue and APCs.

Concern over double dipping — and more generally a concern that if publishers are allowed to set the fees, institutions will not really correct the dysfunctional market — is leading to greater interest in variations on (b). Most strategies risk a “free rider” problem: if you could pay to make content open access, why not let others do so instead and simply take advantage of what they do? While there is generally goodwill among libraries to effect change, those libraries feel powerless to do so alone and under pressure to achieve as much access to content as possible.

To get around this conundrum, and no doubt drawing inspiration from SCOAP,1 schemes like Knowledge Unlatched;2 the proposal for a Library Partnership Subsidy (LPS) by the Open Library of the Humanities,3 and the AAU/ARL Task Force on Scholarly Communication’s “Prospectus for an Institutionally Funded First-book Subvention”4 (which proposes that colleges and universities give a publication subvention for their faculty members’ first books that are accepted by a reputable publisher) use assurance contracts, whereby the arrangement only goes into effect if enough institutions commit, making the investment affordable to all of them, with none left subsidizing a large number of free riders. Funders such as the Open Society Foundations and the Mellon Foundation have stepped in to help launch Knowledge Unlatched and the Open Library of the Humanities, bridging the funding gap during pilot periods in order to keep costs down till a large number of institutions have committed. There is optimism that libraries will be willing to participate, even with the risk of free riders, if the commitment is modest.

The most dramatic version of (b) is found in a whitepaper by Rebecca Kennison and Lisa Norberg of K|N Consultants entitled “A Scalable and Sustainable Approach to Open Access Publishing and Archiving for Humanities and Social Sciences.”5 They propose that institutions pay into a central fund that is disbursed not only to publishers, as in SCOAP, but to partnerships of publishers, scholarly societies, and libraries. They hope to avoid free-riding institutions through persuasion, without resorting to an assurance contract.5

How Does this All Affect University Presses and Academic Libraries?

We are beginning to look at the funding of scholarly communication more holistically, no longer thinking of funding for a library to acquire material and a subsidy to a university press to produce material as unrelated expenses with separate justifications. There is increasing acceptance that a university press is a mission-driven operation that cannot be expected to balance its books at the end of each fiscal year, which often falls just at the time when an investment in print runs is needed for the upcoming semester’s textbooks. Furthermore, presses are under pressure to reduce the costs of their publications — costs that harm individual scholar and library consumers.

Just as library consortia have negotiated over fees with journal publishers, there is some interest in doing the same for access to monographs. A National Monograph Strategy Roadmap, by Ben Showers at Jisc, proposes “a license negotiated […] on behalf of the UK academic sector for access to digital scholarly monographs.”6 While potentially leading to access for more users in the UK at a lower cost per user, such moves toward consortia “reinforce the ‘big deal,’” which “only reinforces the logic of mergers and acquisitions, further strengthening the position of publishers.” In other words, we’d see cream-skimming and oligopolistic tendencies in monograph publishing, just as we have with journal publishing.

Still, these developments do not involve fundamental changes in a university press’s business model. Even Knowledge Unlatched and the plan in the AAU/ARL prospectus, if they gain traction, would simply allow presses to make the incremental change of treating more of their titles than usual as heavily subventioned.

The K|N Consultants proposal, on the other hand, would lead to a more dramatic rethinking of the roles played both by libraries and presses. Instead of small-scale collaborations in which, as is common practice today, a library offers services to the university press on campus in order to fill gaps in the press’s expertise and resources, we would see the development of larger-scale efforts that re-imagine production, access, and preservation of scholarly literature. This would break the university press model of accounting for costs on a per-title basis — a change that would be quite disruptive to decision-making for allocation of resources at a press but would also accelerate the reimaging of scholarly publishing as a core function of a university, much like a library. While some publishers warn against lessening financial incentives in publishing (which they claim spur them to do better work and help allocate resources toward demand), increasingly administrators, funding bodies, and librarians believe that today’s dysfunctional market so poorly reflects demand that it requires a radical rethinking, even of the financial incentives. 

Author’s Note: I would like to thank Isaac Gilman and Maria Bonn for their comments on a draft of this article. — KSH

Endnotes
1. See question in “What open access journals will be eligible for underwriting of their publication charges?” at the COPE FAQ: http://www.oacompact.org/faq/whhich-journals.
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“Use every man after his desert, and who should ‘scape whipping?’” — Hamlet II. ii.

The Sins of the Publishers

Modern publishers have worked their way around to a business model that is ultimately based on preventing readers from reaching or using what they publish. Corporate publishers seek to “corner the market” on academic intellectual property and have put themselves in position to exact a toll from its every exposure or use. Digital technology has whetted their appetites for ever tighter controls, for rights management that persists beyond sale, dictating the terms of access for even the most far-flung user. Publishers are now quietly withholding a growing range of rights from purchasers, obviously in anticipation of assessing further levies against any downstream usage.

These publishers have the power to control and commercialize the intellectual output of the academic and scientific community, even those portions deriving directly from public funding. The real point of interest seems to be how much control over this content can be held back from the contracted delivery — what rights or licenses to re-use, repurpose, analyze, or compile can be reserved by the “seller”? The day seems not far off when they will deliver only temporary and “arms-length” possession of the text, and additional fees will apply if one seeks to “read,” “understand,” or “act upon” its content. (I write this in the wake of the STM publishers’ proposed menu of open-access licenses — slicing the rights “wafer-thin” to exact more revenue over the life-course of an article.)

But the catalog of sins does not stop there. Some publishers are also willing to claim rights they do not legally hold, discourage or contest the legitimate “fair use” of materials, collect fees for items they do not own, and assert their rights at the expense of the author’s interests. As an industry, they have used the courts to oppose indexing of works for Internet search, litigated distribution of educational materials by universities, and contested access to public-funded research products. I understand that all publishers are not Microsoft, or Disney, or the Motion Picture Association of America — but those are the type specimens. They set the standard for excessive greed and desire to exert maximum control over their captive audience. The desire for success or the need for survival drives the rest of the industry to emulate their practices insofar as they are able and confident they can get away with it.

As a former laborer in that industry, I have spent the past ten years trying to explain to librarians the reasons and motives of publisher behavior. Following are some things that publishers believe, and would like the rest of us to believe as well.

The present system is working just fine. It is hard to dispute this from the publishers’ point of view. For example, in 2012, Reed Elsevier had revenues of $8.3 billion — the same figure coincidentally as the state government of Nebraska — and they turned a nearly 40% profit on that figure. They get the content for free, or nearly so; their customer base is locked in, with limited alternatives; and their largest challenge is developing more efficient means of extracting money from the universities.

The greatest threat is interference from government. Now, it is okay for governments to pay for research efforts, including even direct funding of publication fees; that’s not seen as interference. And extending copyright an additional 20 years — that wasn’t interference either. But apart from paying the publishers and protecting their franchises, government needs to stay out of publishing — or so they believe.

There is nothing unusual about turning over into private hands the ownership and rights to monetize the intellectual property resulting from millions of dollars in federally-funded research. We’re really just performing a service for the common good. The fact that we end up owning all it is immaterial and almost accidental. Really, this stuff happens all the time; nothing to see here; move along, please.

Publishing is more valuable than scientific discovery. And strangely, it is not the actual production of the publication — the editing, design, typesetting, printing, or coding — that confers this value. It is rather the act of selling itself that makes the published “article” valuable. This is ultimately the function that the publishers serve — they determine the commercial value of research by charging the academy for access.

The universities have delivered a captive labor force into the publishers’ hands, and they can hardly be blamed for taking advantage. The requirements for tenure continue to generate content with minimal recruitment expense or additional incentives being contributed from the publishers’ side. Indeed, if tenure were not at stake, what would happen to scholarly publishing? It would certainly not cease to exist, but it would be conducted on a different scale and in an altogether different manner. Publishers are not currently serving the communications needs of the faculty, library, and university; they are serving their own needs — for survival, for profit, and for future security.

The Challenges of the University Presses

The university presses (and the publishing arms of various scientific societies) may be several degrees less culpable than the blatantly profit-driven commercial publishers, but they sometimes seem to operate from the same premises. If “less sinful” is a compliment, they should own it proudly. Their economic needs and their organizational inertia for self-preservation lead them to pursue their own interests as publishers, and this condition colors every action and publishing decision they take. University presses cannot be expected to commit corporate suicide; but they will need to develop new modes of coexistence in a digital environment that has evolved much faster than they ever could have prepared for.

This past summer one university press discovered that a perennial backlist bestseller (No-no Boy by John Okada) had been issued in a pirated eBook edition by an enterprising (though legally naïve) high school student from Pennsylvania and was being offered for sale on Amazon. The press had been the book’s publisher for more than 30 years, but the student had scooped them with an eBook edition that offered digital availability, lower price, and a more attractive cover. The pirated edition was quickly and apologetically withdrawn by the student, with much grumbling from the presses about Amazon’s role in enabling it, but the lesson to be drawn is that publishers cannot just sit on their assets and expect the world to come to their terms. Their publishing “expertise” needs to be continually applied and updated if they are to justify their continued stewardship of important cultural resources.

The university presses have had the best content, but they have been too much about exposing too much — protecting their content’s digital virginity — as if it lost rather than gained value with use and familiarity. As one executive put it recently, in answer to a request for permission to archive a chapter by two faculty members at this institution, one previously excerpted and licensed to an academic magazine: “The [name withheld] University Press does not publish open-access online materials and respectfully declines to authorize open-access online distribution of our contracted, copyrighted content.” I couldn’t have said it better myself. And they have a perfect right to do so. As we say in cattle country — “it’s your cow.” But it perfectly illustrates why there needs to be library publishing.

In my view, there are five things about publishing that need to change.

1. Requiring the surrender of intellectual property. There is no need for publishers to own the content for 95 years in order to issue a printed or digital version. All the reasons put forward for this — “to ensure
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maximum distribution,” “required by our charter,” “to protect your contribution,” “necessary to support our mix of business models” — are, to put it naively, poppycock. All that is required is a simple “permission to publish” or perhaps a right of first publication. Anything more represents the appropriation of the author’s brainchild into a one-side contract of indentured servitude. We see many authors’ products locked away from use and access because surplus copies remain languishing unsold in warehouses.

2. The high rates of rejection. Acceptance rates (or, more accurately, rejection rates) are seen as a measure of content quality, but they more properly reflect the degree to which publishers are failing to service the needs of the academy. If a work fails to meet the expectations of peer reviewers who may or may not have been selected appropriately, it is shunted on down the line, postponed, sent packing, to seek an outlet elsewhere, in a repeat of the lottery-like process. Even works with generally positive reviews can be rejected, based on the limited number of slots available. If only one in five submissions gets published, what happens to the other four? Do they not see the light of day because two readers did not get the point? I suppose we can always hope that the peer-review system will improve, and that egos, jealousy, lassitude, ignorance, and bile will forever disappear from the earth. But for many academic presses publishing more works would mean losing more money, so that is not a feasible option.

3. The slow process, long schedules. Congratulations, your book/article has been accepted ... It is scheduled for publication in the spring season/issue three years hence.” In fact, the long, long lead times are due largely to selling timetables based on seasonal catalogues and requiring six to ten months advance information for booksellers and distributors. Of course, the need to ensure the perfection of the copies placed in inventory plays a large role as well. Meticulous editing and proofing is needed, lest the publisher be stuck forever with typographically inaccurate copies.

4. High prices. Book prices are a product of three factors: 1. the cost of labor involved in selecting (rejecting), vetting, and perfecting the works; 2. the antiquated bookselling chain that grants large discounts to wholesalers and retailers who take the lion’s share of the purchase price; and 3. the smallness of the market over which the fixed costs can be spread. This vicious cycle has led to concentration on the subscription market, where a near- captive audience has little choice but to pony up, while cancelling the discretionary items.

5. Limited distribution. Only those individuals or institutions willing to pay the high prices will be able to read, evaluate, and digest the scholarship. Authors, having surrendered their rights to the content, are helpless to effect wider and lower-cost online dissemination.

The Virtues of the University Presses

There are many things that the university presses can teach library publishers — although business models, author relations, content stewardship, and user accommodation might not be among them.

It may not be surprising that, having spent many years in design and production, I feel the most critical lessons the university presses have to offer library publishing involve production values and design sensibility. Even in digital form, a book is not just a collection of words and thoughts; the whole aspires to be more than the sum of its parts, and a book still needs to display its own identity and specialness — even as an electronic file. It is not necessary, or even desirable, to apply “house style” or make everything conform to a predetermined or traditional model. But what is needed — and what is most gratifying — is to help the work achieve its optimal realization — for appearance, for usefulness, and for packaging.

University press publishing demonstrates the value of the finished object: the standalone work, the complete package, the final product — not the open-ended, more-to-come, process-without-arrival, circuitous, serial, or synchronic collections of pieces served up via social media. This is not meant to diminish the importance of innovation in alternate modes of delivery; but (in my opinion) the “book,” having survived past transitions over several millennia, will once again emerge as the most enduring, authoritative, and convenient form of written communication. Nobody this side of the NSA wants to see your collected 10 years of tweets and listserve postings. A single file-object, discrete and complete, is better suited for preservation and distribution. Moreover, a work that was completed, however imperfectly, ages better than one whose resolution was left unfinished, or unattempted altogether. Scholarly books and articles consciously speak to an audience outside of their contemporary time; they reflect the voices of past contributors and appeal to the judgment of an imagined “future history.” They have a beginning and an end, and occupy a distinct place; each can be cited and retrieved and experienced in its entirety.

University presses also demonstrate the value of the uncluttered, unlayered, unlinked, and unembellished object. Library publishing needs to avoid the messiness of the supplementary file, so recently beloved by the commercial and society publishers. Web pages and groups of files are far more troublesome to store, transmit, and manipulate than the discrete file-object — the single article, monograph, or book review — complete in one file. (Although books can sometimes be split up into separate chapters — but not if all the notes are collected in the back.)

The university presses have developed and practiced presentation that is simple, authoritative, clean, and direct. Contrast their work with the journal pages produced by Elsevier or PNAS: 2-column, letter-sized pages in 8-point Lilliputian type, with tables, notes, and bibliographies in 6.5 point or smaller, sometimes in solid light blue, sometimes requiring as many as 20 “Supporting Information” files to complete, and sometimes hiding a minefield of links where the slightest mis-click sends a shaky-handed old man on a Nantucket sleighride across the (sponsored) Internet. Reading onscreen html is even worse; the content contends with extraneous promotional graphics and links that claim screen acreage, make for slow loading, and cause windows to flicker and flip.

Even in the scholarly electronic venues, good traditional design practice seems to be honored more in the breach than the observance. Ragged-right text measures exceeding 100 characters in warm gray sans serif fonts may be visually appealing (to some, perhaps), but are by no standard readable for any length of time.

The Campus Communications Nexus

Library publishing exists to facilitate the production and dissemination of scholarship that does not fit the currently practiced publish—
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ing models. The United States has roughly 130 university presses and 2,870 four-year colleges and universities. Those numbers suggest the need for alternative outlets for faculty scholarship. Especially needed are outlets that do not commandeer perpetual ownership of the content in exchange for its publication. The potential universe of interesting and useful scholarly work far exceeds the capacity of the university presses and lies mostly outside the financially incentivized scope of the larger houses. Everything does not have to be a monograph or journal article. Library publishing can encompass document collections, conference proceedings, digital projects, symposia, speeches, reports, papers, standards, software — all the things a university grinds out. Making public the products of the university’s research is an essential part of the institutional mission. The tip of the iceberg qualifies for the university presses and high-end commercial journals; the vaster mass of information lies below that surface. A large amount of publishing is already being done on campuses, outside the purview of university presses, and consisting mostly of things of no particular interest to them: conference newsletters, professional papers, policy statements, technical reports, posters, presentations — not to mention theses and dissertations. For materials like these, the library has the most convenient, persistent, and trusted platform for their dissemination and archiving. It is a collector rather than a gate-keeper or an endorser, more analogous perhaps to a steward or a zoo-keeper, if you will. This is a publishing universe where the university presses have no ambitions and no interest. The processing and management of thousands of documents with no apparent commercial value is a more library-like function; and libraries that are involved in the production of these “publications” can manage their collection and preservation more efficiently. At minimum, libraries should seek to provide an available suite of services — called scholarly communication — for the use and furtherance of campus writers, editors, researchers. Yale University formerly had a position called “Printer to the University,” and this is the closest analogy I can find to the role of the library publisher.

Libraries can also teach campus publishers about the use and value of title pages, copyright pages, and tables of contents — and the virtues of consistency among them. They have an opportunity to help publications make their own metadata up-front and explicit. Clarity here helps everyone, not just catalogers and archivists. I think everyone should be encouraged to publish, and it should be made as painless and efficient as possible. Doubtless, some pedantic, boring, and misguided works will be issued — but that will be nothing new and will not itself threaten the overall progress of knowledge.

Advice for Library Publishers

Our library publishing program at Nebraska (known as Zca Books) grew out of our institution’s repository and the practice of archiving original content there — which turned out to be quite popular with both users and depositors. The repository (running bepress’s DigitalCommons software) remains our primary platform. We mostly publish eBooks in pdf format, but we offer on-demand production for those who want hard copy, and we prepare Kindle or epub formats when that seems appropriate. Our list is fairly esoteric and obscure; there are no trade books lurking in it. It is all things that more established presses have declined or never would consider.

We use a “permission to publish” agreement with authors that is non-exclusive; they retain copyright and can take their book and go elsewhere if they so choose; either party can cancel the agreement upon 30 days notice. The digital (pdf) versions are made available free; hard copies can be ordered through Lulu.com, who does the printing, binding, shipping, billing, and collections; Kindle versions are sold through Amazon.com. We receive payments quarterly (or monthly from Amazon for Kindle editions) and pay royalties annually. The online pdf and the on-demand hard copy are generated from the same master file, so they match for pagination and layout. We do editing and composition, but no marketing beyond posting to suggested or appropriate online venues or listservs. Some authors are energetic promoters and generate surprising amounts of revenue; others are content to simply have the work available. There are no returns, no free & review, no freight costs, no discounts, no commissions (other than the cut that Lulu.com keeps) — none of the many little leaks and operating costs that make it so hard for publishers to stay in the black. We produce color or black and white, hardcover or paperback, in a limited array of sizes: 8.5 x 11, 6 x 9, and 8 x 8 inches. We do not charge authors for our services. Our online lists can be seen at http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/zeabook/ and our on-demand offerings at http://www.lulu.com/spotlight/untillib.

In addition to the monograph program, we also use the repository to host more than a dozen journals originating on- and off-campus. Most are peer-reviewed; all are free access; and we claim ownership of none of the content. I recognize that Nebraska’s specific path is ultimately not transferrable. We have so far found no clear way to “scale up” or rationalize production; it is artisanal rather than industrial. But every library is different, and the wonderful thing about start-ups is the freedom to invent and experiment. Following is some free advice that new practitioners may or may not wish to apply.

• Avoid things that are broken, like the bookselling trade and the peer-review/tenure treadmill.
• Own as little as possible, content as well as inventory — so you have nothing to lose.
• Focus on instructional materials and items for the scholarly record.
• Build within existing infrastructure; avoid taking on overhead.
• Outsource non-unique services, especially “back office” functions like fulfillment, collections, etc.
• Selling costs are eliminated when you give it away.
• Don’t be afraid to practice basic publishing skills (proofreading, copy-editing) and to acquire new skills for typesetting, imaging, design, and production (InDesign, Photoshop, Acrobat). If you love books, you will enjoy learning how they are made.
• Look for “shelf-ready”; beware of “Winnie-the-Pooh” projects that get stuck halfway out.
• Staff the publishing unit carefully; you need people who are on board with the approach and will not hinder the work.
• Respond to the needs of the faculty. Their trust and appreciation are the measure of your success.

Mea Culpa

I recognize that my argument here is overly rhetorical, repetitive, hyperbolic, and perhaps even circular; and I apologize for that to whatever readers remain. Bob Nardini invited me to contribute to this special issue, and I foolishly agreed without hesitating or considering. Then he also invited a bunch of well respected publishers and/or scholars, with extensive backlists, employees, etc., all the trappings of having achieved a certain gravitas. I expect mine to be the dissenting opinion or minority report.

I think Bob invited me because he had heard a talk I gave at the Library Publishing Coalition meeting in Kansas City in March. That program included one other speaker and a planned group activity, so my time was capped at 10 minutes, and the topic was “should library publishing follow the same model of acquisitions as more traditional publishers?” In ten minutes you don’t have much time for niceties or qualifiers or hedges, so I just let it all hang out. One press person in the audience was quite incensed and took me to task afterwards for the duration of the group activity. But several days later a university press director wrote me that it was the best thing he heard the whole meeting. The Library Publishing Coalition...
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arranged to publish the texts of the talks from the meeting in the Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication (http://jlic-pub.org), whose peer reviewer derided my contribution in dismissive and hurtful language that the editors will not permit me to quote. (The piece is forthcoming nonetheless.)

So writing this piece has been fraught with concerns. I feel obliged to uphold the side of the library publishers, who seem to me at times in peril of being patronized or hegemonized by the more established presses, but I am very aware of the idiosyncratic quality of our experience at Nebraska and the outward nature of my own personal views. I don’t wish to offend the traditional publishers, or to stir up trouble with the university presses. I have (or used to have) some dear friends in that world, and I am not ashamed to have spent 25 years as a publisher — all of it at start-ups or small presses in the $3 million to $20 million range.

Some worthy organizations, including the Library Publishing Coalition, have enunciated the mission and role of library publishing far better than I can. All I hope to contribute here is a somewhat salty critique and antidote to the frequently bland and ameliorist narrative of the library publishers to “come out of Babylon” (as Bob Marley might say) — to leave behind the ownership-based, property-accumulating, copyright-hoarding, commercially-driven publishing model practiced by the corporate giants and imitated to various degrees by academic presses struggling for self-sufficiency.

Library publishing is an opportunity to jettison the things that make commercial and university press publishing unpleasant at times: the constant scrambling for sales, the innumerable meetings, the tyrannical deadlines, the constant scrambling for sales, the interminable deadlines, the anxious sales projections, the radioactively inventory whose value decays every day, the backwash of returns, the frenzy of being out-of-stock, the chewed-over catalog copy, the seasonal ups and downs …. I no longer feel obligated to read the Sunday New York Times Book Review; for what I do, it just doesn’t matter, and frankly, I don’t miss it. Most recently my desktop has been occupied with the return of black-footed ferrets to the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation, revisions to a translated Syntagma Musicum II, De Ornarographia) proposed by an expert reader, composition of a 1,000-page reference on the Historical Common Names of Great Plains Plants, and layout of a collaborative study of the methods of the pioneering Italian educator Loris Malaguzzi. It is tremendously gratifying to work face-to-face with the author-creator, and not at arm’s length through an editorial or promotional bureaucracy. Accommodations and compromises are more easily and conveniently made without the involvement of multiple departments or the satisfaction of numerous egos each needing a win.

If there remains anyone I have not offended, I’m sorry if you feel left out. My object has not been to deliver Hamlet’s whipping to anybody, but rather to point out that we all have opportunities to do better. What Thomas Hooker called “A True Sight of Sin” is necessary before reformation can take hold. If we repeatedly tell ourselves how wonderful we are, we will only sink deeper into quicksand. All of us have a chance to do more and do better. In fact, the universe of publishable materials has never been more exciting and energizing. There is more than enough to go around. To those who would say “that’s not real publishing” or “not good publishing,” I can only say: it’s not a contest. We are all seeking to serve the communication needs of scholars and researchers. The Copyright Office defines publishing as “offering copies for distribution,” and that’s enough for me. We can all get judgmental, or we can each take advantage of the opportunities that the new technology has handed us.

Booklover — Synchronicity

Column Editor: Donna Jacobs (Retired, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, SC 29425)  <donna.jacobs55@gmail.com>

In late September I became curious about the exact timing of the announcement of the Nobel Prizes. I knew it was in the Fall but had never paid attention to the date. Since I have been writing Booklover, it has become a “tradition,” if you will, to seek out the current year’s recipient of the Nobel and write about their work. However, my Google search did not produce a date — they like to wait for the 2014 announcement, I decided to research Tagore and his work.

Rabindranath Tagore was born in Calcutta, India in 1861. His biography is a tale of wealth, travel, self-education, and international influence. He was the youngest of a large family. Servants influenced Tagore’s upbringing because his mother died when he was 14 and his father traveled extensively. The young Tagore chose to skip formal classroom schooling and explore. This pattern followed him throughout his life. His travels would expose the world to his writing and thus his popularity grew outside of his native land.

Tagore wrote in almost every genre, but he began in poetry around the age of eight. His first substantial poetry was published under the pseudonym Bhanushingo (Sun Lion) when he was 16. Short stories and drama followed very quickly from the pen in his young hand. “Gitanjali” is Tagore’s best-known collection of poems and is referenced as the reason for his being awarded the 1913 Nobel Literature Prize: “because of his profoundly sensitive, fresh and beautiful verse, by which, with consummate skill, he has made his poetic thought, expressed in his own English words, a part of the literature of the West.” He was the first non-European to be awarded the Literature Nobel.

However, the work I chose to embrace has a different title: “Fireflies.” Published in 1928, it is a collection of 253 verses that critics speculate were inspired by the Japanese Haiku style of writing that Tagore was immersed in during the 1920s. In the forward of the illustrated collection I read Dr. Ashok Kumar Malhotra creates a beautiful analogy: “A tiny firefly is a much loved insect in India and the rest of the world. When I was growing up in India, during the darkest of the dark nights, while lying on the bed at the roof of the house, we used to watch these little creatures. Through their minuscule lights they opened up windows of hope, breaking the blackness of the sky. We learned from this our wise grandfather who used to say: ‘When you cannot find your way in the darkness, these fireflies act as messengers of hope.’” Alberta Hutchinson’s illustrations give an additional dimension to each of the 253 “firefly” wisdoms of Tagore. Enjoyed together, it is a unique spiritual experience.

The timing of my awareness of this author and this particular collection of his poems is not lost on me, and here is the connection. This past year I learned that the Photinus carolinus firefly is one of at least 19 species that live in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. Their mating season is late-May to mid-June.
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ATG Interviews Audrey Powers
Associate Librarian, University of South Florida

by Tom Gilson  (Associate Editor, Against the Grain) <gilsont@cofc.edu>
and Katina Strauch  (Editor, Against the Grain) <kstrauch@comcast.net>

**ATG**: Audrey you will be editing the April issue of Against the Grain that will be entitled “Disappearing [print] Stacks.” What led you to take on this challenge?

**AP**: I am intrigued by the controversy that surrounds the issue of repurposing library spaces and reducing the footprint of books. It is a contentious issue that generates passionate dialogue among the stakeholders involved.

**ATG**: What major issues/concerns do you plan to cover?

**AP**: I am leaving this up to the authors. They represent large and small academic libraries. Included in this issue will be eclectic, thought-provoking articles, opinion pieces, and case studies. I anticipate many issues, concerns, and opinions will emerge from both practical points of view as well as passionate perspectives.

**ATG**: From what you’ve learned so far what are the key arguments for re-purposing the space currently being used for books stacks?

**AP**: A key argument for repurposing library space used for books is that many libraries are collecting more and more electronic resources; thus, freeing up floor space. In reality, the key reason to repurpose library space is to address the changing needs of the community the library serves.

**ATG**: What strategies are libraries using to implement such changes?

**AP**: My hope is that libraries are taking into consideration all aspects of the issue including being cognizant of the use of library resources, trends in publishing, topics in collection development and management, and most importantly, the needs of the community being served.

**ATG**: Has there been any resistance to this trend from librarians, faculty, or students?

**AP**: There is resistance when the community affected determines their needs are not being addressed. If they decide their needs are being neglected, protests will follow, as was the case at Colby College.

There is an historical belief that the academic library is the “center” of learning, the central place on campus, the center of the academy, and a contemplative place. When that perception is disrupted, there is dissention in the academy.

*continued on page 42*
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**ATG:** If so, what are their counter arguments?

**AP:** Counter arguments include the perception that there is a preference for eBooks, although I am not convinced this is accurate. It may be an economic issue for some academic libraries. Of course, it depends on what kind of academic library, the mission of the library, funding, staffing issues, leadership values, etc. It goes back to the argument in favor of Patron-Driven Acquisitions: just in time instead of just in case.

**ATG:** In her article “Save Our Stacks” which appeared in Slate, Rebecca Schuman argues that book stacks are “the creators and the preservers of the contemplative space that every university needs.” From what you are seeing from your contributors is this a legitimate observation?

**AP:** Interesting question. I will leave that up to you, the reader, to determine if this is reasonable concern.

**ATG:** Recent numbers from Nielsen Books & Consumer show that eBooks were outsold by both hardcovers and paperbacks in the first half of 2014. From your observation, do such figures call into question the trend toward disappearing book stacks? Or are they merely a blip on the radar screen?

**AP:** This is difficult question to answer. In the academic environment, my observation is that your discipline dictates your format preference based on which format best suits your research needs.

Leisure reading is quite different.

At the 2014 Charleston Conference keynote speaker Anthea Stratigos cited a survey of undergraduate students in which 86% of the students preferred print textbooks over eTextbooks.

This is one of many surveys and studies being conducted about reading and learning using electronic resources and devices versus traditional methodologies.

In reality, it is too early to tell; however, again, we need to remember that the library should always be assessing and adjusting its mission to the changing needs of the community.

**ATG:** Undergraduate libraries have different needs than say a medical library. Will this issue of ATG reflect those differences? How?

**AP:** Yes. It may be presented as a case study of “how we did it,” but it will be evident that strategic planning is the underpinning of change.

**ATG:** Is your library at the University of South Florida re-appropriating book stacks for other purposes? If so, what are they? If not, why not?

**AP:** Yes. I plan to write about that, so I can’t give it away ahead of time. Stay tuned for more.

**ATG:** Which of your current print collections are the most viable?

**AP:** We weeded print periodicals long ago as we transitioned to e-journal subscriptions. Recently, we moved collections, installed compact shelving, and weeded monograph and serial collections. These activities have served us well and afforded the subject librarians the opportunity to be proactive in collection management, which in my judgment, is good.

**ATG:** Do you have any predictions about the future of print collections?

**AP:** Let me look into my crystal ball….

My only hope is that we don’t get rid of the old to make room for the new without careful thought and planning.

**ATG:** What about the future of libraries and library collections in general?

Libraries are more popular than ever. Our library is busy all hours of the day and night.

The question reminded me of the time when online searching first became popular and librarians feared librarianship would become a defunct profession. Didn’t happen.

**ATG:** Busy librarians need some down time. Besides being one of the directors of the Charleston Conference, what do you do for fun? Do you have any hobbies or interests that let you kick back and relax?

**AP:** Yes, of course. I love to relax with my husband and our chocolate lab. I enjoy gardening, entertaining, traveling, renovating our house, attending arts events, reading, and… there are not enough hours in the day to do everything we enjoy. Not a bad problem to have.

**ATG:** Audrey we know that you want to get back to editing the April issue of ATG so we’ll let you go. Thanks for taking time to talk to us.

**AP:** Thank you for this opportunity.
For the first time ever, both editions of Andreas Vesalius’ masterpiece “De Humani Corporis Fabrica” are accessible in the English language. They were critically compared and published in a modern layout transforming the Renaissance anatomical atlas for the 21st-century reader. More than 5,000 annotations cover anything from antique sources over Galenic references to the medical and cultural background of Vesalius’ time. To enable the reader and medical student to really study Vesalius’ woodcut illustrations, the images were digitally enhanced and often enlarged to feature his painstaking work of marking each pertinent anatomical part with characters. All over Vesalius’ descriptive text, the standard Latin Nomina Anatomica and Terminologia Anatomica provide the reader with the modern medical terminology.

For more information and easy ordering, please visit www.vesalius-fabrica.com

ATG Interviews Peter Shepherd

Retiring Director of COUNTER Online Metrics

by Tom Gilson (Associate Editor, Against the Grain) <gilsont@cofc.edu>

and Katina Strauch (Editor, Against the Grain) <kstrauch@comcast.net>

ATG: Peter, we understand congratulations are in order. We recently learned that you are retiring as Director of COUNTER after serving since its inception. Looking back on it what would you like people to say about your legacy? What do you view as your key achievements?

PS: COUNTER is and has always been very much a team effort; indeed, the esprit de corps we have built up that has enabled librarians and vendors, who have not always seen eye to eye, to work constructively for more than a decade has been one of our main achievements. My own contribution to that has I think been to keep the show on the road!

ATG: How did your experience working at publishers like Wiley, Pergamon, Elsevier, and Harcourt prepare you to guide COUNTER?

PS: Every publisher has its own company culture, and working in these diverse publisher environments gives one some insight into achieving objectives in different ways. For example, the image of Robert Maxwell’s Pergamon was that of a totalitarian regime. Yet, as individual publishers we were more free to pursue new projects than in any other organization I have worked for. There was none of the micromanagement prevalent in other organizations; it was like working in an earthquake zone, 99% of the time one was left to get on with it, with the occasional tremor, of unpredictable magnitude, to enliven things.

ATG: What were the most serious challenges you faced during your tenure? And how did you deal with them?

PS: Our greatest challenges were at the outset of the project, back in 2002, when publishers and librarians were coming at usage statistics from very different perspectives. There was not even broad agreement within these two constituencies about what they wanted. Some enlightened publishers, those who were the very first to support COUNTER, understood the potential benefits to their industry of providing usage statistics to an agreed standard; others saw it as an unnecessary extra cost. On the library side there was also a tension between those librarians who wanted a set of practical, implementable usage reports, while others wanted a whole range of very detailed usage data that publishers were never going to provide. There were fundamentalists on both sides, but the Sensible Party won through, and there is now very wide acceptance of the COUNTER standards.
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**ATG: On the other side of the ledger, what major opportunities presented themselves? How did you take advantage of them?**

**PS:** There were two major opportunities during my tenure at COUNTER. The first was to show that we could set standards that were both rigorous and implementable by any publisher/vendor that has a platform with online publications; in other words a standard for the Many, not the Few. The second opportunity is to build on the fact that there are now COUNTER-compliant usage statistics for over 20,000 full-text online journals, as well as databases and hundreds of thousands of books. This gives us the opportunity to develop a range of usage-based metrics that can give new insights into the impact and value of scholarly publications.

**ATG: COUNTER develops Codes of Practice to set standards for vendor reporting of online usage of journals, databases, books, etc. How does that process work? Whose input is sought? How are decisions made?**

**PS:** The COUNTER Code of Practice is now in Release 4 and each Release has been developed with the active input of librarians, publishers, and others. As soon as a new Release is published we commence preparation for the next Release by maintaining an Upgrade Log, which records suggested modifications from any source. These are reviewed by the COUNTER Executive Committee and prioritized for the next Release. In addition we conduct surveys and focus groups to gain insights into changes the community would like to see. When we draft a new Release, the Executive Committee discusses and reviews prior to publication of the draft for public comment. Further modifications are then made and a definitive new Release published, with a deadline being set for its implementation by vendors.

**ATG: We understand that COUNTER has broadened its scope to cover new usage-based metrics, notably the Usage Factor for journals and article-level usage reporting. How is COUNTER planning to fulfill these responsibilities? What new usage-based metrics will be covered? Can we expect to see relevant Codes of Practice in the near future?**

**PS:** This year we have published two new Codes of Practice. First, the COUNTER Code of Practice for Articles (http://www.projectcounter.org/counterarticles.html), which sets a standard for the recording and reporting of usage at the individual article level. A very important aspect of this Code is that it can be implemented by repositories as well as by publishers and aggregators. This is important as repositories represent a significant and growing proportion of online usage. We have also published a new Code of Practice for Usage Factors, which will enable publishers to calculate Usage Factors for their journals based on COUNTER data. Release 1 of the COUNTER Code of Practice for Usage Factors is now published on the COUNTER Website at: http://www.projectcounter.org/usage_factors.html . It is based on well-established COUNTER standards, protocols, and metrics, and its publication follows several years of statistical testing to ensure the validity and resilience of this new metric. This Code of Practice provides publishers with the protocols required to record and report Usage Factors for their online publications in a credible, consistent, and compatible way. While Release 1 focuses on Usage Factors for journals, it is envisaged that its scope will be extended in subsequent Releases to cover other categories of online publications.

**ATG: How does the growing open access movement impact efforts like COUNTER? How are COUNTER usage-based metrics being applied to open access journals?**

**PS:** COUNTER is indifferent to the access model used, and our standards apply to open access journals and other open access publications. In the most recent Release of the Code of Practice we have introduced a new report, specifically to cover ‘hybrid’ journals, in which some papers are open access, while others are paid-for access. This report allows usage of open access articles to be reported separately, and allows librarians to assess the usage and value of the paid-for access journals.

**ATG: As a not-for-profit company how is COUNTER funded?**

**PS:** 80% of COUNTER’s funding comes from its members. We have over 200 members consisting of libraries, library consortia, publishers, intermediaries, and industry organizations. This balance of membership is crucial to our mission, as it ensures that no single interest group dominates. We have set the membership fees at modest levels to ensure the widest possible access. The 2015 librarian membership costs U.S.$455. A further 10% of our income comes from Sponsors and the remainder form research grants for projects to which COUNTER provides its expertise. This funding model allows us to make the Codes of Practice freely available and ensures that librarians receive their COUNTER usage reports at no charge from vendors.

**ATG: We would think that as COUNTER takes on new responsibilities, funding would need to be increased. Is there a plan in place to raise more money to meet any increase in operating expenses?**

**PS:** Yes, we intend to expand the membership, which is currently more than 80% U.S./UK based. Libraries and Library Consortia worldwide benefit from free access to the COUNTER usage reports, and we would like to see them of these in Asia, South America, and elsewhere support COUNTER.

**ATG: It strikes us that balancing the needs of librarians, publishers, and vendors is essential to the success of COUNTER. What strategies would you recommend to your successor to maintain this delicate balance?**

**PS:** I think when one is working on standards that serve a range of constituencies one should heed Mae West’s dictum: if a thing’s worth doing it’s worth doing slowly. Take time to achieve a broad agreement before moving ahead; the standard will be more robust as a result. COUNTER’s strategy hitherto has been twofold. First, to ensure that all three constituencies are well represented at every level of the COUNTER organization — on the Board of Directors, on the Executive Committee, and on the International Advisory Board, as well as in the membership. Second, to engage continually with the communities we serve via conference presentations, Webinars, articles, and social media.

**ATG: After leaving COUNTER will you maintain any role in the information industry? Can we expect an occasional visit to Charleston to attend the Charleston Conference?**

**PS:** I don’t plan to continue with any formal role in the information industry after leaving COUNTER, as I have a few other
activities I want to get more involved in. You may have heard that we had a little Referendum here in the UK, where the proposal was to break up the country. Fortunately, the secessionists were defeated, but they do not appear to have accepted this democratic result and continue to stir things up. Those of us who believe in the Union must therefore be prepared to devote further energies to ensuring that we stay together. I am sure, however, that I have not paid my last visit to Charleston.

ATG: What about fun things? What activities do you plan to pursue now that you will have a bit more time to focus on personal interests?

PS: Well, there are many fine Scotch malts I have yet to try, there are salmon waiting to be caught, and Highland hills to be climbed. Apart from that there are Italian operas to be heard, more French cheeses to be tasted, as well as Trollopes to be read. I understand that being retired is a full-time occupation!

ATG: Peter, thank you so much for all of the things you have done for the industry over the years, and of course, for taking the time to talk to us about them.

PS: It has been both a pleasure and privilege to work with such great colleagues in the publishing and library worlds. We are very fortunate in this industry to be able to combine business and pleasure.

Interview — Peter Shepherd from page 46

Booklover from page 40

During this time these lightning bugs create a unique synchronous light show. This particular species is the only one in America that can synchronize the light patterns. With the coming of a milestone birthday, three of my very close high school buddies and I have reservations to experience this synchronous light show. We were eager to explore life when we were young, and now we gather to remember that we can still be fascinated by both the simplicity and the complexity of that life. Some of our wonder is reflected in Tagore’s “Fireflies.” I leave you with five:

“The fireflies, twinkling among leaves, make the stars wonder.”

“In the drowsy dark caves of the mind, dreams build their nest with fragments dropped from day’s caravan.”

“The sea of danger, doubt and denial around man’s little island of certainty challenges him to dare the unknown.”

“Day with its glare of curiosity puts the stars to flight.”

“The tapestry of life’s story is woven with the threads of life’s ties, ever joining ever breaking.”

Rumors from page 34

January 13, 2015, surrounded by family and friends. He was 80. Jerry Curtis was a true legend. He attended the University of Scranton where is played varsity basketball and was voted MVP for the 1956 season. After serving in the U.S. Army, he went on to a distinguished career as a Senior Executive in the publishing industry. He was working at Springer-Verlag when I first met him. Jerry didn’t mince words and was one of the most astute people I have ever encountered. His wife of 52 years, Mary Jane, three children and two grandchildren survive him. Donations may be made to Dana Farber Cancer Institute, P.O. Box 849168, Boston, MA 02284, and Clergy Health and Retirement Trust, 66 Brooks Drive, Braintree, MA 02184. For info and online condolences, www.richardsongaffeyfuneralhome.com. Obituary published in The Scituate Mariner from Jan. 15 to Jan. 22, 2015. http://www.legacy.com/obituaries/wick-edlocal-scituate/obituary.aspx?pid=173858041#sthash.n9R6W8AM.dpuf
Op Ed — Trends to Watch: Books

by Matthew Goddard, MLIS, MA (Digital Services Librarian, Annie Gabriel Library, California Baptist University, 8432 Magnolia Avenue, Riverside, CA 92504; Phone: 951-343-4365; Fax: 951-343-4523) <mgoddard@calbaptist.edu>

It started with a small pilot project at Belvedere University, but a new trend in libraries is picking up steam across the nation. Last fall, librarians at the Cooper Library on BU’s main Seattle campus took the unusual step of installing a shelf and filling it with … books.

You read that right: physical books, print books, made up of hundreds of paper leaves bound together along one edge. Unlike eBooks, every single letter in these novelties is actually imprinted on the leaves in ink. Readers simply hold the book open with their hands and use their fingers to rotate each page from the right side to the left as they read. Within just a few days, without much marketing or fanfare on campus, every single book had been borrowed by students eager to feel the weight of knowledge in their hands, the soft grain of paper under their fingertips, and to lay their eyes on, as one student said, “literally anything besides another digital display.”

For as long as anyone can care to remember, readers have navigated books with a combination of mental and ocular cues with the time-tested “think and blink” navigation, leaving their bodies largely passive and their senses unengaged. However, noticing that nearly all of their students have bodies, and that most of these bodies could theoretically allow these students to engage with the external world in interesting and novel ways, a group of particularly forward-thinking librarians formed a committee to outline their options.

The germ of the final proposal actually started out as one of those whimsical ideas tossed around in a long brainstorming session, mostly for the laughs. “At first it sounded absurd,” says Nancy Martial, one of the six librarians on the committee. “I mean, who wants to lug around a block of paper? But there’s a certain elegant logic to it. We have bodies, so why shouldn’t our texts?”

We sat down with Mary Lightfoot, Dean of Libraries at Belvedere, to get her take on the unexpected phenomenon her librarians helped spark. “Rarely in one’s lifetime, even just once if you’re lucky, some new technology comes along that really shakes things up. From what I’ve seen over the past few months, I think we could be looking at a real paradigm shift. Embodied information that you can hold in your own two hands is an idea whose time has come.”

Asked if print books might turn out to be just a fad, Lightfoot responded, “Time will tell. Right now we’re seeing a lot of enthusiasm from your typical early adopters, like you’d expect, but what’s really telling is the response from young people like our students. They’re really embracing it. Libraries that refuse to take notice of this and respond to it accordingly are in for a wake-up call. My granddaughter isn’t even two years old and she loves these print books, it’s like second nature to her. But more than anything I think we need to frame it as a real opportunity for libraries. I’m challenging folks to think big about this, I really am. Imagine if we had, in addition to our traditional study spaces and cafes, entire rooms full of these things.”

Lightfoot added, however, that budget limitations would very likely make such extravagance impossible for the foreseeable future.

Nevertheless, Lightfoot is enthusiastic about this topic. She talks about research as a physical activity, not failing to note recent speculative medical research on the possible long-term health benefits of physical movement. She suggests organizing print books by subject, enabling students to almost literally walk through their chosen discipline. “But you can’t just stack them in piles, you’d need to use something like the shelves you see at Target or Wal-Mart. ‘Book-shelves,’ if you will. That’s the approach we’ve taken, but I’m looking forward to seeing what other libraries come up with.”

Not everyone shares Lightfoot’s enthusiasm. Some who choose to opt out of the print book trend note the lack of comprehensive full text search, while others cite hygienic reasons. Noting the additional real estate these collections would require, some administrators have privately expressed their concerns about sacrificing valuable campus space that could be used for student recreation centers, athletics facilities or high-end retail.

We spoke to several students to hear their opinions of this unorthodox library offering: “I just thought it was funny at first. So many sheets of paper, oh my gosh! Like I mean, literally hundreds just in one book. I honestly thought it was a little bit of a waste of resources at the beginning, but I really like reading these books now,” reported Ashlei Gutmman, a sophomore. Her roommate, Madison Leary, a freshman, also took some time to warm up to the curiosities: “I didn’t like them at all at first, but then I realized that the ink was completely dry and wouldn’t get on you when you read. So it was a little awkward at first. Sometimes I still get annoyed when I glance to the right and blink but the page doesn’t turn! But then I just think ‘Oh yay, I actually get to use my arm and hand and fingers for something. I’ve read three or four already.’

So far most print books simply mimic the functionality of eBooks, but expect to see more innovations in this area as publishers gain confidence in this new and unproven “physical objects” marketplace.

Some scholars have begun claiming that at some point a long time ago, most or even all reading was done using these objects. However, there is little consensus surrounding this theory, and it remains controversial among cultural historians.

Asked about the challenges these new developments are bringing, one librarian had to think for a bit. “Some of our older readers who are so used to the think-and-blink mode of eBooks have some trouble turning the pages with their fingers, but we always assure them that our traditional eBooks aren’t going anywhere. We understand that change can’t happen overnight. One of my colleagues agreed: ‘We need to be sensitive to certain categories of users who might feel threatened by these changes, but we ourselves must not be afraid of the future. It’s important for libraries to get out ahead of these developments and be agents of change within the culture.’

We asked one librarian what aspect of this trend she least expected. “The smell of the books,” she said. “Everyone loves it. They can’t stop talking about it.”
Blurring Lines — A Post-Charleston Interview on the Future of the Library with Stanley Wilder, Dean of Libraries, Louisiana State University

Column Editor: David Parker (Vice President, Editorial and Licensing, Alexander Street Press NYC; Phone: 201-673-8784) <dparker@astreetpress.com> Follow me on Twitter @theblurringline

Each year at the Charleston Conference
I have the good fortune to meet at least one new person who broadens my perspective on the role we all play in developing, curating, sharing and protecting knowledge as a part of the library world. In this column, Blurring Lines, I focus on people, companies and institutions that I feel are doing unexpected things that are instructive as to where we are heading. Over an excellent dinner (of which the city of Charleston amply offers many options), Stanley Wilder and I discussed the future of the library with a particular emphasis on the provisioning of learning content and the symbiosis of content and services in a digital environment. I hold the view that the provisioning of digital content and services need not be managed/administered by multiple departments in the university, particularly as concerns learning content and learning management systems, and that the library as a “digital nerve center” ought to be the home. In the following interview with Stanley this theme is explored, among others, and I challenge the reader to discern the degree to which Stanley and I concur about the role of the library.

Tell me about your last three positions, in brief, and how you feel they prepared you for your current role.

I worked at Louisiana State University for ten years in the 90s in administrative roles. That experience taught me more than I can convey, particularly as I’m back at the same library now. So much of the staff and the university culture are familiar to me. But my biggest takeaway is how outrageously broad and deep that experience was, given my age and lack of experience. LSU had of necessity to rely heavily on young people, which made it an amazing experience for me and many of my colleagues.

I then spent ten years at the University of Rochester, a private institution that proved to be a daily revelation in comparison and contrast. I was surrounded by brilliant colleagues at the UR, and they helped shape my core beliefs about research librarianship.

I left the UR to be the University Librarian at UNC Charlotte, an already-great research library (the institution dating to 1946) with a strong culture of innovation. Charlotte and its staff taught me more about how to be a library director than I ever gave back.

What is the meaning and role of physical space in the library?

We start out with the proposition that the library is the only physical space on campus that is academically-oriented but non-classroom space. Even the computer labs are fading away quickly at this point. But our special sauce is the synergy: library spaces combine well-appointed academic spaces, collections, technologies, and expert staff available on an ad-hoc basis. Add the long hours, security, and coffee, and, well, nobody else does all that.

Will the library be the digital nerve center of the university?

I make a distinction between enterprise-wide computing infrastructure, and content. I don’t think the library has much to offer in terms of basic computing and network infrastructure, but we have a ton of history and expertise in managing content, from classwork to the creation and publishing of new scholarship, to access and preservation. I know I’m biased, but I really believe that important academic values are likely to suffer if the library isn’t involved.

So who’s the nerve center? I’m not sure it’s helpful to think in those terms. There’s more challenge in both spheres than any group can manage.

Can the provisioning of digital course content and the learning management system ever be under the purview of one person/department?

I don’t think there’s any organizational reason why this can’t work routinely. It’s already working well in some institutions, Columbia University coming immediately to mind.

And then there are lots of obvious advantages to co-locating these functions in the same organizational unit, or to establishing excellent collaboration between two units. I’m mostly concerned with building consensus on the strategic importance of combined efforts. Speaking only from the library side, I know that we have not done enough on that score.

Should the “one person/department” be the library?

I think this interview is revealing my inner library partisan! Sure, one department should be the library. I say that libraries do two things: they build collections and they provide access and pedagogies for collection use. The collection function is essentially a quality filter for the content that drives teaching and research, which connects naturally to the teaching and access systems that support their use. You may be right that digital is digital, but it makes more sense to me to say that content is content. The skills and values needed to do these functions feel cohesive, format agnostic and fundamentally academic to me.

What is the relationship at LSU between the IT department and the Library?

We have a terrific relationship, with shared space and shared library-like functions, for example, ILS management and licensing. This has been critical at LSU, where the library does not have a history of IT-oriented staffing.

I’m working hard to change this last bit, hiring programmers and so on. Here in 2014, we’re behind. Let’s check back and see where we are in a few years.

Should the IT department and the library be centrally managed?

I noted above the infrastructure/content distinction, where the concerns and skill sets are different enough to make me think that these functions are best housed in different units. Ten years ago there was a spurt of research institutions that attempted to combine the two, and to my knowledge, only one such arrangement remains. Not to say that it couldn’t work, only that it hasn’t yet on any scale.

How do you see data and human knowledge combining in the creation of library content and service delivery?

New technologies make it possible for research libraries to do their historic role in ways that make them more effective than ever before. In many ways, what’s required here is just tweaked technologies, and tweaked staff expertise. I don’t deny that new and different are also required, but my point is that the library is very well situated to do the future here. Really, the potential here is unlimited. I seriously can’t imagine a better time to be a research librarian.

Library as publisher? Library as textbook licensor? What do you think?

Library as publisher, that’s easy — insofar as the Internet has lowered the publishing bar to the level of tweets. Tweets and Open Access. So yes, libraries are already publishers, and this role can only grow.

The issue of textbook licensing speaks to my current number one passion. For decades, it’s been axiomatic that there is no library-based solution to the college textbook problem. That was true in the print world, but recent developments in the digital realm have changed the game entirely. This isn’t a turf battle with bookstores; something far more interesting is developing there. But there is huge opportunity for involvement with academic units on campus, or with the University at the level of academic affairs. The opportunity is compelling, but there are threats as well. Without assertive partnership from the library, costs and traditional academic values such as privacy could make the old textbook problem much worse. ✄

A declaration that rings throughout librarianship as a whole these days is that libraries aren’t just about books any longer. For academic librarians especially, we need to be instructors and masters of technology as well. This statement is affirmed in Di Su’s Library Instruction Design: Learning from Google and Apple.

If you are a librarian interested in library instruction, technology, or both, this title will grab your attention as it did mine. You’ll want to open it up and see just how Google, Apple, and library instruction can be related. And you’ll get there, but you have to wade through the introductory chapters first.

The intention of this book is to “present viewpoints on library instruction theories and practices and offer suggestions…on library instruction program design of both philosophical and practical levels.” Su’s idea is well placed. Just as the Virginia Mason Medical Center in Seattle looked to the management style of Toyota, there is much to learn from other industries of public service.

This title has six chapters that set up the variables of the topic in great detail, library instruction more so. This makes sense considering Di Su is an Associate Professor and a Head of Information Literacy. His expertise comes in handy at the end where, after the seventh conclusion chapter, you’ll find multiple appendices that layout possible library instruction plans based on what is learned from the Google and Apple design philosophies. In the first two chapters, you will get a definition and history of library instruction, along with its philosophy and what it looks like in practice. These are a bit difficult to get through if you are familiar with or have read other texts on library instruction as it contains similar information. This leads into chapters on the design philosophies of Google and Apple with bits of interesting history on the ways and why they were formed. Then finally, what you’ve been waiting for, a look at the particular philosophies and principles that can be applied to library instruction. To bring it home, the final two chapters, which are the most interesting, discuss the particular design styles of each and parse through them while relating it to instruction.

Much of the comparisons made by Su between the design philosophies and library instruction seemed a bit cursory and common knowledge, but his focus on the bottom-up, top-down styles regarding the use of user data was incredibly interesting. While Google relies heavily on user feedback, Apple prides itself on being secretive because they should already know what the users want without them asking. Wondering how this plays out in library instruction? Read this book to find out! Also helpful was the practical section where he suggests instructional programs that would work for each style and provides a sample teaching scenario, one-shot for bottom-up and credit bearing for top-down. Although the samples would have been better received if it used either/or for both styles, it was helpful to see the styles in action.

Overall, this title gets you thinking outside the box and entertaining the idea of looking to other industries to guide instruction styles. It is an intriguing read, if only for chapters three to six and the appendices.

From the Reference Desk

by Tom Gilson (Associate Editor, Against the Grain, and Head of Reference Emeritus, College of Charleston, Charleston, SC 29401) <gilson@cofc.edu>


The study of language development is a highly interdisciplinary field that draws from disciplines ranging from neuroscience and psychology to education, linguistics, speech and hearing studies, and genetics. A look at the Reader’s Guide with its broad subject categories reinforces this observation in addition to providing a sense of the coverage. Individual articles address specific concepts and theories, research models and methods, cognitive and biological issues, social and family impacts, disabilities and disorders, and special populations including nonhuman primates.

Besides the Reader’s Guide, finding aids include numerous “see also” references and a thorough general index. Each entry is signed and has its own bibliography of further readings. Value-added features include a resource list of books and articles, journals, associations, and Websites; a glossary; a chronology; and an appendix of world literacy statistics.

The Encyclopedia of Language Development is an informed and scholarly work that employs fact-filled descriptions and explanations of the topics covered. Given that ongoing research is essential to the discipline, there are numerous references to relevant sources and scholarship throughout. Although there are some illustrations, this volume is text dense. While the informed and interested lay reader will find the Encyclopedia helpful, it is obviously intended for students, faculty,
and professionals in the field. In addition to offering discussions of relevant topics, this work provides a service to the scholarly community by furnishing a resource that offers an accessible overview of a diverse field with solid background information, answers to specific questions, and discussions of current research.

Depending on need, academic libraries will find the Encyclopedia of Language questions, and discussions of current research. accessible overview of a diverse field with solid zetti aspects of topics ranging from the looking and materialistic perspective. as well as a turning away from the progressivism essays arranged in ten broad categories with a single-volume work that provides the text of 45 1920-1929 Documents in American History: The 1920s, 1920-1929 (2014; ISBN 978-1-61925-498-5, $399) is a new edition that examines more than 29,000 major characters from 3,500 important works of literature. New to this edition are 245 characters published in popular works of fiction from 2000 to 2012 and “combines the characters profiled in the first three editions of Cyclopedia of Literary Characters (1963, 1990, 1998).” These character descriptions can be used alone to begin researching character development and motivation in a novel. They also can be used as a starting place for analyzing an epic play or novel and its author’s writing style and technique.”

Salem Press also has a couple of recent releases on their list:

- Cyclopedia of Literary Characters, Fourth Edition - five volumes (November 2014, 978-1-61925-497-8, $455; e-ISBN: 978-1-61925-498-5; $399) is a new edition that examines more than 29,000 major characters from 3,500 important works of literature. New to this edition are 245 characters published in popular works of fiction from 2000 to 2012 and “combines the characters profiled in the first three editions of Cyclopedia of Literary Characters (1963, 1990, 1998).” These character descriptions can be used alone to begin researching character development and motivation in a novel. They also can be used as a starting place for analyzing an epic play or novel and its author’s writing style and technique.”

- Forensic Science - three volumes (April 2015, 978-1-61925-729-0, $364; e-ISBN: 978-1-61925-730-6, $364) is a “comprehensive reference source on the theory, techniques, and applications of the various forensic sciences... one of the fastest-growing subjects in academic curricula... The topic list of Salem’s new reference set has been carefully constructed to cover the full range of the forensic sciences, whose incredible variety can be seen in the titles of some of the set’s core essays: Forensic Accounting, Forensic Anthropology, Forensic Archaeology, Forensic Botany, Forensic Entomology, Forensic Geoscience, Forensic Nursing, Forensic Odontology, Forensic Pathology, Forensic Photography, Forensic Psychiatry, Forensic Psychology, Forensic Sculpture, and Forensic Toxicology...”

ABC-CLIO/Greenwood has some new encyclopedias, including:


---

The two volumes are handy and easy to navigate. The basic arrangement is by state and then alphabetically by city. Drawn from numerous sources, each city entry starts off with a descriptive background and continues with a series of bulleted lists that provide the city’s rankings in areas like business and finance, the environment, health and fitness, real estate, safety, retirement, sports and recreation, women and minorities, and miscellaneous. This information is followed by statistical tables on essentials like demographics, city finances, the general economy, income, employment, taxes, transportation, cost of living, housing, health, education, public safety, recreation, climate, and other environmental factors. The sources of the information are fully referenced. There are also appendices that offer comparative statistics, metropolitan area definitions, information on government type and county, as well as lists of chambers of commerce and state departments of labor.

However, there is one caveat. Often the facts and figures cited in many of these profiles are for the larger metropolitan areas in which these smaller cities are located. Despite this, the profiles in America’s Top Rated Smaller Cities offer a useful and fascinating snapshot of the cities covered. Spending time with this reference would benefit not only a family that is considering moving to one of these smaller cities to live. A business owner thinking of re-locating a company trying to expand its market, or a sales person interested in a new territory would all find valuable facts and figures here.

And according to the Grey House Website they are now offering buyers of the 2014/2015 two-volume print set free access to the online version of America’s Top-rated Smaller Cities. Of course, this title can also be purchased solely in eBook format from a number of vendors including: Gale’s Virtual Reference Library (GVRL); MyILibrary; EBSCO; Overdrive; Davidson Titles; and Follett. (EBook ISBN: 978-1-61925-296-7)

**Extra Servings**

SAGE Reference has a number of future offerings to think about, including:

- The Encyclopedia of Educational Technology (March 2015, 978-1-4522-5822-5, $375) is a two-volume set edited by J. Michael Spector that highlights “how to leverage the power of technology to support teaching and learning … exploring how to approach, adapt, and use innovative technology to help achieve true gains in student performance, even in the face of perpetually evolving devices, services, and techniques, this two-volume encyclopedia focuses on core topics and issues that will retain relevance over time. Readers can peruse more than 300 cross-referenced A-to-Z articles, each written by a distinguished scholar and all organized in a Reader’s Guide.

- The Encyclopedia of Education Economics and Finance (Nov. 2014, ISBN: 978-1-4522-8185-8,$375; eISBN: 978-1-4833-4659-5, available through SAGE Knowledge) is “designed as an introduction to the field for those who work in education settings, as well as for policymakers, undergraduates, and general lay readers interested in better understanding the debates about education funding and policy, this two-volume resource provides accessible, non-technical, intuitive explanations of key concepts and empirical findings...”

---

This year Grey House published the tenth edition of one of its more popular statistical references. America’s Top Rated Smaller Cities: A Statistical Handbook (2014; ISBN: 978-1-61925-278-3, $225) is a two-volume set that provides key information and statistics on 126 smaller cities with populations ranging from 25,000 to 100,000 that the editors feel are the best in America. According to the publisher 17 of the cities covered are new.
From the Reference Desk

K. Wayne, with advising editor Lois Banner, examines the issues, people, and events of women's activism, from the early period of American history to the present time. This comprehensive reference not only traces the historical evolution of the movement, but also covers current issues affecting women, such as reproductive freedom, political participation, pay equity, violence against women, and gay civil rights.

- Religion and American Cultures: Tradition, Diversity, and Popular Expression, Second Edition (December 2014, ISBN: 978-1-61069-109-3, $399; eBook, eISBN: 978-1-61069-110-9, call for pricing). "This revised and expanded edition... presents more than 140 essays that address contemporary spiritual practice and culture with a historical perspective. The entries cover virtually every religion in modern-day America as well as the role of religion in various aspects of U.S. culture. Readers will discover that Americans aren't largely Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish anymore, and that the number of popular religious identities is far greater than many would imagine..."

Oxford University Press has released two new works in their Oxford Encyclopedias of the Bible series:

- The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and Law (January 2015, ISBN: 9780199843305, $395) offers "130 A-Z entries, written by more than 100 international authors, making this the authoritative resource on the subject..."

- The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and Theology (March 2015, ISBN: 9780199858699, $395) consists of "nearly 170 signed A-Z entries, by more than 150 international scholars... extensive overviews of key topics, including information on both the trajectory and reception history of theological issues," and "thorough coverage of traditional theological perspectives, such as Forgiveness and Grace, and modern concerns, such as Wealth and Poverty..."

In addition, Oxford University Press recently announced the launch of Oxford Historical Treaties (OHT) on the Oxford Public International Law platform. "Oxford Historical Treaties is a comprehensive online resource of nearly 16,000 global treaties concluded between 1648 and 1919 — between the Peace of Westphalia and the establishment of the League of Nations. (The source for these treaties is The Consolidated Treaty Series, compiled by the late distinguished scholar Clive Parry of Downing College, Cambridge University, and published by OUP in 231 print volumes...)

H.W. Wilson is publishing a new edition of a classic:

- Famous First Facts, 7th Edition (December, 2014, ISBN: 978-1-61925-468-8, $195). This edition "is updated and expanded with new entries reflecting the latest developments and discoveries, and newly organized for easier access to information. The seventh edition includes more than 8,000 firsts, over 1,000 new to this edition. Fields updated include science and technology, military history, and politics, describing events that have occurred since the 2006 edition..."

Routledge has also released a new edition of a standard reference:

- European Union Encyclopedia and Directory 2015 (November 2014, ISBN: 978-1-85743-737-9, $1,015) "provides in-depth information on all matters relating to the European Union (EU): the financial crisis affecting the eurozone is covered in depth, including details of recent developments; progress regarding the recent and future expansion of the Union is addressed; and the EU’s legal and social frameworks, the environment and external relations are discussed..."

And last but not least, Wiley-Blackwell is also planning a couple of new reference works:

- The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction, three volumes (March 2015, ISBN: 978-1-118-61104-4, $495) is a "reference work with contributions from leading global scholars, available both online and as a three-volume print set. It successfully brings into a single source explanation of all relevant work that is developing internationally."

- The International Encyclopedia of Digital Communication and Society, 3 volumes (February 2015, ISBN: 978-1-118-29074-3, $495) "offers critical assessments of theoretical and applied research on digitally-mediated communication, a central area of study in the 21st century... with the aim of bringing together international and interdisciplinary perspectives."

Both of these titles are published with a regularly updated online edition. For further information see http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com

Collecting to the Core — Arabic Resources in Translation: The History of al-Tabari

by Meryle Gaston (Librarian for Middle Eastern Studies, Davidson Library, University of California, Santa Barbara; Middle Eastern History, Languages, and Literatures Editor, Resources for College Libraries) <gaston@library.ucsb.edu>

Column Editor: Anne Doherty (Resources for College Libraries Project Editor, CHOICE/ACRL) <adoherty@ala-choice.org>

Over the years I have guided many undergraduate students to resources on the Middle East, as undergraduates are often lost when asked to find primary sources for research in Middle East history courses. Throughout my reference and instruction work I have learned that students’ need for primary sources is the most troublesome because undergraduates are almost always limited to materials in English, and these sources are rarely available. Despite the recent growth of Middle Eastern studies in the American academy (and the public’s attention), finding primary resources in translation from the modern Middle East remains problematic. More works from the twentieth and twenty-first centuries are being translated, often with an eye to popular works and trending topics, especially memoirs, autobiographies, and other monographs by prominent regional figures. Classical history, however, is another story. The problem is that while there are extant sources dating to earlier times, they are in Middle Eastern languages, most commonly Arabic. While a few translations have been available in the past, the number of translations into English was quite scarce. Fortunately, in the last few years the quantity of translations has been growing. Most are good and accurate, often with critical apparatus. In fact, as bibliographer at UC-Santa Barbara, I will acquire almost any translation of a Middle
The History of al-Ṭabari, for example, volume 1 covers the period “from the creation to the flood”; volumes 2 and 3 deal with Old Testament events and ancient kingdoms. Volume 5 covers the empires immediately preceding the rise of Islam. Volumes 6 through 9 address events during the Prophet Muhammad’s lifetime; volumes 10 through 19 cover the Umayyads; and volumes 27 through 33 the early ‘Abbāsids period. It is not until volume 34 that the reader encounters events from Ṭabari’s own time, and only the last five volumes deal with this period. Volume 39 covers all periods from the rise of Islam and is entitled Biographies of the Prophet’s Companions and Their Successors. Certainly, the volumes covering periods immediately before Ṭabari’s time would still have tapped into living memory, but they are definitely not eye-witness accounts. That is not to say that earlier volumes do not have value as the received wisdom of the time; they are claimed and considered to have been based on reliable sources. The issue of those “reliable” sources (or “akhbar,” i.e., reports) has been rather hotly debated for many decades in Middle Eastern historical discourse. It is sufficient to say that the English translation that has resulted in The History of al-Ṭabari has gone beyond being a welcome addition to the literature of classical Islamic history. It has been a monumental effort striving for and attaining the highest academic standards. It needs to be in every college library whose institution attempts courses in Middle Eastern history. It is a boon to scholars, students, and inquirers of all levels everywhere, especially for those undergraduates seeking accessible primary sources.
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Cases of Note — Sometimes It’s Not a Federal Action #2
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PARAPSYCHOLOGIST LARRY MONTZ DREAMED UP A TV SHOW that would follow his crack team on field investigations. You know, temperature drops in a room without reason. Photos of ghosts. Jack Nicholson smashes down hotel doors with an axe. Well, not that extreme. But it’s hardly likely the author intended it as a gift. And most importantly, it is not preempted by federal copyright law.

So, Let’s Go to the Facts of the Case

Yes, it’s the old paranormal field investigator sh*t. Is there nothing original in Hollywood?

Parapsychologist Larry Montz dreamed up a TV show that would follow his crack team on field investigations. You know, temperature drops in a room without reason. Photos of ghosts. Jack Nicholson smashes down hotel doors with an axe. Well, not that extreme. But you get the idea.

And they would have all kinds of cool gear. Magnetometers and infrared cameras. That kind of stuff to really add to the pseudo-scientific vibe.

From 1996 to 2003, Montz tirelessly pitched the idea to studios, producers and other suits. Took meetings. Held discussions. Included in this was NBC and the Sci-Fi Channel. Meh. No interest.

Then in 2006, Ghost Hunters appeared produced by a partnership of NBC and Craig Piligian as Pilgrim Films. Joseph Conrad Hawes and his crack team, armed with cool gear, travel America on paranormal field investigations.

Montz understandably felt ripped off, and so he sued. And Montz’ lawyer had read up on Desny and specifically alleged breach of an implied-in-fact contract. Plus, the ideas were pitched with the understanding that they were confidential and would not be used or disclosed without compensation.

You can see where under copyright law there would be an issue of whether there was anything the least bit original about ghost hunters with cool gear.

Procedural fol-de-rol

Montz lost based on copyright law preempting state-law claims. He appealed and lost again before a three-judge panel. The Ninth Circuit ordered a rehearing en banc. Woo. All the black robes crowd in to consider the issue.

Getting on all Fours with the Industry

Writers pitch scripts to the movies and TV all the time. Ideas are not protected under copyright, but a studio can violate an implied contract to pay the writer. In Desny — a writer Victor Desny — entered into an implied contract with the famed director Billy Wilder (Sunset Boulevard, Witness for the Prosecution, The Lost Weekend). Wilder produced Ace in the Hole about a man trapped in a cave. The California Supreme Court held that Desny had sufficiently pled breach of an implied contract.

So how interesting is that as a plot? Not terribly. So Wilder made Kirk Douglas into an unscrupulous, drunken reporter who bribes a sheriff to go slow on the rescue to maintain a media feeding frenzy. And Douglas has an affair with the cave man’s wife, Jan Sterling, who wants out of their shabby trading post/cafe in the middle of Nowheresville, New Mexico, thus lending a film noir allure to it. The cave man dies due to laggardly rescue. Jan stabs Kirk to death with pair of scissors.

Yes, it was a flop. Wilder made $250,000. This was 1951, when the dollar bought something. Desny settled for $14,350.

Copyright Preemption

The Copyright Act of 1976 expressly preempts state claims if the work falls within the subject matter of copyright and state law provides rights that are equivalent. 17 U.S.C. § 301(a). But, of course, copyright does not apply to ideas not in a fixed medium. § 301(b). If the idea is in a fixed medium, then it’s preempted. See Nimmer, Nimmer on COPYRIGHT § 19D.03[A][3] (rev. ed. 2010).

To escape preemption, state law must provide rights that are qualitatively different from copyright. With implied-contract, there is an extra element — payment for use of an idea. See Rokos v. Peck, 182 Cal. App. 3d 604, 617 (1986). Further, copyright is a public monopoly while implied-in-fact contracts are between two parties. Rokos, 182 Cal. App. 3d at 617.

“...The whole purpose of the contract was to protect Plaintiff’s rights to his ideas beyond those already protected by the Copyright Act.” Groshert v. Spyglass Entm’t Group, No. CV 02-01803, 2002 U.S. Dist LEXIS 17769, 2002. And by golly, Nimmer expressly said this was a sound ruling because otherwise there would be a gap between copyright protection and industry custom.

Questions & Answers — Copyright Column

Column Editor:  Laura N. Gasaway  (Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill School of Law, Chapel Hill, NC 27599; Phone: 919-962-2295; Fax: 919-962-1193)  <laura_gasaway@unc.edu>  www.unc.edu/~uncnlg/gasaway.htm

QUESTION:  What does the 11th Circuit ruling in the Georgia State University case mean for libraries?

ANSWER: The GSU case is not over but continues to work its way through the judicial continued on page 55
system. This case has been discussed in several earlier columns, but on October 17, 2014, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit reversed the decision of the federal district court and ordered the case to that court for reconsideration in light of its opinion. (See www.medical.ca11.uscourts.gov/opinions/pub/files/201214676.pdf). This case began in 2008 when three publishers sued GSU for copyright infringement for reproducing portions of their books for e-reserves, for its course management system, and in electronic course packs without permission or paying royalties. For a useful timeline of the case see the Georgia State University Library Website at http://libguides.law.gsu.edu/gsucopyrightcase.

The 11th Circuit affirmed the district court’s holding on the first fair use factor (purpose and character of the use) and held that course reserves are not transformative use but that nonprofit educational uses are favored under fair use. The court found that the second factor (nature of the copyrighted work) was not of much value in this case but it did reverse the district court’s holding on this factor, saying that it required a closer examination of the original work and of the composition of the analysis data. It found that the district court erred by establishing a strict quantitative test for the third factor (amount and substantiality used) and said that per se rules were not appropriate. On the fourth factor (market effect) the court agreed with the district court that small excerpts taken did not substitute for the book. The court also found error on the part of the district court by giving all four factors equal weight. It vacated the injunction, declaratory relief, and the award of attorney’s fees and costs.

So, the case is not over. It is possible that there could be a settlement at this point, but it is also possible that the case will proceed to reconsideration by the district court in accordance with the 11th Circuit ruling. Thus, it is difficult to predict exactly what the case ultimately will mean for libraries. It is pretty clear that the old classroom guidelines are not much of a guide since they are clearly minimum and not maximum guidelines; that the course pack cases which involved commercial copy shops are not applicable to nonprofit educational institutions; and that putting portions of works in an e-reserve system is not transformative use.

QUESTION: A corporate librarian asks a question about his photographs which have been published in a book and are already copyrighted by publisher. If the librarian posts the photographs on Facebook, does Facebook then own the copyright?

ANSWER: According to the information provided, the publisher actually owns the copyright in the photographs as well as the book. Facebook does not own the copyright in photographs that users post.

A more important question is whether the librarian has the right to post those photographs on Facebook since he has transferred the copyright to the publisher of the book. The answer depends on the transfer agreement he signed when he transferred the copyright to the publisher. If the librarian reserved any rights or did not specifically transfer the electronic rights, he would have the right to use the photographs that he “authorized” by posting them.

QUESTION: An editor of academic journals asks about situations in which authors “resubmit” papers based on research that has appeared in some form in another association’s conference proceedings. What are the copyright implications when one version of a paper serves as a “launching point” for a new version? For example, a submitted article might draw from the authors’ same core research and demonstrate overlap in its foundational discussion but present findings and implications that are unique to the new article and are targeted and, to some extent, rewritten to appeal to a particular journal’s interests. (1) What are the general copyright concerns in this situation? (2) What burden is on the respective publishers? (3) What burdens fall on the author or authors? (4) If a journal wants to publish papers from conferences it sponsors and it holds the copyright in the proceedings, what if an author wants to adapt a paper and rework it into a new article?

ANSWER: (1) Assuming that the author retained the copyright from the first paper, then publishing a later version with the editor’s journal is no problem. The author owns the derivative right which includes the right to prepare new versions. A new version has a new copyright in the new material added, but anything used from the earlier version retains the copyright from the earlier version. If the journal owns the copyright, then the author can request that it grant the derivative right to produce a later version.

(2) The publisher should make sure that the author actually did not transfer the copyright to a previous version to someone else. Typically, just presenting a paper at a conference does not require a transfer of copyright, so the author likely still owns it. Unfortunately, in my experience, authors often have no idea whether they transferred the copyright. In that situation, the publisher might require the author to indemnify the journal should someone else own the copyright and complain.

(3) Authors should be aware whether they own their own copyrights. If the author transferred the copyright to another publisher, then the author who creates a new version is infringing the copyright (which he or she no longer owns) by creating a derivative work. That is one of the reasons that I encourage publishers to take only the rights they need — reproduction and distribution plus the electronic rights, but not the derivative right.

(4) The first determination for the journal that published the conference proceedings is whether the journal actually owns the copyright in each individual paper or only in the compilation of the papers that is published as proceedings. To own each article, each author must execute a signed agreement to the journal which transfers the copyright to the journal for the individual paper. It is common for authors to adapt papers and turn them into another article. Many publishers understand this and are not so rigid about requiring individual authors to transfer the entire copyright. It is the compilation (the conference proceedings) that the publisher typically sells and in which it claims copyright. If it is important for the journal to own the copyright in the individual article, it still can permit individual authors to retain their derivative rights so there is no confusion over whether the author can adapt a conference paper for publication as a later article.

QUESTION: On the Liblicense discussion list, there has been some question about the meaning of “perpetual access” in library licenses for access to materials. What does perpetual access actually mean?

ANSWER: Oddly enough, perpetual access may not actually mean forever. At the time the license agreement is executed, both parties mean that access will be guaranteed into the far distant future, hopefully forever. But what the copyright holder cannot guarantee is that it will continue to stay in business. Typically, when a business is sold, the buyer honors the contractual agreements entered into by the original owner prior to the transfer of ownership. But what happens if the company goes into bankruptcy? A court is not likely to order the company to continue to provide access when it is going out of business. So, perhaps what perpetual access means is that as long as the copyright owner is in business it guarantees access to its materials to libraries with which it has contracted.
**ATG Special Report — Workflow Collaboration at the American University Library**

by Stacey Marien (Acquisitions Librarian, American University Library) <smarien@american.edu>

and Alayne Mundi (Resource Description Librarian, American University Library) <mundt@american.edu>

American University is a private, co-educational institution in Washington D.C. with an FTE of approximately 11,000 students. It is known for its programs in international service, public policy and public affairs, and international law and human rights. The library is a member of ACRL but not ARL.

In 2009, the library decided to broaden our services with the book vendor Blackwell to provide us with shelf-ready processing for our approval plan books. Blackwell would attach the spine label, apply the bookplate and property stamp, and attach the barcode. At the same time, the library contracted with OCLC Worldcat Cataloging Partners to provide us with MARC records for these shelf-ready approval books. Once the books arrived into the library, the Acquisitions Receiving Specialist would receive the books and review that all the pre-processing was done, and then divert all of the titles to the Cataloging Services Department for the record to be reviewed.

Once the shelf-ready program was up and running, we discovered that shelf-ready and computer-selected MARC records did not mean books were consistently ready to be put on the shelf. All the books were being routed to Cataloging. However, Cataloging did observe that many books coming in through this workflow had no problems with their records and could have been sent directly to Circulation to be shelved after the item record was created. At this point, in 2009, the Acquisitions and Cataloging Departments entered into their first collaborative effort to streamline this workflow.

In 2010, with Blackwell’s bankruptcy, the library decided to use Coutts (now Coutts Ingram) as our primary book vendor. We wanted to continue shelf-ready processing approval books with them as well as the collaboration we had established between the two units.

**The Idea**

If the Receiving Specialist was already receiving the approval book and checking that the shelf-ready processing was complete, why couldn’t she also check that the book’s bibliographic record was complete enough to bypass cataloging? This was the idea that the heads of both Acquisitions and Cataloging decided to explore. We needed to make sure that the Receiving Specialist had the time, knowledge, and attention to detail to ensure the MARC records would be thoroughly checked and that it was done in such a way to make Cataloging staff feel comfortable with not examining every bibliographic record for newly acquired approvals books. It was decided that Cataloging would develop a checklist that the Receiving Specialist would follow. If the book and record matched everything on the checklist, the barcode would be scanned to add the item to the record and the book would be routed to Circulation. If the book and record did not match even one item on the checklist, the book would be routed to Cataloging for review.

**The Specifics**

Cataloging developed a checklist that is used by the Receiving Specialist to check for bibliographic errors in records for shelf-ready approval books. Elements of the checklist include a physical check for processing, instructions for routing non-standard books including folios, multivolume sets, literature that needs reclassification according to local practices, or books that should be sent to our music library. The Receiving Specialist initially checks the Encoding Level (Elvl) of the record, so that books with full-level (“1” or “”) (blank)) records are eligible to go through this checklist. The checklist includes basic matching checks of elements on the book and in the record. This includes:

- ISBN
- Existence of 035 in record with OCLC prefix
- Call number on the vendor-provided spine label matching the 050 and/or 090 in the bibliographic and holdings records
- Matching publisher information in the record and on the piece
- Matching dates in the 050 and/or 090, 260 or 264, and DtSt field in the 008
- Pagination

The checklist also includes more complex elements to examine, such as a check for variant titles (246) in records and more extensive instructions on how additional contributors such as illustrators and editors to a book can be reflected in a record. It should be noted that because the sometimes complex aspects of these elements can’t be fully covered in the checklist, it means that sometimes titles are routed to Cataloging for work when they have otherwise good quality records.

Any books with errors or missing information in their records are routed to Cataloging for correction and enhancement. In 2014, the Receiving Specialist who performs this work was trained to check and compare encoding levels in OCLC and in our ILS. She was trained to import and overlay full level OCLC records onto our existing Voyager record in order to update them from prepublication or minimal level to full level. She then applies the checklist to the newly imported record.

**The Results**

When we began this workflow in 2009, it initially resulted in 24% of approvals bypassing Cataloging, but with additional refinements and additional training of the Receiving Specialist who performs this check, we have increased this number by approximately 10% per year over the course of the past four years, raising the total number of approvals books bypassing Cataloging to an average of 60%. The Receiving Specialist’s accuracy in checking these books was typically 96% to 97%.

**More Collaboration**

Since collaborating on the shelf-ready approval project (the library also has firm order books pre-processed, but these titles always go directly to Cataloging. This may be a future project to analyze, to see if we can apply the checklist to these titles), the Cataloging and Acquisitions Departments have worked together to improve workflows by Acquisitions’ contribution to a long-term move to storage project in which we are moving approximately 100,000 volumes from our library’s main stacks to a shared storage facility that is part of our consortia, Washington Research Library Consortia (WRLC). The purpose of this move to storage project, which will move approximately 15% of our main stacks to storage, is to make space for increased student study and programming space, as well as being part of a renovation of the library. The renovation of the library is somewhat dependent upon creating space in the library based on this move, so moving items has needed to happen at a rapid rate, at times being the Cataloging unit’s number one priority since the project began approximately two years ago. As part of the move to storage process, we confirm that the cataloging record and barcode match the item in hand, make corrections to bibliographic records that are incorrect, correct holdings statements as needed, and examine materials for damage or mold.

One Acquisitions Specialist in particular has contributed significantly to this project, accounting for nearly 35% of the total volumes relocated to storage over the past year. In addition to performing the database maintenance and cleanup aspects of this position, she has also reviewed the work of Acquisitions student workers who have been trained to work on this project during their down time and also serves as a point person for answering student questions. Although she initially only worked on single-volume monographs and titles that were considered the easier part of this project’s workflow, she has, over time, learned additional skills and works to correct problem titles continued on page 57
routed to us that have errors in bibliographic, holdings, or item records. This has allowed us to move significantly more titles to storage and has given Cataloging more leeway to focus on projects requiring higher-level cataloging knowledge and skills.

American University Library’s Processing Department is located in the Acquisitions Department, and the Processing Specialist has provided Cataloging Services staff and student assistants training to identify which materials that are moving to storage as part of this project need to be routed to her department for repair, and has trained staff on how to identify mold so that these materials can be isolated and appropriately handled.

Another way the two departments have collaborated has been with eBook cataloging. Over the past five years, we have shifted to purchasing more eBooks than print books. The Acquisitions department is responsible for ordering all eBooks that are one-time purchases (The Electronic Resource Management unit orders subscription eBook packages). Acquisitions has one dedicated staff member who handles the bulk of eBook ordering and importing of records. Initially, he would send a list of titles to Cataloging in order for them to review the records. That staff member suggested that since he was already in the MARC record changing the URL field, why couldn’t he just check the record to make sure it was correct? Thus was born another collaborative effort. Cataloging developed an appropriate checklist and several staff members in Acquisitions were trained on using it. This collaboration has resulted in the elimination of the backlog of eBooks to be checked.

Onward

Often times in libraries, various units in Technical Services do not necessarily work together. These units may create their own silos and may not be involved with work other units are doing. At American University Library, the heads of the units in Technical Services have worked hard to foster the idea that we are one unit, working for the same cause — to provide the best access to the material for our users. It has been very useful for the Acquisitions unit to learn what the Cataloging unit looks for in a good record. This has provided us with a shared vocabulary and understanding. Cataloging staff have also been trained to work in the Acquisitions module of Voyager. This has helped in the demystification process for everyone. We can do this by collaborating on projects that get the materials out to the user in a timely manner. Our staff members have also been eager to learn new skills and to get a better understanding of what work is done in each unit, and how something Acquisitions does may impact the work in Cataloging and vice versa. One positive outcome has been an increased respect for work done in our units.

ATG Special Report — Some Thoughts on Polling at the Charleston Conference 2014

by Erin Gallagher (Electronic Resources & Serials Librarian, Olin Library, Rollins College, 1000 Holt Avenue, Winter Park, FL 32789) <egallagher@rollins.edu>

A couple of years ago at the annual meeting of the Florida Association of College and Research Libraries (FACRL), I attended a presentation that included live audience polling. I now fail to remember the content of the presentation, but the interactive polling made a lasting impression. Such a lasting impression, in fact, that I have been looking for opportunities to use live polling in various facets of my life in academic librarianship. Library instruction sessions are a terrific venue for live polling. The students light up when asked to pull out their phones or turn on their computers. They enjoy responding anonymously to questions like “how does writing a research paper make you feel?” and seeing their responses pop up in cartoonish bubbles. They seem more willing to speak up, voice opinions, and ask questions when we have already broken the seal on interaction. And we end up feeling a bit more hip.

When brainstorming the details for our presentation proposal for the Charleston Conference this year (with co-presenter Michelle Leonard, University of Florida), we knew we wanted to do something that went beyond the Powerpoint. With so many competing sessions on our topic, use-driven acquisition, we had to stand out and offer our attendees something buzzworthy. Because our presentation focused on surveying the landscape of use-driven acquisition, live polling was an obvious fit. In preparation for our session, we pinged a few listservs and asked for suggestions for polling tools. The most common answer was Poll Everywhere. Anyone can register and create a free account that allows for all the basic functions and up to 40 respondents. Paid plans offer more customization, a few bells and whistles, and an allowance for more respondents. We found their user guide and tutorial videos to be incredibly valuable, but there is no substitute for getting your hands dirty creating some test polls. For those of you who may want to incorporate live polling into your instruction sessions, meetings, or conference presentations, we are sharing some do’s and don’ts based on our experience. Some relate specifically to Poll Everywhere, but we believe they’re applicable to other scenarios.

Do’s:

• Give the audience options for responding. This could include text messaging, Web responding, Twitter, etc.
• Depending on the nature of your poll questions, give the audience a mix of open-ended and multiple-choice questions to keep things interesting and to collect a blend of quantitative and anecdotal data.
• Keep the questions and multiple-choice responses as concise and simple as possible. No one wants to spend a long time reading through a laundry list before responding.
• Practice makes perfect! My colleagues here at Rollins College were generous enough to attend a polling
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practice session before I went off to Charleston. It was beyond valuable to get their feedback and suggestions. It’s also crucial to test out the mechanics of whichever polling tool you’re using; it’s better to work out the glitches in practice and with a group of colleagues or friends than during the presentation itself. Ask them to bring a variety of devices for responding.

- Plan for interactive dialogue with your audience. Once the results start rolling in, the discussion will flow, so presenters will need to act as both moderators and facilitators.
- Start with an open-ended “test” question before getting into the meat of your presentation. This will allow everyone to test out the response mechanics and can act as an icebreaker. We asked, “where is everyone from?”
- Select questions that could be deemed controversial or debatable. These will be more likely to provoke lively discussion.

Don’ts:
- Plan for too many questions. We had a 45 minute session and planned for 9 questions. We ended up speeding through the last few because they spurred such terrific, expansive discussion.
- Wait until the day of your presentation to test out the functionality in real time. The polls may display differently to your audience than they displayed in creation mode.
- Be surprised if one or more attendees has issues with responding. In any scenario in which we’re relying on technology, anything can (and probably will) go wrong for at least one person in your audience. If you have the ability to do some quick troubleshooting, go for it, but don’t let your presentation be derailed by temperamental devices. If someone is having trouble responding digitally, ask them to speak out.

Utilizing live polling in a conference presentation setting requires you to wear a variety of hats. This kind of presentation must be dynamic, fast-paced, well-organized, and presented by those who are confident in engaging an audience for an extended period of time. Presenters will go beyond information sharing and will need to prompt their audience for input, ask follow-up questions, solicit alternative viewpoints, provide clarification on questions and answers, quickly summarize audience responses, encourage networking, and ultimately know when to move on to the next question. Active participation is fun and stimulating, but there must be an element of learning.

Our biggest takeaway from live polling at the Charleston Conference was that this will greatly change the dynamic of the traditional “session.” Instead of the usual format of “let me tell you about what we did at our library and then you ask questions if we have time” (and there’s nothing wrong with this format), live polling puts the power into the hands of the audience. The session becomes something more like “tell us what you did/think/feel and then let’s discuss immediately.” The most valuable and memorable presentations I’ve attended in my admittedly short five years in the profession have been those that engage the audience in the discussion throughout, instead of in a rush for questions at the end. Our polling sessions were not the most well-attended of the conference, but we saw more connections made, tough questions asked and answered, and camaraderie over shared struggles than we saw in others. Contributing to a body of knowledge is empowering in a way that absorbing information is not. Not all presentations or instruction sessions will be appropriate for live polling, but we are absolutely sold. In an era when PowerPoint seems to be going the way of the VCR, why not shake things up a bit?

Author’s Note: To participate in the survey questions from this session, and to view updated results from online participants, visit the ATG NewsChannel at http://www.ainst-the-grain.com/2014/12/poll-e-palooza.—EG

@Brunning: People & Technology
At the Only Edge that Means Anything / How We Understand What We Do
by Dennis Brunning (Director, The Design School Library, Arizona State University) <dennis.brunning@gmail.com>

Guide for the Perplexed: Where Books Gather

How awesome that one of our storage centers might be located in an industrial area by a river. We could then say, in honesty, truth, and a smile, that our books “gather by the river.” An even better image would be storage built above, around, a stream. Architects, in higher end design, love this image; would be storage built above, around, a river. We ended up speeding through the last few because they spurred such terrific, expansive discussion.

- Plan for interactive dialogue with your audience. Once the results start rolling in, the discussion will flow, so presenters will need to act as both moderators and facilitators.
- Start with an open-ended “test” question before getting into the meat of your presentation. This will allow everyone to test out the response mechanics and can act as an icebreaker. We asked, “where is everyone from?”
- Select questions that could be deemed controversial or debatable. These will be more likely to provoke lively discussion.

Don’ts:
- Plan for too many questions. We had a 45 minute session and planned for 9 questions. We ended up speeding through the last few because they spurred such terrific, expansive discussion.
- Wait until the day of your presentation to test out the functionality in real time. The polls may display differently to your audience than they displayed in creation mode.
- Be surprised if one or more attendees has issues with responding. In any scenario in which we’re relying on technology, anything can (and probably will) go wrong for at least one person in your audience. If you have the ability to do some quick troubleshooting, go for it, but don’t let your presentation be derailed by temperamental devices. If someone is having trouble responding digitally, ask them to speak out.

Utilizing live polling in a conference presentation setting requires you to wear a variety of hats. This kind of presentation must be dynamic, fast-paced, well-organized, and presented by those who are confident in engaging an audience for an extended period of time. Presenters will go beyond information sharing and will need to prompt their audience for input, ask follow-up questions, solicit alternative viewpoints, provide clarification on questions and answers, quickly summarize audience responses, encourage networking, and ultimately know when to move on to the next question. Active participation is fun and stimulating, but there must be an element of learning.

Our biggest takeaway from live polling at the Charleston Conference was that this will greatly change the dynamic of the traditional “session.” Instead of the usual format of “let me tell you about what we did at our library and then you ask questions if we have time” (and there’s nothing wrong with this format), live polling puts the power into the hands of the audience. The session becomes something more like “tell us what you did/think/feel and then let’s discuss immediately.” The most valuable and memorable presentations I’ve attended in my admittedly short five years in the profession have been those that engage the audience in the discussion throughout, instead of in a rush for questions at the end. Our polling sessions were not the most well-attended of the conference, but we saw more connections made, tough questions asked and answered, and camaraderie over shared struggles than we saw in others. Contributing to a body of knowledge is empowering in a way that absorbing information is not. Not all presentations or instruction sessions will be appropriate for live polling, but we are absolutely sold. In an era when PowerPoint seems to be going the way of the VCR, why not shake things up a bit?

Author’s Note: To participate in the survey questions from this session, and to view updated results from online participants, visit the ATG NewsChannel at http://www.ainst-the-grain.com/2014/12/poll-e-palooza.—EG

@Brunning: People & Technology
At the Only Edge that Means Anything / How We Understand What We Do
by Dennis Brunning (Director, The Design School Library, Arizona State University) <dennis.brunning@gmail.com>

Guide for the Perplexed: Where Books Gather

How awesome that one of our storage centers might be located in an industrial area by a river. We could then say, in honesty, truth, and a smile, that our books “gather by the river.” An even better image would be storage built above, around, a stream. Architects, in higher end design, love this image; and a river runs through it.”

Unfortunately, lame humor cannot cope with the sadness the trend toward off-site storage evokes. Call librarians gatekeepers, out of need we were; what we kept safe, sound, dry, and within reach warranted gatekeeping.

Not any longer. Stack locations are often “off-site.” Storage solutions are library conversations. Check out my pal Jeff Carroio’s presentation. With Emory University librarians Lars Meyer and Charles Spornick held a great session at the Charleston Conference on a partnership in building a Harvard-style off-site storage for all of Georgia Tech’s print collection and a million or so books from Emory. It’s a great plan that lays out putting all Georgia Tech books in storage plus one million Emory titles as well. Knowing Jeff and his colleagues, I can’t imagine anything but an exemplary execution. It’s fascinating to listen to how books are boxed by size and placed in “cubes” which rest on pallets. Cooled to a constant fifty degrees. A true academic Amazon.

And with its completion and startup, one more storage location will join the ever-growing directory of such facilities off-loading the print book to somewhere else.

Besides giving us a new meaning of “cool books,” permanent irrevocable book storage also ushers us into a flipped vision of Ray Bradbury’s Fahrenheit 451. Bradbury depicts a world where it wasn’t Big Brother so much as Little Sister who through technology and mass exploitation relieved a stressed society from its intellectual toil. Of course, the book was old school, a relic of the past, and

continued on page 59
needed to be torched. Jeff's facility, I believe, comes equipped with state-of-the-art sprinkler system.

In another session, this one on “what faculty think about libraries,” hosted by Arizona State University's next UL, Jim O'Donnell, one young physics professor faculty liked books for other subjects but not in his area of particle physics. A social science researcher and excellent writer talked of her efforts to “MacGyver” solutions to books her library didn’t have. And a classicist spoke eloquently and poetically of the need for books and the library in his intellectual and emotional life.

In this era, our online times, books gather less in familiar places like shelves in our home and office, shelves at our library, or bookstores in our neighborhood. They are also digital files that flow in sines waves over wires and the broadcast air; they are ones and zeros translated into meaning held in electronic aspse.

Books packed in cubics, books irrelevant, books beloved, books sought after like a PI searching for a lost heir. How do we juggle all of these objects; what’s the trick?

We read books. Nothing more experiential than reading. We read to know, to find out, to answer, and to entertain ourselves.

When we talk about reading and when we talk about great reading, no better author comes to mind than James Joyce. A collection of short stories and three novels, most of which is a set piece of an artist’s journey through autobiographical space and time freezing the Irish soul in words forever captured between covers of books.

Remember your own reading and know that Joyce exhausted literature. Insert any great or important-to-you writer where we’ve place Joyce; it’s still true. Our authors added to our lives by our reading books. Collectively, across all formats, books contain our reading which makes up us.

Bezos and Jobs got ahead of libraries and reset where books gather. Now it isn’t clear or certain where that precisely is. Data points to steady but not exploding growth in overall eBook sales and revenues; more data shows steady sales in print. Broadly, readers enjoy and seek all book formats. It’s up to leading public has reached the saturation point for electronic formats.

Librarians seem dead set on making room in our gathering places for new core purpose like creative work spaces. Space in library buildings has become non-library space. We claim that our users don’t care. Doing so, we’ve severely discounted those who do.

For every user who doesn’t notice or care where the books gather, there are those who do. Or there are those who are confused. A guide for the perplexed would be a Ranganathan consideration of reader and books — not necessarily the artifact and machine but how intimate and close that relationship is and our task of making sure it happens for every reader a book, every book, a reader._________________________________________________________


First, we clear up the big question. We don’t find out how Google works in the sense of the secret sauce that makes the search engine the best. By the end of two hundred pages, we’ve no doubt Google is good. The authors stop just short of writing that Google is the Internet, the Internet is Google.

The authors, Eric Schmidt, Google’s former CEO, and another guy, Jonathan Rosenberg, were almost early employees, brought in at the turn of the century to guide the Stanford startup to profitability. They were Google’s adopted parents, one a geek leaning chief officer for Sun Microsystems and Novel — that would be Eric Schmidt — the other a marketing/PR fellow, well-known by Google’s early venture capitalists as someone who could bring light and order to Sergey Brin and Larry Page’s graduate student brilliant, creative, and unruly creation.

How Google Works is mostly anecdote and insight into how to leverage technological genius into money. There is nothing about how Google search works so well or even how Google might evolve from a virtual advertisement serving company — a dazzling billion-dollar annual success — and a technological company so big and dominant it has set limits on its own growth. At its best, Google Works is good reading for MBA types. The authors elaborate the idea of the smart creative, the young computer engineer, long on code, short on communication, who needs freedom, fun, large salaries, and high amounts of trust.

If there is a Google way it is to let smart creatives launch quickly, iterate, and accept failure as another form of success.

These and other insights — the peer review hiring that includes intensive and many interviews integrated with testing may seem a bit familiar to librarians — but the best insights belong to the astute reader. Much isn’t said, and here there is insight.

Google will celebrate its 20th birthday in 2018. Since the early millennium when Google “monetized” search by creating AdWords where keywords retrieve links to Websites as well as links that serve up commercial ads and AdSense, a sophisticated syndicating system to place ads on other Websites and share in the combined revenues, Google has little to show for its technological success. Over 97% of its growing revenues, Google has little to show for its technological success. Over 97% of its growing revenues come from ads; all else, the self-driving cars, Google Drive, Apps and Docs (suite of MS Office-like products and cloud services), none of these account for Google’s high operating margins.

How Google will handle itself with little growth in new products is a topic that would have made a How Google Works an excellent book whose insights would have been transformative. What works in the book is just a breezy, coy style and content which elevates the rhetoric that normally characterizes communiques from the Googleplex.

Perhaps Larry and Sergey never told Eric how Google works — that is, really works.

Meh 2014

Life Hacks — well, tips are always welcome, especially the those that pay off in money or new skills and expertise. But all this advice bubbling on the Web. We need hacks for the hacks.

Gridlock — in Congress, gridlock in our lives, gridlock as permanent human condition. We call it the new normal. Nothing is normal about indecision.

Share — is it an act of giving or confessing? I admit a social ignorance in how often and to whom I should like, share, follow, tweet. What am I sharing?

Reach out — memorable lyric hook by the Four Tops and Dionne Warwick evoked the saving power and grace of love, now gratuitously used in one-speak, now “owned”by those who want us to know they’ve poked you or maybe sent an email.

Ingest — this gastroenterological metaphor has got to go. It suggests we are feeding the machine when, in fact, the machine is neither hungry nor needs food.

Amazon’s Valuation — shareholders are creeping up on Jeff Bezos like the living dead. Amazon’s not shown a profit ever, and they spend, spend, spend to bring us cheap everything. There is no Moore’s law in retail, and everyone’s showcasing Amazon for better buys anywhere.

Big Data — we are keen, almost desperate, to bring Big Data into the library. If we put money down, we need a better pitch than “it’s all data.” The more we reify, the more we lose sight of our core strength — the world documented by research, creativity, and thought.

Mid-Decade Zeitgeist

_Catching whiffs of the future in the detritus of the past...

Facebook at Work’s happening in 2015. Remarkably it took almost a decade for the gloves to come off and the real WTF match of the titans to begin. All hail and bow down to the INCREDIBLE MIGHTY ZUCK.

Net Neutrality: We need a good concept to describe the other side of free. I don’t know about you, but my neighbors drain our cable loop with Netflix, Hulu, and name-of-the-day streaming media service.

Wikipedia Library: An astonishing effort through the Wikimedia Foundation to up the quality of Wikipedia writing and editing through library resources.

I Shot the Sheriff Award to the person(s) who killed “lublishing.” Library publishing is a worthy pursuit. This neologism isn’t. What next — “pibrarians?”

Uber God View: This might be meh if it weren’t so in the face zeitgeist. At a conference of Uber employees, an Uber honcho, demonstrated a beta version of the Uber app that allowed real-time tracking of other Uber customers. The room cheered but not the rest of us. You don’t have to be religious to sense the hubris of this “do it because we can” stunt by this driven startup. What next, hidden cameras in the backseat, catch Jaylo and Ben hooking up on the down-low. Nah, they got their own Uber...
The weeks leading up to this current writing have been chock-full of encounters with technology and content that are of the sort that, if one stops to consider them, can lead to that delicious sense of strangeness concerning the present moment, that sense that a thing, idea, or time that one has perhaps expected, but perhaps not, has in fact arrived, discernible, emerging into the present moment.

The opening bookend to this period for me was, perhaps, the welcome experience of attending the film Interstellar, a film that left me pleasantly surprised: that here was an example of someone in position to produce such a film really “getting it,” in terms of employing solid principles both of science and of science-fiction.

There was little in the film that wouldn’t occur to anyone who’s pondered the Theory of Relativity, it’s just that I never expected such a respectful and caring treatment of it to come out of a Hollywood studio.

But why shouldn’t we live in a world in which such things can be discussed, enjoyed, mused upon? That there is an audience for such content if shown by the splendid examples that occur in published science fiction, when of the highest caliber. Clarke, Azimov, Heinlein, Niven, and Pournelle: these are authors who have produced some great literature — literature that happens to take place in a place and time yet-to-be.

Evidence of change in one’s attitude can also be a welcome surprise. Readers of this columns over the years (look at all those hands going up! Who knew?) might recall the attitude I expressed in earlier days about the perceived need I felt after a purchase to have something in hand. This was as eBooks were gearing up and we were all struggling to understand what these things were (or if indeed they were things at all). I used to speak for the need to have the eBook in-hand to feel that “it” was “mine.” This was, of course, the extension of the idea that one can buy a physical copy of a book, can keep it, can loan it, get it back, give it as a gift, inherit it. The physical artifact was itself an object of delight. I think I wanted this to be extended into the digital realm.

I read fairly selectively, which is to say that, as of now, there are only around 165 eBooks on my eReader. I’ve migrated, nearly out of necessity and certainly out of convenience, to the Kindle platform, after resisting for a number of years the perceived power and influence that might accrue to a corporation with the success of such a widely adopted platform. I guess they never noticed my high-principled abstinence. Amazon managed to become the default platform for such content, despite my reluctance to buy in. It seems they were able to wait me out.

Now I think much less of whether I have a “physical manifestation” of a book. Indeed, a look at my Kindle profile would show that between readers, laptops, tablets, and computers, my Kindle use is distributed among six or seven physical devices. And, I can tell you exactly which feature of the Kindle ecosystem proved to be the undoing of my reluctance to join in…

It was “Whispersync” — that ability to pick up my phone, open a book, and be right where I’d left off at home on my “big” reader, then, once home, to pick up again right where I’d left off on my phone. Having experienced it, it wasn’t as if I couldn’t go back to manual place-keeping, I just didn’t want to. And did I worry that “someone” would know what I was reading or where I was in the book? Well, maybe a little, but not enough for me to want to have to keep track of my place. In other words, they got me by being simply useful.

Too, my sensitivity about “tracking” has been worn down to next to nothing by overexposure to tracking’s utter ubiquity. Tracking technologies saturate our Web experiences. To borrow an idea from Interstellar, the observation that our atmosphere is 80% Nitrogen, and yet we don’t even breathe Nitrogen; our Web experience is 80% tracking, and we don’t even consume tracking.

So, in this day and age, what is a book? The books I enjoy are individually titled works that each are distributed across multiple presentation devices. Wherever I happen to be, there’s my collection, and my place is saved in all those individual books, no matter which device I last used to access them. As I move between devices, replace older devices with new ones, my collection is there. It’s the content and the collection that lend familiarity and continuity across all these devices.

And, of course, we’re learning to expect the same from our collections of music, of photographs. Access to the utility provided to us by something seems to be sufficient compensation for not having the items themselves. This goes hand in hand with a principle of information retrieval drummed into Information Science students: it’s not what you have in hand that matters, it’s what you can retrieve. This is the power of the search, a power that, combined with wireless access everywhere, has changed the way we do things. It truly wasn’t that long ago this all seemed very much like “Pie in the sky” — a phrase originating, by the way, according to the plausible results of a quick search, in Joe Hill’s 1911 work, The Preacher and the Slave.

The latest New Thing I’ve encountered that turned out to seem surprisingly familiar in a welcome way, was Amazon Echo. Having received an invitation some months ago, responding to it, and then forgetting about it, I was surprised to get an email from Amazon letting me know that Amazon Echo was ready for my purchase, if still desired. Well, I’d forgotten all about it. But it seemed reasonable, so I replied in the affirmative. Minutes later I got another email letting me know it had shipped, and would arrive the next day.

To try and cut this short, I must say this: Amazon Echo has surprised me. It works very much as advertised and, if it continues to improve as promised, may very well surprise many people. It arrived here just as the holiday season was underway, and so was present for several gatherings in our home. I was surprised by the reaction our guests to Echo. No one asked to see an instruction manual, let alone a quick start guide. They simply started talking to it, and were delighted with its responses. I’m hesitant to suggest where this product will lead, although it seems to be a component of the Internet of Things, those things to include digital content we already turn to Amazon for, as well as the devices we use to do so. It’s certainly no accident that the companion app for Echo runs on your Kindle tablet and on your smartphone. The conjunction of these technological capabilities is potentially very powerful indeed.

What will it mean for my eBook collection? Will I one day be able to ask Alexa to read Moby Dick to me? Will I be able to pause it, then resume in my car? If “owned” an audiobook, the answer seems fairly clear. As for Text To Speech, well, Alexa is already surprisingly persuasive. Can we leave aside the haunting questions of a few years ago regarding public performance of an eBook? I don’t guess so, not forever and always.

It may be, however, that those concerns will be left aside as content licensors discover an upsurge in demand accompanying new modes of access. Why prohibit something that might make a lot of money?

In the meantime, with all the people who’ve been through our living room trying out Echo in the past couple of weeks, any concerns about tracking I may have held have been blown out of the water. Our guests asked for Jimi Hendrix, Edvard Grieg,
I f you missed the Charleston Conference this year, then it stands to reason that you also missed my talk on Comic Book Markup Language (CBML). If you have a collection of comics that you’d like to open up for retrieval and analysis, CBML is a vocabulary for representation of comics documents in XML developed by John Walsh at Indiana.

CBML is an extension of Text Encoding Initiative (TEI). As such, it incorporates elements of TEI as well as its own elements focused on comics content and features. Many TEI elements are available to represent common structures in a variety of text documents, for instance chapters, paragraphs, spoken dialogue, or features as particular as epigraphs. The full list of TEI elements is available at http://www.tei-c.org/release/doc/tei-p5-doc/en/html/REF-ELEMENTS.html.

Chapters can be represented with the generic <div> that is familiar to Web designers and developers from the HTML version of the same element. Attributes are used within tags to provide more specific information. A type attribute, typically written as @type with the @ denoting that it is an attribute, here qualifies that this div represents a chapter:

<div type="chapter">

Our other examples of paragraphs, spoken dialogue, and epigraphs can be represented with <p>, <said>, and <epigraph>. When Sherlock Holmes awakens Dr. Watson in The Adventure of the Abbey Grange, we might encode the interaction something like this:

<p><said who="#sherlock-holmes">“Come Watson, come!”</said></p>

Now <cbml:panel> is a good start, but clearly not enough by itself to represent everything that’s going on. We can choose from a set of useful attributes to note more about a particular panel. Let’s take a look at a panel from Little Nemo in Slumberland in 1907.

![Little Nemo in Slumberland, September 9, 1907](http://www.jerryspiller.net/pres/CBML/meme_Nemo_1907-09-29.jpg)

**Figure 1: Little Nemo in Slumberland, September 9, 1907.** Public Domain.

So I’m looking forward to an endless supply of laughable, hopelessly clueless suggestions based upon my Echo activity. But perhaps more alarmingly, what if the suggestions become better over time? What if the usefulness of what Echo can do for us counterbalances our latent squeamishness over Echo’s potential eavesdropping powers? Is it HAL? Is it SkyNet? Or is it C3PO? Or Marvin?

Well, too late to worry about that now…

---

### Pelikan’s Antidisambiguation from page 60

Charlie Daniels, John Phillip Sousa, Carlos Santana, and Ernie singing Rubber Duckie. They’ve asked Alexa to read information from Wikipedia articles on Moomintroll, the Beat Generation, and Borscht. The combined, leveraged power of the whole stinking Internet and Amazon’s Cloud Services, and we asked for Fine Young Cannibals.

My metadata must be pure corned beef hash now.

---

### Endnotes

The option to publish an article as open access can be daunting to faculty when combined with the requirement to pay article processing fees, which can be quite hefty. To assist faculty in making their research more readily available, we have joined the ranks of libraries/institutions which offer an Open Access Publishing Fund to help offset associated costs. But the management of this fund comes with its own challenges. We pay invoices at the article level, not the journal level. We have an approval process which often involves dividing invoices so we only subsidize our affiliated faculty. Invoices undergo a hand-off from faculty member to the OA librarian to Acquisitions to Purchasing. Article processing fees often originate from a different publishing division from our standard journal invoices, which in turn leads to required paperwork to add the division as a new vendor in our payment systems.

We want to support open access, but we need an easier way to manage the workflow and invoicing for these article-level transactions if they are to become commonplace. Most publishers offer an institutional deposit account option, but such automated payments could undermine local guidelines for OA Publishing Fund payments; not to mention you would need multiple deposit accounts to allow flexibility in publishing venues.

The Copyright Clearance Center has recently released the availability to run article processing charges through RightsLink, and several publishers are now using this service as an intermediary.

Time will tell whether we’re able to sufficiently untangle the open access process and make it manageable to all parties involved.

---

Valerie Boulos
Head, Collection Strategies & Assessment, Florida International University, <vboulos@fiu.edu>

To be honest, Portland State University Library isn’t doing much with open access. Portland State has added DOAJ and DOAB to the catalog and also supported Knowledge Unlatched but beyond these initiatives, we have not started processing APCs or underwriting OA publication in any major way. However, it is my job as an academic librarian, who is leading my institution in determining what is paid for content, to understand and have the best comprehension of the “total cost of publication” for the content purchased on behalf of students and faculty. “The ‘Total cost of publication’ (TCP) consists of article processing charges for either individual journal articles or as part of a bulk pre-payment scheme, subscriptions for either individual journals or packages, and the additional administrative costs for managing APCs.” (See Pinfield, S., Salter, J. and Bath, P.A. (2015) ~ The ‘total cost of publication’ in a hybrid open-access environment: Institutional approaches to funding journal article processing charges in combination with subscriptions. Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology)

Publisher representatives will tell acquisitions and collection development librarians in the U.S. that the total OA produced by them via hybrid journals is 1-2%. This may be true in the U.S. but in Europe and in the UK, these amounts are higher and range more around 10%. As academic librarians, we need to begin the conversations now of reaching a new price point for the journal content we purchase. The market is changing rapidly, and it does not make sense for our institutions to be paying both APC costs, covering the inherent management costs of APCs, and paying subscriptions for the same content.

---

Celeste Feather
Senior Director of Licensing & Strategic Partnerships, Lyrasis, <celeste.feather@lyrasis.org>

Are you beginning to hear the roar of the scholarly monograph wave breaking through paywalls and evolving into research products that may not resemble books as we know them? Change is coming, as evidenced by ongoing initiatives and reports. The future monograph open access environment is likely to differ significantly from the open access journal movement.

The successful Knowledge Unlatched pilot project in the spring of 2014 gathered support from 297 libraries across the globe to turn 28 scholarly monographs into open access titles. Libraries proved they are willing to step up and explore alternative models to support this type of scholarship. In June 2014 the Association of Research Libraries and the American Association of Universities proposed that universities provide a subvention to a newly-hired faculty member to support the cost of that individual’s first peer-reviewed book. The books would then be available as open access titles.

The sand is shifting quickly as awareness increases. The Mellon Foundation is exploring an idea to subsidize open access digital humanities interactive research products that otherwise would be channeled into a scholarly monograph format. Universities would be asked to provide partial support for these works. The Open Library of the Humanities is investigating alternative collective funding mechanisms for open access in the humanities, including monographs.

University presses, foundations, faculty, administrators, and librarians are all engaged in developing structures that will allow social science and humanities long form scholarship to reach the widest possible audience. These are exciting times!
The 2014 Charleston Conference had me thinking a great deal about PDA/DDA, STL, and now EBA (evidence-based acquisition) programs. Our vendors give us statistics that show purchases moving rapidly away from approval or even single-title purchasing in favor of these above models. The subsequent revenue from these sales certainly shows in publishers’ bottom line, especially as STL purchases result in a fraction of the revenue. Interestingly, there was much gnashing of teeth about costs, revenue, shrinking budgets, and the like at the conference, I actually came away with the distinct impression that usage was UP. That comes as welcome news to university presses, who have often been accused of publishing overly specialized books that few want to read or use.

And yet, in this increasingly pay-per-view world, will libraries actually end up paying more in the quest to save money and purchase selectively?

On the flight back from Charleston, I was reading an issue of Entertainment Weekly (yes, for work! It’s surprisingly helpful to me as an acquiring editor in film and media studies who dropped cable years ago). On the heels of HBO and CBS’s separate announcements of services that would allow viewers to stream recent shows without a cable subscription, journalist James Hibbard wrote an insightful meditation on what this may mean for the industry more widely. In the wonderfully titled “What Streams May Come,” Hibbard notes, “Viva la revolución, right? Not necessarily.” As much as we all love to grouse about cable bills, breaking up the current system could have all sorts of butterfly-effect consequences that might be even worse. Because do you really want to pay $72 a year to watch 2 Broke Girls?”

Hibbard suggests that cracking open the cable box will possibly spur several unwelcome things. In current cable packages, viewers are essentially paying for a handful of the most popular networks and getting a great deal of other content for very little money. Studies suggest that paying for single networks will likely actually mean viewers would have a higher end cost (in Canada and other countries, such models leave viewers “paying more for less,” according to Hibbard). Second, the current infrastructure of in-ground cable simply can’t support such a high volume of individual streaming. Bandwidth caps are becoming a more common response to the crush of traffic on the Internet highway, and this would eventually limit individual streaming. In the article, analyst Fernando Elizalde estimates that “billions in upgrades” would be needed to support such mass streaming. “Who’s going to pay for that?” he asks.

Finally, in a world where every show is not Game of Thrones, what happens to the programming produced by smaller or educational channels? Elizalde hints at a dark, perhaps Darwinian, downside for programming in an à la carte purchase model: “smaller channels could wither and even die.”

It was this last observation that made me realize that we could easily be talking about books here. There is a pretty close scholarly publishing equivalent (particularly in the humanities) to each of Hibbard’s and Elizalde’s observations about cable and individually streamed shows. Cable may be somewhat akin to the packages and similar programs offered by publishers. Approval plans, which offered at least predictable spending and revenue, might be the monographic equivalent of a cable subscription. Dismantling this buying pattern will likely mean that publishers will charge more for both their most appealing publications as well as the lesser used ones, as each offering is expected to carry more of its own financial weight, especially with a not-for-profit publisher.

The question of infrastructure is also a salient one. There may be rafts of free content out there for streaming and viewing and downloading, but the physical cable on which this content travels are not unlimited or free. Nor is the infrastructure (either the people or the technical platforms) that develops, publishes, hosts, and disseminates scholarship. Libraries and university presses know this equally well and manage to do hero’s work on a shoestring nearly every day, but there are limits. Salaries must be paid, content must be licensed, and there must be revenue or budget allocations to support the mission-oriented work we do on behalf of our home institutions and scholars and students worldwide. In the end, to echo Elizalde, who pays for that?

While work to improve the discoverability of university press and library content is improving and librarians and publishers are focusing hard on how to further enhance the discovery and use of our materials, those efforts alone will not save specialized content. Elizalde’s specter of disappearing shows and channels could — and in some ways already has — happened to books. With all efforts and attention focused on the blockbusters, there is little room for experimentation and for the time and resources necessary to cultivate new fields of scholarship and inquiry. Production costs cannot be deferred, even for books — or shows — that may take years or even decades to find their audience and revenue. By the time it became a wildly popular cult hit, the show Arrested Development had long been cancelled. Yes, it was so popular it was eventually brought back in a limited way by a streaming service rather than a network, but it just couldn’t recapture the original magic and momentum. Though I wish there were those after-the-fact advocates among scholars, I would posit that the avalanches of fan mail and kickstarter campaigns would not easily translate to scholarly publishing. There will simply be books that would go undeveloped and unpublished.

I’m certainly not the first to argue that we, publishers and librarians, are part of a very delicate ecosystem. The shifting of costs, funding, and purchase models affects us all. But we need to understand that while breaking open Pandora’s Box may be a necessary thing, we should be aware of its consequences.

Short-term lending and EBA programs will probably not decrease overall content costs in perpetuity, and libraries may in the end get less content for those same flat acquisitions dollars (that we all feel lucky if we even have). Ultimately, someone will pay for infrastructure. If we’re not careful, it may be the for-profit publishers. In his October 29, 2014 article “The Size of the Open Access Market,” Joe Esposito argues that while OA has gained traction as part of our scholarly world, it’s also rapidly being appropriated by the for-profits. The structure that was supposed to set content free is now becoming its own business, and users will in the end pay for it, perhaps dearly, through one channel or another.

So as we make decisions about how we develop and provide access to content, let’s keep in mind those other entities that are sharing our stream of knowledge, the users who want more and not less, and the libraries and presses that have nurtured and preserved scholarship over the decades. Natural selection has its advantages, but if the utility and use of what we do as libraries and publishers is real and meaningful, let’s figure out how to keep the key members of our ecosystem alive.
recently, I reread Other Men’s Daughters, a novel that I read for the first time nearly four decades ago. Published by Dutton, the book was written by Richard Stern, a professor of English at the University of Chicago from 1955 to 2002. (I enjoyed the novel this time, but not as much as I remembered. Professor-falling-for-a-much-younger-woman-and-escaping-a-shrewish-wife-his-own-age has become a cliche. Stern himself had a substantial reputation back in the 1970s, but it seems not to have endured at such an exalted level, or won’t until someone writes a new appreciation.) I have the original hardcover edition; I can tell by markings in my copy that I must have bought it used. When I turned to the copyright page to check the publication year — it was 1973 — I found this lengthy and, I thought, prescient statement:

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system now known or to be invented, without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in a magazine, newspaper, or broadcast.

Whether the statement was ginned up by an imaginative soul in Dutton’s legal department or by Stern himself, who might have gotten wind of some version of the digital future, is probably lost to history. (Stern died in January 2013 and finding the statement’s author among the employees of Wiley, a boutique imprint in the Penguin Group, strikes me as an investigative task beyond my pay grade.) In any case, the statement — in a novel, for goodness sake — far exceeds the one on the copyright page of my monograph, Temperature Control, published by Wiley only five years earlier:

All Rights Reserved. This book or any part thereof must not be reproduced in any form without the written permission of the publisher.

Of course, Wiley has always been a copyright champion, so I’m not going to belabor any supposition that the firm’s legal department contained personnel who might not have been as imaginative as those working for a publisher of trade fiction and non-fiction. Besides, as a copyright champion, Wiley had a major role in the establishment of the Copyright Clearance Center. That’s one of the factors — in addition to the ubiquity of all manner of electronic devices, as well as the Internet itself — that helps produce a paragraph such as the one found on the copyright page of the new edition (the fourth) of my Mechanical Engineers’ Handbook:

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise, except as permitted under Section 107 or 108 of the 1976 United States Copyright Act, without either the prior written permission of the Publisher, or authorization through payment of the appropriate per-copy fee to the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, (978) 750-8400, fax (978) 646-8600, or on the Web at www.copyright.com. Requests to the Publisher for permission should be addressed to the Permissions Department, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, (201) 748-6011, fax (201) 748-6008, or online at www.wiley.com/go/permissions.

Indeed, you can copy something, but you’d better ‘fess up — and pay up — for whatever you do copy.

There’s another lengthy paragraph that publishers have added in one form or another to the copyright page. Whenever I look at one of these paragraphs, I’m reminded of the story told by my mentor, the late Bob Polhemus, my boss when I took a job as an acquisitions editor at Wiley years ago. (An impossibly cheerful, roly-poly fellow, Bob was not only a fund of information about scientific and technical book publishing — some of it possibly apocryphal, but who could tell? — but also a perfect imitator of Louis Armstrong’s rich, gravelly singing voice.) A favorite story concerned the flawed tennis court dimensions that appeared in an edition of Architectural Graphic Standards (AGS), a perennial Wiley bestseller. According to the story, which I’ve never been able to confirm, when a hapless architect provided a doubtless very disgruntled client with a tennis court that used the incorrect AGS dimensions, there was a lawsuit. The judge, Bob’s tale had it, threw the suit out on the grounds that the plaintiffs should have known better than to rely on some book, no matter its reputation.

Nowadays, in our more litigious era, publishers take no chances on finding judges sympathetic to the risks inherent in publishing technical information supplied by outsiders working in a “work-made-for-hire” regime. Now, you will find statements similar to the following on copyright pages of STM books:

Limit of Liability/Disclaimer of Warranty: While the publisher and author have used their best efforts in preparing this book, they make no representations or warranties with the respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this book and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. No warranty may be created or extended by sales representatives or written sales materials. The advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for your situation. You should consult with a professional where appropriate. Neither the publisher nor the author shall be liable for damages arising herefrom.

Publishers cover themselves in the other direction — toward authors rather than readers — with warranty clauses in author contracts. A typical clause — this one is in a contract for contributors of chapters to a multi-author work — reads:

The Contributor represents and warrants that: the Contribution is original except for excerpts and illustrations from copyrighted works for which the Contributor has obtained written permission from the copyright owners at the Contributor’ expense on a form approved by the Publisher; the Contribution has not been previously published and is not in the public domain; the Contributor owns and has the right to convey all the rights herein conveyed to the Publisher; the Contribution contains no libelous or unlawful material, contains no instructions that may cause harm or injury and does not infringe upon or violate any copyright, trademark, trade secret, or other right or the privacy of others; and all statements asserted as fact in the Contribution are either true or based upon generally accepted professional research practices.

It’s not surprising that a publisher with pockets far deeper than those of nearly all contributors would insert such a self-protection clause in a contributor’s agreement, even thought the publisher’s lawyers must know that of all the clauses in a wordy document of five or six pages, this is the one that contributors would be most liable to contest. But lawyers take no prisoners these days, i.e., they seldom give in to contributors who want the warranty clause excised or even modified. And as perusal of their written fears on copyright pages would indicate, lawyers have, I must admit, more imagination than the rest of us might appreciate.
The 2014 LITA Forum took place in Albuquerque between November 5th and 8th. As usual, it brought together leaders in technology from the library world as well as vendors and developers. There was a dizzying array of presentations that addressed technology in libraries ranging from the theoretical to the practical. Vendors demonstrated products, and librarians reported on their projects. There were altogether 28 talks that took place during two days of concurrent sessions, in addition to two preconference workshops, the keynote talk, two general sessions, and 14 poster sessions. This was indeed a very busy conference.

The forum started with two preconferences: Linked Data for Libraries: How Libraries can Make Use of Linked Open Data to Share Information about Library Resources and to Improve Discovery, Access, and Understanding of Library Users, with Dean B. Kroft and Jon Corson-Rickert from Cornell; and Learn Python by Playing with Library Data, by Francis Kayiwa of Kayiwa Consulting. These were hands-on seminars where users learned how to use the products.

The keynote address was given by Anne Marie Thomas, from the University of St. Thomas, who talked on the importance of having fun in a work and research environment. Thomas talked about how “unusual combinations of people in groups lead to delightful outcomes.” This pertains to creating teams of specialists who would not normally work together, like a geologist and a musician, to render the science and experience of an earthquake. The result, totally novel, far exceeded the expected traditional outcome. Thomas also talked about the “Maker” movement, which brings together people who have only one thing in common: they make things, from the artistic, to the culinary, to the technical. Makers are resilient, they don’t give up easily, and they are resourceful. They also share. It is the same mentality that the early programming community had in the 1960s and ’70s before the rise of Microsoft. This and other associated movements are changing the much-touted STEM movement to STEAM: Science, Technology, Engineering, Art, and Mathematics. In the second general session, Lorcan Dempsey, Vice President, OCLC Research and Chief Strategist talked about linked data. This concept, which we almost take for granted today, has been possible because of the tremendous advances in computing power. He made two statements that set the tone for the entire discussion: technology changes how people behave, and people’s use of technology (their behavior) changes technology. In this framework, Dempsey talked about OCLC’s linked data efforts which have already linked over 200 million subject headings from a variety of authority files into 8 million clusters. He described the evolution of technology in libraries from “Automation,” to “Networks,” to the current “Socio-Technical environment.” The social aspect of information is now the pervasive force that shapes the new environments. He ended by pointing out that libraries need to become partners in the whole range of data creation, and certainly this conference provided ample examples of this trend.

The concurrent sessions followed these themes and dealt with cutting-edge technological developments from vendors or their applications in Libraries. The new technical environment is cloud-based, it is linked, and it is social.

In Collaborative Discovery: The Open Initiative In Practice, The Art of Index Search and What it Means for Your Library, Marshall Breeding, a nationally-renowned consultant, Andrew Pace, Executive Director, Networked Library Services at OCLC and Allie Flanary, User Experience Librarian at Portland Community College discussed the development, adoption, and application of the Open Discovery Initiative (ODI) which is now a NISO standard. The standard promotes transparency and neutrality from database creators, which is very important to users and facilitates cooperation across discovery ecosystems. Breeding talked about the need for index-based discovery. Pace discussed the application of ODI. He said that libraries generally look for technical solutions to legal, business, and political problems, while service providers look for unique selling points. So then the dilemma: how to address Content Providers who are also Discovery Service Providers, because the library needs to know why a vendor makes specific decisions. ODI’s standards for transparency and neutrality address these problems. OCLC is ODI compliant. Flanary represented the library’s point of view. She stated that we need to speak the same language and librarians need to be part of the conversation. This session demonstrated that they are.

In Collaborating to Innovate: A Consortium’s Journey, Anya Arnold described the migration experience of the 37 member library ORBIS/Cascade consortium from a stand-alone ILS (Innovative) to a cloud-based system, Ex Libris’ Alma. This consortium practically had to invent the wheel. There were no models to follow for RFIs and RFPs, so they had to write their own. Arnold described the vendor evaluation process, the selection process, and the actual migration from one system to another. She stated that it is important for a library to reevaluate their processes and not simply insist that they be ported to the new system. The new system capabilities are different, and old processes can be discarded. This is a time to look for new opportunities and efficiencies. Arnold stressed that we should strive to leave “Stress” out of the process. This can only be achieved by continuous communication with all constituents and a pragmatic attitude: as long as the basic library functions work well, everything else will be addressed in time. And she reminded the audience that everybody involved in the process wants to succeed: the library and the vendors. Ultimately, this was a very successful transition, and ORBIS/Cascade’s model is being used by other libraries. All their documentation is freely available at https://www.orbiscascade.org/rfp-for-shared-library-management/

Two other sessions discussed the migration experience from stand-alone to cloud-based systems. In Consortial Collaboration in the Cloud: An Innovative Group Implementation of Web-Scale Management, John Petrusa from Butler University, Lauren Maguson from the PALNI consortium, Edward Mandity from Marian College, Karl Stutzman from the Anabaptist Mennonite Biblical Seminary, and Cynthia Wilson from OCLC described this consortium’s migration experience. The interesting thing about this presentation is that they are in the middle of the migration process so they could share and learn with the audience. Lea Briggs from the University of New Mexico described UNM’s recent successful migration to OCLC’s WMS system in Transformation: Taking an Academic Library Consortium to the Clouds with OCLC’s WorldShare Management Services. This migration, essentially complete, took 17 New Mexico libraries on this intense journey in which many lessons were learned. Briggs discussed the process, the preparation, and issues we should not worry about. Another session dealing with migration was Hong Ma, who discussed the Loyola University Chicago’s experience in Evaluating and Selecting Library Services Platforms: Are you ready to Shift? Where Should You Start? In Migration to Kuali Open Library Environment: An Early-Adopter’s Experience. Chulin Meng and Michelle Suranofski from Lehigh University described the KUALY OLE project, which is an open-source, community-based library management system. As a founding partner in Kuali, Lehigh’s experience was unique. These sessions show that there is a lot of activity going on with libraries migrating to new cloud-based discovery platforms.

In their talk, Schema.org – What It Means for You and Your Library, Richard Willis, Technology Evangelist at OCLC, and Dan Scott, continued on page 66
from Laurentian University in Canada, talked about the importance of linked data. Schema.org is a markup language. Willis started with two questions: “Why do we catalog? In order to find things.” “Why do we put things on the Web? So more people can find them.” Many search engines use Schema.org, and 25% of the Web is encoded with this markup language, which makes it a de-facto standard. In 2012 OCLC processed over 300 million bibliographic records with schema, and now these records exist as linked data. Schema.org uses a vocabulary for everybody, not just library terms, so the metadata and the linking is much richer than a traditional library catalog. The approach is to identify all entities in the data. Schema.org uses “Actions” which provide directly actionable links (such as “Search” or “Borrow”), and APIs can find the information. The result is that from one book there are hundreds of links out and they link to other links. Dan Scott pointed out that usability and discoverability are both low in libraries. Schema.org provides a de-facto generalized vocabulary that is embedded in html and is available now. They are moving beyond the library world and working with publishers to apply schema.org to electronic journals.

Islandora is a Digital Asset Management System for Digital Content Delivery. Tommy Keswick from the Cherry Hill Company described the application of Islandora by the Detroit Public Library Digital Collections in a talk entitled: Using Islandora for Digital Content Delivery: Islandora programming is developed in Drupal, which makes it flexible and adaptable. Islandora is a framework that bundles up solution packs that can be turned on or off based on application. It works with Fedora, which is an open-source repository solution, and Apache Solr which is an open-source platform. Keswick showed how they were able to customize the display of the collection to accommodate the specific needs of the library. This is a powerful tool, and the results were impressive. In remarking that this is only the first phase of the process (which included migrating the data from the legacy system), Keswick ended with the observation: “Make it better — just because it works is not good enough.”

In a very interesting talk entitled Library Lab: Improving Library Services and Transforming Organizational Culture, Abigail Bordenax, Sue Kriagsman, and Sebastian Diaz from Harvard discussed a program implemented at Harvard that allowed for the consideration and implementation of new services. Noting that most resistance to change is political, this program created a framework where librarians could submit innovative projects that would normally have little chance for support. The program and review process was run by respected leaders, including community members and had funding authority. In four years there were 171 proposals of which 47 were funded. Some projects required no money to implement, others cost upwards of $100,000. The presenters pointed out that Library Lab is an idea other libraries can implement. Among the many examples provided (they can be found at Harvard’s Library Lab Website http://lab.library.harvard.edu), an interesting one is Awesomebox. This simple idea provides users a way to let their community know which books they found interesting. A box with the Awesomebox label sits next to the return box at circulation, and readers place the books they liked in that box, rather than the regular return slot. Software enables the book to be checked into Awesomebox after being checked into the library. Awesomebox is linked to the library’s Web page, so other users of the catalog can see what members in their community are reading and what they found interesting. In a tech environment where the social aspect is gaining such prominence, this is a product that provides both reader referrals (which the commercial vendors have offered for a while) but also creates a new community — people who use the library’s resources and share their opinions. The best thing about Awesomebox is that the software is free and easy to install. To date, over 347 libraries across the country have implemented it. Information can be found at http://awesomebox.io

In a fascinating talk entitled Death of the Library Website Redesign, Tammy Allgood Wolf from Arizona State University and Melissa Johnson from South Mountain Community College in Phoenix discussed the cumbersome and unsatisfying process of redesigning Web pages. These are major projects in libraries that cost a lot of money. They started with the statement that Big Bang Redesign is bad news. She showed several examples from industry and the conclusion is clear. Users hate change, especially when it comes without warning and when it’s extreme. And annoyances matter because they compound. Wolf did extensive research on Website redesign and user reactions, and the best practice is continuous incremental change. Agile Software Development is the preferred method to the old style of “Design,” “Develop”, and “Test.” In acknowledging that the Web page redesign is a political process, they quoted some of the leading thinkers in the field, Jakob Nielsen and Aaron Schmidt, to support the incremental, agile alternative. And this has certainly worked at ASU.

There were many more sessions on these and other topics. A sampling of titles will give an idea: Does your Library Make Your Users Fat?: Reducing Users’ Cognitive Load with Easy to Ingest Web Design; EAD Finding Aids for Discovery Systems: EgoSystems: Outreach via Social Search; MOOC-ing Up Your Institution’s IR Collections; What Does Your Repository do?: Understanding and Calculating Impact; Using Software Repositories to Manage, Integrate, Curate, and Publish Research Data: MetaArchive at 10: Growing, Diversifying, Innovating; and many more.

As if this were not enough, the 14 poster sessions covered such interesting topics as: Bringing Digital Collections to the Classroom: Integrating a Digital Repository with a Learning Management System; Partners Specialists: Preserving At Risk Content: A Development and Preservation Strategy for University Repositories: Responsive Design: Responding to User Needs, Campus Trends, and the Rapid Evolution of Web-Enabled Devices; Transforming Information Literacy Using Mobile Technology in the Community College Library: and more.

The closing session was given by award-winning artist and activist Kortney Ryan Ziegler, founder of Trans*4ack. Ziegler described the obstacles trans people encounter in society. This is even obvious in technology. Based on the popular hackathon marathon computing sessions where people create things together, he created a hackathon marathon for trans people (the first one took place in Oakland). At these events they designed apps for trans people regarding all issues from health to identity. He featured many such Websites which have a great impact on the community. In highlighting the needs and perspectives of the trans community, Ziegler made the audience aware of technology’s great potential to affect and improve lives.

There were, of course, many opportunities for networking and making connections. There were vendor-sponsored events at dinner and lunch. Visitors also appreciated the weather, which this time of year is quite pleasant in the Southwest. The conference hotel was located in Albuquerque’s Old Town, a major tourist and cultural attraction. And of course, Santa Fe, the City Different is only one hour away.

Complete information about LITA Forum 2014 can be found at the LITA Website: http://www.ala.org/lita/conferences/forum/2014. Complete Schedule of events can also be found at http://lita.libguides.com/. Next year’s conference will be in Minneapolis from November 12-15, 2015. Hope to see you there.


 Reported by: Katie O’Connor (Visiting Reference and Instruction Librarian, College of Charleston) <kconormk@cofc.edu>

The 99th annual South Carolina Library Association Conference was held at the Marriott Hotel in downtown Columbia, South Carolina. Almost 300 librarians attended the three-day conference. Held October 22-24, 2014, the theme was “Unconventional Services in South Carolina Libraries.” A ceremonial ribbon cutting kicked off the opening of the Exhibit Hall on Wednesday. The nineteen exhibitors represented a wide variety of companies and services, including PASCAL (Partnership Among SC Academic Libraries), SC Legal Services, EBSCO, and the University of South Carolina (USC) School of Library and Information Science.

Attendees chose from dozens of fifty-minute sessions with a range of topics: flipped classrooms in information literacy teaching; new continued on page 67
metrics for scholarly communication; using smartphones to engage students; providing community services to families in need, and more.

The breakout sessions commenced Wednesday morning. “The Copyright Decision Tree” examined copyright questions that can frequently arise at academic libraries. Tucker Taylor from USC and Andrea Wright from Furman University shared a common answer given in situations involving copyright: “It depends!” Is the item in the public domain? Is there a library license that may allow us to use the item? There are many questions to consider before tackling copyright issues, and The Decision Tree is a framework to help determine if an item can be used.

Two presenters from the College of Charleston, Jolanda-Pietra von Arnhem and Melissa Hortman, spoke on “Partnerships for Outreach: Building Community in the Library.” The Center for Student Learning is housed in the College’s library, but partnership between the two has been somewhat limited. Von Arnhem and Hortman created and marketed a series of information literacy and study skills offerings for students, faculty, and staff. These classes were on topics such as taking tests more effectively, meeting virtually, and finding helpful mobile apps. One highlight of the presentation involved what was for many, including this attendee, an introduction to the world of interactive print. Apps like Layar allow the user to scan and interact with print content.

Stan Trembach and Liya Deng from the Library and Information Science program at USC presented “Information Professionals of the Future: Evolving Roles, Changing Skill Sets, and New Opportunities.”

Issues in Book and Serial Acquisition, “Too Much is Not Enough!” — Francis Marion Hotel, Embassy Suites Historic Downtown, Courtyard Marriott Historic District, Addlestone Library, College of Charleston, and School of Science and Mathematics Building, Charleston, SC — November 6-9, 2013

Charleston Conference Reports compiled by: Ramune K. Kubilius (Northwestern University, Galter Health Sciences Library) <r-kubilius@northwestern.edu>

Column Editor’s Note: Thank you to all of the Charleston Conference attendees who agreed to write short reports that highlight sessions they attended at the 2013 conference. All attempts were made to provide a broad coverage of sessions and instruction sessions. The three presenters shared which outreach projects worked, and, equally as important, ideas that didn’t work. This lively session presented a wide range of ideas, including a “Researcher of the Month” spotlight, a technology petting zoo, and a promotional effort using whiteboards in the library. Assessment data was collected at workshops and library events when possible, and a student focus group provided insight into what services the student population wanted from their library.

A poster session took place Friday morning and featured posters from both academic and public librarians. The Viewer’s Choice Award went to Huyen Diep from Midlands Tech for her poster “Library Participation in Faculty Learning Communities.” Current LIS students presented several posters, and a Student Spotlight Award was given to Brianna Hughes of USC Columbia.

Next year will be a big one for SCLA as they celebrate their 100th anniversary. The organization will be hosting a special centennial conference October 21-23, 2015 at the Columbia Marriott.

Much can be learned from hearing about experiences in another country, especially when it comes to Open Access matters, which are admittedly complex. This session provided information that perhaps led some to ponder “how would this work in my country?” Estelle, the CEO of Jisc Collections, set the stage. New Open Access policies (and resulting article processing / APC / funding) are driving UK universities. An important “game changer” mentioned was the 2012 Finch Report (Report of the Working Group on Expanding Access to Published Research Findings-the Finch Group) and its recommendations. The 12-month pilot project now underway through 2014 involves an agreement between Jisc Collections (the UK academic community’s shared service for content licensing and administration) and Open Access Key, an online payment platform. The aim of the pilot is to assist UK higher education institutions and publishers worldwide in managing Gold OA article processing charges. Universities’ concerns include: the administrative costs of APCs, insufficient funding, rising APCs, and uncertainty about long-term future of grants from research funders. Per Estelle, Jisc’s role will likely expand into assistance with compliance, help with data gathering, and assistance with efficiencies and accuracy in making APC payments. She emphasized that the policies have far-ranging effects for all stakeholders: research managers, institutional repositories, and finance managers. An interesting statistic: one author processing charge (currently) requires five hours per invoice. Tools and sites mentioned in her presentation included: SHERPA/FACT (Funders’ & Authors’ Compliance Tool, a tool to help researchers check if the journals in which they wish to publish their results comply with their funder’s requirements for open access to research), and the Publishers Association decision tree (that indicates embargoes of up to 12 months (STM) or 24 months (HSS) for the Green OA option if there are no funds for the Author Processing Charge/APC).

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2013
AFTERNOON PLENARY SESSIONS: CHARLESTON NEAPOLITAN

The British National Approach to Scholarly Communication — Presented by Lorraine Estelle (JISC Collections)

Reported by: Ramune K. Kubilius (Northwestern University, Galter Health Sciences Library) <r-kubilius@northwestern.edu>
Picking up from a 2012 Charleston plenary session on the past, present, and future of university presses, the speakers at this session were prompted to demystify the inner workings of their respective organizations. Faran, Director of the MIT Press, began by discussing the variability of costs in publishing an academic monograph as common misconceptions about book publishing. Berkery, Executive Director of the AAUP, echoed this statement as he shared stories on a recent listening tour he undertook upon beginning his directorship. He noted the heterogeneity of university presses and warned against the dangers of generalizing these publishers. Two major challenges for University Presses noted by Berkery are the emergence of technological disruptions, such as demand-driven acquisitions and short-term loans, and the increasing corporatization of scholarship. Heath, Vice Provost and Director of Libraries at UT-Austin, discussed the strategic goals of libraries to collect more of what is unique and to preserve the materials the publishing industry has no interest in preserving. Carreno, Head of Collection Development at NYU, shared problems introduced by ebooks, such as digital rights management, accurate metadata, and the question of access vs. ownership. The panelists were asked to respond to the prompt: “One thing I wish everyone knew about Publishers/Libraries,” and it was clear that, as inhabitants in the scholarly publishing ecosystem, both publishers and librarians can benefit from the skill sharing and collaboration afforded by consistent communication between respective organizations.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2013
POSTER SESSIONS

Creating eJournal Management Reports using Microsoft Access — Presented by Teresa Negrucci (Brown University)

Creating Subject Guidelines: All Hands On Deck — Presented by Maureen James (University of Arkansas at Little Rock Ottenheimer Library); Donna Rose (University of Arkansas at Little Rock Ottenheimer Library)

From Digits to Diagrams: Using Infographics to Inform Database Retention and Cancellation Decisions — Presented by Calida Barboza (Ithaca College)

Imagine More Space in your Library! Weeding Bound Periodicals — Presented by Susan Andrews (Texas A&M University-Commerce); Sandy Hayes (Texas A&M University-Commerce)

Less is More — Weeding and Collection Assessment Project at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point (UWSP) — Presented by Tom Reich (University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point)

Print vs. Ebook Use: An Analysis of the e-Duke Scholarly Collection — Presented by Cathy Goodwin (Coastal Carolina Univ.)

Streaming Video & Libraries: Challenges, Solutions, Best Practices — Presented by Molly Royse (Univ. of Tennessee, Knoxville); Gail Williams (Univ. of Tennessee, Knoxville)

Survey of eBook Usage and Interest at a Public Liberal Arts University — Presented by Amanda Melcher (Univ. of Montevallo)

The Focus of Three - Collaboration and the Stages of Electronic Acquisitions — Presented by Susan Clarke (Stephen F. Austin State University); Debbie Fleming (Stephen F. Austin State University); Barbara Olds (Stephen F. Austin State University)

The Future Landscape of E-book Programs at Columbia University Libraries — Presented by Jeffrey Carroll (Columbia Univ. Libraries); Melissa Goertzen (Columbia Univ. Libraries)

The Good, the Bad and the Unread — Presented by Lauren DeVoe (Tulane University)

Tiered Digital Reference — Presented by Cynthia Cronin-Kardon (Lippincott Library University of Pennsylvania)

Use of Resources Report: Moving beyond Circulation Statistics, Integrating E-Usage that Matters — Presented by Lanette Garza (Trinity University)

User Experience Perspectives for Better Design: Users, Interdisciplinary Collaboration, Vendors, AND the Library — Presented by Elizabeth Kocevar-Weidinger (Longwood University)


Worth Doing and Overdoing: Gearing Up Library Support for New Programs — Presented by Judy Born (State College of Florida - Bradenton Campus); Tracey Smith (State College of Florida - Venice Campus)

Reported by: Kristina M. Edwards (Bridgewater State University) <Kristina.edwards@bridgew.edu>

Even after a long day of sessions, attendees made time to come and view the various posters being presented and speaking to the presenters one on one about their projects. The posters presented covered many of the major aspects of acquisitions and collection development work that libraries are all dealing with today. Posters covered topics like working with faculty to reduce or build better collections, to finding new student space by deselection of print journals available online. One of the areas covered by several of the posters was about collecting and analyzing collection and usage statistics. From posters looking for a way to analyze data in an access database, to using statistics to prove that certain materials that need to be deaccessioned/weeded, it was clear that many libraries and librarians are using statistical data in many ways in an effort make the best decisions for their libraries.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2013
MORNING CHARLESTON PREMIERS


Reported by: Ramune K. Kubilius (Northwestern University, Galter Health Sciences Library) <r-kubilius@northwestern.edu>

Fifteen vendors (societies, university presses, commercial entities) were accepted (out of 40 who applied) to present in this venue new to the Charleston Conference schedule. The presenters, among them-founders, continued on page 69

<http://www.against-the-grain.com>
CEOs, sales and marketing representatives as well as a librarian “concierge” or two, had the challenge to present new products, services or features, all in five minutes. The presentations were diverse. There were announcements about new publishing ventures and information services, about new digital libraries and collections or availability of digitized older content. Attendees heard about “responsive design” and easier “research discovery” of various sites, gateways, and services for: video hosting, new research companion and science literacy reference products, permissions as well as digital asset management. Some products were long in production (e.g., Harvard University Press, after “30 years of labor” highlighting its product, Directory of American Regional English). Some offer hopes of better standardization and a collaborative intersection of related initiatives (e.g., Bowker/Proquest’s ISNI (international standard name id)). All in all, this well-attended session offered vendors and information and service providers (commercial, society, and other) an opportunity beyond the Wednesday vendor showcase to “pitch” new products and services. Admittedly, five minutes (akin to an “elevator speech”) provided an opportunity for only highlights and “teasers.” Some presenters were up to that challenge better than others. Unfortunately, the optional “Q&A/Follow Up Session with Charleston Conference Presenters” in a subsequent concurrent session was not well-attended by conference attendees. All told, though, the base session, “Charleston Premiers” seemed to be mutually beneficial to presenters and attendees alike. It should hold a place in Charleston Conference schedules, probably as a Saturday anchor, at least for the next few years.

SUNDRAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2013 MORNING PLENARY SESSION

The Long Arm of the Law — Presented by Ann Okerson, Moderator (Center for Research Libraries); William Hannay (Schiff Hardin LLC); Georgia K. Harper (University of Texas at Austin); Madelyn Wessel (University of Virginia)

NOTE: William Hannay (Schiff Hardin LLC) was unable to attend and his paper was read by Bruce Strauch (The Citadel).

Reported by: Calida Barboza (Ithaca College) <cbarboza@ithaca.edu>

Members of the panel presented current legal issues of interest to conference attendees. Hannay’s paper (read by Strauch) covered the main arguments and outcomes of the Apple eBook price fixing controversy, the Google book digitization project, and HathiTrust fair use cases. Harper’s presentation focused on the transformative use aspect of the doctrine of fair use and included a discussion of how to determine if a use is transformative, the history of this justification, and examples of successfully argued cases. Wessel spoke about legal issues related to massive open online courses (MOOCs), including copyright, intellectual property ownership and related campus policy issues, FERPA and ADA compliance, and end-user license agreements.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2013 INNOVATION SESSIONS 1

3-D Printing, Copyright, and Fair Use: What Should We Know? — Presented by Posie Aagaard (University of Texas at San Antonio); Michael Kolisky (University of Texas at El Paso)

Reported by: Justin Davis (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina) <davjs59@email.sc.edu>

This presentation began with an overview of 3-D printing. The presenters divided the initial half of the session among them. They discussed practical information about 3-D printing technique throughout the session. They also mentioned issues related to patent, fair use, and copyright, including possible problems with and exceptions to the current laws. The speakers passed out sample 3-D printed objects before and during the session to provide a tangible link to the discussion. They focused on the inventive possibilities of 3-D printing. Of special note is the potential benefit 3-D printing brings to the non-profit educational world as a means to produce “learning objects.” The visually impaired were named as a special population who will benefit from the tactile nature of 3-D printing in the educational environment, which includes libraries.

Electronic Resources Management: Functional Integration in Technical Services — Presented by George Stachokas (Purdue University West Lafayette)

Reported by Calida Barboza (Ithaca College) <cbarboza@ithaca.edu>

According to Association of Research Library statistics referenced by Stachokas, in most academic libraries the use of print resources is in continuous decline, whereas electronic use continues to increase. The majority of materials budgets are now spent on electronic resources, but library technical services are still mostly organized to manage print resources. Additionally, cloud-based systems are reducing the overall number of personnel required for technical services work. For these reasons, Stachokas advocated replacing the current technical services organizational structure with integrated e-resources management. He suggested breaking down technical services into the following functional units: content management, user support, licensing, acquisitions/payment processing, and metadata. He detailed the responsibilities of each unit and emphasized that change can be made in stages if no other option is available.

Head in the Clouds: 100% PDA and No Approval Plan. How We Up-Ended Collection Development and Acquisitions — Presented by Carrie Rampp (Bucknell University); Jennifer Clarke (Bucknell University)

Reported by: Kristina M. Edwards (Bridgewater State University) <Kristina.edwards@bridgew.edu>

Bucknell University presented about how they address the needs of their students and faculty using no approval plans and 100% PDA. They found that with their approval plans that were spending too much on large amount of books that were never getting used. Clarke discussed their process of providing PDA using their WorldCat Local OPAC and ILLiad. Essentially, students using their OPAC search WorldCat to find materials for their research, and if something is not available in the library they are sent to ILLiad to initiate a request that serves as both a request to borrow something through interlibrary loan and as a request for the library to purchase it for the collection. The requests are routed through ILLiad and the Collection Development and Acquisitions Librarian reviews loan requests and decides which will be purchased and which will be moved on to be filled by ILL staff. This process saves them money by reducing the amount of titles that they purchase that go unused as well as lowers the number of ILL requests that need to be placed for loans. There was some discussion about time frames in which materials would come in and get cataloged vs. requesting it through ILL. They don’t seem to have had any issues with the process taking longer and indicated for the most part that library patrons have been impressed with the turnaround time for their requests.

Janus-Faced Collection Ecology: De-selection & Preservation at St. Olaf College Libraries — Presented by Mary Barboza-Jerez (St. Olaf College Libraries)

Reported by: Catherine Martin (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina) <marti622@email.sc.edu>
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Barbosa-Jerez (Head of Collection Development, St. Olaf College Libraries) presented a unique approach to “weeding” undertaken at her institution, the Rolvaag Memorial Library at St. Olaf College in Northfield, Minnesota. This project presented unique challenges because of the history of the institution, which has served as a repository for rare books and historical materials about the Norwegian and Scandinavian communities in the north-central U.S. These materials were present in the collection but were often not properly cataloged (or in some cases cataloged at all), and the rare materials were not being properly preserved. Ms. Barbosa-Jerez worked with a faculty committee to create an initiative for preservation and cataloging of the historically significant books, as well as de-selection and removal of books that were not relevant to the current interests of the library. Her description of working with the faculty committee, and with her student workers (who took on a great deal of leadership in and ownership of the project) provided many good ideas for anyone hoping to take on a collections project of this scale.

Emerging Technologies for Emerging Libraries: A Born Digital Research Library — Presented by J. K. Vijayakumar (King Abdullah University of Science & Technology)

Reported by: Ramune K. Kubilius (Northwestern University, Galter Health Sciences Library) <r-kubilius@northwestern.edu>

Most Charleston Conference programs include at least some sessions providing a global view of library services or scholarly publishing outside of North America. This session’s audience was small but engaged. Through well-prepared slides and well-versed answers to questions, the presenter succeeded in presenting an interesting overview for attendees about library and information resources for KAUST, a four-year-old private, royal foundation established, co-educational science and technology university in Saudi Arabia. Vijayakumar provided background information about the international faculty and student body of the university located near the Red Sea, KAUST’s focus on four primary areas (water, petroleum, food, energy), and the information services provided by a 25-member library staff that includes 15 professional librarians. Very little of the library collection is print, and reference desk activity is minimal (perhaps due to the highly embedded nature of library services?). Administration of this new library, with ample budget and perhaps fewer traditions or bureaucracy, offers the opportunity to make intelligent and fluid collection decisions based on usage analysis and close direct relations with vendors. If a vendor’s business model or packaging is not suitable “as is,” the library is honest with the vendors. In some cases, vendors have responded with more acceptable adjustments. The presenter was honest about the opportunities and challenges of evolving usage and requests of brand new libraries such as those of KAUST. He shared steps to successes to date (the library’s marketing and document delivery services, for example, and the KAUST OA Policy, the first in the Middle East). Future plans include the university’s forthcoming data management plan and the library’s plan to trial DDA in various platforms.

Experiencing “iPads for All”: Results from a Library-Wide Mobile Technology Program — Presented by Michelle Armstrong (Boise State University), Peggy Cooper (Boise State University)

Reported by: Lizzy Walker (Wichita State University) <lizzy.walker@wichita.edu>

With the increasing use of mobile technology across university and college campuses, the need for tech savviness is part of the job. To that end, Boise State’s Albertsons Library put iPads in the hands of its faculty and staff. Presenters Armstrong and Cooper discussed the adoption of eBooks as being the catalyst for getting mobile technology to library staff. They also mentioned that with the change from physical to digital collections, not being able to download an eBook is similar to not being able to read a call number. They presented on the creation of an iPad training Google site, called “iPad uPad mePad,” launched by staff members, each with different expertise in using these devices. This site also encouraged play and created a new avenue of communication among staff. It is one year later, and the iPad program is still going strong. The Albertsons Library has found this to be a successful project, and communicated the value of adopting such a program to the audience. The Q and A afterward was very lively with information that may be of value to those who wish to implement a similar program. They also provided iPads for use by audience members.
There’s a Hole in my Bucket! Too Much Data? Never Enough! Cost Efficient Collections Acquisitions Decisions through Data Analysis — Presented by Eva Gavaris (YBP Library Services); Kat McGrath (University of British Columbia Library); Jamie Miller (University of British Columbia Library)

Reported by: Kristina M. Edwards (Bridgewater State University) <Kristina.edwards@bridgew.edu>

During this session, Miller and McGrath presented about how they worked with YBP Library Services to find a way in which to try and evaluate massive eBook collection offers quickly and in a way that would allow them to minimize purchasing duplicate materials. Many of these eBook collection offers occur towards the end of the fiscal year and come with deep discounts and short time frames in which to make a decision. It was important for them to find a way to quickly compare the title lists of these eBook packages to what they currently own. Since they largely use YBP for their acquisitions, YBP has record of a large amount of what they have in their collections. By comparing the list of items that they have purchased through YBP with the title lists of the various eBook collections they were able to get at least a partial idea of any overlap between their current collections and the eBook package being offered. The largest issue with perfecting this system seems to be having one reliable and easily queried database of all the library’s holdings in order to make these decisions that involve large amounts of funding quickly and ensure minimum duplication. There was also some conversation in the session about using a similar procedure to evaluate large ejournal collection offers by the various vendors. Gavaris indicated that YBP is looking in the future to providing a collection analysis tool that might address issues such as this.

Using Augmented Reality (AR) as a Discovery Tool — Presented by Jolanda-Pieta (Joey) van Arnhem (College of Charleston Libraries); Jerry Spiller (Art Institute of Charleston)

Reported by Calida Barboza (Ithaca College) <cbarboza@ithaca.edu>

van Arnhem and Spiller demonstrated how they used Layar, an augmented reality app, to provide a context for the paintings in the College of Charleston’s Addlestone Library and to explain why the artwork is displayed there. The app enabled van Arnhem and Spiller to enhance the art with digital information, such as video, audio recordings, and a geolayer. The presenters described some problems they encountered while creating the app, such as using assisted GPS on smartphones for geolocation and getting appropriate permissions to re-record the audio for uploading to a SoundCloud playlist. The app was designed to function as a non-linear experience because people could come to the collection from any direction.
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Reported by Calida Barboza (Ithaca College) <cbarboza@ithaca.edu>

Well, this completes the reports we received from the 2013 Charleston Conference. Again we’d like to send a big thank you to all of the attendees who agreed to write short reports that highlight sessions they attended. Presentation material (PowerPoint slides, handouts) and taped session links from many of the 2013 sessions are available online. Visit the Conference Website at www.katina.info/conference. — KS
Don’s Conference Notes
by Donald T. Hawkins (Conference Blogger and Editor) <dthawkins@verizon.net>

Charleston Seminar: Introduction to Data Curation

The 2014 Charleston Conference began with the inauguration of a new event: the Charleston Seminar, which is envisioned to occur annually from now on and become a series of seminars on topics of high current interest. This year’s seminar, “Introduction to Data Curation,” was a 1-1/2 day event conducted by Jonathan Crabtree and Christopher (“Cal”) Lee, both from the University of North Carolina (UNC) at Chapel Hill. Crabtree is Assistant Director for Archives and Information Technology at the Odum Institute for Research in Social Science (which hosts the country’s third-largest archive of computer-readable social science data), and Lee is Associate Professor at the School of Information and Library Science. Both are extremely well qualified to teach a seminar on data curation; see the Charleston Conference Website for further biographical information.

Jonathan Crabtree
Cal Lee

The seminar was structured as a series of talks by the presenters, interspersed with audience interaction and exercises. The first day consisted mainly of the presentations summarized here.

History of Data Curation

Beginning in the 1950s, as organizations began to amass collections of digital data, the realization grew that those collections had long-term value and needed to be preserved. In many scientific fields, the focus on space exploration in the 1960s provided a significant impetus to data collection efforts, and a broadening awareness of the issues resulted in the development of standards and reference models. These efforts culminated in the late 1990s with a reference model for an open archival environment for storing and replicating information. Information professionals work to bridge the gaps in what they do, and digital curation education curriculum is presented on the DigCCurr Website. It lists six major areas:

1. Mandates, values, and principles, including core reasons why the digital curation functions and skills should be carried out,
2. Functions and skills,
3. Professional, disciplinary, institutional, or organizational content,
4. Types of resources,
5. Prerequisite knowledge needed in order to get other things done, and

What Makes Data Different From Documents?

You may have noticed that the seminar focused on data curation, not document curation. According to Wikipedia,1 “pieces of data are individual pieces of information” and “data as an abstract concept can be viewed as the lowest level of abstraction, from which information and then knowledge are derived.” Data thus is any information that can be stored in digital form, such as text, numbers, images, video, software, etc., and it therefore includes documents. Curation practices for documents may vary, but once digitized, the issues relating to them are the same as those relating to data.

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has defined four categories of data:

1. Results of laboratory experiments,
2. Records of operations,
3. Observations from sensors or surveys, and
4. Computational simulations and algorithms.

Data can occur in many formats, in contrast to documents which generally contain only text and images.

The Data Curation Process

It is important to understand that digital data curation is an active and ongoing process, and understanding the research data cycle is critical to building relationships with data producers. Some objectives of data curation work are:

• Preserve research data,
• Enable possibility for secondary use,
• Understand the research context where data was created,
• Help next generation researchers discover the data,
• Help researchers understand their appropriate uses, and
• Understand collaboration points with research teams.

Data curators need to focus on quality issues, understand the difference that file formats make, and understand discipline-specific needs. Data curation does not mean just storing the data in a database. Most research outputs include both digital objects and data sets, and often digital objects depend on multiple files having a complex relationship to each other.

Challenges in the data curation process include a wide variation in data citation formats (in contrast to those generally employed for publications, which are fairly universal), missing data, proprietary software used to create and gather the data, and design of the research project. Faced with these sometimes daunting challenges, the data curator may be tempted to simply convert the data to text for storage, but that approach is not good curation practice because much of the representation information may be lost. Treating all formats, metadata representations, and non-textual data in the same way is very dangerous and must be avoided.

Challenges in the Representation of Digital Information

It is well known that the context of information is never captured completely. Information professionals work to bridge the gaps in what is not captured by adding metadata to the information and developing environments for storing and replicating information.
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Representations and interpretations of digital objects are complementary (although multiple interpretations are possible). Every digital object has physical, logical, and conceptual characteristics, and preservation makes the information represented by the objects useful. We must realize that there is no such thing as benign neglect of digital objects; they change and degrade over time, so preservation strategies are important. Extensive information on data preservation and archiving is available in the literature, and organizations such as the Internet Archive have played a leading role in the development of such operations.

Data Management Plans and Data Curation Profiles

Data management plans are now required in proposals by funding agencies such as NSF. They contain information on how the data generated by a research project will be collected, processed, stored, and preserved, and cover issues such as:

- Access to the data,
- Sharing and re-use policies,
- Data standards and capture,
- Metadata,
- Storage and preservation of the data (including backup), and
- Security.

(For further details, watch for my report of the recent CENDI/NFAIS workshop on data quality in an upcoming issue of ATG.)

A data curation profile describes the origin and lifecycle of data during a research project and is designed to capture the requirements for data as developed by the researchers. Using the profile, librarians and archivists can make decisions on how to archive and store it, based on scholars’ needs and potential uses of the data. Reasons to develop data curation profiles include:

- To provide a guide for discussing data with researchers,
- To give insight into areas of attention in data management,
- To help assess information needs related to data collections,
- To give insight into differences between data in various disciplines,
- To help identify possible data services, and
- To create a starting point for curating a data set for archiving and preservation.

A data curation profile “toolkit” has been developed jointly by the Purdue University Libraries and the Graduate School of Library and Information Science at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign and is available for downloading.

Metadata

Metadata, long created and used by information professionals, is commonly defined as “data about data,” but it also can refer to data that facilitates the management and use of other data. It has been described as “the curator’s best friend” and is essential in managing digital resources because it preserves their context, facilitates rights management, controls versions, and supports preservation. The Framework of Guidance for Building Good Digital Collections, published by the National Information Standards Organization (NISO), lists six principles applying to good metadata:

1. Ensure that it is appropriate to the materials in the collection,
2. Supports interoperability,
3. Uses standard controlled vocabulary terms,
4. States the conditions for use of the digital object,
5. Is authoritative and verifiable, and
6. Supports the long-term management of the collection.

The Dataverse Network

The Dataverse Network is an open-source archiving software application that was developed at the Institute for Quantitative Social Science at Harvard University. According to its Website, its purpose is “to publish, share, reference, extract and analyze research data. It facilitates making data available to others, and allows one to replicate
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work by others. Researchers, data authors, publishers, data distributors, and affiliated institutions all receive appropriate credit."

On the second day of the seminar, attendees performed an exercise to become familiar with the Dataverse Network and then each individual developed a workflow and prepared an action plan appropriate to his/her own environment.

Based on the attendee evaluations, this initial Charleston Seminar was a success. Attendees liked the mix of theoretical and practical information, despite the amount of material presented. Over 80% of them said they would attend another Charleston Seminar in the future. One comment summed it up well: “It ran very on-time. And they fit everything in! Very impressive.”

Donald T. Hawkins is an information industry freelance writer based in Pennsylvania. In addition to blogging and writing about conferences for Against the Grain, he blogs the Computers in Libraries and Internet Librarian conferences for Information Today, Inc. (ITI) and maintains the Conference Calendar on the ITI Website (http://www.infotoday.com/calendar.asp). He recently contributed a chapter to the book Special Libraries: A Survival Guide (ABC-Clio, 2013) and is the Editor of Personal Archiving. (Information Today, 2013). He holds a Ph.D. degree from the University of California, Berkeley and has worked in the online information industry for over 40 years.

Collection Management Matters — Frienemies: Vendor Tech Support

Column Editor: Glenda Alvin (Associate Professor, Assistant Director for Collection Management and Administration, Head, Acquisitions and Serials, Brown-Daniel Library, Tennessee State University, 3500 John A. Merritt Blvd., Nashville, TN 37209; Phone: 615-963-5230; Fax: 615-963-1368) <galvin@tnstate.edu>

Two of the many responsibilities that I juggle are being the administrator for both our link resolver and facilitating access to our online journals. To have both of these services function effectively, I have to communicate with the vendors’ technical support departments on a regular basis. When these people are responsive and genuinely care about making the product perform as advertised, things can be resolved fairly quickly and satisfactorily. However, if the support department does not really know what a link resolver does or understand why your access to the journal results in an error screen, it can lead to a long, drawn-out, frustrating, and sometimes futile effort.

Our former Dean was forward thinking and loved library innovation and technology, so consequently, when we migrated to Innovative Interfaces (III) in 2005, we purchased a couple of products that looked wonderful in the demos, but no one had the will or the skills to implement them once they were ours. One of these was our link resolver. We knew what it did, but even after our Webinar, we were clueless as to how to make it work. Both the Webmaster and computer specialist, who back then doubled as the systems person, would not take it on. Not wanting to waste money and seeing its potential for helping students link to full-text articles, non-technical me decided to make an attempt to implement it. After I had some initial success, with heavy support from the III HelpDesk and the WebBridge Listserv, I decided to keep going and install the link resolver in every database that was open URL-compliant. Thus began my love-hate relationship with vendor tech support.

Some tech support departments are very helpful and will even go to the extent of using a guest login, so they can have the same user experience you are describing to replicate the error. Technical support at two of my major vendors were very helpful when I was implementing WebBridge, and they even checked back with me to see if I was satisfied with the solution. “Jerry” at a third aggregator’s site shared advice about copy/pasting the URL into Notepad and how to get rid of white space. If it was not an issue on his end, he made helpful suggestions about how I could remedy the situation on my end and encouraged me to call him back with the results. But he moved on, and the folks that followed were not as helpful. For instance, I found a page on their support site that had the open URLs for one of their subsidiary products. Tried as I may, I could not get any of them to work. I contacted technical support and was told that open URL linking for that product was not supported. When I sent a screenshot from their support website that displayed the (erroneous) open URLs for the subsidiary databases, the tech told me that she would check with the product manager. After sending follow-up inquiries for a month, I received an email from the same rep that said the open URLs were not supported for the product — virtually the same wording as her first response. The page with the errant URLs disappeared from the vendor’s support site.

Even more aggravating are the vendors who hire technical support personnel who do not have sufficient experience with open URL linking. I had problems getting the link resolver to work in one database of a large periodical vendor. When I contacted the III HelpDesk, they said that the problem was with the database vendor. After much back and forth, I was finally put in touch with a senior tech support supervisor who did not understand what the problem was, although I kept sending screenshots with explanations. When I found myself sending email with definitions of open URL linking and explaining how it worked, I realized that if I had to explain it to her on that level, there was no way she was going to be able to help me. In desperation, I went back to III and explained that the vendor was incapable of solving the problem, and they resolved the issue for me. This same vendor listed the WebBridge link twice on each citation and could not remove it. Even today, they cannot just have the link resolver show on abstracts only. It offers “all or nothing,” so the link resolver button has to appear on every article citation or not at all.

Over the years I have learned some tell-tale signs of when to know whether or not I am dealing with someone who can actually solve the problem once it lands in their lap:

a) They give you bad advice about what to do to solve the problems, without testing their solutions themselves and when those fail, then
b) They don’t respond to your email about what progress they are making with solving the issue, until,
c) They tell you to check the link resolver listserv and the wiki to see if you can solve the problem yourself, as if you have not done that already! Many a time my hands have been poised over the keyboard preparing to write a nice-nasty note saying, in effect, “You did not ask me, but I have already done that!” Then I figured what good would it do? They obviously cannot help, so I move on to the next option.

My experience with an article delivery service taught me that things can always get worse. After being assured that they had a WebBridge expert to help me implement the service, I received a corrupted coverage load and a manual written by another III library system’s department. I got it up and running except in one important database with heavy usage. I offered a guest login, which they ignored, and every solution they sent was
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I have one password I use as a default, but I still have five spreadsheets with passwords. There is no assurance that the password that I created last year will work the following year. Second, I have to get into the site and install and/or verify the IP addresses and then check the proxy for off campus access. If I still cannot get access, my next step is to notify customer service, the circulation department, the technical support department, or whoever is listed on the contact page as the most likely source for help that we have a subscription via [our agent], but cannot get access.

This year I kept getting responses that I needed to have the subscription agent send the journal’s proof of payment. I then had to contact the subscription agent for the proof of payment, wait for them to send it to the vendor or to me, and then test for access again. Since I don’t activate the journals until March, when the subscription agent should have settled all payments for regular renewals, I wonder why is it that the journal’s support team cannot check their subscriber database to see if our institution has a valid subscription, instead of sending me on a Payment Quest?

It’s important to get a prompt response, especially when you have a professor with a class that starts in two hours and he just realized that the database is down, or the electronic journal has an error link. I appreciate it when the technical support person realizes that I don’t have the same level of computer or software expertise and shows patience with working out a solution with mutual respect, instead of passing on untested advice. Sometimes they don’t thoroughly read what you send them. I have had tech support start a thread and then three days later ask me the same information that I have already responded to in the thread, which I then copy/paste to the top and highlight.

I have found when dealing with tech support, who are are not librarians or have not had field experience working with various databases to know how they function, you can get advice that has no basis in reality. I have sent a question about a vendor’s embedded link in ScienceDirect to that company and was told to check my link resolver. If the tech support had some familiarity with ScienceDirect, they should have known the difference between an embedded link on the page (for their product) and a link resolver. Trying to explain a functionality issue to somebody who is not knowledgeable about how their own product works with library applications is an errand in the wilderness.

Being service-oriented is the key to strong and effective vendor technical support. Some tech support personnel can tend be condescending, which may sometimes be irksome, and others can be lazy. I used to have an A-Z list of tech support that did not list all of the databases that came in our subscribed packages. When I contacted them to say that the Index to Legal Periodicals was missing from our Omnifile Fulltext, the response was that the
Curating Collective Collections — Grassroots Monographic Shared Print in the Corn Belt

by Teri Koch (Collection Development Coordinator, Drake University) <teri.koch@drake.edu>

Column Editor: Bob Kieft (College Librarian, Occidental College, Los Angeles, CA 90041) <kieft@oxy.edu>

Column Editor’s Note: In my November column, I summarized the physical and artifactual issues raised for readers and scholars by monographic shared print agreements. I promised at the time a follow-up column about projects that address these issues; although I still plan to write that column, I have the opportunity in this installment of CCC to present at greater length one of the projects I would have discussed. A group of libraries in Iowa are working through matters of monograph verification as they make retention commitments in the context of a multi-dimensional shared collections initiative that also features prospective collection development for e-books and pBooks, delivery time concerns, and the opportunities of membership expansion. My thanks to Teri Koch and colleagues for this report. Their work is especially interesting for the shared print community because of its verification process and the Web app developed to facilitate it; their work is also important in that it shows how a loosely federated group are developing a more tightly coupled relationship over a relatively short time. Teri will be on the agenda of CRL’s Print Archive Network Forum at ALA in January 2015 (http://www.crl.edu/archiving-preservation/print-archives/forum) at a session about verification strategies. — BK

After observing successful shared print projects in Maine, Michigan, and elsewhere, and after attending a Charleston Pre-conference in 2012 on shared print, a couple of Iowa librarians, Pam Rees, Library Director at Grand View University, and Teri Koch, Collection Development Coordinator at Drake University, asked “Why not us?” From our answer to this rhetorical question has sprouted the truly grass-roots Central Iowa Collaborative Collections Initiative (CI-CCI).

Iowa libraries have a long history of collaboration, but we proposed to our private academic library colleagues that they consider developing a shared print agreement for monographs. Central College, Drake University, Grinnell College, Simpson College, and Grand View University agreed to participate. The group secured commitment by senior administration at each institution to form a collections partnership that would take a data-driven approach to securing titles for retention; we would promise each other 24-hour delivery and also coordinate acquisitions to eliminate all but the most critical duplications and thereby maximize local budgets. An MOU adapted from the Michigan Shared Print Initiative (MI-SPI) was signed six months after project initiation by the library directors and chief academic officers — maybe not record time but a rapid stand-up for this kind of project.

The colleges in the CI-CCI group are fairly homogenous in size, location, and mission, with FTE’s ranging from 1388 to 4400. All are members of the 31-member Iowa Private Academic Libraries Consortium and are committed to programs that benefit group members. We have no joint catalog and relied on local staff and funds to undertake the project. We worked by phone call, and Drake application developer Dan Taylor created a Website for key project documents (https://cci-cci.org/)

We hired Sustainable Collections Services (SCS) to analyze our combined holdings of slightly over one million title records, about one-half of which are unique. After discussion with SCS of various data analysis scenarios, we decided to use the following criteria to identify volumes for one-copy retention in the shared collection: published before 1991, zero (0) recorded uses since 2005, at least one non-CI-CCI library in Iowa also holds a copy.

Our focus on retention/preservation prompted us early on to perform what we called a “retention verification” project; we wanted to make sure that the volumes assigned for retention were accounted for and were in good enough shape to be used. Having assured ourselves on both counts, we would then stamp each book with “CI-CCI 2013” to indicate that it was a retention title and would declare the retention commitment in the book’s local catalog record. We ended up with 143,294 retention titles in the shared collection. SCS attempted as much as possible to evenly distribute these among group members relative to collection size. We agreed that we would not begin looking at potential weeding candidates until the verification process was accomplished by each institution.

Drake’s library decided early on to employ Dan’s skills to build an app to facilitate the verification process. He built the application on a custom framework that Drake uses for other library Web applications, which allowed the app to be built and updated quickly and easily; he designed the app’s front end to facilitate verification at the shelf with any device with any size screen, from phones, to tablets, to laptops on carts. Responsiveness of the app was made simpler by using a freely available CSS and JavaScript-based user interface library called “Bootstrap.” Because of the amount of data involved, proper indexing and table design were critical to achieving good performance.

Once the app was developed, the data from SCS were imported into a database that the app would use. In most cases student employees performed the verification process. Using a dropdown menu in the Web app, students assigned each item a status: “Verified On Shelf” if the item was found on the shelf; “Poor Condition” if the item was found but needed repair; or “Missing.” The Web app showed real-time information regarding how many titles were in each category for the institution. The vast majority were initially in the “Verified On Shelf” category (96.5%). Each school then investigated the titles on the “Missing” lists to determine whether they might be checked out or otherwise accounted for, and many were eventually located. “Poor Condition” titles (less than .5%) were, for the most part, repaired sufficiently to move to “Verified On Shelf.” Ultimately, every title needed a status of either “Verified On Shelf” or “Verified Not On Shelf.” In the end, a total of 2,601, slightly less than 2% of items, were “Verified Not On Shelf” across the libraries.

A period of “horse trading” followed the initial round of verification because libraries could not retain volumes assigned to them that were in poor condition or missing. These titles were reassigned to another library for retention. It was important to all that the smaller libraries have a chance to “pull their weight” in this process; thus the group decided that each institution would claim at least the same number of items that it had marked “Verified Not On Shelf.” For some of the smaller libraries, that was not possible, and the larger libraries claimed more. The re-claiming project proceeded with the smaller libraries claiming first, followed by the larger libraries.

Dan extended the functionality of the existing Web app to provide a reclaiming mechanism. This primarily involved the identification of availability at institutions other than the one originally assigned retention. He also added a feature that showed each institution’s items that were unclaimed from other institutions and that were only held at their institution. This became the logical place for each institution to start the reclaiming project.

After the retention project is complete, each library may begin making collection management decisions. Drake has begun a deselection process by sharing information regarding approximately 50,000 withdrawal candidates with the teaching faculty using a database Dan created that includes standard bibliographic information, total uses, last checkout, a link to the catalog record, and the number of Iowa and national libraries that own the title.

The database is set up so that when each faculty liaison logs in, the system automatically goes to the call number(s) associated with his/her discipline (based upon our collection conspectus). Faculty also have the option of adjusting the filters to see additional call num-
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ber ranges. Built-in search features include title, author, publisher, OCLC number, and call number. Faculty have the option to retain any item they deem necessary by selecting a button that says “Retain This Item.” When that button is selected the item is automatically removed from the database.

Some faculty have been reluctant to participate in the collection review because they do not agree with the necessity of withdrawing books and do not have the time to invest. The Web app has been well received, however, and has alleviated most of their concerns. Faculty like seeing all the pertinent information about the book and being able to “work” the list. That at least one other CI-CCI library has agreed to retain the item has been a major factor for most faculty in their decision to withdraw items.

Prospective collection development has been a primary objective of the collaborative since the outset. In addition to securing access to retained copies and saving space through deaccessioning, we think that the future payoff of our collaboration will be in a collective approach to acquisitions and, potentially, on such other big-picture issues as technology. We plan to coordinate acquisitions with the goal of developing a shared collection among the participants to reduce duplication, leverage acquisition funds, and reduce the need to refresh data with SCS. We have established a guideline that if two or more CI-CCI libraries already own the title, the others will not purchase it unless it is specifically required onsite.

Several of the smaller CI-CCI libraries have begun employing this method. At Drake we haven’t yet because of faculty concerns, most of which relate to the guaranteed 24-hour turnaround for a loan request. The current average is 72 hours, and we are exploring ways to ensure faster delivery times. Additional concerns about the shared acquisitions approach include length of checkout for faculty; CI-CCI has met this need by extending the loan period from ten weeks to 120 days.

As the CI-CCI transitions to the collection development phase of our project, we are considering whether to merely coordinate our acquisitions so as to minimize duplication or to go a step beyond by developing areas of subject specialization at member libraries. The subject specialty approach is of particular interest to some of our faculty. Task forces are currently looking at options for a common vendor solution for print books and whether we can establish a common eBooks collection.

The group realizes that prospective collection development will be a challenging endeavor given the differences in budgets and curricula and subject specialties of the colleges. The varying degree of adoption of eBooks and patron driven acquisitions are other factors that challenge us in coming up with an approach that meets the needs of each campus.

In the coming year, several tasks await. First, we will consider expanding the partnership. The University of Northern Iowa, a state-supported institution with 11,000 students, hopes to join the collaborative in the fall of 2014. UNI is employing SCS and will have a stand-alone data set since incorporating their data with CI-CCI data would require a data refresh by the entire group. We are thrilled at the possibility of bringing in a larger institution especially as we begin to look at prospective collection development. Second, each school must decide how and whether to weed, and we will implement an OCLC Shared Print Symbol to register title retention commitments in WorldCat. We will also update the MOU to reflect current practices and new member(s), and as we expand the scope of the collaborative we will have to consider how we fund and staff our work, which means possibly seeking grant funding or budgeting for a project manager.

Finally, based on a presentation by Prof. Andrew Stauffer (University of Virginia, Founder of BookTraces http://www.booktraces.org/) at a symposium held in 2014 to celebrate the Maine Shared Collections Strategy (http://tiny.cc/7hdcx), Drake will consider examining candidates for withdrawal for such evidence of reader interaction as marginalia, inscriptions, insertions, etc. This examination will help Stauffer and others establish the incidence of these interactions as scholars and librarians try to determine how to preserve the history of reading practices and cultures.
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vendor did not send it, and nothing else was done. I contacted the vendor rep for my region, who said that it was out on the server for the e-resources management companies to pick up. I then went back to the A-Z list of tech support and told them to look on the server for the database’s file. All that time I was thinking that even if the vendor had not made the database available, what prevented the A-Z techs from contacting the vendor to request the file? The indifferent tech support and the fact that they were more expensive than their competitors made me decide not to renew the subscription, since the library was not getting any value for the extra money it spent. Tech support should be just as user-friendly as customer service, but that perspective is not sometimes shared.

When companies send surveys asking for feedback on your experience with their customer service, that is an indication that they have some interest in your satisfaction with their service. I try to respond to these surveys, whether I have a positive or negative encounter, because there is no use in complaining if you are not willing to do something to remedy the situation. If you have a technical support representative that does goes the extra mile with solving your problem, it’s important to tell them that you appreciate their efforts with troubleshooting the problem and resolving the issue.
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Creating the Cover Image

After selecting an eBook title to promote on the New Books display shelves, we access the eBook and, using the computer’s print screen function, create a screenshot capturing an image of the eBook cover. This image is then pasted into Microsoft Paint for editing. In the Paint program, we are able to isolate the cover image and then copy and paste it onto a blank document in Microsoft Word. Each eBook cover image will have its own page.

Generating the QR code

Inspired by the University of Exeter’s use of eBook placeholder markers in the book stacks containing QR codes, I also sought to use QR codes to create a link to the eBook record in the catalog. (Green, 2013). All records in our catalog, named Consuls (Connecticut State University Library System), have a persistent link available to the patron for use as a reference URL. Placing a QR code beneath the eBook cover image would permit a patron to scan the code using their mobile device. The scanned QR code would then access the bibliographic record in Consuls. Ideally, it would be best to be able to link the QR code directly to the eBook. However, on account of authentication issues with the eBooks, the QR code needed to be linked to the bibliographic record. A patron scanning the QR code with their mobile device would access the bibliographic record in Consuls and then be able to determine if they wanted to click on the link to access the eBook.

Tracking the Results

Beginning on April 1, 2014 when the eBook frames were placed on the shelves, through June 30, 2014, 32 eBook titles were displayed. This timeframe and eBook selection would serve as a pilot project and would provide a launch point on which to base further action. On account of the limited shelf space available, it was decided that 32 display frames would fit comfortably along the shelves. From this selection, 13 titles received 59 scans during the pilot project. Unfortunately, it is not possible at this time to determine if the patron then clicked on the link in the bibliographic record to access and download the eBook.

Conclusion

Although this project is still new to the library, preliminary results show that patrons are interacting with the eBook displays. Based on the positive usage data collected during the pilot project, we decided to continue displaying select eBook covers with QR codes. In fact, we have decided to extend our display by adding 10 frames to occupy space usually reserved for new books or DVDs. Either by scanning the QR code or by just viewing the display, the library is pleased to be bringing attention to these valuable resources.
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Biz of Acq — Increasing Access to eBooks at Central Connecticut State University

by Dana Hanford (Head, Information Systems and Resources, Elihu Burritt Library, Central Connecticut State University, 1615 Stanley Street, P.O. Box 4010, New Britain, CT 06050-4010; Phone: 860-832-2058) <hanfordd@ccsu.edu>

Whether they’re downloaded through OverDrive or batch loaded into the catalog, eBooks are an increasingly dominant presence in our libraries. Although present digitally in the catalog, their lack of physical presence creates a barrier for patrons who are browsing the book shelves. Over the past couple years, the Elihu Burritt Library at Central Connecticut State University has significantly increased its eBook holdings. In an effort to bring attention to and attract usage for our eBook titles, I endeavored to create a way to make the eBooks physically visible and add them to the New Books display shelves in our library’s lobby and in a second floor reading area. By using a cover image from an eBook and a QR code to link to the corresponding bibliographic record in the catalog, I hoped to engage our tech-savvy patrons and promote our eBook collections.

As the main and only library supporting the community of learners at Central Connecticut State University, the Elihu Burritt Library strives to facilitate knowledge creation and inspire intellectual curiosity and lifelong learning (Central Connecticut State University, 2012). The library serves a population of approximately 12,000 students at the undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral levels (Central Connecticut State University, 2014). Over the past several years, the library has subscribed to various small, subject specific eBook packages in support of the curriculum. Starting in 2013, the library (in conjunction with our sister, consortial libraries: Eastern Connecticut State University, Southern Connecticut State University, and Western Connecticut State University) significantly increased its access to eBooks with two large eBook subscriptions. The EBSCO E-book Academic Collection, supplying titles to support a broad range of academic disciplines, provides our patrons with access to over 132,000 eBooks for browsing or downloading. In the other eBook subscription is a patron-driven acquisitions program offered through our vendor, Ingram. This program provides access to, as well as the possible purchase of, over 2,000 eBooks with new titles added on a weekly basis.

Selecting the eBook

eBooks for the display shelves are selected either by myself, other members of the department, or by our student workers. There are no set selection criteria; however we look for titles that would be of general, popular interest. Also, it is helpful if the eBook cover has a colorful, eye-catching image.

Creating the QR code

In Consuls. Ideally, it would be best to be able to link the QR code directly to the eBook. However, on account of authentication issues with the eBooks, the QR code needed to be linked to the bibliographic record. A patron scanning the QR code with their mobile device would access the bibliographic record in Consuls and then be able to determine if they wanted to click on the link to access the eBook.

Generating the QR code

Inspired by the University of Exeter’s use of eBook placeholder markers in the book stacks containing QR codes, I also sought to use QR codes to create a link to the eBook record in the catalog (Green, 2013). All records in our catalog, named Consuls (Connecticut State University Library System), have a persistent link available to the patron for use as a reference URL. Placing a QR code beneath the eBook cover image would permit a patron to scan the code using their mobile device. The scanned QR code would then access the bibliographic record in Consuls. Ideally, it would be best to be able to link the QR code directly to the eBook. However, on account of authentication issues with the eBooks, the QR code needed to be linked to the bibliographic record. A patron scanning the QR code with their mobile device would access the bibliographic record in Consuls and then be able to determine if they wanted to click on the link to access the eBook.

Displaying the eBook

After the QR code is pasted onto the document beneath the image of the eBook cover, a color printout of the document page is made and inserted into an acrylic frame. The frame is then ready for display on the Library’s New Books display shelves.

Displaying the eBook

After the QR code is pasted onto the document beneath the image of the eBook cover, a color printout of the document page is made and inserted into an acrylic frame. The frame is then ready for display on the Library’s New Books display shelves.

Tracking the Results

Beginning on April 1, 2014 when the eBook frames were placed on the shelves, through June 30, 2014, 32 eBook titles were displayed. This timeframe and eBook selection would serve as a pilot project and would provide a launch point on which to base further action. On account of the limited shelf space available, it was decided that 32 display frames would fit comfortably along the shelves. From this selection, 13 titles received 59 scans during the pilot project. Unfortunately, it is not possible at this time to determine if the patron then clicked on the link in the bibliographic record to access and download the eBook.

Conclusion

Although this project is still new to the library, preliminary results show that patrons are interacting with the eBook displays. Based on the positive usage data collected during the pilot project, we decided to continue displaying select eBook covers with QR codes. In fact, we have decided to extend our display by adding 10 frames to occupy space usually reserved for new books or DVDs. Either by scanning the QR code or by just viewing the display, the library is pleased to be bringing attention to these valuable resources.
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A mid all the high dungeon about news from various corners of the earth, leave it to academics to ignore what is really important: the cost of getting a college education. We all know that the price tag on even a modest college education (not one of the premiere Ivy League institutions) is through the roof. What used to cost under $10,000 for four years of college (that tells you how old I am) is hardly enough to get through one semester. Moreover, getting a degree in four years proves something of a miracle. It is more likely to be five or six, and often through no fault of the student but the fault of some institution for not sequencing the classes appropriately.

Given the brouhaha about parsimonious adjunct faculty pay that one hears about routinely (the schedule adjunct walk-out is tapped for February 2015), you’d think that getting a college degree is relatively inexpensive. And, of course, you’d be wrong. Adjunct pay is the black eye of academe, one of its dirty little secrets that is no longer that secret. The state of that abysmal pay is somewhat ironic when you think about all the tweed-coated know-it-alls who weigh in on minimum wage in every state. The state of that abysmal pay is somewhat ironic. I say this because it is connected with what I’ve been talking about in my columns, which is the black hole that is our backwardness in college costs. And it’s problematic because it is connected with what I’ve been talking about in my columns, which is the black hole that is our backwardness in college costs.

The cost of going to college is now completely out of hand, or rather completely out of pocket. Student debt is now at $1.1 trillion, a matter that won’t hit home like other economic bubbles because those who have to pay that back won’t realize its impact for a number of years. But let’s not kid ourselves: these are unsustainable dollars that are certain to sink the enterprise of getting a college education. Perhaps academics are looking the other way because of the early failure of MOOCs and the fiasco of many for-profits. We in the academy have decided that there really aren’t any threats, so it’s business as usual. That’s the kind of attitude that will hasten our demise.

One reason for the rising costs are the near-palatial amenities that colleges and universities think they must have. I’m talking about smart classrooms, gyms that are Hollywood-esque, dining halls that rival five-star restaurants, and all the rest. (For more, see: http://onforb.es/1BqpgK and http://bit.ly/1rWPDI1). Some schools have lounging pools, other gyms. And, of course, you’d be right to say that our universities are full of black holes of every institution — also connected with the fact that it is difficult to get a college education.

The millions that are paid to some surely are excessive. Of course, these dollars pale in comparison to what is being paid to coaches of football, basketball, and other sports. Today, we’re not counting the number of head football coaches who make more than a million annually, but counting the number of assistant coaches who make more than a million annually. Over 7 football coaches make one million annually (at least, that’s the salary); the number swells to more than 100 making half-a-million or more. The we-try-harder basketball coaches have a meagre 35 who are making a million or more annually, some of them at schools that are also paying football coaches a million or more. The news this week is that the University of Florida paid about $7 million just to get the coach of its choosing. Some will argue that supporters pay a lot of these costs and that is in part true. But it’s also true that this drives up the cost of everything else one way or another.

Finally, in order to get everyone mad at me, let me add that libraries — the financial black holes of every institution — also contribute to these costs. In the grand scheme of things, we are behind a lot of other people and things in this very, very long line of exorbitant costs, but we are still in that line and we cannot deny it. We have databases that cost four, five, and six figures, depending on the size of the institution, journals that cost four or five figures, and updates, refurbishments, and new buildings that cost millions and tens of millions.

Now add to this that it turns out we’re not, as a group (I mean academics) educating young people fully prepared to go out into the world. Some graduate unable to read or write proficiently. Some graduate not knowing much of anything about their majors. Some graduate with hangovers and a good deal of debt. To worsen matters, we academics are quick to point out that these kinds of empirical measures are unfair, don’t get at the heart of who and what we are, and do not “tell the whole story.” I hyperbolize a little — but you get the point.

So what are we doing about any of this? Sadly, not much. We academics bellyache about not being paid enough, whine about legislatures, opine over how no one understands how much good we do, how hard we work, how hard this job is, and so on. None of these things change the fact that it costs far too much to get a college education.

We are going to have to do a great deal more. We need to own up to some of these deficiencies and then work harder at trying to
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hared print management, deselection, collaborative collection development — it’s all about balancing the tension between space, budget, and service to users. With real estate at a premium on academic campuses, many libraries are clearing shelf space to make room for areas such as technology labs and collaborative workspaces, making the already challenging chores of weeding and space allocation for incoming acquisitions more difficult. Whether deselection is handled as a large-scale project or an ongoing operational process, local institutions depend on both local and shared catalog and circulation data to evaluate the implications of deselecting particular materials before final decisions are made. In recent years, more formal agreements between groups of libraries exist to prevent the inadvertent disposal of unique materials and to ensure there is always a “last copy” within the group to guarantee ongoing access to the materials. However, it’s all for naught without effective programs to connect users to those increasingly scarce materials; resource sharing is the key to sustainable collection management.

The same sentiment is echoed across several library consortia with collaborative collection management programs: the keys to success depend on collection analysis across multiple libraries, a focus on preservation, and ready-to-go resource sharing arrangements that support transfer of items between libraries quickly and easily. And that’s why we see so many academic libraries doubling down on resource sharing. Access to detailed data regarding requesting, borrowing, and lending patterns across systems means that libraries can be assured they are providing optimal service to their users, as well as tracking that activity to drive local or collaborative collection decisions. This article will share collection-related insights from the experiences of several consortial borrowing (aka resource sharing) systems, as well as describe some of the opportunities for future enhancements to such systems.

An alternative to ILL, Innovative’s INN-Reach is one system that offers direct consortial borrowing by extending a local circulation model and applying it across a consortia’s union catalog. Local systems contribute bibliographic and holdings data to a union catalog, which is exposed in a central discovery interface searched directly by public users (often as a secondary search from the local discovery interface). Highly configurable matching and overlay algorithms ensure a clean union catalog, making it easy for users to find the right materials. Users request materials directly using the same credentials they use within their local libraries; the request triggers standard paging and transit workflows to fill the request based on real-time circulation status and automated selection of the best available copy (when more than one copy is held across the consortia). Automatic real-time updates (e.g., additions to collection, modifications of circulation status) keep the union catalog in sync with local systems. Because the process is completely integrated into local circulation, no special training is required for staff.

All this integration guarantees the requests will be satisfied quickly with very high “first to fill” rates; that is, over 90% of requests are filled by the first identified source to get materials into users hands within an average of 2-3 days. That’s as fast as a patron-driven acquisitions program for physical materials and with no need for the borrowing library to allocate local space for the items. INN-Reach is almost as fast as Amazon Prime, and it’s free to the library users. With 50% unique content in the union catalog (representing the 50% of unique collections across local institutions), we’re talking valuable, sought-after research materials — many of which might not be appropriate for permanent local acquisition — from discovery to delivery in just a few days.

Even when overhead is factored in (e.g., expenses related to the courier service required to support the rapid transit of materials), the system delivers clear value over ILL. Gwen Evans from Ohio Link did a review of cost avoidance among their 91 members over a ten-year period to assign some dollar values to their model.

“I wanted individual members to see how much they borrowed over time versus how much those materials would have cost to buy themselves to understand the value of their participation — not just to the greater good, but to their own bottom line,” says Evans.

With an average of almost 617,000 borrows each year across the system, she estimated more than $44.8 million in cost avoidance annually and more than $433 million over the life of the system. Based on participation and library type, those numbers translate into an average savings during the past decade of more than $2 million for each two-year institution, almost $3 million for each private institution, and a whopping almost $20 million for each public four-year university that participates in the statewide system. Resource sharing systems provide a highly cost-effective way to extend the collection for users — without risk of selecting the wrong titles — where everything shared is specifically requested by an end-user.

The MOBIUS statewide consortial system in Missouri has enjoyed similar success. MOBIUS libraries borrow twice as often and lend nearly three times as often through the MOBIUS union catalog as they do through their local catalog. With books arriving in two to three days, the consortial system is a core component of how Missouri libraries serve their users. And at an estimated cost of $2 to $3 per transaction (compared with $25 to $30 per transaction with traditional ILL), systems like INN-Reach are the only scalable way that participating libraries can afford to make so many materials available to their communities.

“Everyone wins in this scenario,” says Donna Bacon, Executive Director of MOBIUS. “Library users have access to materials that they would never have known about and are empowered to find their own information online and order it themselves. Our libraries can focus their precious resources on collection development and expansion of service, rather than being bogged down with small ILL.”

Earlier this year, Bacon joined forces with George Machovec, Executive Director of the Prospector system in Colorado, to take things to the next level, growing their members’ savings — and the breadth of their cooperative collections — by collaborating across state lines through the use of Peer-to-Peer resource sharing. MOBIUS and Prospector signed an agreement to provide access to their combined union catalogs for every user of each of their member libraries. This inter-consortial borrowing program is the equivalent of adding tens of new members to each system overnight, without the overhead of individual implementations. MOBIUS already enjoyed success across statelessness when Tulsa City-County Library (in Oklahoma) was added to their consortial system, so they knew they could manage the logistics. With 75 libraries of every type represented in the combined Peer-to-Peer collection, MOBIUS and Prospector libraries now have access to more than 27 million items and over ten million unique titles.

“We are excited that the MOBIUS / Prospector partnership will provide patrons with greater access to materials in a multi-state region,” Machovec says. “This system builds on the commitment of libraries to provide the very best materials to their patrons coupled with fast discovery and delivery.”

When asked about the implementation, Bacon is careful to note that bringing together two well-established and highly effective independent consortia is not without its challenges. “It’s called ‘PEER to PEER’ for a reason.”

In other words, there were compromises to be made to effectively integrate the different pre-existing systems. Bacon points to the fact that pulling together well-established consortia with different systems, different models for ac-
choose to specialize in and to demonstrate for stakeholders how those unique materials are serving a broader audience. For example, the MOBIUS/Prospector Peer-to-Peer arrangement opens the door for users from Missouri University libraries to access the Colorado Health Sciences Library collections as easily as their own local collections. Additionally, the reports expose opportunities to streamline access to less unique titles (e.g., purchasing an electronic copy of something that was requested multiple times from a cooperating institution). Integration with user type categories means libraries can leverage information regarding the types of users making repeated requests (i.e., students or faculty) to support collection decisions.

Finally, the structure of the union database enables individual libraries to record institutional selection and deselection decisions locally and expose them via systems like INN-Reach for all participating members of the consortia to see. This visibility supports workflows for consortial review prior to permanent withdrawal and offers a common system for libraries to identify and confirm availability of last copies across the consortia. This type of infrastructure and reporting mechanisms are needed to support ongoing collaborative deselection and retention decision-making. Building it into the resource sharing system ensures efficient processes for users to access those last shared copies and contributes to the likelihood of success across initiatives.

Tools like the shared system and access to shared data are incredibly powerful for libraries to mine data for the purpose of driving appropriate actions. What’s even better is what systems like INN-Reach can support going forward. Tim Auger, Director of Resource Sharing at Innovative, explains, “In the future, both transaction and selection/deselection data will be automatically analyzed for real-time decision-making, and that’s where it gets really exciting.”

...more to come...
Academic libraries have been involved with various aspects of the open access (OA) movement for many years. Activities have ranged from educating faculty and graduate students about copyright to encouraging publication in open access venues to paying article processing charges (APCs) from library funds. One additional important activity has been working with faculty to pass institutional open access policies and assisting colleges and universities in the implementation of these policies. While some refer to these as mandates, it seems more accurate to call them policies since enforcement relies on social norms rather than coercion. These faculty-developed policies should also be distinguished from open access deposit requirements of granting agencies which may more accurately be called mandates. This article will examine the general development of such policies and then focus on one specific policy that will serve as an open access policy by the faculty of the University of California.

Faculty Open Access Policies

Faculty open access policies support “Green” OA — that is, making content, usually articles, available in an open access repository, rather than “Gold” OA that is publication in an open access or hybrid journal. Usually such policies are framed as a way to allow faculty to retain some intellectual property rights, specifically the right to deposit a copy of an article in an open access repository, rather than transferring all rights to a publisher. In this sense, faculty open access policies are an important component of efforts to educate faculty about the importance of retaining copyright in their work. In addition to supporting faculty sponsors of open access policies, libraries often maintain the repositories required to implement the policies.

From an examination of various faculty open access policies on the ROARMAP site, http://roarmap.eprints.org, most appear to share many of the same features. There is a general statement that the faculty desire to share the results of their research and scholarship as widely as possible. There is a legal description of exactly what rights in their articles the faculty are giving to the institution. There is a statement that faculty can secure a waiver of the policy (“opt-out”) for a particular article. Finally, the policy states what office of the college or university is to receive the “final version” of the article and establishes the procedures for the administration of the policy.

Not surprisingly, many policies follow that of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of Harvard University that was adopted in February 2008. The adoption of this policy was widely publicized at the time and undoubtedly influenced succeeding policies. Because of the influence of the Harvard policy, it is useful to quote from it, particularly in relation to the University of California (UC) policy that will be discussed later.

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences of Harvard University is committed to disseminating the fruits of its research and scholarship as widely as possible. In keeping with that commitment, the Faculty adopts the following policy: Each Faculty member grants to the President and Fellows of Harvard College permission to make available his or her scholarly articles and to exercise the copyright in those articles. In legal terms, the permission granted by each Faculty member is a nonexclusive, irrevocable, paid-up, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, and to authorize others to do the same, provided that the articles are not sold for a profit. … The Dean or the Dean’s designate will waive application of the policy for a particular article upon written request by a Faculty member explaining the need.

Significant differences among the various policies lie in two areas: the level of compliance expected of faculty and the level of autonomy permitted to the author ("opt-out") provision. Most follow the Harvard model: “Each faculty member grants [to the institution] permission … to exercise the copyright in those articles.” Oberlin College’s policy is a bit stronger: “Oberlin faculty and professional staff will make their peer-reviewed, scholarly articles openly accessible …” Emory University takes a somewhat less prescriptive approach in that the grant of permission is only for those articles “the author has chosen to distribute Open Access.” It’s impossible to determine from the policies themselves which approach will produce greater compliance since compliance is voluntary in all cases. No faculty member risks termination for failure to adhere to an open access policy.

One area in which most of the policies do not follow the Harvard model is in the necessity for an author to explain the reason for asking for a waiver. Harvard’s policy requires the author to submit a written request “explaining the need.” Other policies say the author “may opt out” or that an official “will waive” the policy upon request of the author. Again it’s impossible to know from the policies themselves how any particular language affects the actual number of waiver requests made or authorized.

University of California Policy

Although individual University of California (UC) faculty began to advocate for the University to adopt an open access policy soon after the Harvard University policy was adopted in 2008, it took the adoption of a campus open access policy by the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) in 2012 to start a serious discussion of the adoption of a systemwide policy for all ten UC campuses. In order to understand how events unfolded, it is first necessary to understand the role of the Academic Senate in the University of California.

The principle of shared governance is alive and well within UC. Tenure-track and tenured faculty, under the organizational structure of the Academic Senate, are “empowered to determine academic policy, set conditions for admission and the granting of degrees, authorize and supervise courses and curricula, and advise the administration on faculty appointments, promotions and budgets.” http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/about.html Given this level of autonomy and authority, any proposal for a UC faculty open access policy would have to originate in the Academic Senate. Such an Academic Senate policy would apply only to Academic Senate members. Extending the policy to other authors such as academic lecturers and professional staff would require action by the President of the University.

The passage of the UCSF campus policy in May 2012 led to a proposed systemwide open access policy being sent to the Academic Senate for discussion in July 2012. During the discussions that continued for the remainder of 2012, it became apparent that a significant number of faculty had serious concerns with the proposed policy as written even though it largely followed other policies that had been in force for several years at other institutions.

Many faculty feared that the central administration, the University of California Office of the President (UCOP), would enter into commercial agreements with publishers to sell articles placed in a UC open access repository. These faculty were unwilling to proceed without assurances that UCOP would never do this. Many faculty also incorrectly interpreted the proposed policy as requiring publication in an open access journal, thus possibly obliging them to pay APCs. This misconception was relatively easy to clear up, but the fear of commercial exploitation by UCOP of authors’ work took longer to address. In the end, Senate approval required a side letter from the University Provost promising that UC would not sell the contents of the open access repository.

A revised policy was submitted to the Academic Senate in March 2013. Before the Senate would agree to adopt the revised policy, UCOP was asked to affirm the following:

• Joint oversight of the policy by the Academic Senate and UCOP
• That UC would not sell deposited articles without the express permission of the faculty authors
• That UC would fund the development of automatic deposit capability into the repository
• That UC would commit to funding APCs for publication in Gold open access journals

The university administration agreed to the first three points, but was unwilling to make a blanket commitment to cover future APCs. Despite the lack of agreement on this last point, the other assurances were sufficient, and the Academic Senate adopted the revised policy on July 24, 2013. Anyone interested in the detailed history of the adoption of the policy can find all the documentation at http://soc.universityofcalifornia.edu/open-access-policy.com.
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Many of the earlier policies contained a statement encouraging the institution to establish a repository to preserve and make available the deposited articles. The Princeton University policy from 2011 observes, “An open-access policy without a ready means for faculty to post their scholarly articles and an equally ready means of retrieval would be of very limited value.” http://roarmap.eprints.org/520

Fortunately the University of California is not in this situation. Despite its name, the California Digital Library (CDL) is part of the University of California and provides a variety of collections and library technology services to the UC libraries, the university as a whole and the public. One of its services is to host the UC institutional repository, UC eScholarship which it has done for years. Therefore, it was natural that CDL be given the task of implementing the open access policy.

The policy itself, http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/open-access-policy/policy-text, obviously owes much of its language to previous faculty open access policies, but there are some important differences. The preamble states after a general statement of the importance of making scholarship as widely available as possible, “Faculty further recognize that by this policy, and with the assistance of the University, they can more easily and collectively reserve rights that might otherwise be signed away, often unnecessarily, in agreements with publishers,” thus explicitly stating that a principal purpose of the policy is to assist faculty to retain copyright in their work. The license is granted to the University “for the purpose of making their articles widely and freely available in an open access repository. Any other systematic uses of the licensed articles by the University of California must be approved by the Academic Senate.” This relates directly to the fear among many faculty that UC intended to sell the articles to commercial vendors. Contrary to the Harvard Arts and Sciences policy, the license will be waived for a particular article upon request without the need to explain the basis for the request. Articles may be deposited in any appropriate open access repository, not just in eScholarship. Finally, there is no requirement that faculty publish in any venue that charges a fee.

Once the Academic Senate passed the policy, the CDL began to develop an implementation plan. One decision was that deposited articles would be made publicly available under a Creative Commons CC BY-NC license, although faculty would be free to use a different Creative Commons license if they chose. The Senate had made it clear that successful implementation of the policy depended on CDL development of an automatic deposit mechanism that was easy and “painless” for faculty to use. If such a technology could not be developed in a timely manner, there was a real risk that implementation of the policy could be postponed or even abandoned. Since the eScholarship repository had existed for many years, manual deposit mechanisms already existed. The problem was to automate these deposit mechanisms to support large-scale ingest of articles, and, if possible, to develop harvesting mechanisms that would remove the necessity for faculty to personally deposit articles. The decision was made to first implement the policy at three campuses, UCSF, UCLA and UC Irvine (UCI), rather than try to implement at all ten campuses at once. The policy would be declared to be in effect at these three campuses and the deposit tool tested there first, then be implemented at the remaining seven campuses. The original implementation timeline was:

- Nov. 1, 2013 — policy in effect at UCSF, UCLA and UCI
- May 2014 — six-month review by Academic Senate
- June 2014 — harvesting tool completed for UCSF, UCLA and UCI
- July/August 2014 — review of deposit tool by Academic Senate
- Nov. 1, 2014 — policy in effect at remaining seven campuses
- June 2015 — harvesting tool implemented for remaining seven campuses

The first two milestones were met, but there have been some delays in the development of the harvesting tool. A contract was awarded to Symplectic on March 3, 2014 for implementation of a publication harvesting system using Symplectic Elements. The system will monitor publication sources, including public and licensed publication indexes, for new articles published by UC authors. The system will then contact the authors by email for confirmation and article upload to eScholarship. The harvesting system was made available to the three early-implementing campuses on November 1, although the harvesting system will not be available at those campuses until a future date. Along with developing the harvesting tool, CDL also has been working to streamline the manual deposit process. CDL has also developed a Website allowing faculty to request a waiver of the policy or an embargo on public access for a particular article and also to generate an addendum to a publication agreement containing the terms of the policy.

Once the policy was adopted, CDL undertook to notify publishers of the provisions of the policy. As of October 2013, over 200 publishers had been contacted. As of May 2014, UC authors have been granted 174 waivers of the policy. It is not known how many of these waivers were requested by the publisher or how many resulted from the preference of the author. At this point no publisher has notified the CDL that it will request waivers from UC authors as a matter of course.

In addition to CDL activity, librarians on the three early-implementing campuses are engaged in various activities to inform faculty of the policy and facilitate the deposit of articles. Activities include creating Websites, handouts and marketing materials; directly assisting faculty in manual upload of articles; and helping faculty link their work with author identifiers, such as ORCID and ResearcherID. As a separate but somewhat related activity, the UC libraries conducted a pilot program between January 2013 and April 2014 to pay APCs for UC authors. The pilot built on the UC Berkeley Research Impact Initiative begun in 2008 and was jointly funded by the ten campus libraries and the CDL. Some campuses chose to fund publication in both fully open access and hybrid journals, while other campuses only funded publication in fully open access journals. Campuses are waiting for the results of an assessment project to decide whether or not to continue the program.
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everever a discussion takes place de-
scribing the process of how informa-
tion professionals negotiate contracts
with salespeople to buy goods and services, I
am reminded of the classic Joni Mitchell
song, “Both Sides Now.” That tune became a hit
for Judy Collins when she sang, “I’ve looked
at life from both sides now, from win and lose,
and still somehow it’s life’s illusions I recall. I
really don’t know life at all.” Of course, Joni’s
song was not about the way in which vendors
and information professionals negotiate terms of
a purchase, but it should be common knowledge
that in a negotiation, both sides need to have an
understanding of what the other side may be
thinking about because if both sides lack even a
basic perception of what the other is contemplat-
ing, problems will hopefully arise, and the
final results may not be acceptable to either party.

The worlds of the vendor and the information
professional intersect many times during
the course of a year. Trade shows, product
presentations, and on-site negotiations to buy a
new product or renew a current one all serve to
emphasize that there will always be a significant
amount of time spent together. When entering
the inevitable negotiation, neither side can afford
to buy or sell a product/service without some
degree of preparation.

What strategies will the vendor employ to ob-
tain the library’s business? Will those strategies
melt into the library’s objectives? Are both sides
in sync? The road to unfulfilled results is littered
with good intentions, poor execution of goals,
and a significant amount of misinformation. To
achieve acceptable terms from the vendor, the
librarian must be willing to invest the time to
draft a careful course of preparation and strategic
planning so that the library’s acquisitions needs
are effectively met.

In a recent survey developed by Data-Planet
for the 2014 Charleston Conference, a number of librarians were asked about their thoughts
and experiences in dealing with and negotiating
with vendors. When asked “Do you have a
documented set of objectives for each major
negotiation?” 72% said they did not have a
set of objectives when going into a negotiation
with a vendor. Having been on the sales side of
the table for many years facing the information
professional, I can categorically state that every
vendor has a defined set of objectives when
entering a serious negotiation with a library.
Furthermore, those objectives change as the
process becomes more defined and closer to
resolution. The library simply cannot walk into
a vendor meeting without a clear set of objectives
and planned strategy.

That same survey asked “How did you do in
your most recent difficult negotiation?” It was
no surprise that 60% of the respondents said that
they were not happy with the results and that
in spite of this they renewed or purchased the
product anyway. Really? The goal is for both
sides to walk away from the table feeling that
everyone’s objectives have been met. If one side
is unhappy, that means that one person’s goals
were not met. That should not be an acceptable
outcome for either party.

But when the survey asked if the librarian
considered the vendor a “partner, competitor,
or adversary” 71% of the respondents chose to
consider the vendor as a partner. That result
was a bit puzzling because a partner should be
working side by side with the other person to
achieve a satisfactory result for both. So, if the
majority of the people polled did not think their
last negotiation ended satisfactorily for them,
how could they then say that they consider the
vendor as a partner? A person who is considered
a partner in a business negotiation simply means
that both sides are working towards a common
goal whose results will benefit both. It is incon-
gruous to say the vendor is a partner and then be
mostly unsatisfied with the results of the most
recent negotiation with that vendor.

And so it goes on and on about both sides
being on the same page and yet too many infor-
mation professionals go into vendor meetings
without a list of objectives and no strategic plan
to how to attain those objectives even though
they know full well that the salesperson under
the mandate of the company has examined,
stratified, and role-played every aspect of the
negotiation process with the library.

I had always thought that an integral part of
the MLIS “real life” education involved teaching
the students about dealing with vendors. I found
out that my supposition was incorrect when, in
preparation for an article “Planning and Man-
aging A Sales Call” that I wrote for the March/
April 2012 edition of the SLA publication,
Information Outlook, I researched the curricu-
um of a number of library schools to see what
courses were given to help prepare graduating
library students in the fine art of negotiating
with vendors. After all, one inescapable fact
that every practicing librarian knows is that a
steady stream of vendors will ultimately beat a
path to the library’s doorstep to attempt to sell
any number of products and services.

Sadly, there were few, if any library schools
that offered comprehensive courses on the topic
of dealing with vendors. I then decided to inter-
view some of my librarian friends to ascertain
how they developed their skills in working with
salespeople. Overwhelmingly, the answer
was that their skills were developed by on-the-job
training and at the outset of their careers,
lack of negotiating skills training probably
resulted in some deals for the library that were
not as good as they would have liked them to be.

What all this tells you is that in the negoti-
ation process, the vendor seemingly holds all
the cards. After all, they have the products.
They have also been schooled in the fine art of
negotiation since it is a well-known fact that in-
f ormation industry companies spend significant
amounts of money to train salespeople and
company executives on how to successfully negotiate a license with a library and that the expectation is that the final
terms of the deal will favor the vendor. It is also
known that certain databases are a necessity for
libraries to acquire and that they are expected to
have a set of the popular information available
for their patrons. Just because the library has to buy
resources related to specific data doesn’t mean
that the library has to accept an unfavorable deal
from a vendor.

So what does the library staff do to level the
playing field when the vendor calls and asks
for an appointment to present a product/service
for the library’s consideration? The salesperson
has determined through careful research that
the library needs the product the company is touting.
And the library’s objective is to select the right
product for a reasonable price that likely will be
used by the patrons of the library and will also
be renewed the following year.

It all comes down to a preparation and
leverage for the information professional to
begin to level that playing field. In preparing
for the salesperson’s visit, the first step is to ask
for an agenda which will list the reasons for
the salesperson coming to visit, whether anybody
else from the vendor is planning to attend, as
well as the date/time of the meeting. Once
that proposed agenda is sent, then it is up to the
library to dictate terms of topics, confirmation
of date/time, and acknowledge if more than one
person from the library will be there. So if the
salesperson is planning to bring the Sales Man-
ger, the library may want to have the Director
or another senior executive attend so as to counter
that strategy by the vendor.

The next step is basic research. The salesper-
son is coming next week to talk about their new
Whiz Bang database. To get a basic understand-
ing of the product to be discussed, visit the
to the company Website to see what is written about
Whiz Bang. Next, check out product reviews
in various journals. And, best of all, use the
network of fellow librarians to ascertain if any of
your colleagues have had any experience using
this product. After this preparation, the library
is now ready for the meeting.

The next step is to understand the landscape.
According to the Outsell 2014 Information In-
dustry Outlook, the companies in our industry
will generate $721 billion in revenue this year.
Furthermore, there are a finite amount of libraries
and a finite amount of companies selling goods
and services to those libraries. It’s a relatively
limited universe that information companies
have to sell their products. Additionally, selling
databases to libraries is a highly profitable busi-
ness, and since it is an annuity-based model, sub-
scriptions are renewed each year and as a result,
the lifespan of a subscription-based product is
continued on page 85
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this report, I came away with a whole new set of new thoughts about today’s iSchool style of library science training.

My first thought was, looking at the curriculum of the iSchool receiving the highest ranking, the University of Illinois, I can understand why some libraries might find it hard to find graduates fit for the entry-level positions they were offering. Indeed, unless students were carefully counseled to focus on the few traditional services offered at most libraries, the very richness of the courses available to these students might render them fairly useless. For example, at Illinois, I found a list of 186 courses taught on campus that master’s degree students could attend. But that wasn’t all. I found they could also choose from another 63 WISE (Web-based Information Science Education) courses being taught at other iSchools.

My second thought or conclusion was that most of the nearly 250 courses available for study looked to be of great value. Initially, as I went through the course listing I thought I might find all sorts of techno gobbledygook classes but that wasn’t the case at all.

But this discovery led me to my third, and perhaps final, thought about iSchools. It can be best expressed by twisting George Barnard Shaw’s oft quoted dictum about the value of youth: “Youth is wasted on the young.” In my case, after reviewing the broad variety of courses dealing with the problems faced by today’s libraries, I fear today’s iSchool courses are probably being wasted on new librarians. Our profession needs to find a way to enable established librarians to take these courses. I am optimistic that this can happen.

By the way, this is my final Back Talk column. I personally have loved working in libraries. There have been ups and downs, but overall it has been a great experience. Now, however, I have decided to focus my energies elsewhere. Of course, I may get coerced by Katina to write something else from time to time or to attend the Charleston Conference, and if so, I’ll see you in Charleston or on the pages of ATG.

Both Sides Now ...

from page 84

anywhere from five to seven years. That means that a $10K sale to a University library usually translates into $50-$70K projection over a five-to-seven-year period because cancellations usually occur after a few years, if at all.

Therefore, vendors selling subscription-based products to libraries are usually willing to be receptive to granting discounts (when asked) because they know once the product is in the library, that it will probably be there for another five to seven years so that any initial discount is more than made up for in the later years of the subscriptions’ life cycle. If it’s a renewal discussion and the vendor is coming in with a five-percent price increase over last year, it would be hard to believe that the vendor would walk away from a signed order if the library proposed a one-percent or a two-and-a-half-percent price increases instead of the original price submission. Moreover, a vendor seeking to displace the competitors’ product may be willing to grant a large discount to gain a foothold into the library.

A vendor is in business to satisfy the customers by providing a high level of service with relevant products at a reasonable price. Quite frankly, the vendor may balk at the library’s initial counter offer, but in the end, the vendor is there to do business and most of the time will not reject a reasonable counter offer.

All of which brings us to the concept of leverage. It’s no secret that library budgets are shrinking, and with that reality the library must be judicious in their selection of materials for their users. Aside from vendors with sole source offerings, the fact is that in a competitive environment, two or three vendors will have similar content in their databases. Sure, one vendors’ offerings may be better than the others, but that does not stop the library from suggesting that they believe that a better price for similar content may be obtained at the vendors’ arch competitor. Just sayin’…

Another example of leverage involves the payment of the product that probably will be the selected. Given that funds for library purchases are in short supply, perhaps an extended payment plan might be accepted by the vendor. Or maybe a negotiated cap on future price increases over the next three years of the life of the product may be an item placed for consideration on the table. Sometimes vendors will accept a 15-month subscription for the price of 12 months.

It is a fact that in the world of libraries, vendors are continually developing better databases for their customers. Not a year goes by without a slew of vendors announcing new and better databases for sale. Having been involved in many new product introductions, it would not be outside the realm of possibility to say that sometimes those new products combined with new platforms may not work as well as advertised, much to the chagrin of the vendors. In such cases as a vendor wanting the library to buy something new, the concept of making the library a beta site for three to six months at a nominal cost so as to test out the new offering may be met with approval since the vendor wants to get that new product in as many libraries as possible. Both sides prosper in this type of arrangement.

Libraries and vendors are in business together. It makes perfect sense for both sides to respect one another, be prepared, and understand the landscape in which the goal is to create a “win-win” outcome for both. 🇺🇸

Mike is currently the President of Gruenberg Consulting, LLC, a firm he founded in January 2012 after a highly successful sales executive career in the information industry. His company is devoted to providing clients with sales staff analysis, market research, executive coaching, trade show preparedness, and best practices advice for improving negotiation skills for librarians and salespeople.

His book, “Buying and Selling Information: A Guide for Information Professionals and Salespeople to Build Mutual Success” is available on Amazon and Information Today.

Mike has an Undergraduate degree (BA) from Long Island University and a Masters degree (MS) from St. John’s University. He is an avid life-long collector of music recordings and since 2000 a columnist for www.jambands.com.
Back Talk — Library School: Is it Where You Get Your "Union Card" or is it, Like Youth, Wasted on the Young?

Library School. Not sure what comes to your mind when you think of this compound noun. For me, it called to mind the concept of a union card. I will explain this later, but for now let me provide some background information.

I had attended one year, 1963-64, at BYU doing the usual freshman things: learning to do my own laundry; learning to cook Kraft Macaroni and Cheese for breakfast, lunch, and dinner; and relearning everything that I was supposed to have learned in high school (champion oxymoron). But then I went off to Taiwan for 30 months of living and learning. When I got back to the States, I returned to school and got a part-time library assistant job shelving books between classes and pretending to be a reference librarian a few evenings each week. Working in the library was great. Unlike the landscaping crew, I was sheltered from the elements, it was clean work, and the scheduling was forgiving so that I could work for a few hours, go to class, and then come back to earn my $1.50 an hour. I subsequently continued to do all sorts of nonprofessional library jobs at two universities while finishing my BA and MA degrees focusing on Chinese politics. It was during graduate school that I began to get cold feet about finishing my PhD in political science. China had not yet opened. We were still fighting in Vietnam. America wanted to get out of Asia, and so the prospects of getting a China-focused position was doubtful.

It was at this juncture that I began looking around for some way to earn a living since by that time I had a wife and son in addition to myself to support. I was then working in the University of Washington’s undergraduate library as a part-timer doing all sorts of clerking and research tasks. One day I mentioned to one of my bosses that I was rethinking my career goals. He said, “Tony, you seem to like working in libraries. Why don’t you become a librarian?” As we talked more, I learned that before I could become one I needed a library “Union Card,” or MLS degree.

The question then became how should I go about getting such a degree? I considered working on the MLS part-time along with a full-time job. This librarian, named Jay, said, “Tony, going to library school is like drinking a bowl full of vomit: you can sip it a mouthful at a time, or gulp it down as quickly as possible.” So, after making application to UW’s championship library school, I stopped my political science studies on a Friday and took up Library Science on a Monday.

Actually, I found library school to be a lot of fun. UW’s library school was full of largely brainy students and eccentric teachers, and most of the work could be done 9-5 pm, Monday through Friday. That left the evenings and weekends open to pretending I was a real librarian. 1967 was a Championship Library School year, by the way. I took one LC course, one database course, two Dewey cataloguing courses; a series of social science, humanities, and science bibliography courses; a “computer and libraries” course where we learned that computers and serials would never mix; a collection development seminar taught by the library director; and a serials course where we learned about the future of libraries. I have to admit I stand amazed at the changes that have taken place in library education since I was a student. In my day (1970-71) I had quite a bit of freedom on what to study. Compared to what today’s students can do, my experience was quite different. I took one LC and two Dewey cataloguing courses; a series of social science, humanities, and science bibliography courses; a “computer and libraries” course where we learned that computers and serials would never mix; a collection development seminar taught by the library director; and a few other courses just in case my first job dealt with one of those specialties.

Space considerations here won’t allow me to share everything I have learned about iSchools. I began by looking at the U.S. News and World Report article that ranks all sorts of graduate programs in library science. After a review of many of the schools mentioned in the article that ranks all sorts of graduate programs in library science. After a review of many of the schools mentioned in the article that ranks all sorts of graduate programs in library science...
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fulfillment

noun \fʊ(l)-ˈfɪl-mənt also fə(l)-\n
: the act or process of fulfilling
: the act or process of delivering a product (as a publication) to a customer

When you're ready for a vendor dedicated to fulfilling your entire order, call us. We offer:
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- Immediate Order Fulfillment from Stock or Publisher
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