Perspectives on the Future of the Monograph

by Adriaan van der Weel (Book and Digital Media Studies, Leiden University) <a.h.van.der.weel@hum.leidenuniv.nl>

and Colleen Campbell (Director, Institutional Participation and Strategic Partnerships – Europe, JSTOR | Portico) <Colleen.Campbell@IthakaInternational.org>

The theme of this issue of Against the Grain is the future of the monograph. It is hard to find anyone who is not convinced that the monograph is important and deserves a future. Certainly none of the contributors to this issue express any doubt about it. Yet the continued role of long-form scholarly output such as the monograph is by no means assured. The articles collected here take a step back from the dizzying vicissitudes of technological and economic change to examine the monograph more fundamentally. For surely we do not want to continue to produce monographs simply because it is economically and technologically possible to maintain them as a system of academic currency. The challenges the monograph is facing are intellectual at least as much as they are economic or technological. What are the implications of regarding the monograph primarily as an intellectual tool? Is it still fulfilling that function? Are monographs actually being read? What pressures are exerted on the monograph’s function?

Libraries experience difficulty in purchasing enough monographs for their faculty and students. Presses experience difficulty in making monograph publishing pay. Authors experience difficulty in getting monographs published. Until recently this constellation of issues was commonly attributed to the “monograph crisis.” The monograph crisis was the corollary of the serials crisis, i.e., insufficient library purchasing power resulting from the exorbitant prices charged by the large scientific publishers for must-have journals. Even taking into account the global growth in the sheer number of academics looking to publish their research output, the problem could simply be regarded as a preponderantly economic issue. That had the undeniable benefit of also suggesting where the solution might be found: libraries needed more funding to buy books. More recently, digital developments have furnished a variant on this economic solution to an economic problem: scholars could be given more funding to pay processing fees for open access publication. Whether through pre- or postpublication funding, the monograph may be kept alive at least for a while longer. But with some calling continued on page 10

If Rumors Were Horses

You heard it here! I have resigned from my position as Assistant Dean of Technical Services and Head, Collection Development at the College of Charleston. I have worked in libraries for 45 years. And decided to finally give up all the evaluations of staff, annual reports, forms to fill out, budget planning, administrative issues, etc., etc. Nothing much will change from the outside. I will continue to have an office at the Addlestone Library. I will keep my cofc email account, I will continue to convene the Charleston Conference and edit Against the Grain and do a few new things!

Speaking of the Conference, we had 59 registrations in four hours the first day that conference registration opened — June 6! Gosh! Also the Vendor Showcase only has a few more slots left. Be sure and register. www.thcharlestonlibraryconference.com

The theme for this year is Roll with the Times or the Times Roll Over You! Be sure and visit the Charleston Conference and do a few new things! continued on page 6
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Against the Grain / June 2016
From Your (tickety-boo) Editor:

It’s summer and my last one at the College of Charleston Library as Assistant Dean of Technical Services and Head, Collection Development. Sad and exciting at the same time! I am looking forward to no more annual reports, no more budget spreadsheets, no more staff evaluations, no more SACS reports, etc., etc.! Instead I will do other things. I am keeping the Charleston Conference and Against the Grain and keeping my office in the library and cote email address so no change at all on that front except I will have more time and maybe do something else!

Moving right along, this issue is guest edited by the awesome Colleen Campbell of Ithaka and Adriaan van der Weel of Leiden University and is on the future of the monograph. Articles are by Geoffrey Crossick (open access monographs), Rick Anderson (authorial intent), Colleen Campbell (researcher perspective), Agata Mrva-Mondoya (evolution of the monograph), Adriaan van der Weel (reading monographs), and Don Waters (monograph publishing in the digital age).

In this issue we also have a bam-zowie special report section on consolidation in our industry with answers from ten of our noteworthy colleagues Don Beagle, Dennis Brunning, Tim Collins, Peter Frochlich, Nancy Herther, Matthew Ismail, Alison Mudditt, James Neal, Audrey Powers, and Stephen Rhind-Tutt.

Our Op Ed is about how we are failing at preservation of our heritage especially on microfilm. In Back Talk, Ann Okerson talks about “flipping” from the subscription to the APC model. Our interviews are with Ann Okerson and Alex Holzman as well as Yoav Lorch. Glenda Alvin’s column in this issue spoke to me! Boy. It’s oh so true that a good business relationship with one’s Business Services Departments is crucial.

We have a summary of the 2016 Otsell Information Management Benchmark Report. Also, a new regular column from Dan Tonkery called Straight Talk. We have our usual book reviews from Tom Gilson and Regina Gong. As always, Donna Jacobs keeps us on our toes with François Maurice, and I was fascinated with Tom Leonard’s Oregon Trails which is about his visit to the famous Hay-on-Wye and his book searching there.

There’s much much more! But I have two upcoming conference calls about the 2016 Charleston Conference! Register!

Love, Yr. Ed. 💙

Rumors
from page 1

Charleston Conference Call for Proposals! www.thecharlestonlibraryconference.com/call-for-proposals/

Speaking of new things we can do now that I have resigned (notice I am saying resigned from my day job at the College — I am NOT retiring!!) Anyway, this year we are introducing the CHARLESTON FAST PITCH. In an exciting new and experimental session called CHARLESTON FAST PITCH, 3-5 applicants, thoughtfully pre-selected from among all those who respond to a CALL (soon to be issued), will “pitch” their ideas to the entire audience and a select group of judges. For more information, see this issue, p.46 and the conference website www.charlestonlibraryconference.com.

AND — I want to give huge, immense, and boundless THANKS!!!! to Steve Goodall and Ann Okerson who have spearheaded this initiative! THANK YOU BOTH, Steve and Ann!!

Just received my June 2016 (v.33, issue 5) of Information Today. One of the lead articles “Ebooks in Libraries: Equal Access to Digital Content” by Jenny Arch points out that...
SAE DIGITAL LIBRARY IS BECOMING SAE MOBILUS™
YOUR DESTINATION FOR MOBILITY ENGINEERING RESOURCES

You may know the SAE Digital Library as the place for the latest technical resources - including over 200,000 technical papers, standards, books, magazines and more. Now it’s getting even better. Get the same trusted content you need on the new SAE MOBILUS™.

Solve project challenges and streamline your workflow quickly and efficiently through this user-focused platform that enables you to:

• Work collaboratively across your institution
• Provide single-point access to all users
• Download the latest, most-reliable content specific to the industry
• Access peer-reviewed research on a wide range of technologies

SLA ATTENDEES:
• Stop by the SAE Booth (#637) to get a personalized demo and to learn more about the new content and platform features.
• Don’t miss a special Hot Topic Session on Sunday June 12th from 3:30-5:00PM, featuring guest speaker, Don Marinelli, founder of the Entertainment Technology Center at Carnegie Mellon University and partner of the late Randy Pausch (*The Last Lecture*).
• Join us in the Exhibitor Theater Sunday, June 12th from 5:30-6:30PM for an in-depth look at the new SAE MOBILUS. Attendees will receive a free gift.

For more information, contact:
SAE Customer Sales
(p) 1.888.875.3976
(e) CustomerSales@sae.org
If you are interested in leading a discussion, acting as a moderator, coordinating a lively lunch, or would like to make sure we discuss a particular topic, please let us know. The Charleston Conference prides itself on creativity, innovation, flexibility, and informality. If there is something you are interested in doing, please try it out on us. We’ll probably love it...

The Conference Directors for the 2016 Charleston Conference include — Beth Bernhardt, Principal Director (UNC-Greensboro) <beth.bernhardt@uncg.edu>, Glenda Alvin (Tennessee State University) <galvin@tinstate.edu>, Adam Chesser (AIP) <adam.chesser@cox.net>, Ed Colleran (Triumvirate Content Consultants) <ecolleran@triumvirateconsultants.com>, Cris Ferguson (Murray State University) <cferguson13@murraystate.edu>, Rachel Fleming (Appalachian State University) <rfeilingrm@appstate.edu>, Joyce Dixon-Fyle (DePauw University Libraries) <joyfyle@depauw.edu>, Tom Gilson (Against the Grain) <gilson@cofc.edu>, Chuck Hamaker (UNC-Charlotte) <cahamake@email.uncc.edu>, Bobby Hollandsworth (Clemson University) <bhollan4@clemson.edu>, Tony Horava (University of Ottawa) <horava@uottawa.ca>, Albert Joy (Retired) <albert.joy@uvn.edu>, Ramune Kubilius (Northwestern Health Sciences Library) <rkubilius@northwestern.edu>, Erin Lueckert (Readex) <elueckert@newspay.com>, Jack Montgomery (Western Kentucky University) <jack.montgomery@wku.edu>, David Myers (DMedia Associates) <dave@dmediaassoc.com>, Ann Okerson (Center for Research Libraries) <aokerson@gmail.com>, Audrey Powers (UFS Tampa Library) <apowers@lib.usf.edu>, Anthony Watkinson (Consultant) <anwatkinson@btopenworld.com>, Meg White (Rittenhouse) <meg.white@rittenhouse.com>, Katina Strauch (College of Charleston) <kstrauch@comcast.net>, or www.charlestonlibraryconference.com.

Send ideas by July 15, 2016, to any of the Conference Directors listed above. The Call for Papers form is available at http://www.charlestonlibraryconference.com/participate/call-for-papers/.

Or send ideas to: Katina Strauch, MSC 98, The Citadel, Charleston, SC 29409 • 843-723-3536 (voice) • 843-805-7918 (fax) 843-509-2848 (cell) • <kstrauch@comcast.net> • www.charlestonlibraryconference.com

Rumors from page 6

many innovative formats do not replace older formats. Quoting from the Pew Research Center Report, “Libraries at the Crossroads” she says that only 38% of people are aware that their library lends eBooks. There are many interesting statistics in this report. http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/09/15/libraries-at-the-crossroads/

And Nielsen’s 2015 U.S. Book Industry Year-End Review Report is finally available! We’ve all heard the saying “Everything that’s old is new again.” In the book realm, that statement couldn’t ring more true, as sales of traditional print books increased almost 3%, while sales of eBooks dipped. As a result, eBooks’ share of the total market slipped from 27% in 2014 to 24% last year. That said, however, certain genres maintained a larger share in the digital realm than others, including Romance and Thrillers. Despite the slight shift in total eBook sales, one channel within the digital space saw significant growth — smartphones. In fact, eBook consumption via smartphone grew from 7.6% in 2014 to 14.3% in 2015, which is yet another signal of how ubiquitous our handheld best friends have become. In looking at category trends, non-fiction was the highlight of 2015, with 12% growth in children’s non-fiction and 7% growth in adult non-fiction. On the fiction front, the big gainers were science fiction (44%), classics (32%) and graphic novels (22%). Adult coloring books also had a breakout year, with an estimated 12 million copies sold in 2015, compared with 1 million in 2014. http://www.nielsen.com/us/en/insights/reports/2016/2015-us-book-industry-year-end-review.html

On another note, DBW reports that Author Earnings has posted a new report … on eBook pricing from the Big Five publishing houses. According to the dataset they used, the eBook prices of the publishers’ most-heavily-promoted frontlist launches were, for the most part, still priced between $12.99-$14.99. But, as the report points out, once you take a step back and look at the 157,000 eBooks from the Big Five, “a significant shift” is seen. The average price of a Big Five eBook, according to the report, dropped from $10.31 in January 2016 to $8.67 in May 2016. http://www.against-the-grain.com/2016/06/author-earnings-big-five-2016.html

Just heard from the focused Leila Salisbury. (See her profile in ATG http://www.against-the-grain.com/2012/12/atg-star-of-the-week-leila-w-salisbury-director-university-press-of-mississippi/) Leila has accepted the position of director at the University Press of Kentucky. She says she hates to leave colleagues in Mississippi but her family is in Lexington. (I also noticed that she interned at the University Press of Kentucky when she was in college.) She will begin work...

2016 Charleston Conference — 36th Annual Issues in Book and Serial Acquisition

Call For Papers, Ideas, Conference Themes, Panels, Debates, Diatribes, Speakers, Poster Sessions, Preconferences, etc ...

2016 Theme — “Roll With the Times or the Times Roll Over You”

Preconferences — Monday-Wednesday, October 31 - November 2, 2016
Vendor Showcase — Wednesday, November 2, 2016
Main Conference — Thursday-Saturday, November 3-5, 2016
Charleston Gaillard Center, Francis Marion Hotel, Courtyard Marriott Historic District, Embassy Suites Historic Downtown, Charleston, South Carolina
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With Get It Now, you can:

- Enable your patrons and staff to request immediate delivery of content from 150+ leading publishers
- Choose from three different service models to best suit your needs
- Track your purchases and adjust your settings based on usage
- Pay for article purchases using your IFM account

Get It Now at copyright.com/getitnow

Integrated with leading link resolvers and ILL services!
The Scholar-as-Reader Perspective

Contributing an overview of the Mellon Foundation’s support for experimentation with digital formats for the monograph, Donald Waters suggests in a careful analysis of stakeholder interests that it is the scholar-as-reader perspective that is most in need of further research. Probably the first and foremost consideration of the scholar-as-reader when it comes to monographs is to find the most relevant — and only the most relevant — books to read. In our so-called attention economy, there are two besetting challenges for the monograph reader: that of inclusion (how to discover the titles one does want to read) and that of exclusion (how to negotiate the overwhelming number of titles that are newly published as well as how to deal with their length). Where discovery is concerned, the increasingly online digital workflow of most scholars tends to be problematic when it comes to finding monographs. Here digital formats, including of course Open Access, offer many opportunities.

The interests of the scholar-as-reader are clearly not in sync with those of the scholar-as-author. In the attention economy intellectually speaking underconsumption is as much of a problem for the scholar-as-author as overproduction is to the scholar-as-reader. This conflict of interests is repeatedly identified by our contributors, from a range of perspectives. Colleen Campbell’s informants don’t only evince clashing interests as authors and readers, but find themselves divided even just in their capacity as readers. Dr Jekyll’s Ctrl-F requirements — best met by the digital monograph — are at variance with Dr Hyde’s desire to engage with monographs in their full paper splendour. As library dean, Rick Anderson asserts that regardless of the scholar-as-author’s intentions, the scholar-as-reader has always been best served by the monograph as database. The provision of more granular metadata by publishers and vendors will no doubt aid the reader in terms of discoverability, and thus improve use. However, Geoffrey Crossick draws attention to the fact that this reader-directed form of access may threaten the monograph’s integrity as an extended argument intended from that of the scholar-as-reader.

The Scholar-as-Author Perspective

The monograph remains an important academic currency. In writing monographs scholars have three aims. The first and foremost aim is to establish intellectual communication: to reach — and persuade — peers. The second aim is to gain recognition from superior and institutions, resulting in a salary, tenure and career advancement. Thirdly, many HSS scholars aspire to reach a wider, non-academic audience. The primary motivation here may have been originally to accrue extra prestige or extra income. The social demands of valorisation have more recently become an additional factor to consider in scholars’ publication strategy. Agata Mrva-Montoya calls attention to the first and third of these aims in particular as drivers behind the search for new forms of scholarly output in the scholarly communication ecosystem.
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YUMI EATING DISORDERS
by Bruce Strauch  (The Citadel)


THE RETURN OF BRITISH FOR-PAY LIBRARIES
by Bruce Strauch  (The Citadel)

Bromley House Library is a quiet haven in a Grade II-listed Georgian house in the center of Nottingham, England. It’s having its 200th anniversary as a subscription library. The cost is £96/year. You can drink coffee and read in a quiet corner rather like a club.

The *Public Libraries Act of 1850* (yes, it’s that old) largely replaced the subscription ones with local government free libraries. But now they’re back in popularity.

The first one was the Leadhill Miners Library in Lanarkshire founded in 1741 by 21 miners, a minister and a schoolmaster. Other famous ones are the PORTICO LIBRARY in Manchester, the LEEDS LIBRARY, and the BIRMINGHAM AND MIDLANDS INSTITUTE. The Liverpool Athenæum is the priciest at £795/year.

Heritage and history value is a huge draw.

*Plus, I would imagine, no derelicts, Internet smut and noisy children doesn’t hurt.*


LET’S READ ABOUT STRONG WOMEN
by Bruce Strauch  (The Citadel)


OH JOY! LET’S READ ABOUT BAD MARRIAGES
by Bruce Strauch  (The Citadel)


FIRST NOVEL AND THE BACK END
by Bruce Strauch  (The Citadel)

No doubt you learned in high school that *Pamela* was both the first novel and epistolary. Samuel Richardson was highly puritanical and sought to impart a lesson in just and prudent actions “in the common concerns of life.”

While Pamela’s letters are lively and conversational, they are consumed with issues of virtue and honesty. Alexander Pope said the novel would do more good than volumes of sermons.

It was wildly popular and inspired merchandise from tea cups to fans, spurious sequels, a theatrical version plus a comic opera. Henry Fielding, a failed playwright studying to be a lawyer found it so unbearable he wrote a spoof called *Shamela* with the girl a slattern. And Joseph Andrews about her brother.

And of course he later gave us the ribilal Tom Jones.


PADDYWHACKERY
by Bruce Strauch  (The Citadel)

Her detractors call it Celtic Disneyland and the garden equivalent of Lucky Charms. But Mary Reynolds has multiple fans and is famous for upending the garden establishment with subversive designs evoking mystical Irish landscapes.

Her new book *The Garden Awakening* is a hot seller on Amazon and her biopic *Dare to Be Wild* won an audience prize at the Dublin International Film Festival.

Her first creation was inspired by the W.B. Yeats poem “The Stolen Child.” A path led to a moss-covered island in the shape of a sleeping fairy woman.

“Faries, to me, embody the spirit of the land. I wanted to lead people back to that place.”
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The Ecology, Evolution and Future of the Monograph

by Agata Mrva-Montoya (Sydney University Press and Department of Media and Communications, The University of Sydney) <agata.mrva-montoya@sydney.edu.au>

Introduction

The debate around the future of scholarly monographs has primarily focused on the financial viability and sustainability of monograph publishing. There are, however, more fundamental issues that are changing the scholarly communication ecosystem and the role of the monograph. Digital, networked and open technologies of Web 2.0 are transforming the ways knowledge is produced, communicated and taught, and affecting the expectations of academic authors and readers, and the general public. Cultural meaning is being created and transmitted across societies in new ways: in the era of algorithms, digital networks and social media, authority is not automatically conferred on the intellectual or the printed book.1 The book may still be the “gold standard” in academia, especially in the humanities and social sciences, but it is no longer sufficient to fulfil the universities’ and presses’ mission of communicating research and ideas to the general public. In its traditional form — as a stand-alone print or digital book — it is also not adequate for academics, who require improved means to facilitate the process of scholarly research, writing, reviewing and reporting.

The Monograph in the Scholarly Communication Ecosystem

The scholarly monograph, defined as “a work of scholarship on a particular topic or theme ... written by a scholar (or scholars) and intended for use primarily by other scholars,”2 has been an integral component of the scholarly communication ecosystem. If this ecosystem were a forest, monographs would be mature trees serving as “containers” for long-form writing for “long-term knowledge communication, preservation and curation.”3 Surrounded by smaller shrubs and other greenery, monographs have been one of several forms of formal research output of the typographic culture. Research reports, conference papers and presentations, and journal articles have all played a role in the advancement and communication of knowledge, each with a different function. For example, journal articles are “immediate,” are “good to write to work out ideas in detail,” to “try them out,” “float them,” etc., usually in anticipation of a longer piece of work, i.e., a monograph.4

As a result of the affordances of the digital, networked and open technologies, new species and life forms appeared in the scholarly communication ecosystem: blogs, Websites, social networks, social videos, data repositories, mobile applications, and so on. While many of those remain unrecognised in the authorisation and accreditation practices of academic promotion and research funding, they play an increasingly important role in the scholarly communication ecosystem. On the one hand, they act as “media parasites”5 preying on content of formally published works, which may serve as a source of text for tweets, for example. On the other hand, these formal and informal modes of scholarly communication live in a symbiotic relationship. For example, blogs, Facebook and Twitter enable early sharing and testing of ideas, help disseminate them, and provide a sense of immediacy and topicality unimaginable in the formal context of scholarly publishing.6

These new tools and technologies have been changing the way scholarship is conducted, written and published. The interactive and user-oriented nature of “Web 2.0” technologies has encouraged the development of a culture of participation, openness and sharing, affecting the expectations of academics and reader as well as the general public. They have enabled experiments with open peer review, collaborative authorship and the dissemination of the monograph in digital forms and open access mode.

The digitisation of monographs has remained problematic for various reasons. First of all, the print codex remains a better format for what Paul Fyfe described as “a complex mixture of nonlinear information uptake, manual annotation, on-the-fly mnemonic indexing, ocular collation, and ambient findability.”7 Second, there have been issues with the cost and complexities of obtaining copyright and permissions for digital formats for illustrated books. Additionally, there remain financial, cultural and institutional obstacles to the adoption of digital monographs, especially those released in open access, in terms of quality, prestige, and findability in an online environment.8

The delay in the uptake of digital format in the publication of frontlist monographs and the digital conversion of backlist titles has affected their findability online. While journal articles have been integrated into various scholarly databases (such as JSTOR), associated with a DOI, and indexed in research analytics platforms, monographs have been left behind. As research workflows have become predominantly digital, if a title is not visible and accessible online, for many researchers and students effectively it does not exist. Eventually, some but not all monographs have migrated online and joined the existing journal content in a number of scholarly databases. Although this has improved the accessibility and findability of monographs, at the same time it made them indistinguishable from other forms of scholarly output. On the Web, “bookish material tends to dissolve into an undifferentiated tangle of words.”9 In databases, monographs dissolve into a tangle of chapters.

The Evolution of the Monograph

Even if digital and usefully assimilated into online databases, “monographs remain largely static objects, isolated from the interconnections of social computing, instead of being vibrant hubs for discussion and engagement.”10 Kathleen Fitzpatrick and others have postulated that the monograph could and should be integrated into the digital environment in more creative ways than a stand-alone print or eBook. It could be part of a network and ongoing conversation. The publication of monographs could include datasets, Websites, multimedia and software, and provide opportunities to “facilitate interaction, communication and connection,”11 and measure the dissemination of works on a granular level, similarly to journal publishing, to report back to the universities and funding agencies.

While far from being the norm, experiments in scholarly publishing have resulted in several forms of symbiosis between scholarly monographs and new media, or even new hybrid species, which combine features of a book with those of a blog, a Website, or a journal article.

Blogging platforms have been used in two ways: as a tool to draft the manuscript, and to extend the life of a static monograph. For example, Martin Weller used his blog12 to draft content and to receive comments and feedback, which he then incorporated into the manuscript,13 which was eventually published as a traditional monograph. In a more structured approach, Fitzpatrick made a draft form of her book Planned Obsolescence available for public comment on the Media CommonsPress platform.14 This example of a “networked book,” written, edited and read in a networked environment, emphasises author-reader interaction. The final version was published by NYU Press in 2011 and is static, but the draft manuscript remains available online for open discussion.15 Even if a monograph is “offline,” blogs can be used to keep the content up-to-date and continue the discussion started by the book. Often the book-centred blogs are abandoned, and it is more common to see personal blogs that fulfil this purpose without being tied to a specific title.16

A monograph + Website hybrid has also become a fairly common occurrence. The ability to post additional content such as appendices, archival material, references, research data, and multimedia elements online can help keep production costs down while adding extra value for readers by presenting the wider context of the author’s scholarship.17

Monographs released entirely online as HTML files are technically Websites, with the associated loss of boundaries and stability,
ENDOCRINE SOCIETY: AN INFORMATION LEADER IN ENDOCRINOLOGY AND HORMONE SCIENCE FOR 100 YEARS

Your researchers count on you to keep them in the know. Provide them with the most cutting-edge information by subscribing to Endocrine Society journals.

**Endocrine Reviews**
- ranks #1 in Thomson Reuters, with a 2014 Impact Factor of 21.059.

**The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism**
- and was cited more than 72,000 times in 2014, more than any other journal in endocrinology and metabolism.

Launching January 2017, **Endocrinology** will be the single most comprehensive basic science journal in endocrinology.

**The Endocrine Legacy**
- Access archives of four top Endocrine Society journals.
- Browse and search more than 347,000 pages in endocrinology and metabolism.
- Explore nearly 100 years of scientific discovery advancing human health worldwide.

More than 10 million Endocrine Society full-text articles and abstracts were viewed or downloaded in year 2014.

For more information or to subscribe, contact Krystyna Bielawska, Associate Director, Circulation, kbielawska@endocrine.org

press.endocrine.org

© 2016 ENDOCRINE SOCIETY
but with the ability to be “continually and collaboratively written, edited, annotated, critiqued, updated, shared, supplemented, revised, re-ordered, reiterated and reimagined,” though they rarely are. The fluidity of the Web contradicts the core nature of the monograph, that, by definition, contains discrete and static results of research output. As Fitzpatrick argued, “[w]e rely on such stability as a sign of a text’s authority.”

Less frequent and even more complex is the release of the monograph as an e-book application. With the ability to include multimedia, interactivity and game elements, e-book applications can be used to make difficult texts more accessible and engaging, and hence are a particularly suitable format for educational purposes and general audiences.

In responding to changing reading habits, time and attention scarcity, as well as the fact that in a digital format a book’s length need no longer be defined by the economics of print, several university presses have established “shorts” series, like the Chicago Shorts, Princeton Shorts, Stanford Briefs, and UNC Press E-Book Shorts. Typically released only in a digital format (occasionally also as print-on-demand books), these publications are longer than an article but shorter than a book. They can contain excerpts from longer works (focusing on core arguments), archival material or newly written content in response to a topical issue. No longer considered to be “monographs,” they can be published quickly and priced for impulse buying, and they are aimed at time- and attention-poor general readers or students.

These new forms are like evolutionary adaptations of a resilient species. At its core, however, the monograph remains fundamentally unchanged: whether in print or digital formats released in open access or for sale, it remains an extensive and nuanced scholarly piece of writing on a specific subject, which follows scholarly method and purpose, goes through a process of peer-review, is formally published, and participates in the “transmission of knowledge in a typographic form.” This stage of ecological equilibrium is undoubtedly kept alive by the institutional and cultural conventions of the scholarly production of knowledge, despite the economic pressures and attention scarcity.

The Future of the Monograph

Looking at scholarly publishing from an ecological perspective allows us to see the emergence of new forms of scholarly communication, and the survival and evolution of traditional forms of the monograph as a result of “the relationships established between technologies, subject, and institutions” in the scholarly publishing ecosystem. At present, the monograph is under pressure from challenging environmental conditions, which have been extensively discussed elsewhere, such as the tenuous financial viability of scholarly
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book publishing, falling readership,\textsuperscript{26} and the precarious role of the arts and humanities in contemporary society.\textsuperscript{27} Moreover, the drive to “publish or perish,” the increasing speed of research, and the focus on quantified assessment processes are not conducive to reflection and long-form writing.

As Tim O’Reilly said in 2007, publishing is “about knowledge dissemination, learning, entertainment, codification of subject authority.”\textsuperscript{28} The book is one of many formats that facilitate making knowledge “public,” but not the only one. In the scholarly context, the use of microblogging, blogging and other forms of digital communication has increased the speed of research and spread of ideas, but at the same time has limited its “chronological reach”\textsuperscript{29} due to the ephemerality of some digital media. The use of digital media also affected the meaning of content and its impact, as exemplified by McLuhan’s statement “the medium is the message,”\textsuperscript{30} by encouraging focus on minutiae, specialisation and topicality, and a lack of in-depth reflection. Moreover, electronic media encourage skimming and dipping in and out, affecting the reader’s engagement with content.

While the monograph may no longer be the dominant medium in the transmission of knowledge, I argue that it remains a keystone species in the scholarly communication ecosystem and its survival is vital for the future of scholarship. As John Willinsky states:

The monograph provides researchers with the finest of stages for sustained and comprehensive — sometimes exhaustive and definitive — acts of scholarly inquiry. A monograph is what it means to work out an argument in full, to marshal all the relevant evidence, to provide a complete account of consequences and implications, as well as counter-arguments and criticisms. It might well seem — to risk a little hyperbole — that if the current academic climate fails to encourage scholars and researchers to turn to this particular device for thinking through a subject in full, it reduces the extent and coherence of what we know of the world.\textsuperscript{31}
Monograph Publishing in the Digital Age ...
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Rich, challenging, and substantive as this list of features may be, note that it does not include open access as a defining feature. The Mellon Foundation strongly supports open access, and believes that it will play an important role in how its vision of the monograph of the future is achieved, but open access is one of the means to the ends we envisioned, not an end in itself.

Some pieces of this vision are well within reach. For example, a series of Mellon-funded experiments on digital annotation eventually led to the Open Annotation standard of the World Wide Web Consortium, which is now being widely implemented by the Hypothesis Project and others.1 However, other pieces are missing and there are many points of resistance. This is not just because one is interested in change. Rather, the system is large, entrenched, and complex and so there is no reliable single lever of change. Moreover, as John Maxwell of Simon Fraser University has observed in response to our request to review Mellon’s approach to this complicated system, the inward-facing importance of the monograph as a credential has often overshadowed the outward-facing features of the monograph, which are intended to promulgate broad understanding of humanities research. Mellon is embracing the institutional and market-building dimensions of change required in a multi-pronged, multi-year funding initiative. So far, in a little over a year, the Foundation has made 21 grants in this initiative totaling more than $10 million.

Quantity and Costs

The Foundation started this initiative with two baseline questions. How many monographs are produced and what are the costs of monograph publishing. The question of how many is a measure of significance. Joseph Esposito explored this question for us, navigating the data-intensive, or multimedia rich are still not yet well understood. These cost estimates are sobering: 3,000 books a year at an average per book cost of $30,000 yields a total cost of approximately $90 million in the U.S. alone.

In 2014, ITHAKA S+R began working with 20 university presses to establish the costs of monograph publishing, which prove substantial. The University of California Press in its Luminos Open Access initiative quotes a baseline cost of $15,000.2 Raym Crow in his study for the Association of American Universities and Association of Research Libraries estimated the average cost at $20,000 per book.3 In a recently published Mellon-funded study, the university presses at Indiana and Michigan put the average costs respectively at $26,700 and $27,600.4 The Ithaka cost study attempts to get at full costs of the first digital file; that is, excluding the costs of printing and distribution of print copies, but including marketing and overhead. The study reports average costs ranging from $30,000 per book for the group of the smallest university presses to more than $49,000 per book for the group of the largest presses. These are costs for monograph publication only; the costs of innovative long-form genres that are non-linear, data-intensive, or multimedia rich are still not yet well understood. These cost estimates are sobering: 3,000 books a year at an average per book cost of $30,000 yields a total cost of approximately $90 million in the U.S. alone.

How are these costs to be afforded in a new regime of long-form monographic publishing? Can the need to advance scholarship be reconciled with the need to drive down the costs of both monograph and other long-form publication to affordable levels? Let’s look at these questions from the perspective of the faculty, the university, the presses, and the reader.

The Faculty

Mellon staff have been visiting campuses for consultations with faculty about the future of scholarly publishing since early 2014. Some faculty see no problem with the current system, others clearly would welcome support of a new regime, including those who want to work on digital projects, or want the means to produce publications that can only be accomplished digitally. However, a primary concern of faculty is how high-quality digital monographs would be assessed for promotion and tenure.

As part of its publishing initiative, the Mellon Foundation followed the lead of the Modern Language Association, which has long-established guidelines for the evaluation of digital scholarship, and supported the development of similar principles at the two other largest scholarly societies, the American Historical Association and the College Art Association (in partnership with the Society of Architectural Historians).5 While it is clear that disciplinary guidelines have their force, institutional and departmental guidelines are even more important, and this brings us to the role of universities and colleges.

Universities and Colleges

Universities and colleges have substantial interests in promoting their faculty and in the fields they represent. Sponsorship of publications could translate institutional interests into first-class digital products, representing a sustainable source of income for long-form scholarly publishing in the future. There are two lines of thought that universities are currently exploring: a direct pay-to-publish model as one way of funding monograph publishing, and a slightly less direct model in which there is an on-campus agent who assists in developmental editing and in placing works with presses.

With support from Mellon, the universities at Indiana, Michigan, and Emory have walked through a model in which institutions would sponsor and pay to publish the works of at least some of the monographs their faculty produce.6 The essence of the model is as follows:

1. Presses recruit authors and review the quality of their publications through normal means.
2. Institutions select authors to participate in a pay-to-publish model; authors could decline and pursue traditional forms of publication.
3. For a negotiated price that the selected author’s institution would pay, the press produces a well-designed digital publication that it would:
   a. Deposit in at least one trusted preservation repository with full metadata;
   b. Make available online under an agreed-upon Creative Commons license;
   c. Market through social media, and
d. Submit for disciplinary prizes and awards.
4. Presses could also sell derivative works to other markets (print on demand, or in Amazon formats) or generate new services for sale to generate additional income.

The three institutions each deemed the pay-to-publish model to be feasible. Michigan and Emory are now following up with plans to draft model contracts between the university and the author, the author and the press, and the university and press.

The idea of a campus agent and other means of institutional support for digital book production are being explored with Mellon support at Brown University, and at the Universities of Connecticut and Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.7 These experiments promise to challenge and compete with the university press book acquisition process, one of the more costly and opaque activities identified in the Ithaka study.

The Presses

I turn now to the question of the capacity within the university presses. With the help of subcontractors, most are already capable of producing eBook versions of print monographs. But how are they addressing the needs of natively digital readers in a competitive environment that, over time, drives down costs? To help answer
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this question, I have space only to list briefly some of the activities now being undertaken with Mellon support:

- **Michigan Publishing** (with presses at Indiana, Minnesota, Northwestern, and Pennsylvania State) is developing a Hydra/Fedora platform for disseminating and preserving digital monographs and their associated media content.1

- The **University of Minnesota Press**, in collaboration with the **City University of New York**, is developing tools and workflows for publishing iterative scholarly monographs, in which work remains dynamic by means of the ongoing interaction between author and reader.9

- The **Stanford University Press and Stanford University Library** are developing peer review, editorial, publication, and preservation workflows for “interactive scholarly works” that is long-form, born-digital publications that depend on the interactive features of the Web to link interpretive scholarship to related secondary sources, primary source evidence, visualizations, and software tools.10

- The **New York University Libraries and Press** are creating a discovery and reading interface.11

### The Reader

Now let me conclude with simply a gesture toward the most important ingredient in this complex mix, namely the reader. All of the ambitious and creative activity that I have described has originated mainly on the producer side of the author-reader interaction. The work of the faculty, the universities and colleges, and the presses is worthwhile if and only if a market is created in which readers find and read the works of knowledge that are produced. The most important question, which the humanities’ deans raised in their discussion that I described at the beginning of this article, is: What makes for an active reader in the digital age? Exploring the answer to this question still lies before us as largely virgin territory. We have an enormous amount of work to do. 📖

---

**Rumors**

*from page 8*

on August 1st. In the interim, her personal email is <salisbury.leila@gmail.com>. One aspect of her new position is that the press at UK reports through the libraries, so Leila will have an even better opportunity to connect with the library world! Fodder for more columns!

I understand from Leila that the AAUP has formally launched a new set of “best practice” recommendations for peer review. Mick Jeffries, who was on the AAUP editorial committee and who helped put together the guidelines plans to do a column about the guidelines and the process of developing them. Watch for it in September.

http://www.aauap.net/resources/for-members/handbooks-and-toolkits/peer-review-best-practices

Moving right along, the University Press of Florida announces that Linda Bathgate joins the Press on July 1 as Editor in Chief and Deputy Director. Bathgate comes to UPF from Routledge, a division of Taylor & Francis, where she is Publisher in Communication. For over a decade she developed journals as well as books for communication and writing, composition, and rhetoric disciplines at Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, prior to their acquisition by Taylor & Francis.

---

**Endnotes**


Bathgate is a member of Pace University’s Master of Science in Publishing Advisory Board. Bathgate will lead UPF’s book division and burgeoning journals program. She will be acquiring for the press’s robust regional gardening list and coordinating an expansion into earth sciences. Meredith Morris-Babb is Director of UPF. This search was handled by the awesome Jack Farrell & Associates. upress.ufl.edu

How about the print book and the scholarly monograph? This issue of ATG (June) is ably edited by the gorgeous Colleen Campbell (Ithaka, once at Casalini Libri) and the astute Adriaan van der Weel. They convince us that the print book is far from dead!

Noteworthly! The Rare Book School has received a $1 million gift from philanthropist Jay T. Last. This donation, the single largest in the School’s history, is to be used over the next four years to “strengthen the School for the future,” as Mr. Last wrote in a letter accompanying the gift. The funds from Mr. Last’s benefaction will be used to improve and expand Rare Book School programs, and to increase the School’s visibility, sustainability, and impact over the long term. “After carefully studying our organization, Jay has chosen to make a philanthropic investment in the future success of RBS’s educational mission,” said Rare Book School Director Michael F. Suarez, S.J. http://rarebookschool.org/news/gift-received/ continued on page 26
When my elder daughter left home for University last fall, some amount of transformation was to be expected. She, like her younger sister now, is a bookworm — a very hungry caterpillar that I had nurtured for twenty years with a careful diet of literary classics, and the time had come to let her spread her butterfly wings and soar solo into the storm of scholarly resources. It was an unsteady departure to say the least; to save time as she devoured leaves of critical essays in preparation for a battery of last-minute entrance exams, I flew from branch to branch of our public library system to track down crumbling monographs in the editions specified on her required reading list. But she fluttered through admirably and has now alighted in Pisa where she can studiously sip nectar from the flower of academic content — and electronic format, at that!

But abandoning one metaphor for another, like every other concerned parent, I was anxious to know just what she was consuming while off at University. Regrettably, I had seen evidence of illegal substances circulating in her college: unauthorized photocopies and pirated downloads. Yet when she returned home for semester break, I was both relieved and surprised to see her tucking in to a wholesome diet of (print) academic books once again.

Wanting to understand just how her tastes for monographs were evolving, or at least those of researchers further along but still at the start of their academic careers, I interviewed a group of extremely bright and generous doctoral students in the Social Sciences here at the European University Institute in Fiesole, Italy on their habits and expectations with regard to the long-form scholarly monograph, defined as a “book-length work of scholarship that treats a relatively narrow topic in great detail.” My aim was to gather their spontaneous and wholly relevant perspectives on the monograph and its future, not least because of the unique position they hold as students reading books who will very soon be authors.

The interviews, conducted with researchers from fields of sociology, political science, law and history, highlighted significant challenges that they encounter both as readers and writers of monographs, taken from their practical experience in preparing their dissertations. And yet, throughout the interviews, they all expressed a veritable passion for the monograph and high hopes for producing and disseminating their research in this form of scholarly output.

When asked how important books were to their research, with respect to other forms of scholarly communication, such as journal articles, blogs, etc., there was consensus that monographs are absolutely essential to their work. Pressed on what their objectives were when reading monographs as opposed to journal articles, for example, one researcher explained that, from his perspective, “a journal article really functions as young seedling that will develop into a book, so it serves a specific and necessary function. The monograph provides comprehensive treatment of a given topic or a comprehensive answer to a specific question and is the final product of a long research process.” Another offered, “As a sociologist, I need to understand the methodological approach of a study, so the appendices are, of course, important, but I also look at the actual narrative, or progression of the author’s argument from its presentation and development to its resolution.” And yet another, “monographs have greater weight, because they are the result of in-depth research over time and have undergone a thorough review process. They constitute comprehensive treatment of a certain topic or an exhaustive answer to a certain question presenting the other literature, essential background and context of a topic.”

Having established the fundamental importance of monographs in their work, I then questioned the researchers on how, exactly, they interact with them, i.e., how much deep reading vs. scanning they did, and whether they interacted with print books and eBooks differently.

The responses immediately brought to light the contrast between their preference for monographs and their actual use of them: “I read the introduction and the conclusion of a book before deciding whether to actually read it.” “I may read one book for every ten I scan.” “As it is now, I only read a whole book when I am writing a book review.” But one researcher goes on to explain, “That is, in fact, one of the problems with academia today — we just have no time to read monographs, but at the same time you are expected to publish one. There is such a vast amount of literature, and you are expected to have a certain understanding of the main monographs in your field and to keep up with the general literature as well, but it is impossible to read it all!”

Yet when they do read, researchers noted a few advantages to reading eBooks as opposed to print, such as search functions and the convenience of having all of your sources at your fingertips when traveling, but overwhelmingly showed a preference for print: “Using print books is extremely important because you understand the weight of the knowledge that you are being exposed to. When I walk with ten books in my hand, I really understand the significance of what I am working with, whereas working with content online, I have no understanding of how many different sources I am using. It is an extremely abstract universe — I have no sense of how much information I am using and it prevents me from understanding the size of the argument or issue that I am trying to investigate.” Not unexpectedly, researchers said they spend more time on a book if it is in print and use eBooks for rapid scanning; “reading a print book I can think about how the author writes and reflect on the structure of his argument.”

When asked to consider what particular advantages monographs have over other forms of scholarly output, the clear answer was that there is more space to develop a research topic, illustrate the research tools, and the background and context of an argument in a monograph. Journal articles, on the other hand, are merely “artificial tools” with a limited function and which, consequently, have a limited audience. One researcher described a situation in which he was talking with another researcher about a paper that she had written on a topic that happened to be outside of his own area. The problem was that because the article by nature was limited in length, the author did not include any contextual information on the topic and so it was impossible for him to grasp the significance of her argument. He would have expected a monograph to provide this contextual information.

Looking toward their future, all of the researchers were aiming to develop their dissertations into monographs and all felt an obligation to publish books for career advancement. But from their own perspective as scholars, they truly wish to produce monographs because, in their words, “the monograph is the ideal form in order to address the complexity of the problem I have chosen to analyze.” “When you are addressing a topic, you must be able to clarify your position and provide information that is not central to the argument but which might become central if another scholar wants to dispute it. So you truly need that space to develop and present your ideas.” And, “having a monograph published is a way to make your research known to people outside of your academic field in a way that journal articles simply cannot because they are too narrowly focused.”

Yet, based on the responses I gathered, the primary challenges they face are related to the same obstacle to their reading monographs: time.

“Creating a monograph, aiming at 100,000 words, is a big thing and it is a lengthy process, so certainly producing continued on page 22
a monograph is a challenge. You run the risk of it being outdated or requiring revision as soon as it is published.”

“Today researchers are exposed to an overwhelming quantity of information and multitudes of opportunities for academic debate, so much so that your own ideas can change rapidly. It is so much easier today to travel to conferences where you meet your peers and exchange ideas; we can share perspectives on the Internet, and even simply access ideas by googling. So, you often start with a specific research question and then, as you discuss topics with your peers and learn about their perspective, your focus can shift. In this context, journal articles are more efficient forms of output because they allow you to quickly address an issue and publish in a matter of months, and then move on to a new idea in another article. Such rapid shifts in focus are impossible with a monograph.”

I concluded the survey asking what changes the researchers foresee in the scholarly monograph itself and the paradigm of the book as the touchstone of intellectual output in their fields. Nearly all expressed concern for the field of output because they allow you to quickly address an issue and publish in a matter of months, and then move on to a new idea in another article. Such rapid shifts in focus are impossible with a monograph.”

Information inflation is also a factor that will continue to impact the monograph. One researcher hypothesized that with easy access to information on the Internet researchers run the risk of shaping their research based on what they can discover about their professors’ positions and theoretical approaches, or, even worse, their intellectual interrogation could be stilled as they discover other researchers already developing ideas similar to their own.

Yet despite their concerns, most believed that monographs will continue to be written and published:

“I don’t have a fear that the quality of monographs will decline, but I think that there will be fewer. That may not be a negative thing.”

And as for my own budding researcher off at college, I’ll be happy if she manages to finish her first-year research paper by the end of the term; there is a whole pile of books at home waiting for her to read over vacation.

The author wishes to thank Pep Torn, Library Director of the European University Institute for kindly facilitating the survey.

Monographs as Essays, Monographs as Databases: Or, the Irrelevance of Authorial Intent

by Rick Anderson (Associate Dean for Scholarly Resources & Collections, Marriott Library, University of Utah; Phone: 801-721-1687) <rick.anderson@utah.edu>

Although eBooks are now generally a fact of life in academic libraries and have been for at least a decade, debate rages on as to the benefits and drawbacks of the eBook format and its strengths and weaknesses relative to print. These debates touch on many different issues: the remote accessibility of eBooks versus the reliable permanence of print; the full-text searchability of eBooks versus the easy readability of print; the rights-management nightmare of eBook lending versus the first-sale simplicity of print lending; etc.

But the concerns people express about eBooks aren’t only about accessibility and permanence. Another important issue that often arises in these discussions is a seemingly unavoidable fact: that when it comes to monographs, the books in question represent extended, linear treatments of their topics — treatments that are designed to be read from beginning to end so that their arguments can be followed and absorbed. If this really is a true characterization of the monograph, then it would tend to undermine the value proposition of the eBook format, which is still (despite significant advances in e-reader technology and growing marketplace acceptance) not a great one for extended, linear reading. In other words, if an author writes a book as an extended essay, intending that it be read from cover to cover, then does it really make sense for the library to provide it as an eBook?

Others have hashed out this argument from a variety of different angles over the past decade. In this venue, however, I’d like to sidestep that question and pose one that is logically prior to it: when it comes to the value proposition of a scholarly monograph, how much does the author’s intent actually matter?

To be clear, I’m not talking about “authorial intent” in the sense used in reader-response criticism, which places the reader’s interpretation above the author’s intent when it comes to determining the meaning of texts. I’m talking about the author’s intentions with regard to how the book will be used. In other words, it may well be that the typical author who produces a scholarly monograph does so with the hope and expectation that it will be read in a more or less continuous manner, from beginning to end, and organizes his or her text accordingly. But what if that’s not how the book’s users — and I’m using that term deliberately here, instead of the term “readers” — make use of it?

This question clearly begs two more: if people aren’t using scholarly monographs for extended, linear reading, what are they using them for? And should such uses be encouraged by librarians?

An answer to the first of these two questions is suggested by recalling what all of us who attended college in the pre-Internet days used to do when we wrote research papers in our humanities or social-sciences classes. Very often, we found ourselves in the library’s book stacks pulling relevant texts from the shelves and bringing them, in piles, to our work tables. Depending on the topic and the required length of the paper, we might have had anywhere from three to thirty books on the table before us. And how did we use those books — did we sit down and read them from cover to cover? Almost certainly not, at least not in the great majority of cases.

Instead, we searched them for the chapters, pages, and passages that would help us complete the intellectual task at hand. Basically, we text-mined these books (though that term didn’t yet exist), trying to pull the “signal” of relevant text from within the “noise” of text that was irrelevant to our immediate needs. Of course, in this context, given the laughably crude indexing tools available to us during the print era, our searches tended to be laborious and inefficient. Worse than that, they were ineffective — our access to the book’s content at the word or phrase level was limited by the granularity of the index, assuming that we were fortunate enough to be using a book with an index. In such cases, we were using these books as if they were databases. For most of us, especially during our undergraduate years, this kind of activity characterized a great deal of our use of library books.

Of course, we had another option if we wanted to search a book at the word or phrase level: we could read the whole thing. It’s not that print books aren’t full-text searchable — it’s just that print books are only full-text searchable at a tremendous cost of time and energy. In other words, printed scholarly monographs make great books, but they make terrible databases. And yet an awful lot of the use we made of those printed monographs in the pre-Internet days was as databases. The fact that they contained extended, linear, well-developed arguments was incidental to their usefulness to us as researchers. For us, what was centrally relevant to their usefulness was continued on page 24
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the fact that they contained specific, discrete chunks of relevant and (we hoped) reliable information. In other words, the value proposition of these monographs may or may not have had anything to do with the use intended by their authors.

To answer the second of the above questions — should this kind of use be encouraged by librarians? — I must confess that as a librarian myself, my knee-jerk reaction is to regard someone who doesn’t want to read the whole book (especially when the whole book is a scholarly monograph) as intellectually lazy, as someone unwilling to do the hard work required to create a high-quality scholarly product. But obviously, to respond this way would be fundamentally wrongheaded. It would be to say that the only appropriate thing to do with a book written as a monograph is to use it as a monograph — that using it as a database is somehow less worthy, or less scholarly. But no one, I think, really believes that the only way to write, say, a ten-page undergraduate research paper is to read twelve monographic sources is to read twelve graduate research paper with a minimum of printed monographs in my library? (These are assignments that should (and do) require that kind of reading, and others that don’t, and there’s nothing wrong with that.

But here’s the even harder truth: when it comes to making format decisions in libraries, we need to be guided by more than just what we believe (rightly or wrongly) our patrons ought to do. We have to take into account what they are demonstrably willing to do, and when we can’t determine with scientific rigor what it is they’re willing to do, we have to try to figure out what they’re most likely to be willing to do. Because the bottom line, I think, is that readers — whether undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty, or anyone else — are going to use books in the ways that make the most sense to them, for better or for worse, no matter how hard we try to convince them to do otherwise.

In any particular case they may make wise or unwise use of the books we provide, but if we truly value our patrons’ intellectual freedom we have to give them the leeway to use them as they see fit — and in any case, our ability to judge their wisdom is limited and we should probably maintain some professional humility in that regard.

So what does an appropriately humble approach to book formats, one that is informed by what can reasonably be known about patron preferences, look like? Obviously it will depend, and will vary from library to library.

In order to fashion such an approach, each of us should be asking ourselves questions like these:

What are the long-term trends in circulation of printed monographs in my library? (These will tell you something, though not everything, about whether and how your patrons’ format preferences are changing over time.)

What are the long-term trends in in-house use of scholarly monographs in my library? (Books that are used in-house are almost certainly not being read from cover to cover, unless you’re open 24/7 and have noticed patrons sitting at the same table for days on end.)

Are my patrons using different types of eBooks in different ways? (We all know that eBook usage data is a horrendous mess, but often it’s possible to detect broad-stroke trends.)

Recognizing that two patrons might want to use the same monograph in radically different ways, how open are we to the possibility of buying books in multiple formats? (This gets tougher to justify as our budgets shrink, of course, but it probably isn’t something we should reject as a matter of inflexible policy.)

Notice that none of these questions is “How do I believe the authors of these books intend them to be used?”; ‘because truly, it doesn’t matter — not when it comes to figuring out what to give our patrons and in what formats. When it comes right down to it, as librarians, we don’t really serve scholars in their capacity as purveyors of books already written; we serve them in their capacity as researchers and authors of future books, and we want to support them in that capacity in whatever way works best for them.”

Endnotes


Why Monographs Matter

by Geoffrey Crossick (School of Advanced Study, University of London) <geoffrey.crossick@london.ac.uk>

In 2015 I published a report for the Higher Education Funding Council for England that assessed the implications and challenges for monographs of the trend to open access publication.1 In the UK open access was becoming increasingly compulsory for recipients of public research funding.

For that reason it seemed to me important to think not simply about the technical and policy issues involved in requiring monographs to be available through open access but about the fundamental question it raised for those concerned for the generation and communication of new knowledge in the arts, humanities and social sciences. That question was why the monograph was important in a broad swathe of disciplines and whether it was in crisis as was often claimed (more frequently in the U.S. and Australia, it should be noted, than in the UK). Technical policy solutions can end up damaging the research and communication that it is meant to support, and we needed to know why the monograph mattered. In a world where research quality was increasingly measured in terms of citations and journal impact factors, should we be concerned if the humanities in particular followed what seemed an inexorable trend towards peer-reviewed journals as the main way to get research known and read?

The conclusions were striking. The monograph is not without problems but it continues to be important; academics value it deeply as authors and as readers, and UK publishers are producing them in ever-increasing numbers. So, when science subjects had gone entirely over to journal articles and refereed conference papers, to the extent that in the UK’s recent Research Excellence Framework journal articles constituted 98-100 percent of outputs submitted from science subjects,2 why was that not happening in the arts and humanities? Journal articles ranged from 17 percent of outputs in Classics up to the highest by far, Philosophy, with 60 percent. Most others lay somewhere between the two. People get their research to a wider academic and non-academic readership in a variety of ways, and books continue to be the single most significant form: amongst them collections of essays by different authors on a single research theme, continued on page 25
Why Monographs Matter

from page 24

scholarly editions of texts, and monographs. It is the monograph that resonates most with humanities scholars, and to a lesser but still significant extent those in the arts and social sciences, and it is on the monograph that this piece will concentrate.

The book has a special place not just in the dissemination of research in these disciplines but in their culture, and that is why researchers not only identify with their own books but also remain committed to reading those written by others in their field and beyond. A 2014 survey by OAPEN-UK of over 2000 academics in the arts, humanities and social sciences confirmed this: 66 percent of humanities researchers who responded had published at least one monograph and 48 percent of those in the social sciences. When asked how important it was in their discipline to publish monographs, 95 percent of those in the humanities said that it was important or very important to do so while the figure for reading monographs was 98 percent. By far the main motivation for reading the last monograph they had used was research and writing, and for that last monograph 40 percent of humanities academics had read the whole book, with the rest having mostly read at least a few chapters. Very few had read only a single chapter.

The evidence of this survey confirms the more informal sense that the monograph remains the scholarly communication in the UK. The key question, of course, is why should be the case when the journal article has come to be supreme in other parts of the research landscape. It is not a matter of researchers in the humanities not publishing journal articles because almost all do so, but as one part of a wider portfolio rather than the overwhelming dominance that we find in the medical, physical and life sciences. There are various reasons why the book-length report on research has come to play such a pivotal role across virtually all humanities disciplines and some in the social sciences (politics, sociology and anthropology in particular though to a lesser extent than the lead humanities disciplines of English, history and classics). As I argued in my report, the most effective way of communicating several years of sustained research on a single topic is to present it as a monograph. It provides the length and space needed to allow a full examination of a topic, with the objective of presenting complex and rich ideas and arguments supported by carefully contextualised analysis and evidence. The research data are of a character which cannot be replicated or modelled, and this means that there is a need to present “thick description” and more direct evidence. Journal articles do not provide the same opportunity to weave together the elements of a complex and reflective narrative. The observation made to me by a lecturer in comparative literature sums it up well and equivalent though not identical formulations could be made elsewhere in the humanities: “where the journal article allows a scholar to make suggestions, provocations, and establish starting points for research, a monograph enables the scholar to go much further in terms of embedding their research in a larger scholarly, temporal and spatial network.” This is, of course, but one sense of the journal article, which in other disciplines such as history, classics or social sciences may represent a contained and focused presentation of a specific topic. Both are different from the monograph.

The term “thinking through the book” emerged through the consultations, a concept that effectively renews the research into the writing process itself. Discussion of different forms of scholarly communication may imply that the purpose of each is an equivalent process of imparting conclusions with the difference between them a matter of effectiveness. Yet the difference between a journal article, a monograph and an exhibition, each the product of sustained research, can be more fundamental. The act of constructing and writing a book is often a core way to shape the ideas, structure the argument and work out the relationship between these and the evidence. An earlier study cites an English literature academic who said that “the medium in which we, ourselves, construct our arguments is book-based.” Journal articles are of varying lengths and objectives and it would be wrong to insist that this process is absent from their writing, but it is nonetheless the case that authors generally see the article as a way of presenting to an audience arguments and evidence that they have already shaped, whereas the literary and intellectual form of the monograph makes its writing a much more dynamic part of the research process. The character of internal debate in a field, which means that theoretical and methodological approaches have to be set out and interrogated, may be a further reason why the book is the appropriate means of working out and communicating an underlying approach. Here too “thinking through the book” captures the process well.

Is this one reason why academics in the humanities feel such a strong sense of identity with the books they write? Part of this may be the time, effort and often emotional energy that goes into researching and writing a monograph, but it is more than this because an academic author can also develop and articulate through writing a book what might be seen as their personal and distinctive voice. It has been argued that non-English speaking authors of the monograph are more likely than their science colleagues to publish in their native language because their “thinking may be deeply intertwined with their language expressions.” This is not, then, simply about communication. The book may come to serve as the physical expression of a long period of thinking, understanding and research. It is, in a very real sense, part of the author’s identity.

Lest what I have argued suggests only high-minded reasons for books to be so important, we must ground them in the reality of the academic career. The monograph has long been seen in most of the humanities as a signal of an academic’s qualities as a researcher, and that has woven itself into university appointment and promotion procedures. The consultations undertaken for my report revealed a pattern much more flexible than in the United States. There is in the UK simply no de jure or de facto expectation of one or two monographs for appointment, tenure or promotion. There was great variation between disciplines, within disciplines and across institutions. The monograph was important in most disciplines but, even where it is timed strongly in history and English, it was not obligatory. The apparent monograph requirement in the U.S. may be one of the forces behind a sense of the crisis of the monograph because it is so bound up with credentialism.

I interrogate the question of a crisis of the monograph from the UK perspective in the report, and interested readers are referred to the discussion there. There is no crisis in terms of numbers published which have doubled between 2004 and 2013 for the four biggest monograph publishers, with significant growth across all disciplines apart from modern languages. A major growth in student numbers has led to more academics and more research, which may have increased the long-existing problem of its being more difficult to publish in some sub-areas than others. The decline in print runs means little with print-on-demand publishing systems. There has been a decline in library purchasing as budgets have been squeezed by the cost of science journals and other pressures, and there is anecdotal evidence of a decline in individual personal purchases, but it should also be noted that 72 percent of humanities academics in the OAPEN-UK survey reported that it was either easy or very easy to access the books they needed to read. Things are by no means rosy, but the report concludes that it was hard to describe the problems in the UK as having become more acute in recent years and thus constituting a crisis. If there is an argument for open access for monographs, and my report concluded that there is, then it should be seen in firm intellectual terms of integration of an academic’s qualities as a scholarly community.

There may be a crisis looming, however, which will put far more pressure on the monograph as I have presented it here, an extended work of 250 or more pages that exists as an integrated album. If more and more books are available digitally and behind paywalls the trend to purchasing individual chapters online, and many people do so. It is the same process that was seen with online purchase of individual tracks in music which resulted in damaging consequences for the industry album. If more and more books are available digitally and behind paywalls the tendency to purchasing individual chapters will...
Monographs in a Changing Reading Culture

by Adriaan van der Weel (Book and Digital Media Studies, Leiden University)
<a.h.van.der.weel@hum.leidenuniv.nl>

There is a need universally acknowledged for the SSH monograph to migrate to the digital realm where we all now reside so much of the time. The monograph continues strongly as academic currency, both economically — to buy prestige and a career — and intellectually. No one doubts the importance of the monograph, and neither do I. Nor do I doubt the need to adapt it to the research practices of modern scholarship, which are indeed increasingly digital. So clearly for the sake of digital discoverability — to remain visible — and for convenience of access the monograph should digitize.

Yet taking a longer view, both as a book historian and as a reading researcher, I have some niggling doubts whether giving it a digital guise will be enough to secure the monograph’s intellectual future. It may make excellent technological and economic sense, and it may answer better to readers’ information hunting strategies than paper does, but is this enough? Couldn’t the monograph as an intellectual genre be just as historically contingent as are text technologies and reading cultures? What if the monograph were the product of a particular reading culture that, however dominant it may have been, is now rapidly being overtaken by a radically different one? Worse, what if moving it to the digital realm actually hampered rather than aided the monograph’s chances to make a successful contribution to scholarly communication?

As we all know, to do justice to the long-form argument as the author intended it, the monograph ought ideally to be read from cover to cover. And as we also know, this is best done on paper. No screen is a match for paper in its conceptual sense paper is more conducive to concentration than screens with their inbuilt distraction. Rather than deliver ourselves into the hands of the author in the classic “one author, one text, one book” paradigm, as digital readers we are faced with an infinite “docuverse” of linked texts. Helpful as links may be for some purposes, such as discovery, they are also invitations to go in search of greener pastures, necessitating constant decisions to constitute the reading text. The reading
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Speaking of this issue, don’t miss the Special Report on Consolidation in the Industry. This was conceived over dinner by David Parker who is the driving force behind this initiative. There are statements from ten luminaries so far. And we hope to get more. Are you interested in adding your perspective? If so, please write David <dparker@astreepress.com>, or Tom Gilson <gilsonT@cofc.edu>, or me <kstrau@comcast.net>! Looking forward!

See Erin Gallagher’s Hot Topics this week. Erin was in Orlando this past Sunday where at least 50 people were killed and many wounded. She facebooked that she was safe. Thank goodness. We love you, Erin. Stay safe! www.against-the-grain.com/

Just heard a minute ago that Microsoft Corp (MSFT.O) will buy LinkedIn Corp (LNKD.N) for $26.2 billion in its biggest-ever deal, marking CEO Satya Nadella’s first big effort to breathe new life into the software giant’s business-productivity tools. I don’t do much with social media but I find that LinkedIn is a great resource.
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process thus requires constant choices from the reader. But more importantly, on most screens the competing attractions of other screen-based activities such as gaming, social media, YouTube, are continuously and obtrusively present, only ever one click away, demanding ongoing conscious discipline.

In terms of the physical, multisensory engagement with a technology we have always read paper books, albeit largely unconsciously, with our fingers. Human cognition is embodied. As a 3-D material object the paper book represents its content — it is even identical with it. It has a physical presence, unlike a digital file, that can admonish its owner to read it or, once read, serve as a reminder of its contents. On the level of the page (the “mise-en-page”), readers often remember the physical location (top left-hand page at about one-third of the book) of a particular part of the text. In a text without hard page divisions, such as a scrolled text, such mapping of contents to locations is not available. Memory and recall are impaired by the lack of “anchoring” of the information contained in the text.

From a phenomenological perspective (i.e., reading as a personally meaningful activity), readers take texts on paper more seriously to begin with than digital ones. Research has shown, for example, that in the case of digital texts readers engage less in metacognitive learning regulation. That is to say that they expend less effort on making sure they understand what they have just read. Also, the emotional associations with reading as such may be affected by the substrate. If screens are associated with distraction or work pressure this may adversely affect intellectual engagement. In this context it may be significant that even in the case of recreational reading, reading from paper is beginning to be regarded, especially by digerati, as a welcome holiday from the permanent and tiring immersion in a hyper-stimulating online world.

Regardless whether readers are aware of them, these issues — jointly or separately — interfere with their concentration. In other words, cognitively demanding forms of reading, or “deep reading,” are not (yet) adequately facilitated by screen presentation. By the way, even if in spite of all this we insist, perversely, on using the book as a database, a paper copy will still give us a sounder feel for the structure of the book and the author’s argument than approaching it through a fulltext search in a digital copy. Encountering the snippet that I might cite in a paper book gives me a better sense of context than any digital presentation can.

Yet as scholars we no longer go to the trouble of consulting paper books as often as we used to. Screens may not be the ideal reading substrate for many intellectual purposes, but screen use is growing notwithstanding. Screens have moved centre stage of our everyday lives. Not only our social lives and leisure time, through Facebook, Twitter, WhatsApp, and blogging, but also shopping, banking, travel bookings and other transactions that were once carried out in person are being “mediatized.” Or perhaps “textualized” is a better word for this phenomenon. For the net effect of all of this screen activity is that just to live our everyday life requires ever more reading — all on screen.

In the wake of this deluge of screen reading activity, researchers and students, too, have become heavy users of a very sophisticated digital scholarly communication system. Screens nudge us towards a different use of textual resources. Yes, we tell ourselves and each other that the monograph is important — and indeed it still is for their authors’ careers and sense of achievement, and for readers because it still offers the best way to grapple with an in-depth argument. But whether in paper or digital form it represents at the same time an investment in time that readers would gladly avoid, and in paper form an inconvenient interruption of their digital research workflow. In this digital day and age having to go and borrow a copy or read it in the library feels like a major inefficiency — a hitch in an otherwise seamlessly connected universe. Might PoD copies delivered to the scholar’s work place, though expensive to buy compared to a free library copy, offer an acceptable compromise between digital convenience and the concentration that paper affords?

In other words, we are living through a major revolution in the way we consume text. Whether we are aware of it or not, and whether we like it or not, ours is increasingly a screen mentality. This mentality has been formed by the digital technologies that we have adopted with such enthusiasm over the last few decades, and I suggest that it is a lasting change. For this represents by no means the first reading revolution in human history, and each time we can observe a similar mechanism at work: a major change in text technology leading to a cognitive paradigm shift.

The first such revolution, and one that is sometimes forgotten, is the invention of script and reading in the first place. It is hard to overestimate the cognitive effects of that invention. Indeed, rather than a mere skill, learning to read is actually an amazing intellectual achievement, which last few decades, and I suggest that it is a lasting change. For this represents by no means the first reading revolution in human history, and each time we can observe a similar mechanism at work: a major change in text technology leading to a cognitive paradigm shift.

The first such revolution, and one that is sometimes forgotten, is the invention of script and reading in the first place. It is hard to overestimate the cognitive effects of that invention. Indeed, rather than a mere skill, learning to read is actually an amazing intellectual achievement, which last few centuries brought about a unique reading culture, characterized by particular ways of reading. The screen revolution that is currently unfolding will have no impact on our literate mentality than any of these earlier text technologies.

I firmly believe that the current screen revolution will turn out to be yet another paradigm shift, and one that will prove on a par with the invention of writing. Paradigm shift or not, it is a shift that is still in progress. In this transitional time we are witnessing a hybrid paper-screen reading culture. And even surmising the possible future dominance of the screen does not mean that we need to regard paper as doomed. It is just likely that it will find a new, even if probably reduced, niche. It is not possible to predict the outcome, but for the time being it seems important for intellectual reasons (i.e., apart from all economic and technological considerations) to continue to have a paper option available for monographs besides the increasingly digital version.

However, what if in the longer term this digital mentality causes readers to regard the monograph as too monolithic, curtailing its integrity in favor of mining it for their own purposes? If readers refuse to be guided by the author, will that not lead to what I have termed elsewhere a “deferral of the interpretative burden”? That is to say, will readers not need to take more and more responsibility for the interpretation of the facts and opinions they assimilate in the course of their reading? And will not then authors in response feel forced to desist from presenting long drawn-out arguments and to come up with less monolithic, and perhaps more collaborative alternatives, better suited to the digital reading culture and the online mindset? They might support new and “enhanced” digital possibilities of knowledge representation and communication, but shy away from producing traditional well-wrought long-form arguments. There is no reason to be pessimistic about these changes, for cultural change is only natural, but they will certainly transform the scholarly world.
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During one of hundreds of dinners at ALA Midwinter, a few vendors and librarians got into a very, very frank discussion on the topic of industry consolidation. In a sense, this is a topic as old as the library itself or at least as old as corporate America post industrial revolution. Yet there are trends afoot both within and without the university and library space that shade the conversation now with unique nuance. For example, what does the very recent acquisition of Baker and Taylor by Follett portend for the library, given Follett’s deep roots in running college bookstores? And with data growing exponentially, and the need to store that data growing at a somewhat similar pace, how long will it be before the big names in cloud computing see large (by our definition) library service companies as targets. Once this occurs the line between consumer products (video streaming services) and the library patron as consumer of streaming scholarship will really blur. The boundaries of the library service environment assuming the pace of consolidation continues and possibly quickens?

This then is the question: Think forward to 2026. Assume what you will about the changing needs of libraries. Consider the pace of consolidation and the nature of consolidation we have seen over the past 10 years. Factor in everything from demand-driven models to open access. In 500 words or less, please give us your take on the future impact of consolidation on the industry. Concerns like competition, pricing, the growth of startups, etc. are all grist for the mill. Please keep in mind that we are looking for your candid opinions on this crucial issue and naturally we’d be delighted if you could tell us something we hadn’t considered or don’t already know.

We received a solid mix of responses, some very short and pith, others long and contemplative. In sum they paint a picture that captures our take-aways for all of us as we consider the surprising and not surprising moves we see take place as part of industry consolidation in the library and information services space.

Response From — Donald Beagle (Director of Library Services, Belmont Abbey College, Belmont, NC) <donaldbeagle@bac.edu>

Because I see the IT revolution continuing through 2026 and well beyond, I see vendors using multiple strategies for ongoing repositioning. Consolidation-through-acquisition (CTA) is probably most evident in the for-profit subsector. Others are merger-between-peers (MBP), and strategic developmental partnerships (SDP). This last seems promising for the non-profit subsector.

Ameritech’s acquisitions of NOTIS (1991), then Dynix (1992), seem classic CTA. Both can be viewed as virtuous. Ameritech/NOTIS may actually have been more fully-featured, but Dynix had leveraged the PICK Operating System to better exploit relational database potential, a functional and structural advantage that may explain why Dynix proved more durable as the composite brand. Similarly, Sirsi’s acquisition of DRA (2001) seems classic CTA. But the merger of Sirsi and Dynix (2005) diverged to MBP. The merger consolidated market shares, but what of its subsequent acquisitions by private equity firms Vista Equity Partners (2006) and later ICV Partners (2015)? Were these driven by perceived need for investment capital to fund innovation? We now see an SDP between SirsiDynix and Zephyra, again potentially virtuous, because linked data (via BLUEcloud LSP) should benefit customers by leveraging library records out to Google’s broader search/discovery marketplace. Key point: the “boundaries” or “borders” of LIS became more malleable, reflecting the inherent fluidity of digital media.

But has this for-profit CTA activity hampered development and deployment of open-source products from non-profit SDP’s, harming customers? I could only conjecture whether Kuali Ole, for example, might have followed a different trajectory had CTA activity been dormant. As Wikipedia states, “On October 29, 2009, the WikiLeaks Project obtained a document from SirsiDynix taking a negative view of open source projects as compared to proprietary products, including risks of instability and insecurity.” LIS community debate has ensued. But the subsequent emergence of OCLC’s WMS suggests that the “Library ILS” is not yet a moribund arena for new product development. Still, these are all updated iterations of a core legacy product. I see an even larger arena of future innovation looming beyond the borders of the industry’s traditional identity, as evidenced by the Chronicle’s announcement of what I view as “modified CTA”: the acquisition of Lynda.com by LinkedIn.2 The Chronicle referenced an op-ed by Ryan Craig, described as “an education investor” titled: “LinkedIn Eats the University.” This rhetoric was perceived as hyperbole by commenters (mostly teaching faculty) who were mostly skeptical and scoffed at the column’s premise. But I saw no comments by librarians — odd since each enterprise is, in a sense, a digital library: LinkedIn, as a collection of data records on “human capital,” coded for expertise (albeit far from perfected); Lynda.com, as a collection of instructional media to build expertise, especially in marketable skills. I view this as modified CTA because the acquiring entity (LinkedIn) not only expands its potential market, but also its underlying definitional identity. I would explore further, but I’m at my word limit.

Endnotes
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The librarian in me wants choice and instinctively doubts consolidation increases choice. The investor in me, catapulting toward retirement at the speed of a Saturn Rocket booster, cheers any financial move that adds wealth to my portfolio. Those public companies that lead publishing still do well in that repetitive way that should bring a smile to the old reading this. Ask your broker.

The Amazon and Apple junkie in me worships the convenience offered by these tech companies. I don’t care how they grow as long as they keep shipping free, choice relevant, and me happy.

2026 is so far-off in real and Internet years that I don’t feel snarky or dumb to say that my bull don’t have that much crystal to say for sure what “then” will look like. Who knows what the rules will be in a post-Trump world. But I will offer a couple of observations for this challenge.

One, we can only hope and pray consolidation is the solution to our industry’s revenue problem. We want to remain paying customers of companies that offer us value, a value we can communicate to our bosses. Through takeover the industry can contain costs and leverage intellectual capital.

Two, consolidated or not, successful brands like JSTOR, Elsevier Science Direct, Thomson-Reuters, and Springer-Link need careful handling so we communicate to users that we run our business in their interest.

The best lesson in good library business — in the user interest — I learned from Jim McGinty, brilliant and personable guy in charge of all things Cambridge Information Group for many years. One day just before I introduced him at an ICOLC meeting in Scottsdale he revealed the truth. It went something like this: “Dennis, judge our value or any company’s value by a simple measure — your cost per unit value should go down. Your getting use and we are delivering value. Achieve this and everyone wins.”

Wise counsel and guiding words for what consolidation means or might mean 2026. If what my users want goes down in price as measured by use, what accountant could raise a red flag? It’s time and motion bliss.

So industry, consolidate as much as you can afford to bring my costs down. Innovate as much as you can through consolidation and, well, through coming up with new efficiencies that blow the socks off how much I pay per unit you sell me. Any other relationship is just bad business.

Response From — Tim Collins (President & CEO, EBSCO Industries, Inc.) <tcollins@ebSCO.com>

The library community landscape continues to grow and evolve, becoming more and more complex. The technologies, products and services utilized by libraries have changed tremendously over the last decade. During this time we have seen a great deal of innovation, a large number of new business entrants to the marketplace, and various acquisitions. And by all accounts, we can assume that a similar growth and transformation will occur over the next ten years. These are all signs of a healthy, dynamic industry, not dissimilar to any other industry that is advancing and prospering.

Our community is a close-knit one, one of long standing partnerships and friendships across libraries and the vendor community. And because we are closer to the details, we naturally have more interest, and even concern, about the changes that may affect us. In the retail world in which we all live, there is constant change, and acquisition, but the difference is that we tend to remain distanced from it. We purchase and enjoy a product. What we care most about is quality and value, and as long as these characteristics are upheld, it is of little consequence, or even interest to us, if that company merges with another.

Conversations and fears around consolidation in recent times are likely stemming in large part from the bankruptcy of a long-time library service provider and some well-documented acquisitions and mergers. While we use the term “consolidation,” it is important to consider that as library needs have grown, there is a far more diverse range of companies operating in and supporting the library community than ever before. And while libraries must be attuned to the financial well-being of a company before investing in it in the form of buying its products or services (and there are many obvious signs to consider), when it comes to the aftermath of a merger or acquisition, like the retail industry, it’s all about quality and value.

In many cases, mergers can help a small company to grow and improve. But, on the flipside, if a company overpays for another, or has motivations not in line with library interests, we may see a decline in overall value (service, support, enhancements, etc.). The sheer fact of a merger should not be the concern, instead, what is critical is whether the new entity maintains and consistently improves their product, provides quality service, and keeps pricing fair. Companies’ actions speak louder than their words. And companies’ actions are driven by their interests and goals. For EBSCO, we remain a family-owned company, committed to the library market. Yes, we create and sell products and services. But we create these products and services as solutions to challenges that libraries face and needs that libraries have. We focus on achieving sustained growth and believe that we can achieve this only if libraries grow and prosper. In this way, our goals are completely aligned. We continue to strive toward an environment where the relationships between EBSCO and libraries, as well as EBSCO and other vendors — are strengthened. EBSCO has always been an intermediary. We have literally thousands of partnerships across the entire library-vendor landscape — from publisher and database partners, to ILS and eBook vendor partnerships. Often our competitors are also our partners. We want to create deeper inroads with each partner — because partnership creates interoperability, and interoperability leads to choice for each library, and that library choice allows for the most ideal, customized scenarios for each library.

So, what is next? Well, for EBSCO we’ve never been more excited than we are now. We believe that we have found an approach to move library services to new heights, in a way that will address major challenges and goals of libraries, enable deeper meaningful collaboration and partnership among the library community, and create new opportunities for vendors.

For many months, EBSCO, together with Index Data, Open Library Environment (OLE), and a quietly growing initial group of library advisors and partners, have been developing the first ever open source, next generation Library Services Platform (LSP). OLE is an international open source entity driven to re-envision ILS processes and workflows. OLE is contributing resources and expertise toward expediting the overall goals of the project. Index Data is taking the lead role in platform architecture and subsequent application development based on community input. It’s a natural fit for the Copenhagen-based software development and services organization given their tremendous experience in open source technologies and community development. While EBSCO is providing financial support to ensure the project’s success, the LSP is community-driven, with code available under an Apache license, allowing for broad use of the code across personal, academic and commercial purposes.

The fundamental principles of this Open Source LSP are predicated on the ideas of giving choice and control to libraries. The intent is to build this modular, cloud-based, multi-tenant, extensible platform that allows libraries to choose, adapt and plug and play the components and workflows that they want, and not be forced to use a bundled, pre-determined set of services. By the end of this summer, Index Data expects to deliver an open platform with complete documentation via GitHub. At that point, developers will have a “sandbox” to play in. Moving beyond the base platform, Index Data is playing a lead role for the collaboration in developing a fully-functional suite of applications that will be available to be used at no cost by any library. It will be a “ready” LSP solution. However, any library can use all of these applications, some of these applications, change and extend them, add their own, etc. Any library or vendor can host the solution — or the LSP can be deployed on local infrastructure.

continued on page 32
Further, any vendor can not only create and contribute to the open source community, but create for-fee applications that plug into the LSP, thus again creating more options and choice for libraries. EBSCO, as well as some other vendors, will offer hosting and support services for the Open Source LSP. This way, libraries will not only have a single point of contact for implementation, maintenance and support, but concerns for libraries with limited technical staffing about the viability of an open source solution are alleviated. We believe that libraries using outside vendors to host this open source platform will have an ideal next generation library services infrastructure catered to their needs and workflows — at a much lower cost than a traditional ILS. Libraries with the technical staffing to host and support on their own can implement a custom solution at no additional out-of-pocket costs.

So, as we consider industry consolidation, we hope that an open source movement will continue to break down the walls that cause concern, and give more control back to libraries. Opportunities will be created for existing companies to diversify their offerings by creating applications that plug and play with the Open Source LSP, and for new companies to emerge around support services, new applications, greater connections with faculty, enterprise systems, etc. And best of all, it gets us on a collective path, by providing the impetus and momentum toward a greater collaboration among the library and vendor population.

Response From — Peter C. Froehlich (Director, Purdue University Press, and Head, Scholarly Publishing Services, Purdue University) <pfroehli@purdue.edu>

T

trends to watch are non-linear moves, machine-driven obviation, and the macro-market corrections that ensue from both — to which even the megafauna that result from traditional M&A will be subject. Players to watch are the omni-models: Google and Amazon and their ilk.

I’ll throw out a few examples of future events that might illustrate these trends (because guesses are fun). Apologies in advance if these examples are hackneyed or missing due citations to current or recent work. I’m behind in my reading and am likely missing many good citations and better thinking.

In the future:

• Amazon 2026 gobbles libraries like Amazon 2006 gobbled bookstores
• Acquisitions (in libraries) continues its “merger” with Acquisitions (in presses)
• Public Media enters Publishing/Education — lest a merger with Public Media prevails
• We see an increase in phrases like “ecosystem bloat” and/or Rube Goldberg machine-like metaphors being applied to higher education — as we begin to describe the post-information age “turn” and whole industries become apps (metaphorically speaking)

Amazon 2026 gobbles libraries “market share” like Amazon 2006 gobbled bookstore space: Amazon enters new countries selling books; i.e., its core strength, it then learns the lay of the land to see what services it can best offer next. Amazon has a lot to offer. Amazon 2026 could be building and buying content providers, offering big data management services, leveraging Echo/Alexa to build high-impact teaching assistants, and more. It might have seemed prognosticative-vendor to imagine Amazon entering higher education, ten years back, but now, with new Amazon Campus and Amazon’s OER discovery tool pilot, the entryway should be clear.

Acquisitions (in libraries) continues its “merger” with Acquisitions (in presses, especially university presses): Driven more by moves in commercial houses like Elsevier and others, by 2026 we should be seeing a deeper partnership in libraries and presses to explore recommendation algorithms for not only research and discovery but also in publishing decisions. ...guessing many have written on this; my apologies for not listing all of our better thinkers here.

Public Media enters Publishing/Education — lest a libraries/press merger with Public Media prevents: Public (or Open Access) Radio and Television have moved online relatively more easily than text-based publishers (or content producers). Where will Public Media go from here? The multimedia move to add text to video, etc. seems one worth exploring. I’d imagine we’ll see publishing ventures from Public Media expanding, unless possible appetite and interest in such exploration is preemptively met with publisher and publishing-led offers to acquire/merge.

We see an increase in phrases like “ecosystem bloat” and/or select Rube Goldberg machine-like metaphors being applied to higher education. Nature abhors a vacuum, but technology abhors complexity. At some point, perhaps a tipping point of sorts, commercial players like LinkedIn, Facebook, and Google may take a long look at the higher education space that they have each expressed expectations of replacing, and begin leveraging some framing words to advance their cause(s).

Response From — Nancy K. Herther (Librarian for American Studies, Anthropology & Sociology, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Campus) <herther@umn.edu>

I personally don’t see the private sector as giving up on the academic marketplace — nor should they. They offer economies of scale, marketing prowess and the ability/deep-pockets/functionality for innovation. Clearly the consolidation and huge profits have created their very reasonable reputation as robber-barons. Their tenacious refusal to address the extreme crisis they have created is certainly something the industry needs to address and resolve.

Today academe — and all the more so academic libraries — are embracing new, available Open Access tools and systems to be able to offer some type of internal publishing capability. Few libraries have the experience, talent or ability to take on the high-quality professional publishing that has developed over many decades (or longer) in university presses, association/disciplinary or commercial publishers. Technology has created a window of opportunity and academe is hoping to stake a claim in future publishing. Without major investment, we are bleaching those precious, limited library budgets from services/collections in favor of moving into untested territory. It is yet to be seen whether or not they would be able to replicate the quality or reputation of what we have now or be able to continue to innovate and reinvent publishing over time. The idea of repositories is easy — getting folks to be able to use these without traditional indexes to find key information has yet to be demonstrated.

Cloud computing and storage are available, but are we really willing to bet the future on Google’s “deals” for technology or have such faith in Google’s intentions and algorithms to replace tried-and-true discovery systems and indexes? The issue for libraries, at the least, is what will be pushed aside for the sake of taking on this publishing role. The ARL Strategic Thinking and Design is a bold statement redefining the academic library... however, it comes at quite a cost: the assumption that “in 2033, the research library will have shifted from its role as a knowledge service provider within the university to become a collaborative partner within a rich and diverse learning and research ecosystem.” All of this needs definition and clarity — and, if I may say — buy-in by academe at-large. Are academic libraries no longer a “knowledge service provider with the university?” Is there any research to show that faculty and students are independently able to perform high-quality research and instruction without the key assets provided by libraries from traditional well-vetted databases, highly trained professionals and resources? Instead “libraries” are to become a “collaborative partner” in what they see as “a rich and diverse learning and research ecosystem?” I find this foggy future as troubling as the potential of an ongoing commercial stranglehold on library budgets. This critical issue deserves far more discussion in all quarters than has been done to date. Deconstructing what libraries are and do now — or the primacy of trained information professionals as key players in this ecosystem — seems to be a very slippery slope along an uncertain path into an unknown future. We are betting the store on an extremely uncertain future as libraries continue to divert precious funds and alter priorities into these areas.
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eries, publishers, and vendors occupy very different niches in the scholarly communication ecosystem. Libraries have traditionally been intermediaries between their users — faculty and students — and the content providers who publish and package the books and serials libraries purchase on behalf of their users. Content providers, however, produce materials that meet the needs of faculty and students with or without libraries, whose contribution in the university context has largely been framed by the fact that they pay the bills for subscriptions and books and organize them for discovery. One of the ironies of the championing of open access publishing by librarians — in the name of social justice and against the corporate control of information — is that it is largely the subscription model of access to information that has maintained the library as an essential intermediary with publishers, who could collect article processing charges from other university offices than the library.

It is my view that, by 2026, the scholarly communication ecosystem will have shifted considerably. Given that many traditional library services, such as the cataloging and processing of books, have already largely been outsourced, it is likely that this process of integrating library collections and services with vendors will only expand in the future.

The consolidation of vendors and publishers will probably be so advanced by 2026 that they will be looking for more opportunities to grow — and that will lead them to offer cost-effective, nimble, customer-focused, and convenient cloud library services based on user needs. A company such as EBSCO or ProQuest could approach community colleges, liberal arts colleges, and small universities and offer the administration an opportunity to access a curated cloud library (eBooks, e-journals, streaming media), a 24/7 reference call center, and a suite of online tutorials, thus outsourcing the work of most librarians and library staff. Indeed, ProQuest, EBSCO, and an online education company such as Udacity could joint forces to offer targeted education that could siphon a percentage of students completely out of the traditional university system.

This consolidation of libraries into the vendor space would probably affect smaller libraries at first, but there is also every opportunity for vendors to offer access to services such as the reference call center (perhaps even consortia-wide) to those larger universities which still maintain substantial print collection, archives, and the staff needed to support the specialized research that would tax an online system. Onsite staff can deal with printer questions and the like.

Most libraries today believe that their long-term mission is to provide information literacy, not building and maintaining collections. Thus, many believe that the future of the library profession is secured by offering information literacy to help students navigate the world of information. The question is whether cash-strapped colleges and vendor-oriented library services will be integrated into these creative environments, and play the role of convener, enabler, distributor, and archive.

Response From — Matthew Ismail (Director of Collection Development, Central Michigan University) <ismai1md@cmich.edu>

I'm approaching this question as a publisher who has worked for global conglomerates and now runs a large university press — though a small player by scholarly publishing standards. Over recent decades scholarly publishing has evolved in such a way that a handful of large organizations control the most valuable content. In a mature and relatively flat market, this ability to roll up an enormous amount of “must-have” content into large packages has enabled these organizations to dominate library spend, driving out smaller publishers and limiting the amount of budget for experimentation with new models.

Unchecked, these trends will strengthen the monopolistic power of large, global players and make it harder for new entrants to gain market share. Yet the paradox is that our markets are also fragmenting at a time when these global organizations require increasingly large markets to drive both growth and profitability. And so I see two trends that can offset this seeming inevitability:

The first drivers are those moving us towards democratization of access. Whether this leads us into a truly “flipped” OA world or not, it’s clear that user expectations are shaped by the commercial web. And that means ease, convenience and immediacy.

Secondly, there is a growing gap of confidence and trust in publishers. While at this point we tend to all be lumped together, there are growing opportunities for smaller organizations to leverage their strengths — trust, brand recognition, close relationships with their audiences — to capture and retain authors and audiences with tightly integrated offerings in ways that cannot easily be replicated by large commercial competitors.

So while current M&A activity seems likely to continue, I think that user demands and behavior, along with increasing levels of innovation from smaller and new players, could upset the dynamics of an increasingly mature and consolidated market over the next decade.

Perhaps the biggest challenge for publishers and librarians alike in all of this is the growing challenge of discovery and access. If there’s one thing we can all learn from SciHub, it’s that we are collectively doing a poor job of making it easy to find content — even when users have legitimate access. There seems to be a growing gulf on this issue between content providers and users, and it’s a gap that one could easily imagine being filled by one of the tech giants if publishers, libraries and service providers aren’t able to solve the problem. Whatever the eventual solution, the big winners in all of this are going to be users — whether they are readers, students, researchers, or professionals — who will enjoy access, tools and prices that are better than ever before.

Response From — James G. Neal (University Librarian Emeritus at Columbia University, New York) <jnealb@columbia.edu>

In 2026, there will be no library information and services industry targeting products and services to the library marketplace. Content and applications products will be directed at the consumer. Open resources for learning, research and recreation, and open source applications supporting innovation and individual and organizational productivity will be more dominant in the global economy. Self-publishing and niche technology development will dominate. Libraries will be integrated into these creative environments, and play the role of convener, enabler, distributor, and archive.

Response From — Audrey Powers (Associate Librarian & Librarian for College of the Arts, University of South Florida, Tampa Library) <apowers@usf.edu>

When asked to give my thoughts about the future of library content and services in light of consolidations occurring in our industry, my first reaction was rooted in the ever increasing rise in the cost of journals, or for that matter, any library resource with a recurring cost. How dare they [companies] acquire more companies and then raise the cost of journals when libraries are struggling to survive? The question raised a sore topic.

I know we have been observing this occurrence with more and more frequency, but at that moment I realized I needed to acquire a more holistic view of the situation, without jumping to conclusions or viewing this phenomena from a myopic perspective. Those thoughts sent me on a mission to contact a small, but representative group of people with varying perspectives.

We are all aware of the fact that librarians, and libraries, grapple with the rising cost of acquiring content, shrinking library budgets, and offering content in the most discoverable manner possible. As companies acquire companies, does this diversify their products and services
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and benefit libraries, or does it inflate their prices and water down their offerings? When companies become larger with the acquisition of other companies, does it inhibit innovation? Or can one liken this trend to the closing of a store in a small, rural downtown because Wal-Mart just opened up on the outskirts of town?

I suspect there are many reasons why large companies are subsuming smaller companies and my hope is that it will benefit all stakeholders.

During Katherine Skinner’s keynote talk at the 2015 Charleston Conference, Needle-Moving Collaboration: From Act to Impact, her comment, “the publishing industry is going to implode” struck a raw nerve. My immediate reaction to this comment was she is right!

How can this be avoided?

Scholarly communication is the responsibility of many stakeholders and will impact all of us in the industry. How can we make sure this is a win/win situation and avoid implosion? It begins the acceptance of the premise that “we think local, not global” and that we need to “shift attention from institutional concerns to a system-wide transformation and build bridges across relevant players.” We need to recognize that we are interdependent and our success as an industry is directly related to each other’s success. As the scholarly communication community undergoes a system-wide transformation, we need to know that “our problem” is the problem of each and every one of us and that collaboration is an essential component of the solution.

We need to sit down together, find neutral ground from which we can focus our energies, and work through our concerns collaboratively. We will not be successful if we attempt to solve this for our individual selves, individual institutions, or individual companies. According to Ms. Skinner, scholarly communication is the problem of many stakeholder groups. We need to coordinate our efforts, collect and present publishing data in a transparent manner, and work together to address this problem in a collaborative manner to affect a change that benefits everyone.

Endnotes


Response From — Stephen Rhind-Tutt (President, Alexander Street) <rhindtutt@alexanderst.com>

Internet-based businesses are pre-disposed towards large consolidation and small independent players. The clue as to why is in the name — networks are more efficient and more valuable to their users as they get larger. Smaller sites can survive and even thrive, but they tend to do so by serving niches. So we see systems like YouTube — a massive global network that serves billions of individuals, with successful channels serving individual constituencies.

The customers for much of higher education are students who want to learn faster, more efficiently and at low cost. Today diverse and separate businesses serve that need including Learning Management System companies, online universities, courseware companies, and textbook publishers. Most of the businesses in the library space serve this need too — aggregators, library system vendors, journal publishers, book publishers, and subscription agents. The Internet is pulling all of these business together. Sometimes they collaborate to serve customers using standards and licensing agreements and sometimes it happens by consolidation, but the underlying forces are inexorable, especially when these organizations needs the same skills, when there are efficiencies of scale and when customers demand the benefits of network effects.

We’re seeing this play out in libraries. Over time and with the Internet library system vendors and aggregators have grown ever closer.

Both seek to improve the efficiency and effectiveness with which an institution delivers content to its patrons. Both need their products to excel in search, discovery, delivery, order processing, user interfaces, quality content, manipulation, and analytics. Customers favor one interface and one system — a single, high functionality way to deliver patrons content — not a series of separate systems, so they’re looking for systems that answer both needs. Since both business are doing much of the same work, consolidation provides economies of scale and creates network benefits. It’s unsurprising that ProQuest and ExLisis merged. I expect we’ll see more consolidation in the future.

The same is true in so many areas. A new $1m journal publishing system would cost a big 5 journal publisher less than $400 per journal. For a society publisher with 20 journals the same system would cost $50,000 per journal — clearly prohibitive, even before factoring in the value of sales forces, the benefits of cross-searchability, easier discovery, delivery platform and so on. Expect more consolidation as learning companies realize the importance of discovery, of reference content and of primary sources. By 2026 online learning systems will have features like automated adaptive learning, and automated diagnosis of where students are struggling. A vendor of such a system may decide exclusively to acquire a major publisher with the idea that it’d confer unique competitive advantages. Or it may be that a major publisher decides to acquire such a system because it’d protect their publishing revenues. As long as it’s cheaper, more efficient and you can deliver more value by consolidation it’ll happen.

Do we need to worry that by 2050 there will be one massive global library learning system aggregator, book agent, discovery service, OPAC, book and journal publishing behemoth that charges universities unaffordable amount? No. Not in my opinion. Why?

Firstly, I believe customers get what customers want. I can think of no historical examples where this doesn’t happen in the long run. Sometimes it may take legal intervention, as it did with the robber barons in the early 19th century, but it always happens. A mega-service will only happen if it serves customers.

Secondly, there are many, many counter forces. As markets develop, new skill sets become important, many of which are better done by smaller, independent, fast moving, fast reacting organizations and individuals. The African savannah has elephants and mice, lions and insects and they all fit together well. In my example above of the journal system publisher, it may actually result in new service organizations that deliver sales and publishing tools to smaller organizations so that they get benefits of scale.

In the early 1990s there were over 250 organizations engaged in microfilm publishing. Anyone remember Primary Source Media, Scholarly Resources, Norman Ross, IDC, Bell & Howell, or Kraus? By 2005 almost every one of these companies had been acquired. Why? Because electronic publishing required different skills and because there were substantial economics of scale. Was it a bad thing? No, because the acquiring companies invested in and improved the titles they bought. They developed software, systems and processes that drove down costs and enabled large collections to go digital. Scholarship was enhanced. Content was preserved. Customers got what they wanted.
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The 2016 Outsell Information Management Benchmark Report

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

The 2016 Outsell Information Management Benchmark Report points out important “tipping points” for the information profession and the people who manage it.

Background

Since 2000 Outsell has surveyed information managers and librarians to construct a profile of the profession. They ask about budgets, staffing, content investments, service offerings, vendors, pricing and contract negotiations.

Responses

296 responses were received from information managers with budget responsibilities. The Web-based survey queried listservs and organizations including Special Libraries Association, Fedlink and the Charleston Conference. The response rate has a confidence level of 96%.

60% of the respondents were from the U.S. with 22% from the UK, Canada, Asia Pacific, Africa or Middle East and other made up the remainder of the regions of the respondents. 34% were for profit companies, 21% from educational institutions (2-4 year colleges and and universities and graduate schools), 15% from K-12 educational institutions, 9% were from government-owned sites of institutions; the remaining included non-profit companies, health care facilities and public libraries. Corporate respondents included 16% pharmaceuticals 8% consulting and professional services, 12% non-profit 9% legal, 8% financial and accounting services, 7% publishing and information services.

Budgets and Spending

The budget data were drier than in past years. Overall growth was anticipated at slightly less than 1% in contrast to the 2016 Outsell Information Pricing Study which found price increases of between 3-5% in most cases. Based on World Bank and the U.S. GDP, show that information management budgets are stagnating.

While government and education budgets are tracking similarly to previous years, it is alarming that the expected growth of corporate libraries is a meager 1.3% after 5% or modest growth in previous years.

Future Investments and In What Areas

If respondents had an extra 10% added to their budgets, where would they put it? Answers tracked with previous years — 46% on content and 25% on staffing. Where would they increase investment? Corporate and government anticipate increased spending on data and analytics, the reality is that most are struggling to stay afloat due to sparse budgets and relentless content price increases. In actuality, corporate, government, and education sectors spend less than 5% of their time on data and analytics. One area with little flux is funding models for information centers. For further information, see Outsell’s 2015 IM Business Models.

Spending on digital content continues to creep up. Government and corporate libraries report well over 80% of their budgets spent on digital assets with the education sector trailing with 70%. The majority of digital spend is for online databases and ejournals. eBook spending is flat. In the education sector the concept of digital courseware solutions is replacing the discrete etextbook.

Many libraries in all sectors feel handcuffed by the multitude of licensing options offered by various eBook providers further causing sales to lag.

Proportion of Spending on Content Types

Most respondents report they will continue the investment in content given limited budgets. Spending on scientific and technical information was 35%; medical information 11%; consumer and entertainment 11%.

legal, tax and regulatory information 7%; general business and news aggregation7%; and company information 5%.

Technology areas such as discovery tools, federated search, and general IT capabilities continue to be areas of investment.

Two areas have increased slightly: authentication and single sign on, specifically in the corporate sector. This reflects the trend toward frictionless access via multiple platforms, including mobile. The blending of work/live roles, globalization, and the accelerated pace of business require workers to have access to information anywhere, at any time, from any place. Outsell’s recent report on millennials’ information usage shows 77% of millennial knowledge workers thought single sign on information access was important.

The second area that saw a boost in anticipated investment this year is expanded training in using library resources. When millennials were asked for their “go to” resource when researching a company or product, two-thirds said a search engine like Google. Sadly aggregators and online databases were not among the top three choices. Obviously raising awareness and improving information literacy are essential if libraries and information managers are to be involved in the research process.

Staffing and How Staff Spend their Time

Though steady last year, this year the number of staff (managers, researchers, administrative and contractors) has dipped overall by 30%. This is a trend to watch more closely. Slightly over half of staff time is spent on research such as reference inquiries, custom projects, general research and current awareness. Vendor contract management and administrative duties account for 25% of time as well as 5% on marketing and/or building awareness. Even less time is spent on data and analytics.

In terms of skills gaps, the need for different skill sets to match evolving demands is a constant theme though managers are under pressure to do with less and less. Definitely not a recipe for success. On the flip side there’s opportunity. Data and analytics are changing the way enterprises operate, how they drive value, and how they contain costs and mitigate risks. Data is content and information managers and librarians have been managing content for years. It’s time to get a seat at the table.

The State of Information Management

The concept of information management is disintegrating and will continue to disintegrate without “profound change.”

There has been slippage in budgets and staff, content prices are rising and budgets and staff to manage it are being reduced.

Bottom line: the status quo is not a recipe for success. What is needed?

Managers and executive stakeholders have looked at information management as a cost center. Instead, they should focus on information management as an investment center.

Cutting budgets and staff is not the recipe for success. Instead, more content management research and analysis; attention and strengthening of technological infrastructure; and data management strategies for information delivery and visibility are paramount.

The boomers generation of information managers must collaborate with the new generation of millennials. Not all stakeholders have the same needs and interests. While content curation, research, and reference are still important, they have diminished in value to the current cohort. Fluency with cognitive computing, data visualization, text mining and other emerging technologies is essential.

What are we waiting for? ⏳
Straight Talk — Private Equity Firms and their Influence in the Library Marketplace

Column Editor: Dan Tonkery (President and CEO, Content Strategies, Inc., 17 W. 17th Street, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10011; Phone: 210-416-9524) <tonkery@gmail.com> www.contentstrategies.com

The recent announcement that Follett Corporation is buying long-time library supplier Baker & Taylor has been met with surprise and shock by many including comments about what is going to happen to the cats. I got calls and emails from many of my friends asking what is going on and what does it mean for the library community. What does this mean and why now? What is going on in our industry?

Well, for the most part nothing is going on! Yes nothing! There is no grand plan, no conspiracy, and no strategy. Yes, Follett Corporation is buying B&T. End of story. But why now? What is really going on? Is the library market in such disarray that all of our vendors are buying each other up?

The answer is fairly straightforward. The sale of Baker & Taylor Books is the final transaction, clean up and sale for Castle Harlan Partners IV, L.P., a New York-based private equity fund managed by the Castle Harlan, Inc. firm that acquired Baker & Taylor for $455 million in July 2006. That’s quite a jump in price as only three years earlier Willis Stein & Partners, L.P paid only $255 million for the company. Someone told me that the high price paid was due to the expectation that Baker & Taylor would have a major role in Amazon’s distribution network, but in the end Amazon built their own distribution centers and bypassed B&T.

The Castle Harlan private equity firm has owned Baker & Taylor for ten years and I have reason to believe that they originally overpaid and have been looking for a way to get out of this situation for several years. I happen to know that Castle Harlan took control of B&T business unit for about 18 months before EBSCO bought them in 2015. About the same time that YBP was sold to EBSCO, Baker & Taylor’s Marketing Services and Baker & Taylor’s Publishing Group were acquired by Readerlink Distribution Services LLC. So now, with two units of the Baker & Taylor group sold off, Castle Harlan only had the largest unit to sell.

Finally, after flogging Baker & Taylor to a number of venture firms and other potential buyers on both coasts for months, Castle Harlan finds a willing buyer and hopes that they have the unit all wrapped up, spit shined and ready for a new home. So the answer to everyone’s question: the sale of Baker & Taylor is a simple acquisition from a private equity owner that has been trying to sell this company for months. The timing is related to when they could find a buyer, plain and simple. I don’t think that Follett Corporation was planning on buying or seeking out this acquisition. But when the Castle Harlan sales pitch came they made Follett Corporation an offer too good to ignore. However, this not the first time that the Follett Corporation tried to buy Baker & Taylor, in 1994 there was a serious effort by Follett Corporation to buy Baker & Taylor from another private equity group, The Carlyle Group and after months of negotiations that deal fell through.

Private equity firms are a good way for companies to raise capital, and Baker & Taylor have had a long history of private equity owners starting back with the Carlyle Group that acquired Baker & Taylor from W.R. Grace in 1970. Each private equity firm for the most part has made a better than average return without making any significant investment. The Carlyle Group lucked out and left Baker & Taylor alone but did pay attention to the deal that B&T did with a new start-up in Seattle. Baker & Taylor licensed their title database and publisher files to Amazon for a modest upfront fee and B&T took a stock position which Carlyle later cashed in and made more money from the Amazon stock sale than they might have received from the sale of Baker & Taylor.

Baker & Taylor is not the only library services company that has private equity ownership or involvement. I am not here to judge whether private equity ownership is necessarily good or bad for the library industry but one thing is clear: the financial returns of the private equity firm are always maximized for the shareholders and not for the library clients and customers. As usual, library customers carry most of the cost of these deals in terms of higher prices, delayed development and diminished customer service. Too often, the private equity firm has no idea what they are buying, what business they are in, nor do they care about the market.

Some recent examples of private equity plays in the library marketplace would be in the ILS marketplace. Nearly everyone is aware of ProQuest’s acquisition of Ex Libris in 2015. I think many librarians are still shaking their heads at the whopping $500 million plus price that ProQuest paid a venture firm for Ex Libris. Yes, over $500 million, and most of that paid for by subordinated debt with a group of bond holders who are financing that debt. Ex Libris has had an interesting history with private equity ownership starting in the early days with Hebrew University and some other organizations that invested $4 million. From that small $4 million investment the growing company was able to find their next investor, Francisco Partners, who invested $62 million in June 2006. In August 2008, the next private equity firm, Leeds Equity Partners paid $150 million for Ex Libris which they sold to Golden Gate Capital for a little over $200 million. But wait there’s more... at the end of 2012, less than two years later, Golden Gate was able to flip Ex Libris for over $500 million. Not a bad payday for their investors!

ProQuest must now meet certain performance goals in terms of sales, etc. in order to satisfy the bond holders. Any time your company takes on debt, that debt always comes with someone looking over your shoulder on a quarterly basis. If you are unable to meet the performance criteria then you possibly end up like Cengage. Again the library community may be indirectly involved in helping to manage that debt by paying rising database prices and/or higher maintenance prices.

Another example of a private equity acquisition is Innovative Interfaces, Inc. where Huntsman Gay Global Capital and JMI Equity made a strategic investment in Innovative in March 2012. Innovative was founded in 1978 and had long been one of the libraries’ favorite companies with a broad base of support and a huge customer base. Innovative was in serious need of a technological engineering overhaul. They chose to raise capital from the private equity community. In the end, Jerry Kline decided to sell out to a venture group and let someone else deal with the task of reengineering the various systems and platforms into the next generation systems. As an outside observer, it was interesting to note that one of the first tasks that the private equity firm undertook was a reduction of a number of well-known and highly respected library vendors that had worked for years at Innovative who understood the unique aspects of the academic and research library marketplace. It will be interesting to follow the developments in Emeryville, CA.

While several of the ILS vendors are owned by private equity firms, there are other examples of venture ownership in our industry. High Wire Press, a hosting service founded by Stanford University as an auxiliary unit of Stanford University Libraries in May 2014, received a significant equity investment to support its strategic growth from Accel-KKR, another private equity firm. High Wire Press received a much needed investment that will enable HWP to develop the next generation hosting service. High Wire Press had been under pressure from a number of their publisher partners to reengineer their services. This investment will enable them to remain competitive in this niche market. Recently, High Wire Press announced the opening of a new European Office in Belfast, Northern Ireland and the addition of 74 new positions over the next three years. I cannot help but wonder if this is the first step to moving all the software development to a much lower cost area.维昂廷一个长期的软件开发团队 in
Redwood City, one of the most competitive and high cost locations where software engineers are constantly looking for the next opportunity is a challenge.

My final example of a private equity play is OverDrive, the Cleveland based company supplying digital content to libraries, primarily schools, public libraries, and public library systems. OverDrive caught the wave of the shift from print to electronic formats and experienced a dramatic growth spurt. It needed a cash infusion to help pay for expansion and for a new headquarters. In 2010 Insight Venture Partners, a private equity firm provided the necessary cash investment and became the primary shareholder and majority owner. In five years with continued growth OverDrive became a hot target and in 2015 Insight Venture Partners sold OverDrive to Japan’s Rakuten, Inc. for $410 million. The OverDrive example is another great payday for a venture firm. Anytime you can turn $30 million into $410 million is an impressive win.

Back to my original question: Are private equity firms in the library marketplace good or bad for our industry? One thing is certain, a number of private equity firms have made investments in ILS, Book supply, and e-books that have yielded impressive returns. We can expect that private equity firms will remain players in our marketplace. In addition, private equity firms allow library service companies to raise much needed capital for expansion or for buying other companies.

On the other hand, private equity firms are focused on maximizing their profit potential and have little to no interest in growing, developing or even understanding our market place. A private equity firm most likely will have ownership positions in ten or more companies often in a variety of businesses. The library company they invested in is just a balance sheet to watch over and make sure that the profits grow. In some cases, the venture firm makes a wrong investment and after attempting and failing to find an exit strategy is left with the option of stripping the company of all its cash and/or other assets and simply walking away and leaving the company to fail. Recent examples of this type of venture play include both Swets and Faxon.

My money is on vendors that are long term players in the marketplace, who are conservative and who have a deep understanding of the marketplace. Libraries should avoid companies that are saddled with huge debt and pay attention to what is going on in the marketplace. The Swets situation is a prime example of too many people ignoring the warning signs. Investment banks were having second thoughts about Swets and in the end they stripped out all the cash, protected their investment and pocketed many libraries’ prepayment payments. Several major U.S. libraries each lost more than a million dollars.

For 30 years, the Software & Information Industry (SIIA) has conducted the CODiE annual awards program and the CODiE program is the industry’s only peer-reviewed awards platform. I understand that ACI beat out two strong finalists in this CODiE category: Elsevier Reference Module in Biomedical Sciences and ProQuest Ebook Central. Pat Saboski, the manager of the ACI Scholarly Blog Index has been in the industry for many years. I first met her when she was editor and publisher of Choice magazine. On the personal side, Pat has a grandson in Greenville and she recently vacationed in Hilton Head! She is also planning a panel in Charleston during the 2016 Charleston Conference! http://aci.info/2016/05/18/aci-scholarly-blog-index-named-siia-2016-codie-award-winner-for-best-scholarly-research-information-solution/

On the Elsevier page — BA Insight and LexisNexis Legal & Professional have announced a strategic alliance that integrates Lexis Search Advantage natively into law firms’ Microsoft SharePoint environments using the BA Insight Software Portfolio to
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I have spent my entire professional life — more than a couple of decades now — focusing on preservation, archiving materials, and ensuring access to library collections. With this unique focus comes an unusual perspective, one resulting from having watched as issues around preservation have emerged, and re-emerged. Just as the library community once observed the preservation problems with acidic paper (resulting in innovations around acid-free paper), we are now seeing problems with a preservation medium that emerged in the late 1920s and was still in use as recently as the mid-1970s: acetate-based microfilm.

Challenges around preservation are certainly not new. Starting early in the 20th century, inherent space and condition issues placed collections of books, bound periodicals and newspapers at risk. As a result, aggressive microfilming started in the 1930s in an effort to preserve centuries old print collections. At the time, acetate silver microfilm was the state-of-the-art medium used to preserve and protect volatile and cumbersome paper collections. Today, however, once highly regarded acetate film has become chemically unstable and is rapidly failing. This means that significant percentages of our historically significant, and in many cases, unique film collections across the country are now at risk. It’s time to take decisive action.

When acetate based microfilm fails, as is currently the case in many public and university libraries, you smell a telltale vinegar aroma from the acetic acid gases. Some compare the smell to pickles, others to salad dressing; perhaps it’s because I associate it with deteriorating collections, I personally think it just stinks. Acetate based microfilm, used from the late 1920s through the mid-1970s as a strategy to preserve print collections, will eventually go through a molecular change that results in the shrinking of the plastic base. As this occurs, the acetic acid environment that results will cause the process to accelerate until the film either becomes so brittle it breaks into pieces or it fuses to itself resulting in what I call the hockey puck effect. Another clear sign of an issue is white powder on the boxes or the film itself; this means that gases have actually crystalized. In each case, our history is silently disappearing inside the cabinets and by the time it starts to smell it is sometimes too late to save it.

The process or condition I just described is known as Vinegar Syndrome and it WILL eventually happen to ALL acetate film. Even when stored under perfect conditions, acetate based film will only last 100 years. I don’t know of any library environments that have maintained the perfect conditions that require less than 60 degrees and constant 40% relative humidity for the storage of acetate film. The fact is that even if we could always keep our environment at a comfortable 72 degrees and 50% humidity, acetate film would start developing Vinegar Syndrome within 40 years. Considering when acetate film initially became the industry standard, it is clear that deteriorating film probably became apparent in some collections as early as 1970 and as recently as 2010.

What can you do?

I recommend a three step approach:
1. Test to evaluate the extent of the problem
2. Evaluate the affected content and consider whether or not there is a desire to save it
3. Choose a remediation and content reclamation alternative

Microfilm as a preservation technology continues today, but thankfully silver microfilm manufacturers switched from acetate to a very durable polyester base in the mid-1970s. Reassuringly, polyester film has undergone scientific age acceleration tests that suggest it will last 500 years or more. Engaging a preservation service company who can use your own film as the input source to create a durable polyester copy is the quickest and lowest cost action you can take to save your historical information before it deteriorates. Digitization, or converting film to a digital format, is also a viable recovery strategy, although it is typically more costly and requires consideration of text capture, metadata creation, image formats and hosting solutions.

Citing a real life example, I recently had the opportunity to get involved with Racine Wisconsin’s Public Library on a restoration project. Their heavily used collection of the Racine Journal Times was deteriorating due to Vinegar Syndrome. Knowing that the Publisher did not have a complete collection and the reels they did have were in worse condition than those at the Library, Racine Public Library decided to not only replace their collection of service copies but also create an archive by also investing to create a negative copy for dark storage. The key to success for their project was early detection and swift action. They now have brand new service copies for patron use and negative archive to support long-term preservation.

Ben Franklin observed that “An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.” We have an opportunity to save our history and the valuable archives libraries worldwide have curated. It starts with the simple step of checking your microfilm collections for this deteriorating condition and coming up with a holistic preservation plan that ensures continued access to the valuable content in these archives for generations to come.
ATG: Your study “The Once and Future Publishing Library” has garnered a lot of acclaim from a variety of sources. How did you all get involved with the project? What was your primary motivation for studying the topic of library publishing?

AO: Steve Goodall, a keen Charleston Conference supporter and representative of the Goodall Family Foundation, entered into a discussion with Katina about interesting studies that could be done for the benefit of the library and publishing communities. They then informally broadened the discussion; library publishing became of quick interest; and the rest is history! Or as some would say, “timing is everything!”

ATG: What differing models are libraries following as they embark on the business of producing scholarly content? Is there a common thread among them?

AO & AH: The primary model is open access, using mainly funds from the overall library budget. There are variations on this, even including end-user pays subscription models, but the open access model is most often funded by the library budget, though sometimes by the home institution out of a separate pocket or by outside foundations.

ATG: How many libraries are publishing original monographs and journals? Do most of the libraries you surveyed have the experience, talent and ability to take on high-quality professional publishing? How do they exercise the necessary level of quality control and peer review?

AO: If you mean libraries per se, then only a small minority of the libraries listed in the Library Publishing Coalition Directory. However, now nearly 30 university presses report to university libraries, to a greater or lesser degree of integration, and certainly those are very robust publishers.

ATG: You say in your study that libraries are becoming the new “go-to” places on many campuses when innovation in publishing or dissemination is sought. How so?

AO: For over 20 years, since ARL began its scholarly communications program (1991), academic libraries and librarians have become increasingly interested in how publishing works, how it affects the library, its faculty authors, and its readers. (We became interested, of course, in journal pricing long before that!) Librarians started to try to understand in particular how not-for-profit (society and university press) publishing works, what are its challenges and futures. The publishing and library communities have had, during this time, a number of conversations and formal meetings on these topics. Libraries have often become very visible and available on campus, in a way that presses probably are not supported to do in their professional missions.

AH: I think, too, that libraries, which enjoy larger discretionary budgets than most presses, have had the freedom to undertake some experiments, say in open source textbook publishing, that most university presses have not had the capital to undertake (or especially to risk in a project that fails). It is also a simple truth that every campus has a library, but many campuses do not have a press to go to even if they so desired!

ATG: Libraries and university presses have had an interesting relationship over the years. How would you characterize the current relationship between them?

AO & AH: It’s probably better than it’s been for a long time, in no small part because the number of libraries and presses with direct reporting lines has been increasing. The nature of the reporting differs, but the “forced” partnership has led to more and more dialogue, both within individual universities and at various conferences. Some granting institutions, especially the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, have been encouraging various projects and meetings involving both communities, the Library Publishing Coalition also encourages more dialogue, and various annual conferences, including the Charleston Conference, provide additional opportunities to explore our respective worldviews. Presses and libraries have always respected each other while disagreeing on various fronts. But the dialogue today is much better than it was a decade ago.

ATG: Some have argued that scholarly publishing is a logical and critical function for the 21st century library. Does your research bear this out?

AO: Yes, there’s a certain degree of unambiguous faith in that assertion being made by a number of library publishing advocates. Think, for example, of leaders such as Paul Courant (and see our bibliography for some of his excellent and influential work in exactly this area); there are many more who reason similarly. We know that library publishing can be logical and even critical, but that success depends on whether a given academic environment is open to such a development, whether its library leaders choose to take that path, and, if so, how carefully and strategically their organizations will pursue publishing. Some libraries, as we know, have charged in and become successful; others have taken aboard their campus press; others pursue the more modest repository path. And for some time to come, the library publishing space will be diverse in its ambitions and execution.

ATG: To what extent have library publishers been successful in reaching the goal of liberating academic publishing and making scholarly research more universally available? Have they had an appreciable influence on pricing?

AO: Risking the wrath of many readers, I’ll say that libraries have only somewhat made some scholarly research more universally available. Some experiments, say in open source textbook publishing, have had the freedom to undertake some experiments, say in open source textbook publishing, that most university presses have not had the capital to undertake (or especially to risk in a project that fails). It is also a simple truth that every campus has a library, but many campuses do not have a press to go to even if they so desired!
Although available, probably mostly through the institutional repository path. The influence on pricing has been minimal to zero, but the exploration into new ways of publishing and testing of new business models has been highly useful. Getting more librarians conversant with how publishing works and introducing new ideas into the field has also been a contribution. In addition, increasing library-university press collaboration has helped both partners think a bit harder about what constitutes success.

ATG: Where do these libraries get funding for their publication efforts? What are their main sources of financial support? How would you rate the support of campus stakeholders for the role of library as publisher?

AO & AH: Unless things have changed mightily since our survey, the leading form of support is the library budget itself. It’s not entirely clear what this means in terms of sustainability, but time will tell. As we noted earlier, support also sometimes comes from the home institution (outside the library budget), grants, and other parties involved in a particular publication. Rarely, but occasionally, there are end-user payments.

ATG: According to your findings only about 11% of the libraries you surveyed spend money on marketing. How do they get the word out about their publications?

AO: This seems to be the greatest weakness of libraries where they act as stand-alone publishers. We don’t know much about marketing channels, we’re not budgeted for marketing, and many don’t even think marketing matters — for in an age when you make your documents discoverable, won’t people just find what they need? One hears this a lot. And coming from librarians, who know just how important and tricky library discovery is, it’s a kind of incomprehensible position!

ATG: Are library publishers having a discernible impact on spreading the open access movement? If so, in what ways?

AO & AH: It’s very hard to say. There’s probably some impact, given how prevalent the commitment to open access runs, but libraries generally have not been pulling journals (or books) from publishers with subscriber or end-user pays models. They’ve been more focused on smaller, often new journals, frequently with a tie to the local institution. It’s not clear how many of those — especially new ventures — would
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PROFESSIONAL CAREER AND ACTIVITIES: Initially serials librarianship (Simon Fraser University, Canada), then worked for ARL (Washington, DC); Yale; and now CRL. Also an Associate for INASP (UK).

IN MY SPARE TIME: Adore and pursue fine dark chocolate and cupcakes.

FAVORITE BOOKS: For light reading, mysteries by Donna Leon and Andrea Camilleri.

PET PEEVES: Listening to people speaking loudly into their cell phones in public places.

PHILOSOPHY: So much to accomplish, not enough time!

MOST MEMORABLE CAREER ACHIEVEMENT: At ARL in 1991, hosting the first ever invitational meeting to bring together editors of the new online scholarly and scientific journals where there weren’t many of them in the world: we knew this would become big. As I like to say, “And all 9 of them came!”

GOAL I HOPE TO ACHIEVE FIVE YEARS FROM NOW: To be working on issues that haven’t quite emerged already.

HOW/WHERE DO I SEE THE INDUSTRY IN FIVE YEARS: I hope we will have moved on from needing to talk endlessly about open access — there will be enough business models in place to ever increase openness. We will be focused on active, measurable support for research and student learning. We will be operating more successfully on collaborations “at scale,” for example, by engaging in cooperative collection development (led by players such as Hathi), by creating viable print storage and service capabilities at a whole new level; by partnering (across sectors) to develop legal constructs for sharing, services that will obviate Scihub and other questionable information sources.
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sally available, probably mostly through the institutional repository path. The influence on pricing has been minimal to zero, but the exploration into new ways of publishing and testing of new business models has been highly useful. Getting more librarians conversant with how publishing works and introducing new ideas into the field has also been a contribution. In addition, increasing library-university press collaboration has helped both partners think a bit harder about what constitutes success.

ATG: According to your findings only about 11% of the libraries you surveyed spend money on marketing. How do they get the word out about their publications?

AO & AH: Unless things have changed mightily since our survey, the leading form of support is the library budget itself. It’s not entirely clear what this means in terms of sustainability, but time will tell. As we noted earlier, support also sometimes comes from the home institution (outside the library budget), grants, and other parties involved in a particular publication. Rarely, but occasionally, there are end-user payments.

ATG: According to your findings only about 11% of the libraries you surveyed spend money on marketing. How do they get the word out about their publications?

AO: This seems to be the greatest weakness of libraries where they act as stand-alone publishers. We don’t know much about marketing channels, we’re not budgeted for marketing, and many don’t even think marketing matters — for in an age when you make your documents discoverable, won’t people just find what they need? One hears this a lot. And coming from librarians, who know just how important and tricky library discovery is, it’s a kind of incomprehensible position!

ATG: Are library publishers having a discernible impact on spreading the open access movement? If so, in what ways?

AO & AH: It’s very hard to say. There’s probably some impact, given how prevalent the commitment to open access runs, but libraries generally have not been pulling journals (or books) from publishers with subscriber or end-user pays models. They’ve been more focused on smaller, often new journals, frequently with a tie to the local institution. It’s not clear how many of those — especially new ventures — would

continued on page 43
Interview — Okerson and Holzman
from page 42

have gone to publishers charging end-users. On the other hand, our definition of library publishing included institutional repositories and perhaps in the long run these will help increase open access.

ATG: As you mention in your study, some library publishing initiatives have “faded away without marked success.” What lessons can libraries aspiring to developing a publishing program learn from them?

AO & AH: Several. When the failure involves money, there’s often a discovery that the costs involved in quality publishing, while not necessarily large, are real and persistent. Sometimes the depletion of initial funding without sufficient planning for subsequent cost recovery has led to hard lessons learned for the next project. Other than the financial, there can be lessons learned about the difficulty in maintaining editorial excellence when engaged in projects that usually involve parties outside the library. There have been lessons about what authors need from a project if they’re to be successful in their pursuit of career advancement. One very big lesson that has clearly been learned is the need for community, a sharing of what works and what doesn’t among a larger group than just one library. The Library Publishing Coalition, dedicated as it is to specifically library publishing, is evidence of that.

ATG: What was the most surprising thing that you discovered in the course of your research?

AO: I was surprised that libraries were players in publishing starting many years ago, and that (according to the LPC Directory) so many institutional repositories run with what appear to be very limited resources — i.e., how inexpensively this can be done.

AH: I was quite surprised to learn that a significant number of the people who responded to our survey expressed a preference that a project shut down rather than impose even a modest end user fee. The breadth of library publishing across subjects and formats was surprising and impressive.

ATG: Where do you see library publishing in five years? Ten years?

AO & AH: Our remit didn’t cover future-telling! As we learned from a review of the professionalization of university presses (and how much elapsed time that took), it will take time for library publishing to find its spot in the eco-system, though with the rise of the LPC, there is early on a fostering organization. I don’t think we will have a definitive answer in five to ten years. This is a very diverse space in which, for some time, we will find many flowers blooming — that would be a good outcome. If the energy around this area fades or is absorbed by other players in publishing, that would be less fortunate. In any event, there will likely be a range of outcomes.

ATG: On a more personal note, what do you all do to relax and get ready to write the next award winning study?

AO: I track down some great dark chocolate or cupcakes (Charleston is one of the places where you can do exactly this) and curl up with the latest Inspector Montalbano (Andrea Camilleri) or Inspector Brunetti (Donna Leon) mysteries! Next best thing to being in Italy!

AH: I’m with Ann on the chocolate and cupcakes! And on meetings like Charleston and others. Anybody who knows me knows I use baseball as relaxation therapy and a place for engaging in conversation with friends and colleagues. But my greatest source of relaxation and inspiration is watching my great nieces working and playing so passionately as they discover their world.
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**ATG:** Yoav, your new Total Boox venture is based on a fascinating concept but why the name Total Boox? What's the reason/inspiration for the name?

**YL:** My original thought was to turn things around. To create books that are not permissive and forthcoming, always happy to open up and offer their treasures to anyone. I imagined a family of books that would unveil their secrets only under their own very specific and very demanding conditions. The plan was to use all the sensors available on smart phones and tablets to turn reading a book into an adventure, and the aspiring reader should gear up for a total experience that would take him places and make him do things he knows little about. There are many examples. Some portions of the book can only be read between 5:30 and 6:00 in the morning, while facing east; a chapter opens up only when you are sitting on a specific bench in a specific park; some parts can only be read backwards; some words are covered and are only revealed when you are moving at a speed of over 60 miles an hour, etc. In other words, if you wish to read the book you better obey it, and you may find yourself hopping up and down reciting a poem in Latin in order to be able to read the whole book. Maybe not a mass market product, but definitely a first.

Total Boox started off as an attempt to make book reading a “total” experience. Hence the name.

As I was contemplating the right business model for this concept (should we reverse the charges as well, and simply penalize those who try to skip the hard parts?), it dawned on me that the whole business model used in eBooks is flawed from the core. Wrong, unnecessary and harmful.

Books are supposed to instigate reading. They have no value if they are not read. The need to purchase them prior to reading them was essential only since the “container,” the pages and covers, and the massive organization needed to move the “containers” around, had real costs. But now these containers are gone, no transportation or warehousing is necessary. We can finally make availability a non-issue, and deploy the model of paying for value received. Paying for reading.

**ATG:** It appears that your original concept of creating “a family of books that would unveil their secrets only under their own very specific and very demanding conditions” is no longer part of the Total Boox model.

**YL:** Yes, you are right, the original concept for Total Boox was abandoned long ago. It just seemed so small and local in relation to the major revolution at hand.

**ATG:** After flirting with the idea of marketing Total Boox to individual readers you’ve decided to make libraries your primary market. What led to that decision?

**YL:** It started off in a chance meeting at BEA, and gradually I realized that the models by which eBooks are served to public libraries are absurd. When a book is a file, its inconceivable that if one person is reading the book, another one is denied it, and that a book is snatched away from you after a set time, regardless of your own volition. Add to that the high cost of digital books, and the need of librarians to “gamble,” and guess beforehand what books their patrons would likely read. It seemed then, and seems today, that the value we bring to libraries is so substantial, that it makes sense to move the company in that direction.

That said, we are going against the grain of library routines, and defy much of the historical thinking in libraries.

• Librarians do not have to pick and choose. All our books are always available to all.
• Books move only one way. From the library to the patron. They never move back.
• When a patron checks out a book, he/she can keep it. It never goes away. Or as we like to phrase it: “Download them all. Keep them forever.”
• The focus is on “reading” not on “lending.” Circulation is a secondary parameter. We place value on “patron-engagement” and actual reading.
• Payment is based on the true value received by the community, and not on the purchasing decisions made by librarians. If books have not been checked out, or not been read, no money changes hands.

**ATG:** And it seems that public libraries are your main focus. Can you tell us which libraries are your biggest customers? Are there plans to expand into the academic library market?

**YL:** We have a varied list of clients, from large to small, urban to rural, rich or poor, e.g., Westchester County Libraries in New York, San Jose and Palo Alto in California, Brazoria County in Texas, and the State Library of Kansas that bought the service for all its residents.

We have recently signed an agreement with the Tocker Foundation that focuses on helping small and rural libraries in Texas. They chose us to provide eBooks to twenty libraries, and each library will get our full collection, with a retail value of $2.5 million, and all the benefits of our service. This is a big step towards closing the digital divide. A teenager in rural Texas will have access to a collection identical to a teenager in Palo Alto. We also help the accessibility issue since people without internet access at home can load their devices with books when online, and keep reading when offline.

Our model makes a lot of sense in Academic libraries, and we would eventually address academic libraries as well.

**ATG:** Who do you see as you key competitors?

**YL:** In the library world we compete with the main eBook vendors. In the general market we compete with Amazon, iBooks and the such.

**ATG:** You call your model “incremental purchasing” and that it’s not pay-per-use but more like purchase-as-you-read. They sound very similar, what is the difference?

**YL:** In the pay-per-use you are paying as you go along, but not creating any asset for yourself. In our model “what you read is what you own.” That is, if you read a page and pay for it, next time you read the same page you are not charged. So if a patron checks out a cookbook, and uses only one recipe, but uses it often, the library is only charged for the first time. From then on the patron has the right to read the same recipe again and again free of charge.

**ATG:** Total Boox employs a concept called “crowd curating.” Can you explain what that is? Are users required to participate and share their “reading shelves?”

**YL:** There are lots of books out there, and even more when our model is deployed. You need all the help you can get to discover the books that would truly engage you. So we built a system where anyone can create a short-list of
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books, per subject, per event, or just personal choices, and house that list in a “shelf.” Then any reader can simply add the whole shelf, with all the books in it, to their library, and readers build their personal library by adding quality collections others have created. These “shelves” created by specialists, librarians, readers, teachers or other, e.g., the State Library of Kansas is using a shelf called Happy Gardeners, with nine quality gardening books to promote gardening http://kslib.info/128/Digital-Book-eLending.

ATG: You say that in order to charge the user fairly, and pay the publishers and authors fairly, your incremental purchasing model requires that you monitor what everyone is reading. That will raise some privacy red flags for librarians. Your response?

YL: The issue of privacy is often raised by libraries, and rightly so. Reading is an intimate, revealing activity, and many people would not like others to know what they are reading. We take this issue very seriously in Total Boox, and all personal information in not accessible at all. True, in order to provide the service we have to monitor what people are reading. We need it in order to charge the libraries and pay the publishers fairly, and to maintain the quality of service. If a patron buys a new device the experience is seamless. We duplicate the full personal library, and also avoid charging for parts already paid for. We only provide librarians and publishers with aggregate information, e.g., the number of people reading a book, how much has been read, etc., and any personal information is totally blocked.

ATG: Assuming that you can ensure privacy, you are still accumulating a lot of data and related information. What are your plans for its use? Will you sell it to other vendors? Use it to improve services to you readers?

YL: We are not selling and will not sell any personal information to anyone. We are in the process of building a personal recommendation system based on the reading done by every reader, and the level of engagement that occurs between readers and books. Once fully deployed it will provide superior personal reading suggestions, that together with our friction-free immediate-availability approach will establish a new standard for the industry.

ATG: You’ve said that “ownership” of eBooks has become an issue of some contention between publishers and libraries. How does Total Boox address that contention? Do libraries own, subscribe to, or license content from Total Boox? Or are we talking about something else entirely?

YL: In the digital sphere the meaning of “ownership” is very confusing. It actually relates to certain types of licenses. If you buy an eBook on Kindle you cannot give it or lend it. But you still own it. If a library buys an eBook from a publisher they’d call it “ownership” just because the publisher doesn’t have the right to take it back, but still the library has to abide with “one-user-one-copy” etc. It is within reason to call “ownership” a situation where you are free to use something exactly the way you want to, and there are no limitations on how and when you can use it. In that sense the full catalog we provide libraries, now about 100,000 titles, is actually owned by the library, since the library can provide it to all its patrons, with no one-user-one-copy or any other limitation. Moreover, the books never disappear from the patrons’ devices which adds to the notion of “ownership.”

In our dialog with libraries we avoid the term “ownership” as it is far too unclear. We provide the service on an annual basis to the library, and the libraries can choose between two different modes. Many libraries fear that with our model patrons will read “through the roof,” and they will end up going over budget. For these libraries we provide a cap, and take the risk of “reading through the roof” on ourselves. With other libraries we just bill them monthly for the reading done by their patrons.

It’s important to note that paying for reading is extremely cost effective, and in general the cost of reading is only a small fraction of the price of the full collection.

ATG: How are publishers and authors reacting to your concept? How many books are currently available in Total Boox? How many publishers are represented? Are any of the “Big Five” participating yet?

YL: Publishers feel they are not realizing their full potential with libraries. They look at their extensive lists of books, and notice that not more than 5% of the eBooks they can offer are ever bought by libraries, as libraries tend to spend most of their eBook budgets on a limited number of expensive best-sellers. So the publishers see us as a unique and potent channel for exposing their full lists to patrons, and providing the chance to be discovered and read to each and every title on offer.

Total Boox has around 100,000 titles, coming from over 250 publishers, and covering a very diverse array of subjects. We grow the content through a live dialog with librarians, and try to supply the types of books librarians feel the communities are interested in. At the moment we work only with established publishers, among them some well known names as Workman, O’Reilly, Sourcebooks, Elsevier, Oxford University Press, F+W Media, Hay House Publications, and many, many more.

We are in constant discussion with one or the other of the big five, and they eye us with great interest. It’s difficult to guess which one will be the first to work with us.

ATG: How do you determine the pricing for your purchase-as-you-read model? If a library is interested in Total Boox, what will it cost them? Can you tell us how many libraries currently have Total Boox?

YL: We do a wise guesstimate of what the library’s patrons will be reading in a year. Its based on the number of active card holders, the current number of “digitarians” (patrons actively reading eBooks) and on our experience with other libraries. It’s always a surprisingly low figure given the breadth of our selection and the freedom of use. We then cap the library’s expense at this amount, and if patrons read over that it’s our problem, and we pay the publishers for the extra reading done.

ATG: Being the driving force behind an innovative start up like Total Boox must be exciting, but also draining. How do you recharge your batteries? What fun activities continued on page 46
I’ve dabbled in, and recently I read some military history, and an extremely effective I’ve dabbled in, and recently I read some increased the subjects and types of books old, but I can get easily immersed in more or less anything. In fact, Total Boox has greatly bit more order in my mind, and the priorities, has on the mind the effect of reformatting the a dance with the wind and the waves, and out in almost all weather, day and night. It’s suspicious glances we get elsewhere. patrons and librarians, that it quickly balances way. As you can imagine libraries are not potent energy source.

There is no shortage of hardships on this way. As you can imagine libraries are not quick to embrace newcomers, especially those branded “vendors.” On the other hand we often receive such warm and heartfelt thanks from patrons and librarians, that it quickly balances the suspicious glances we get elsewhere.

I love the sea and my sea-kayak, and I go out in almost all weather, day and night. It’s a dance with the wind and the waves, and has on the mind the effect of reformatting the hard disk. When I’m back on shore there’s a bit more order in my mind, and the priorities, both practical and philosophical, are more correctly placed.

I read mostly literary fiction, both new and old, but I can get easily immersed in more or less anything. In fact, Totol Boox has greatly increased the subjects and types of books I’ve dabbled in, and recently I read some military history, and an extremely effective diet book.

I n 2015, the Charleston Conference presented several well-received panels about startups, innovation, and entrepreneurship. For 2016, the Conference will seek to expand on those themes and that spirit by actively encouraging creative solutions in academic libraries. In an exciting new and experimental session called CHARLESTON FAST PITCH, 3-5 applicants, thoughtfully pre-selected from among all those who respond to a CALL (soon to be issued), will “pitch” their ideas to the entire audience and a select group of judges. TWO proposals will be awarded, one by the judges and one from audience votes. This CALL will be open to all who have interesting, useful, and implementable ideas for change and improvement in their own workplaces and seek a community “vote of confidence” plus a small financial award ($2500 each) to seed their proposals. Immense thanks to Steve Goodall and the Goodall Family Foundation for funding the 2016 prizes in this new Charleston Conference Feature. For further information, contact Ann Okerson <aokerson@gmail.com> or Katina Strauch <kstrauh@comcast.net>. continued on page 78
American Governance (2016, 9780028662497, $700) is a major five-volume set recently published by Macmillan Reference USA. Edited by Stephen Schechter, this encyclopedia includes 737 entries authored by 414 scholars that treat a broad swath of topics and issues related to a research topic that most academic libraries support.

The coverage here is comprehensive and includes articles that discuss key concepts and principles ranging from the meaning of government and self-governance to power, justice and equality, as well as articles that focus on legal foundations like constitutionalism and judicial review, not to mention those covering specific laws and landmark legal cases. The ways Americans govern themselves are explored in entries ranging from those on citizenship and civic duty to those dealing with voting behavior, interest groups, dissent, political parties, and specific governing bodies. A lot of attention is also paid to other nuts and bolts issues including the various parts of the policy making process, diverse policy types, intergovernmental relations, and the role of lobbying. In addition, there are a number of biographical entries, not to mention articles, covering institutions ranging from local boards of education to the Congressional Budget Office to the Electoral College.

The entries are well written and thorough, providing researchers clear explanations and useful analysis of the topics being covered. They can vary in length from 250 word definitions to involved 7,000 word essays that cover major concepts, events, or fields of study germane to American governance. Aside from providing pertinent information about the topic, each entry has “see also” references and a valuable bibliography which will prove useful for further research. A thematic outlining consists of 66 categories organizes the various topics providing not only a useful browsing aid but also an excellent overview of the coverage. Black and white photos and illustrations are interspersed throughout all the volumes. Other added value features include a list of relevant websites, a short collection of primary “foundational” documents, and both a helpful subject index as well as an index of the legal cases covered.

American Governance is a thoughtful, comprehensive, and well designed reference work that students and researchers will find of real value. As one examines this set, the overall impression is one of serious scholarship having lasting merit. Welcome attention is paid to the intellectual underpinnings of American governance and the constitutional and legal framework within which it exists as well as the numerous institutions and processes that enable it to function. Academic libraries supporting classes in political science, governmental studies, and public administration will find this set particularly worthwhile. At a time where one and two volume reference works seem to dominate the landscape, it is refreshing to see such a well designed, scholarly, multi-volume treatment of a highly studied topic. The eBook version is available via the Gale Virtual Reference Library platform: e-ISBN: 9780028662558.

A Guide to Intra-state Wars: An Examination of Civil, Regional, and Intercommunal Wars, 1816-2014 (2015, 9780872897755, $175) is a single-volume work from CQ Press that profiles some 400 intra-state wars that have occurred in regions throughout the world. An outgrowth of the Correlates of War Project, the longest running research program in the study of international relations, it is edited by scholars Jeffrey Dixon and Meredith Reid Sarkees and springs from the perceived need for the systematic, scientific study of war. The editors lay the ground work for this volume with the first two chapters in which they describe the COW project and explain how they distinguish among civil, regional, and inter-communal wars and why these conflicts are relevant. There is also a discussion of the data sets and coding used for the statistics cited. The remaining six chapters are devoted to coverage of intra-state wars in North America, South America, Europe, the Middle East and North Africa, Asia and Oceania and Sub-Saharan Africa. Each entry is structured in a similar fashion and starts with basic facts like the participants, dates, number of deaths, the initiator, the outcome, the type war, and the total number of military personnel followed by the numbers engaged in the actual theater of war. However, the bulk of each entry consists of a description of the antecedents or events leading to the conflict, a narrative about the war itself, and a discussion of its termination and outcome. Given the scholarly concern for data in this type research, the coding decisions that led to the statistics quoted are also described. Each entry ends with a list of the sources referenced by author which refers to an impressive bibliography in the back. The entries are thorough and detailed with factual accounts and relevant data. There is also a chronology including all of the wars covered and a useful general index.

Given that far more attention has been paid to inter-state and great power wars, many of the conflicts covered in A Guide to Intra-state Wars are obscure. However, as this reference makes clear, these wars play a vital role in telling the history of global conflict over the last two centuries. Editors Dixon and Sarkees have done an important service in gathering relevant facts about these conflicts and putting them in one handy and easy to navigate volume. The care and attention to relevant facts and data is also obvious and adds a welcome scholarly dimension to each entry. Most academic libraries will welcome a copy in either reference or circulation depending on need. The electronic version is available on the Sage Knowledge platform: e-ISBN: 9781452234205.


Using the tried and true format established for the series, 40 primary sources are considered, which in this case include speeches, laws, letters, religious sermons, and excerpts from legal cases. All or part of the document is contained in the entry supported with a critical essay that includes an overview, a biography of the sources’ author, a document analysis, the key themes, and a discussion of the defining moment leading to the creation of the document. As you might expect, documents dealing with African American civil rights are the most numerous but other minorities are given deserved attention including Women, Latinos, Gays, and Native Americans.

As with other titles in this series, each essay provides a clear and relevant discussion that will be helpful to students in understanding the context of the document and its importance, as well as a list of resources for further research.
The Encyclopedia of War Journalism 1807–2015 (2015, ISBN: 9781619257540, $165) is the third edition of a title that was originally published in 1997 as the Historical Dictionary of War Journalism by Greenwood Press. This most recent edition is published by Grey House Publishing, but as all prior editions it is authored by Mitchel P. Roth. Many of the entries have been updated and revised and there are some 200 more entries than in the 2nd edition for a total of more than 1,100.

The vast majority of entries are biographical and cover correspondents, illustrators and photographers. Each of these entries includes birth and death dates (when appropriate), as well as the pertinent facts about each individual’s career and contribution. Considering that thousands of people have reported on wars in the last 200 years, coverage is selective and includes only those reporting on significant conflicts from the frontlines. In addition, they must have been affiliated with a newspaper, magazine, radio, television, or digital news source. Although many of the journalists covered are from the United States and Britain there is representation from a number of other countries. Along with these biographical entries, there are entries on individual publicists and publishers, news organizations, relevant journalistic awards and prizes and the actual conflicts being covered. The articles are brief and straightforward, offering basic but useful information. Each entry has a short list of references of one or two entries that in the case of better known journalists could be more expansive. Cross references are indicated with an asterisk within the text. Supplementing and supporting the entries is a list of primary documents and photographs arranged by the wars covered including conflicts ranging from the Crimean War to the American Civil War and from the Boer War to the Wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. There is also a chronology as well as a series of appendices that list all the correspondents by the wars that they covered. A collected bibliography and a general index round out the volume.

The Encyclopedia of War Journalism 1807–2015 is a one-volume reference that offers up-to-date coverage of a sometimes obscure, but nonetheless important topic. It gathers together relevant biographical facts about both well and lesser known war journalists and combines those facts with coverage of other important and related topics to offer a handy and useful background source for students doing research in the area. It is one of those titles that could easily find a place in either reference or circulating collections. It is also available as an eBook (eISBN: 9781619257547). For a list of eBook vendors see: http://www.greyhouse.com/ebooks.htm.

Extra Servings
• BowArrow Publishing has published the third edition of Tiller’s Guide to Indian Country: Economic Profiles of American Indian Reservations as an eBook in PDF. (2015, ISBN: 9781885931061, $325) Compiled by Dr. Veronica E. Velarde Tiller, noted historian and member of the Jicarilla Apache Nation, this reference “profiles 567 federally recognized Indian tribes from Maine to San Diego County, from Alaska to the Everglades, and includes brief accounts of the history and culture of each, with detailed information regarding their economies, infrastructure, resources, enterprises, labor forces, populations, size and characteristics of their reservations, as well as hard-to-obtain contact information…” (For further information go to www.veronicatiller.com.)

• Macmillan Reference USA is releasing some newer titles:
  • Mathematics (2016, ISBN: 9780028663777, $725) is the 2nd Edition of a reference first published in 2002. It is a four-volume work offering a full-color update that “explains concepts, provides a historical overview, and explores careers in the field. Written for middle school/high school students, as well as non-math-major undergraduates, Mathematics contains some 300 entries that cover the basics of algebra, geometry and trigonometry, with the goal of making these topics more accessible and interesting. Readers will see the uses and effects of math in daily life, while short biographies highlight notable mathematicians. Thirty percent of the content is new to this edition, highlighting advances in mathematics since 2000…”
  • The College Blue Book, 43rd Edition (2016, ISBN: 9780028663135, $660) is a four-volume set that provides “a comprehensive guide covering more than 12,000 academic institutions, programs, business opportunities, and distance learning programs. The College Blue Book also features information on obtaining financial assistance for pursuing postsecondary education…”
  • The CQ Press Guide to Radical Politics in the United States (April 2016, ISBN: 9781452292274) provides an overview of radical U.S. political movements on both the left and the right sides of the ideological spectrum. It focuses on analyzing the origins and trajectory of the various movements, and the impact that movement ideas and activities have had on mainstream American politics. This guide is organized thematically, with each chapter focusing on a prominent arena of radical activism in the United States…
  • The CQ Press Guide to Urban Politics and Policy in the United States (Mar. 2016, ISBN: 9781452292274) provides an overview of urban politics and policies on both the local and state levels, focusing on topics such as public transportation, housing, education, and public safety. It is intended for students, policy makers, and the general public who want to understand the challenges and opportunities facing urban areas today.

SAGE Publishing and CQ Press have some new and forthcoming titles that deserve attention:
• The Sage Encyclopedia of Marriage, Family, and Couples Counseling (Oct. 2016, ISBN: 9781483318356, $650) is a new, four-volume set intended “for researchers seeking to broaden their knowledge of this vast and diffuse field…this authoritative Encyclopedia provides readers with a fully comprehensive and accessible reference to aid in understanding the full scope and diversity of theories, approaches and techniques and how they address various life events within the unique dynamics of families, couples and related interpersonal relationships…”
• The Sage Encyclopedia of On-line Education (Oct. 2016, ISBN: 9781483318356, $495) is a three-volume set that “provides a thorough and engaging reference on all aspects of this field, from the theoretical dimensions of teaching online to the technological aspects of implementing online courses—with a central focus on the effective education of students…”
• The Critical Survey of American Literature (Nov. 2016, ISBN: 9781682171728, $499; eISBN: 9781682171479, $499) was “previously published as Magill’s Survey of American Literature in 2006, it offers detailed profiles of major American authors of fiction, drama, and poetry, each with sections on biography, general analysis, and analysis of the author’s most important works. This new edition features over 100 new entries focusing on contemporary American authors at the core of literary studies…”
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When I studied dance theory and history in college, the professor assigned the task of building an anthology of dance works by the choreographers who helped shape the dance of the twentieth century. While there was a great deal of information available regarding individuals’ biographical details, choreography, personal aesthetic, cultural data, and responses to their works (reviews, etc.), in order to complete the assignment we needed to see the dances. So we watched recordings of the dances on reel-to-reel, U-matic, Beta disc, VHS, and yes, even some on LaserDisc (DVDs hadn’t been produced yet). Later, as a graduate student and scholar, I conducted close readings (exegeses) of danced texts, which required the ability to stop, slow up, view and re-view all or portions of a recorded work. At that time my needs were met by the institutions’ libraries. Then, when I started working in an academic library as a drama and dance librarian, I began conducting collection assessments. Through experience I knew what texts best supported research and theoretical courses, yet as I delved into the holdings, I noticed that a large portion of what would constitute a good dance collection was missing; that is, the visual component. For no matter how comprehensive a collection might be in terms of written texts, dance is a visual art, and thus it is imperative that scholars, researchers, and students have access to a breadth of dance works in a visual medium, the moving texts. And, although I had been fortunate that the universities where I studied held fairly large collections, I realized as a librarian that research can be restricted by a lack of holdings in visual materials.

Providing access to visual representations of dance works, however, is not as simple as adding videos to a collection. Several factors impact the value of a visual collection. As with written texts, the academic focus of the dance curriculum will drive the selection process for visual media. An undergraduate department with a conservatory approach will perhaps need more instructional videos on technique in the department’s focused genres (e.g., ballet, jazz, modern). A department that concentrates on dance history and theory (especially in graduate studies) will require examples of choreography from not only the well-known choreographers and dancers but also those whose work might not be commercially available. And, as many libraries depend upon approval plans for purchasing materials, which do not take into account the genre or context of the visual material, the automatic purchase of video may not match the requirements of the academic department. Streaming services, such as Alexander Street Press, may not comprehensively support course content either, as a breadth of material does not necessarily mean the content is of value to a particular course. For example, in the case of the Alexander Street Press database Dance in Video, a preponderance of the content is geared toward ballet (25 percent), which will not support a dance history course focused on twentieth century modern dance.

Then, too, once selections are made, the purchase of visual material may present a challenge due to availability. Many commercially available videos are not included in conventional distributors’ approval plans, and some libraries are not able to purchase directly from vendors such as Amazon or Dance Books. So, too, might a database be cost prohibitive, and decisions should be made as to a lease option or a purchase. (Full disclosure: at one institution I recommended purchasing Dance in Video, while at another we opted for a leased site license.)

Costs aside, at least with the Alexander Street Press databases librarians and users can feel assured that the material has been vetted. The same can also be said for collections held by individual repositories or archives such as Jacob’s Pillow Dance Interactive, the New York Public Library’s Jerome Robbins Dance Division - Audio and Moving Image, the Dance Heritage Coalition’s Online Exhibition of the Dance Treasures, and the Dance Notation Bureau Online Digital Archive. For those interested in dance ethnography or anthropological video, the Ethnographic Video for Instruction & Analysis (EVIA) Digital Archive project contains materials uploaded by scholars, often from anthropological field work. It is not open access, but there is a request process for access, and the materials are selected by an editorial committee. The same cannot be said of YouTube or Vimeo, frequent go-to websites for students and scholars alike. I often speak regarding the many and various instantiations/versions of a work, and use examples of The Dying Swan I collected on YouTube. Although there is a copy of Mikhail Fokine’s original version danced by Anna Pavlova in those twenty examples, there are many alternate versions of choreography (not Fokine’s) and dancers (not Pavlova), as well as an anime version that is actually Swan Lake, not The Dying Swan. Further, in most of these cases, there is no information regarding provenance. In fact, one must search for any hint of provenance; for example, in the Fokine/Pavlova clip it is through the public comments that viewers can find details on the ballet’s premier date and likely film date. And one should always question whether user-generated information is correct. While metadata may be lacking and provenance unclear, YouTube and Vimeo do offer convenience, speed, and accessibility often missing in the subscription services and archival repositories (in part due to dissimilar approaches regarding copyright concerns). That said, there are examples of dances posted to YouTube by the curated archives mentioned, especially reconstructions from Labanotation uploaded by the Dance Notation Bureau. Proper vetting of streamed content then, is required.

Another issue with these streaming databases is the abbreviated lengths of the dance works, as only one- to two-minute clips — often taken out of context — are available, and many are locked due to copyright and fair use issues. So, too, is that aforementioned need to slow down, rewind, and replay portions of a moving text in order to provide analysis, functions not always offered by the databases. Some do, however, offer a means of previewing a work so that a determination can be made as to acquiring a full-length version for a collection either through purchase or ILL.

Staying abreast of the most recent materials can present a challenge as there is, as yet, no equivalent to Books in Print or Choice for video and other visual media. One small database with reviews of audio/visual material does exist, Educational Media Reviews Online, but it includes fewer than 100 reviews of dance videos, doesn’t contain
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2016, ISBN: 9781483350035, $185) uses “the CQ Press reference guide approach” to “help students understand how American cities (from old to new) have developed over time (Part I), how the various city governance structures allocate power across city officials and agencies (Part II), how civic and social forces interact with the organs of city government and organize to win control over these organs and/or their policy outputs (Part III), and what patterns of public goods and services cities produce for their residents (Part IV).”
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the most recent releases, and doesn’t have a representative collection for dance. It is, however, open access, which is a plus. A new bibliographic database hosted by the Library of Congress (LOC), Tap Dance in America, is based on over twenty-five years of research by dance scholar Constance Valis Hill and includes information on the performance medium that can help in selection and procurement decisions (as well as adding a wealth of documentation). Still, as helpful as it may be, there are no links to any digital video materials, and locating copies of the moving texts themselves, many of which are historical, may require a great deal of detective work. As RCL editor for Dance I not only rely on my subject matter expertise as a scholar, but I also reach out to colleagues in various subdisciplines for recommendations, especially those in ethnographic studies and/or genres with which I am less familiar (e.g., Bharatanatyam, African styles, tap). So, too, I use listservs and social media; I discovered the LOC tap bibliography through Facebook!

A final challenge with visual material in dance is the metadata provided by websites, databases, and the OPAC, which in turn affects my ability to provide RCL users with the bibliographic information necessary for acquiring materials. For example, even commercially available videos do not always have ISBN numbers, and although I try to provide OCLC numbers, by doing so I am falling into the restriction dilemma I mentioned earlier, for this limits selection by virtue of the material/item having an OCLC number. As for streaming websites, I can only hope that they contain a URL that is a persistent link, so that RCL users can find them and circumvent a catalog maintenance nightmare. Production data such as dance title, publisher, and publication date can offer some assistance to users hoping to locate visual materials, but other metadata elements are at times more difficult to find and add.

Individual choreographers, performers, dates of original performance, date of performance captured on video, performance space, set costume/light designers, composers, specific dances included on a video, alternate versions (new editions or a completely new version, as in the case of The Dying Swan): all of these elements and more are important to the study of dance. In fact, I believe that dance is one discipline that could use a FRBR-like concept to improve cataloging and metadata records.

With these and other challenges inherent in the inclusion of visual/moving texts in a dance collection, it might seem futile to try. But try we must, for as librarians we are in a position to provide infrastructure support for our constituents, even those who study the ephemeral art of dance. And as interactive databases, websites, digital materials, and other media enter into the mainstream of academic study in the sciences, arts, and humanities, tackling the challenges with video will help us as we move into the virtual library of the future.

Booklover — Off-Broadway

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

When rewinding on some previous columns, I realized that “a little gem of a used book” is my routine description for “Great stories by Nobel Prize Winners” that I purchased from a second hand bookstore a while back. And it is. I come back to it often and each time I am intrigued. A Man of Letters by François Mauriac caught my attention and I begin to read. There is a bibliographic forward prior to each story. This one italicized paragraph is dense with information. As I learned about Mauriac — born in Bordeaux in 1885; considered a leading Catholic novelist of his century; served in World War I; awarded the Nobel Prize in 1952; and wrote a play that appeared off-Broadway to successful reviews in 1958. Wait, off-Broadway productions?

I am also currently reading Alexander Hamilton by Ron Chernow — the novel that was the inspiration for Lin-Manuel Miranda’s sensational off-Broadway and now Broadway musical “Hamilton: An American Musical.” One of the principals in the show is Marie Joseph Paul Yves Roche Gilbert du Motier, Marquis de Lafayette, or simply Lafayette. He and Alexander Hamilton had some similarities in their respective timelines prior to when they met at that tumultuous point in American history and they established a close bond during the American Revolution. If you are unfamiliar with the musical sensation “Hamilton,” the entire performance is presented in rap and brilliantly crafted. The simple line: “Immigrants ….. We get the job done” from the tune “Yorktown” sung by Lafayette and Hamilton is just one example of the one-point lyrics from Miranda’s libretto. Frenchmen and off-Broadway, my reading choice in Nobel literature oddly always ties into my life.

Mauriac’s story, however, is about a more elemental struggle — the one between a man and a woman. On the surface the story reads like a dime-store novel more suited for a day at the beach. A writer named Jerome; his fifteen-year paramour named Gabrielle; the affair with Berthe, the mother of sickly children; the intervention; the angst of the betrayed lover; the departure in a cab all are introduced to us by an unnamed third person, a friend whom Gabrielle not only confides in but also entices to speak with Jerome on her behalf. However, Mauriac pushes the reader a little deeper. “Some books lay on a small table, but none had been open for months. How on earth did this woman spend her evenings? No sort of reading could release her from herself; nothing her imagination prompted could prevail against what was torturing her. What creature of a poet’s fantasy could succeed, even for one minute, in distracting her from the man who had deserted and betrayed her?”

Mauriac was presented the Nobel Prize in Literature “for the deep spiritual insight and the artistic intensity with which he has in his novels penetrated the drama of human life.” A Man of Letters captures this intensity very nicely.

Author’s Note: While reading about Mauriac I stumbled upon some quotes attributed to him. This one seemed especially apropos for the booklovers among us: “Tell me what you read and I’ll tell you who you are is true enough, but I’d know you better if you told me what you reread.” — DJ

50 Against the Grain / June 2016
Column Editor’s Note: Summer is upon us once again and for those of you like me who work throughout the summer, it’s a time where we finish off projects, do our research writing, or prepare for the coming academic year. Personally, I look forward to our month-long family vacation in the Philippines in July. But before that, there is the ALA Annual Conference in June of course. Orlando is really not that bad for an ALA Annual site compared to what we’ve all gone through with Las Vegas two years ago. I’m looking forward to seeing a lot of my librarian friends and colleagues there.

Anyway, since this is our ALA Annual issue, we have all ALA publications up for review in this column. ALA Publishing is a vital part of ALA and ALA Editions continues to be the leading publisher for us in the library and information services community. I’m so impressed by the new titles that are coming my way and our all-Michigan librarian book reviewers can’t wait to share them with you. I hope you consider buying these books for your library or even for your personal use. It’s a small investment to make for our professional development and growth.

If you enjoy reading and wouldn’t mind reviewing a book or two, contact me at <gongr1@lcc.edu>. May you all have a relaxing, enjoyable summer and happy reading! — RG

Todaro, Julie. Mentoring A-Z. Chicago, IL: ALA Editions, 2015. 9780838913291. 153 pages. $58.00 (ALA members: $52.20)

Reviewed by Regina Gong (Head of Technical Services & Systems, Lansing Community College Library) <gongr1@lcc.edu>

Mentoring is an important part of everyone’s career. At one point or another, we have been mentored by people we look up to and admire. In our profession, we probably think of mentoring as only for those who are new and need to be “guided” by more seasoned librarians or those who are in leadership positions. While this is true, a growing number of mentorship programs are now focusing on those who are at the mid-point or even at the later part of their careers. After all, there is never an end to learning new things and no matter where we are in our professional careers, we can surely learn from both ends of the spectrum: from the old and the new.

Julie Todaro, dean of library services at Austin Community College in Texas and President-elect of the American Library Association (ALA), writes a concise primer on the in-and-outs of mentoring. Todaro, author of a number of books and articles on leadership, management, staff development, assessment and even disaster preparedness, takes a close look at the process of mentoring as a way of expanding, building, and enriching not only one’s career but their personal lives as well.

Chapters are brief and build upon each other. The first two chapters discuss the concept of mentoring in general; mentor and mentee roles and responsibilities; including an overview of mentoring programs in various settings (associations, schools, clubs, corporations, etc.). Succeeding chapters provide readers with ideas on designing and implementing mentorship programs in their own institutions as well as training and educating mentors and mentees to ensure successful partnerships and outcomes. The best part of the book in my opinion is the part where the pitfalls and issues are discussed. I really like that the author presents the pitfalls that may arise out of a bad mentoring relationship both on the part of the mentor or mentee. Of course, it is important that assessment and evaluation is done in order to ensure that the goals of the mentoring program meet the needs of the people involved as well as ensure that both parties benefit from the mentoring arrangement.

The only thing that I did not particularly like about the book is the scenario section that is in some of the chapters. I think it would have been better if actual case studies of successful and not so successful mentoring relationships are included instead. However, the strength of the book is in the appendices. Mentoring A-Z provides more than the usual number of appendices especially for a short publication such as this. These appendices are invaluable for those who are thinking of starting or implementing a formal mentoring program. Even more valuable are the checklist for every timeline in the mentoring process. It also includes sample correspondence, application, recommendation, and evaluation forms. Todaro takes great pains in outlining the different mentoring programs within ALA (division and roundtable level), professional organizations, state organizations, other higher education institutions, and even blogs and Websites devoted to mentoring and leadership.

Overall, this is an excellent resource on mentoring. If at all, it encourages us to consider sharing our time and talents for the betterment of ourselves and others.

Coyle, Karen. FRBR, Before and After. Chicago, IL: ALA Editions, 2016. 9780838913451. 179 pages. $50.00 (ALA members: $45.00)

Reviewed by Maurine McCourry (Technical Services Librarian, Hillsdale College, Mossey Library) <mmccourry@hillsdale.edu>

FRBR, Before and After, while at first glance somewhat outside of Coyle’s area of expertise, actually draws heavily on the author’s knowledge of systems design and information theory, placing FRBR in context with the theories on which it was built. Coyle was an active participant in the development of the technology that laid the foundation for our current catalogs, “using the data we had, not the data we would have like to have” (p.51), and thus understands very well how we got where we are, with systems that don’t play very well with others in the now very wide world of digital information. FRBR is portrayed here as an attempt to force concepts developed for use in database design onto vast quantities of data meant to be stored as print. While Coyle does not give the impression that FRBR should be abandoned as a model for the work catalogers do, she does question whether its current form does what was intended.

Coyle begins her discussion of FRBR with a detailed overview of the concept of “work” in library cataloging, covering the writing of Lubetzky, Wilson, Smiraglia, and Taniguchi. She also introduces a new theory, which she calls a “cognitive view” (p. 17) even though it draws on ideas that some might describe as more socio-cognitive, involving not just an individual’s understanding of the term, but also the way it is used in that individual’s interactions with others. Regardless of the definition of the abstraction, though, Coyle questions its relevance in cataloging as a practical matter, while acknowledging its facility in certain specialized situations, such as music.

Once this central tenet of the FRBR model is explained, Coyle addresses the model as a whole, including its place in the history of bibliographic models, the technological environment in which the model exists, and from which it developed, and the more general entity-rela- tion modelling technique on which it is built. The book goes into more
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detail than seen previously regarding the seeming lack of empirical data regarding user needs actually employed in the development of FRBR, alone making it worthy of wide reading and discussion in the profession. Coyle concludes with descriptions of some of the expansions of the FRBR model that have developed as libraries move onto the Semantic Web, including its use in RDA and in the development of BIBFRAME, and in additional models such as FRBRoo. She hopes that the book can help the library community “to move fruitfully from broad concepts to an integrative approach for bibliographic data” (p. 159). Although it is likely not to be accepted as gospel in that community, it is certainly likely to promote some debate, and hopefully also some refocusing on the user-oriented goals IFLA originally proposed to meet with FRBR.

Reale, Michelle. Becoming an Embedded Librarian: Making Connections in the Classroom. Chicago: American Library Association, 2016. 9780838913673. 128 pages. $54.00 (ALA Members: $48.60)

Reviewed by Corey Seeman (Director, Kresge Library Services, Ross School of Business, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor) <cseeman@umich.edu>

As academic librarians seek out new ways to engage with the communities they serve, one path to choose is with embedded librarianship programs. Borrowing its name from embedded journalists during the Iraq War, embedded librarians enabled a re-envisioning of our roles and responsibilities at a time when the profession was changing rapidly. Among the many different “flavors” of embedded librarianship used by academic librarians include: librarians participating in practically all classes to ensure that the information needs of students are met; librarians working within a department as opposed to their central library; or librarians focusing on supporting teams of students working on individual assignments. While the methods and the logistics might vary, all of these strategies have elements in common. First, embedded librarians serve in a dedicated role for students, allowing them to easily help students find resources needed for their course. Second, the embedded librarian typically has a good grasp of the assignment and is well situated to help students when they are in trouble. Third, the embedded librarian will typically have a good grasp of the subject matter at large. Finally, the embedded librarian has a good sense of where students are in the project, so they do not have to start every request with “In the beginning...” No matter how the program is incorporated on campus, the embedded librarianship model provides a tremendous opportunity to engage more directly with students and provide a real value to the campus community.

Given the number of options and possibilities for embedded librarian programs, having a good road map is very helpful to librarians hoping to add these services. Written by Michelle Reale, an associate professor at Arcadia University, this book provides a vision of how she has developed and refined a classroom-based embedded librarian program at Arcadia University. She talks about the program developed for the English Thesis class of 15 Arcadia seniors. Much of the book focuses on the experiences gained and gleaned from her experience. The book is well written and organized, with chapters containing individual works cited, strategies for success and bulleted final thoughts. The book chapters take you through a class, zeroing in on topics such as relationship building, communication, roles, teaching style, and the librarian as facilitator. This makes the book useful as a reference tool for someone venturing forward with a classroom-based embedded librarian program at their college, university, or community.

Reale makes it clear that there are other types of embedded librarianship programs that she is not going to focus on. The elements not addressed in the book leaves it wanting, especially for administrators who might be looking at how such a program could be incorporated at their library. While Reale showcases how her program worked, there was very little discussion about the other elements in place at the library that make the role possible. As librarians take on these time-intensive responsibilities, they potentially need to shed other work that would be assumed by colleagues in the library. Furthermore, a program for a small senior-level thesis writing class might not be scalable to meet the information needs for the university as a whole. It would have been nice to have this included in the book for librarians wishing to see the entire cost for such an endeavor. But as with any research project, multiple sources and books would need to be consulted to best evaluate the costs and benefits of bringing such a program to your library. As long as the readers see this work as being focused solely on the role and purpose of a classroom-based embedded librarian program, they will likely find it a useful work.

Vnuk, Rebecca. The Weeding Handbook: A Shelf-by-Shelf Guide. Chicago, IL: ALA Editions, 2015. 9780838913277. 196 pages. $45.00 (ALA members: $40.50)

Reviewed by Leslie D. Burke (Collection Development & Digital Integration Librarian, Kalamazoo College Library) <Leslie.Burke@kzoo.edu>

Our library is currently engaged in several space-related weeding projects so Rebecca Vnuk’s The Weeding Handbook is very timely for me. Many librarians may be familiar with Vnuk’s popular blog Shelf Renewal and her work as Editor, Reference and Collection Management with Booklist. She is a public librarian by background, but also an accomplished speaker, writer, and consultant and has received several library industry awards such as Fiction Reviewer of the Year from Library Journal, excellence in Reader’s Advisory from the Public Library Association, and was named a Library Journal Mover and Shaker.

This book is a good collection of practical ideas, some background on collection management theories, and helpful explanations for those who struggle with the concept of weeding, and how to explain it to their communities. Her introduction starts out with a funny, and probably true-to-life skit that she and some colleagues presented at the 2000 ALA Annual Conference in a workshop by Merle Jacob entitled “Weeding the Fiction Collection: Or, Should I Dump Peyton Place?” She follows that up with some of the challenges we all face with various staff and constituents about weeding and a careful explanation of how she intends this book to be used.

A unique approach that Vnuk takes in this book is the “shelf-by-shelf” guide. She admits that the book is mostly geared toward public libraries and the shelf-by-shelf breakdown is primarily related to Dewey classified collections. This approach provides guidelines on retention, replacement, and the rationale behind weeding and replacement decisions by Dewey hundred groupings (e.g., 300’s). Within each hundred break down, there are subdivisions for those Dewey categories that are more expansive and require further explanation.

Although the text focuses mainly on public libraries, Vnuk does include some details and suggestions for academic libraries as well. Academic collection managers can still glean some wisdom from this book, especially on how to create a good working policy and procedure manual for weeding tasks. I find it helpful to see an example of a continuous weeding method that would minimize those huge one-time projects which often cause misunderstandings between librarians and their users.

One whole chapter is devoted to “Weeding Gone Wrong,” which addresses the pitfalls of poor planning, questionable decision-making, badly written policies, and most importantly lack of communication with constituent populations (including library staff). An excellent addition to the book is that it is a full 103 pages — the appendix — include sample collection management plans from real libraries. Although many are from public libraries, there are a few from academic and special libraries. Following the appendix is a nice selection of further readings and some Websites that may be consulted for additional information.

I found this book to be very practical and plan to go back through it to incorporate some of the excellent suggestions Vnuk has included, as well as to revisit our collection development and management documents, especially regarding our weeding policies. Vnuk credits much of her approach to this book to a publication entitled CREW: A
Weeding Manual for Modern Libraries, created by Joseph P. Segal and Belinda Boon, of the Texas State Library and Archives (updated by Jeanette Larson). While there are other weeding texts available, this work’s shelf-by-shelf approach and inclusion of sample policies and methods make it a welcome update and addition to the literature. Those libraries that do not use Dewey classification may find ways to adapt Vnuk’s approach in their own classification schemes.

McAdoo, Monty L. The Students Survival Guide to Research. Chicago, IL: American Library Association, 2015. 9780838912768. 232 pages. $58.00 (ALA members: $52.20)

Reviewed by Susan Ponischil (Access Services Librarian, Grace Hauenstein Library, Aquinas College) <susan.ponischil@aquinas.edu>

In this digital age when students are relying heavily on Google and Wikipedia for their research, it is important for us academic librarians to help our students do “proper” research. Monty L. McAdoo, a Research and Instruction Librarian at Edinboro University of Pennsylvania, writes a clear and concise instruction manual for students trying to navigate the world of research. The tone, coverage, and layout of this book are geared towards students in that liminal state between high school and college. Compared to William Badke’s Research Strategies book, which talks about the role of research in education, McAdoo addresses the challenges of research and offers step-by-step solutions.

The chapters in this 232 paged guide are relatively short, ranging from seven to twenty-two pages. Thirty-three figures, i.e., charts, screenshots, etc. are used throughout to supplement the text. Each chapter includes tips covering things like “backup your files regularly and often”, and “if you’ve having difficulty reading or understanding an article it’s probably not a good source for you to use in your research.” At the end of each chapter are question prompts called reflections which, according to the author, are “designed to help you think more critically about yourself and the research process.” Examples range from, “is it easy or difficult for you to ask for and act on feedback?” to “click on the author’s name of one of the articles you think might be relevant” and “did you find other articles by the same author that might be relevant?”

From the outset McAdoo keeps the discussion simple. He begins by talking about what research is and what it requires. His first foray into the more practical aspects of research begins with a look at the assignment, i.e., how long does the paper have to be, what are the deadlines, and which resources will be accepted. This section also includes straightforward explanations of the inherent and relative values of term paper assessment and how they affect grades, which students will appreciate. Topic selection, the first official step in the research process in most schema, is introduced about a third of the way in. Strategies for topic exploration such as freewriting, mapping, and cubing are explored as well. In addition, simplistic rationale for determining the strengths and weaknesses of various resource types is offered. For example, the first of three bullet points under weaknesses for Web resources reads “information is often inaccurate, purposely biased, or out of date.”

Possible misconceptions when viewing results lists help to provide a more analytical way for students to think about the information they find. On the topic of plagiarism, McAdoo’s audience is clear when he states that “once you’ve committed plagiarism your instructors are likely to scrutinize your work more heavily in the future.” The last two chapters offer help getting started writing a paper with tips for managing anxiety and getting help when needed, and a sample search that begins with topic selection and ends with a brief introduction to reading and evaluating sources. Continued on page 54
Linked data continues to be one of the most discussed topics in library, archives and museum (LAM) community. While much has been said and done both in theory and practice, linked data is perceived as a viable metadata alternative by the LAM community, and to this day keeps evolving. However, how much do we know about the current state of library linked data?

Erik T. Mitchell’s *Library Linked Data, Early Activity & Development* tries to answer just that question. Published as part of the Library Technology Reports series from *ALA*, the author takes a panoramic view of linked data including linked open data landscape and the important core issues surrounding these practices.

This publication is Mitchell’s second Library Technology Report series work that deals with the topic of library linked data. In 2013, Mitchell published his first work, *on Library Linked Data, Research and Adoption*. In that publication, he takes on a similar approach by reviewing the state of linked data practices at the time. Most of that takes root on his research of the semantic Web, new bibliographic and metadata standards, library services and discovery platforms. He manages to focus on the general state and direction of metadata specifically linked open data. Fast forward to today, in writing his second publication, he revisits the same topic but with more focus on the broad trends and technologies surrounding linked data practices and implementation.

The first three chapters deal with the current state of linked data and give an overview of trends, noticeable projects, programs, and research initiatives. It also touches on the new development of linked data vocabularies, standards, as well as applied systems that are on the horizon. Throughout the chapters, the author provides a rich and well covered collection of resources and illustrative context on the major players and technologies in the current linked data landscape. In the linked data development, the author argues advancements of technology “have had dramatic influence on the direction of projects” (page 19). In the technical sphere, RDF/XML remains the metadata standard, and larger efforts are on collaboration, discussion about policy, governance, and funding.

The last chapter, which stands out as the most exciting part of this book, talks about opportunities and challenges facing library linked data. The author points out that data openness, standard compatibility and supporting system are the emerging issues. It also explores the impact of existing linked data projects and practice as well as educational opportunities. It is also insightful to read that the author discusses how we can support systems—both open source and commercial. Although I wish the author devotes more discussions on the potential roles library system creators and providers can play in linked data development. At the daily operations level, a RDF record editor or conversion tool, a triple-store, or SPARQL endpoint can help libraries become part of the linked data practices or implementation even if it is on an experimental basis.

As a busy systems librarian, I often have a hard time keeping track of new developments in linked data or because of the nature of my work, my tendency is to only concentrate on the technology side. If only for that, I appreciate reading Mitchell’s book and getting a comprehensive linked data update in a clear and concise way. Although it’s definitely a quick read, there’s a lot to ponder at the end.

Reviewed by Dao Rong Gong (Systems Librarian, Michigan State University Libraries) <gongd@msu.edu>

Despite its flippant-sounding title, *Adults Just Wanna Have Fun* is a serious book. Although it superficially has a “program cookbook” structure, this is not a title you should dip into without reading the thoughtful supporting text in which the program suggestions are embedded. Barbakoff, Adult Services Manager at the Kitsap (WA) Regional Library and one of *Library Journal’s* 2013 Movers & Shakers, makes a fairly complex case about the value of play in learning in the introductions to the book and to each section, and any program implemented without the context of this argument will likely be less effective.

*Barbakoff* cites several studies linking the inclusion of play and hands-on experimentation to better learning outcomes. For instance, one study found that undergraduates in Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics (STEM) courses were 55% more likely to fail a lecture-based class than one with even a small active learning component. While this data may help a public librarian (the book’s target audience) pitch fun adult programs to her manager or director, they are vital to academic librarians as well since academic librarians are much more likely to face resistance by staff who see programs like *Barbakoff*’s as diverting resources away from more scholarly programming that directly supports the curriculum and/or essential learning outcomes (ELOs).

These justifications will be important if you intend to implement one or more of the suggested programs from this volume. With the exception of the craft/maker programs, most require a fairly high investment of resources. Especially for larger libraries that are open many hours per week, one of the biggest challenges with implementing the splashier programs will be scheduling. Many of the included programs require at least a part of the library (not a classroom or program room) to be exclusively devoted to the planned activity, which typically means an after-hours program. In addition, since academic libraries can’t raid a Youth Services department for supplies and expertise the way public librarians can, many of the programs may also require investments in materials and staff time.

Overall, even if you don’t end up implementing any of the programs that are included, I recommend taking the small amount of time necessary to read through this book. It is likely to change your thinking about how your library can best use programming to support your college’s or university’s goals for student success, persistence, and retention. Rather than offering endless information literacy instruction sessions or citation workshops, which students will see as an extension of the passive listening that is required in so many of their courses, consider helping students learn through play. Although *Barbakoff* would caution us not to underestimate play’s inherent value, the even more significant impact of taking her advice will be students’ improved retention of information from instruction sessions in which they actively participate in their own learning.
JOHN DRYER, ELVIN BETHEA, EDWARD WHITE V. THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE. UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT. 814 F.3d 938; 122016 U.S. App. LEXIS 3435.

We’ve come a long way from the days when pro baseball players gave up their image for $125 a season and the Leagues made millions off trading cards.

And yes, I had to look it up. The 8th Circuit is Arkansas, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, North and South Dakota.

NFL Films does films of significant games, seasons and players in the NFL history. Our players were in the NFL in the 1960s, 70s, and 80s. They are in the game footage and gave interviews after retirement.

They sued under the right-of-publicity of a variety of states and for unjust enrichment. There were more than just the three named in the suit. The others settled after the NFL created a fund for the benefit of all players.

Our named three did not settle, and on appeal the issue was their individual right-of-publicity and Lanham Act claims for use of their images.

NFL won summary judgment in the district court on the right-of-publicity claim. The Copyright Act preempted the claim because NFL had a copyright in the film. The court also held the film to be expressive, non-commercial speech protected by the 1st Amendment. Plus, under the state laws, the films were newsworthy and protected by the public interest.

NFL won summary judgment on the Lanham Act claim as it applies only to commercial speech. There was no possibility of confusion for consumers.

The Appeal

To determine Copyright Law preemption, the court asks (1) is the work subject to copyright, and (2) is the state law created right-to-publicity equivalent to any of the exclusive rights under Copyright. Nat’l Car Rental Sys., Inc. v. Comput. Assocs. Int’l, Inc., 991 F.2d 426, 428 (8th Cir. 1993).

Somewhat fatuously, players tried to argue the issue (1) saying a film was not an “original work of authorship fixed in any tangible medium ...” 17 U.S.C. § 102(a).

True, the initial game is an “athletic event” outside copyright subject matter. Nat’l Basketball ass’n v. Motorola, Inc., 105 F.3d 841, 846 (2d Cir. 1997). But a recording of the game is squarely within the Act. Indeed the 1976 amendment was made specifically to insure recorded transmissions of games would meet the fixed in tangible medium requirement. Id. At 847.

I didn’t know that.

As to (2), the purpose of Copyright is to “supply the economic incentive to create and disseminate ideas.” Harper & Row Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enters., 471 U.S. 539, 558 (1985). The right-of-publicity rationale is “the desire to provide incentives to encourage a person’s productive activities and to protect consumers from misleading advertising.” C.B.C. Distribution & Mkgt., Inc. v. Major League Baseball Advanced Media, L.P., 505 F.3d 818, 824 (8th Cir. 2008).

You have to read those several times.

Players are seeking to limit — through their right-of-publicity — the use of material in an expressive work. This puts the issue over into Copyright.

Players argued that the films are advertisements for “NFL-branded football,” a product promoted for NFL’s economic benefit. Three factors determine whether speech is commercial rather than expressive: “(i) whether the communication is an advertisement, (ii) whether it refers to a specific product or service, and (iii) whether the speaker has an economic motivation for the speech.” Porous Media Corp. v. Pall Corp., 173 F.3d 1109, 1120 (8th Cir. 1999).

The films fail to propose a commercial transaction and thus are not advertisements. Nowhere do they encourage consumers to buy a product or service. They tell the history of past contests. Consumer demand for the films proves they exist as “products” in their own right. People consume the films by buying them or subscribing to ESPN.

The economic motivation (iii) of the NFL does not convert the other two elements into commercial speech. Cf. Joseph Burstyn, Inc. v. Wilson, 343 U.S. 495, 501 (1952).

Lanham Act

The Lanham Act “prohibits false representations concerning the origin, association, or endorsement of goods or services through the wrongful use of another’s distinctive mark, name, trade dress, or other device.” Am. Ass’n of Orthodontists v. Yellow Book USA, Inc., 434 F.3d 1100, 1103 (8th Cir. 2006).

Players claimed there was an issue of material fact as to the films falsely representing that they endorsed or currently associated themselves with the NFL. And yet they had nary an example of the films saying that.

The films show them playing. The NFL is shown in a positive light, but nothing shows Players agreeing. Indeed they were interviewed in the films and asked to express their opinions. They agreed to the interviews. 😊
QUESTION: A public librarian asks for clarification about the latest in the Authors Guild v. Google case.

ANSWER: In April the U.S. Supreme Court declined to review the case. So, Google, the “case that will not die” has finally met its end. Initiated in 2005, the case has continued with multiple decisions and appeals. (For a brief history of the case, consult Wikipedia.) In November 2013, the Second Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals dismissed the Authors Guild’s challenge to Google’s use of copyrighted works finding that such use was fair use. On remand, Judge Benny Chin said of the Google Books Project that it: (1) provides significant benefits to the public; (2) advances the progress of the arts and sciences; (3) maintains respectful consideration for the rights of authors and other copyright owners; and (4) does not adversely impact the rights of copyright holders. The Second Circuit unanimously affirmed this judgment in December 2014 following an appeal by the Authors Guild. The court found that: (1) the digitization of copyrighted works, the search functionality and the display of snippets only is transformative; (2) such activity does not provide a market substitute for the original; (3) the for-profit nature of Google’s business does not negate fair use; and (4) Google’s provision of digitized infringement to the libraries that provided the books is not infringement because it is done so with the understanding that the libraries will use the copies in a manner consistent with the copyright law.

In December 2015 the Authors Guild appealed. The U.S. Supreme Court’s denial of certiorari means that the Second Circuit opinion in favor of Google stands, and the case is over.

QUESTION: A high school librarian asks about an upcoming musical performance at a student talent show at her school. The show will not be broadcast or streamed and it is held on private school property, but admission tickets are sold. Some parents/friends will likely record on phones or hire private videographers.

ANSWER: The change in the lyrics described is very minor and is not much of a problem. When pop stars make music recordings of other people’s songs, they obviously pay royalties (called the mechanical license), but they also get the right to make an arrangement of the song which likely has included minor changes in the lyrics to fit the singer. While the school’s talent show is not making a record, it is likely that the alterations are so minor that no music owner would ever complain.

In fact, there are often shows at schools where all of the lyrics are changed in a song. While this is certainly a technical infringement of copyright, there are no complaints about these performances. Weird Al Yankovic actually gets permission for his lyrics to popular songs, but he is changing everything, makes a recording and sells that for commercial purposes.

QUESTION: A college faculty member asks about copying extensively from his own works. Must he seek permission of the publisher in order to do this?

ANSWER: This is an area in which an intuitive answer may be wrong. It seems sensible that one could copy extensively from a work he has written, but it actually depends on who owns the copyright. If the author retained the copyright and transferred to the publisher only the right to publish and distribute the work, or if he retained the right to reproduce for his own use, then the author may copy from the work as described. If he transferred the reproduction right to the publisher, then that right belongs to the publisher and permission must be sought.

Certainly, reproducing a fair use portion is still permitted but the question uses the qualifier “extensively” which denotes that it is greater than a fair use portion.

QUESTION: Are middle school writing assignments and student learning outcome assessment templates copyright protected?

ANSWER: Yes, these works are copyrighted unless they are developed by federal government agency. If they are developed by a state agency, the answer is less clear since some states actually claim copyright in some of the works they produce. If a private company developed the assignments and assessment templates, they are copyrighted; however, they may also be licensed for use by the school.

Student responses on writing assignments are also copyrighted, and the rights are owned by the student. This means that if a teacher wants to post student assignments on the web, the teacher should seek the student’s permission for such displays of their works. This can be easily accomplished with a blanket permission signed at the first of each term.

QUESTION: Does the latest decision in the Georgia State University case mean that libraries can reproduce works for electronic reserves and for course management systems without seeking permission?

ANSWER: No, libraries and faculty members should still apply the fair use test to determine whether reproducing a portion of a work for e-reserves or to place in a course management system is fair use. The recent opinion by the district court (on remand from the 11th Circuit U.S. Court of appeals) may or may not be the final word on this case. In other words, the plaintiffs still may appeal the court’s decision.

The federal district court reconsidered the case as directed by the circuit court of appeals. (For full text of the opinion, see http://policynotes.arl.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/DKT-No.-510-Order-dated-2016_03_31.pdf). The court originally found five instances of infringement of 74 excerpts at issue in the case. The court of appeals vacated this decision and sent the case back to the same judge in the district court with instructions on how better to apply the fair use test. The earlier decision said that use for e-reserves is not transformative, and the circuit court did not challenge that holding. The decision’s new fair use analysis is intended for situations where the use is not transformative.

(1) The purpose and character of the use must be considered, including whether such use is of a commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational use.

(2) The nature of the work must be examined for each excerpt, and here the judge found that the mix of information and commentary in the excerpts favored neither party. (3) For the third factor, amount and substantial used, the judge applied appropriateness of the amount of the excerpt to the fair use purpose and its potential to substitute for purchase of the work. (4) Market effect is the most important factor in the judge’s decision.

For that factor, the judge focused on both actual harm to the potential market for the work and on harm to the value of the work. Moreover, the judge stated that this fourth fact should comprise 40% of the fair use analysis. The analysis would examine sales of the work over time as well as the amount of revenue derived from licensing reproductions. If there is little demand for excerpts, “the likelihood of repetitive unpaid use is diminished.”

Of the 48 excerpts remaining after the earlier decision, the judge found that only four were not fair use. 𝕎
I had my first book published in the late nineteen sixties. It was an engineering monograph, titled *Temperature Control*. It was based in part on work I was doing on the Apollo project at the MIT Instrumentation Lab. I did the literature research I needed in the MIT engineering library, which was under the dome above the building with the columns that you see when you look at the original campus from the banks of the Charles River. That building, with the dome, is cast on the sides of my MIT class ring. The main library is in a separate, more modern building further to the east on the campus.

I confess that I hadn’t used the engineering library during my student years. By the time I did, half a dozen years after graduating in 1959, I discovered that I didn’t need three-by-five index cards or a yellow pad to hand write notes from the publications I was consulting. There were photocopiers and copiers machines that I could avail myself of. So I could copy pages that contained what I needed, which shortened my research time markedly. I was what I might call a copyright naif at the time and I gave no thought to whether or not I might be violating property boundaries.

Nearly two decades later, in the mid-nineteen eighties, after having written a total of seven fiction and general non-fiction books that were published by trade houses, I published the first of fifteen or so contributed works that I have (for the most part) dreamed up and then solely put together for such commercial scientific and technical houses as Wiley, McGraw-Hill and Elsevier.

When I think back to those early days in the part of my career devoted to writing and editing engineering books, it strikes me that that time was much more innocent and transparent than the time in which we’ve been living since the Internet permeated our lives. Let me explain.

First of all, you could, it seems to me, easily check up on your publisher’s sales efforts, or lack of them, on behalf of your books. There were brick and mortar stores which you could visit to see if your books were on the shelves. Some cities had technical bookstores. Large general bookstores had sections with technical books. I actually visited stores whenever I happened to be in a city away from home to see whether they had any of my engineering books for sale. I also checked out catalogues and shelves in engineering libraries whenever I happened to be on a campus.

In addition, there were direct mail brochures and catalogs of both new and backlist books that I could ask for to see whether my books were prominently featured, or even included at all. Because I’m a longtime member of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, my name was on potential customer lists that publishers could purchase and use, so mailings would arrive at my home. Of course, budgetary cutbacks, in the midst of fiscal years when sales and margins weren’t meeting expectations, could put a kibosh on direct mail programs. And accounting disciplinarians would criticize direct mail programs for any tiny bad debt percentage to get senior management to clamp down on them. Still, the programs existed, even if they were dormant from time to time, until new management took over or until a fiscal cloud lifted.

In any case, publishers’ current marketing tactics seem to me much less robust than they were twenty or more years ago. When I asked one of my editors, who’s in a senior position, about marketing for my books, his reply was: “any marketing is usually done just before and upon publication as you know and I don’t have records of what was specifically done for your handbooks.”

Nowadays, if I want to check on where my books are for sale, I have to go either to Amazon (somehow looking at your books on your Amazon page isn’t quite the same as finding them on the shelves of brick and mortar stores used to be), to publishers’ own Websites or to the sites of aggregators who I hope have made deals with my publishers. (Elsevier, of course, owns the books aggregator Knovel, with which Wiley and McGraw-Hill won’t do business any more. They’ve transferred that business to Information Handling Services (IHS).) Because I don’t work at a university or other organization that subscribes to services provided by aggregators, such as IHS or Skills soft, I’m handicapped in quickly discovering whether any particular book of mine is available for searching. I don’t always know the right people to call, and the people a general operator puts me in touch with often haven’t a clue about the substance of my questions.

There’s another thing: I decide what goes into my books. But I’m not consulted on how an electronic service handles my books and presents the contents to its customers.

In the print-on-paper days of yore, royalties on sales from my books were based entirely on straightforward calculations. To be sure, different sales channels (domestic, foreign, direct mail, etc.) had different discounts from the list price and royalty rates, which might increase if overall unit sales exceeded a certain threshold, but all you had to do to get a royalty amount was multiply the number of copies sold through any channel by the appropriate discount and royalty rate. There could be a hitch: while consulting for a client, I discovered that their publisher sold copies to foreign subsidiaries at unexpectedly severe discounts from the list price and at a lower royalty rate, to boot.

Of course, publishers don’t sell anywhere near as many physical copies of engineering books as they used to. For contributed books, “it’s twenty cents on the dollar,” one senior editor told me. What physical copies publishers do sell don’t go through brick and mortar stores, but through the Amazons of this world. A lot of the money that does manage to arrive in publishers’ accounts comes from electronic sales, sometimes of entire books, sometimes not.

And whereas royalties for print sales still follow the traditional straightforward computation, the royalty calculation for electronic sales is opaque to me. Some of my royalty money comes from hits or “snippets” (that charming word). I do know that a substantial number of hits doesn’t translate into substantial royalty dollars — my publishers aren’t cheating me, that’s just the way life is in our Brave New World. And now, through no fault of the publishers, people can view snippets without my getting paid at all.

There are other ways in which usage of material from my handbooks brings me no joy. Let me return to the copyright issue I alluded to earlier in this column. Years later, I chaired the Association of American Publishers’ copyright committee and became an intellectual property zealot. But I don’t have to be one when I find chapters from my handbooks on sites where there is no connection to a publisher, and thus no royalty flow. In one particularly annoying instance, I wrote an angry letter to the two grinning persons who openly ran the site. I dispensed with asking them if they were information-wants-to-be-free imbeciles and bluntly accused them of theft. I glanced at their clueless response and then notified my publisher, and thus no royalty flow. In one particularly annoying instance, I wrote an angry letter to the two grinning persons who openly ran the site. I dispensed with asking them if they were information-wants-to-be-free imbeciles and bluntly accused them of theft. I glanced at their clueless response and then notified my publisher, and thus no royalty flow. In one particularly annoying instance, I wrote an angry letter to the two grinning persons who openly ran the site. I dispensed with asking them if they were information-wants-to-be-free imbeciles and bluntly accused them of theft.
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Y es, I write about library science topics, especially collection development; but I do so mostly with the methodology and perspective of a Humanities professor. I received my French Language and Literature doctorate from Yale University in 1971 so that my scholarly training prepared me to deal with texts. While historical research and statistical analysis are also valid areas for literature researchers, my preferred specialty was analyzing works to look for aspects that were not obvious but that would increase the enjoyment and understanding of the literary text. Perhaps my best discovery ever was about the novel Madame de Stael. I managed to prove successfully to my professor that the basic structure was mostly likely a conscious reworking of Vergil’s Aeneid. I heard that he added this insight to his subsequent teaching of the course.

I have basically continued the same strategy for many of my current publications as those of you who follow this column know. I look for insights of potential interest to readers that come from a broad familiarity with the literature of collection development and scholarly communication. Some of these from the past have included the decreased importance of the journal as a container for the article, the lack of any discussion on how libraries provide materials for copyright violation, the complicity of university administrators in the scholarly communication crisis, and how retirement might affect scholarly production. I explicitly look for contrarian ideas that challenge the conventional wisdom. My bibliography includes many traditional research papers; but I much prefer, for better or worse, writing opinion pieces. For the column that follows, I will compare my experiences as a researcher with what I believe to be true about the life of STEM (science, technology, engineering, and medicine) faculty.

The Need for Expensive Research Facilities

Most though not all STEM researchers require expensive laboratories. To give an example from a random search: “The start-up hiring incentive provides up to 20% of start-up costs for faculty in STEM fields if the total start-up costs exceed $400K, with a cap of $200K per hire. The total start-up funds that may be awarded to any individual campus are limited to $400K per year. All disciplines are eligible for the start-up incentive, as long as a fellow’s research is in a STEM field” (http://apo.ucsc.edu/news-events/campus_memos/8-21-15_EVC_Memo.html). That’s a lot of money. Any university will expect return on this substantial investment. A newly minted STEM researcher or one who wishes to move to a new institution will need to provide significant justification if the research area requires a new laboratory or a retrofit of an existing one. In fact, I would assume that the first step for many beginning researchers is to join an existing team in their research specialization. I would also expect high continuing costs for new equipment, lab maintenance, supplies, animal care, etc.

Hiring a Humanities researcher is cheap. If I had moved to a new institution, I would have expected an office with a computer ($750 would provide enough computing power) though this would even be less important if I were teaching online from home and brought my preferred computing device to work. As long as the university subscribed to Library Literature Online, I might not need any additional library resources if my requests for new books were honored or if the demand driven acquisitions choices included the more important library science resources.

Need for Outside Funding

Most STEM researchers must obtain outside funding to support their expensive research. In fact, almost all universities anticipate using the indirect costs from grants to support other parts of the institution. Senior researchers bear the heaviest responsibility to keep their laboratories afloat by obtaining a continuous stream of grants through their own efforts or from getting other members of the team to write winning proposals. Tenured faculty members are thus not able to slow down because doing so would threaten the financial stability of their area’s research efforts. In fact, I know from sitting on my university’s tenure and promotion committee that some STEM researchers do not have tenure support for their full salaries so that a portion disappears if they don’t bring in enough outside money. For this reason, some universities offer bridge support during dry spells; but this transitional funding doesn’t last forever. Furthermore, faculty employment contracts may require submitting grant proposals or winning grants as a condition of employment so that not doing so could lead to detenuring though I suspect that this happens rarely. At the very least, administrators and colleagues can make life unpleasant for unproductive researchers. On the plus side, successful research can lead to patents that reward both the researcher and the university, a near impossibility for a Humanities scholar.

I was an excellent grant proposal writer when I was a library administrator and wrote or directed grants totaling over $1 million. As a Humanities oriented library science professor, I consider myself successful for having obtained miniscule funding of around $10,000 from three outside sources. From publicity releases and talking to colleagues, other LIS researchers, especially in IT but also in Social Science type research, require outside funding to support their laboratories, expensive computer equipment, costs of survey distribution and analysis, and support staff for these tasks; but these costs are probably less than in many STEM disciplines.

I’m quite pleased that I don’t have to shoulder the burden of being responsible for a large team. I pick research topics of sufficient interest that can easily get published in respectable journals but that depend upon my individual analysis and ability to reason about the issues. Even my serious research studies employed methodologies that I could implement myself or call upon a colleague as a second author in areas where I’m weak. For example, to the surprise of some, I’ve never taken a course in statistics even with a doctorate from Yale University; but I’ve always found a co-author willing to do the statistical analysis. I also have never worried about losing a portion of my salary or being detenured for not obtaining grants. Getting published in reputable journals, having my research frequently cited, and producing evidence of my reputation in the field was quite enough for my university to be pleased with my research efforts.

Scholarly Communication, Subject Focus, and Academic Life

The evidence suggests that scholarly communication is more critical for STEM researchers because of the importance of publishing success for obtaining grant funding in a highly competitive environment. STEM researchers must have excellent knowledge of the published literature. In some fields, the more informal communications that report recent developments. Preparing a duplicate grant proposal for a project that has already been funded would be a colossal waste of time. I also expect that proposal reviewers expect to see a firm grasp of current research in the proposal’s subject area. STEM researchers also need to publish results in the highest quality journals possible since this factor is also part of the review process for future grants. The number of publications from a research project also counts so that results are divided up into smaller publishable units even if some are placed in journals of lesser quality. Other factors include the possibility of page charges or fees for publication both continued on page 59
in commercial and open access journals and the requirement by some journals to make data files available.

The economic importance of STEM fields can be seen in the number of vendors and publishers at the Charleston Conference who market to these disciplines. They are making the rational decision that universities, libraries, and researchers are willing to spend much more in STEM areas for the potential economic rewards. On the other side, the number of vendors who specialize in products in support of Humanities research could probably be counted on one hand. This emphasis extends to evaluation tools such as the various citation and productivity rankings. The definition of the h-index, for example, clearly shows that it was developed for scientists with only a passing knowledge of the subject. I learned about the concerted efforts to get the author rankings. Next, any research with need for lab facilities limits the researchers’ ability to be absent from the university for an extended period or to continue working in the field after retirement so that these researchers have less flexibility in their professional lives. Finally, being a “public intellectual” may be more difficult since the general populace may be less interested in complex research areas that are hard for researchers to explain to people with little to no background in the subject. The library science journals that I submit to realize that scholars like me don’t have the resources to pay page charges. I don’t even have to consider making extensive data files available. What may be more important for me than for STEM researchers is to organize my ideas well and to write clearly enough to make it easy for the reader to understand my ideas. My opinion pieces like this one are more important for the humanities where research has tended to become so specialized as to be of interest only to fellow experts. Exceptions might be research on the most popular highbrow authors such as Shakespeare or areas of cultural
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The factors above also have an effect upon the academic life of STEM researchers. Changing the research area is much harder when doing so requires an expensive new lab and bringing together a new research team. From hearing about strategies at my own university, I would expect this happens mostly when funding focuses on a new area with less competition; but even here the university would most likely bring in researchers from other institutions. Having to work in a large group can potentially cause stress. Team leaders must be good managers as well as good researchers. I suspect some research projects flounder because of internal group dissension. From having a friend who was a biostatistician, I learned about the concerted efforts to get the highest possible placement in the author list. She would brag as if it were a great accomplishment about going from 16th to 12th in the author rankings. Next, any research with need for lab facilities limits the researchers’ ability to be absent from the university for an extended period or to continue working in the field after retirement so that these researchers have less flexibility in their professional lives. Finally, being a “public intellectual” may be more difficult since the general populace may be less interested in complex research areas that are hard for researchers to explain to people with little to no background in the subject. On the other hand, doing so isn’t completely impossible and may result in wide-spread fame (The Role of the Public Intellectual by Alan Lightman http://web.mit.edu/comm-forum/papers/lightman.html).

My life as a researcher is much simpler. I have a fast Internet connection at home so that I can search my library’s databases/holdings and other Internet resources in my pajamas. Some of my original research has focused on issues that require holdings information, but WorldCat is also available from home. For several of my most important papers, I’ve had to travel to consult historical sources; but doing so is still less costly than having an expensive lab. Retirement will not end my research efforts because I retain library access as an emeritus professor. My opinion pieces like this one are even easier to write since I have more time to think deeply with fewer distractions. While many Humanities scholars have collaborators, I had a bad experience early in my career so that I normally work with others only where I have some control as is the case with a paper co-authored by tenure track faculty or students. With mostly single author publications, I don’t worry about author placement and am quite willing to be the second author on the others.

The public isn’t much interested in library issues or many Humanities subjects where research has tended to become so specialized as to be of interest only to fellow experts. Exceptions might be research on the most popular highbrow authors such as Shakespeare or areas of cultural...
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S

imply put, social media is the media humans use to be social. Thus social media embodies how humans use emerging technologies to effectively reach out and connect to other human beings, create relationships, build trust, and help each other. The social media phenomenon represents a major shift in communication as it flattens the world and brings people together to be friends, interact or transact. The strength of the social media lies in the fact that social conversation is one of the most powerful communications in this generation. This explains why social media tools and techniques are remarkably and permanently changing the way information is created and passed across society and around the world. Statistics indicate that people now spend more time on social media than any other media category; the overall time spent on social media continues to increase exponentially; social media has overtaken pornography as the prominent activity on the Internet; one of eight spouses in the United States first met on social media, and one of every five divorce cases have been blamed on social media. These scenarios demonstrate that social media continues to have an outstanding impact on personal and professional relationships, and in some cases has raised ethical and legal issues relating to information management and use.

One sphere of life where social media has had a remarkable impact is marketing, giving rise to the concept of social media marketing, which is a form of marketing which utilizes social networking sites. Social media marketing works by drawing the attention of the interested publics to conversations which discuss the services or products being marketed. Social media marketing largely works in a subtle way and does not overtly promote services or products. It is also important to note that organizations or individuals marketing services or products promoted through social media are ordinarily members of the social communities they are promoting to. Membership of target social communities enhances acceptance and increases the chances of the promotional messages being received positively. Social media marketing takes time and is not a one-shot activity because social media is not just about marketing; it is about conversations. Social media marketing is powerful because most consumers trust peer recommendations; not advertisers. This shift in the decision making approach is more founded on the desire by people to benefit from the experience or competence of others, whom they view as trustworthy, than on mere marketers interested in making profits.

Social media marketing enables organizations to learn from their customers; target their marketing initiatives to specific potential clients in specific places using context-specific information and offers; increase traffic to their online outlets; improve their search ratings; reduce overall marketing costs; develop new or strengthen existing business networks and partnerships; and enhance brand popularity. Social media marketing can also create brand awareness; generate a positive buzz; stimulate brand engagement; shift consumer expectations; influence opinion leaders; build a customer base; stimulate conversations and the formation of relationships with interest groups; facilitate social mobilisation; develop customer loyalty; enhance customer service; and educate customers. Libraries can benefit greatly from social media marketing by creating awareness of their services and products, encouraging readership and attracting fleeing users back to the library. Libraries can use social media marketing to augment their user education programs by using the platforms and messages to create user support groups; facilitate collaboration between the users and between them and librarians to work together, communicate and share documents; provide platforms for user education demos and practice; and act as customer support channels. Through the emerging concept of infodemiology and information, librarians are able to detect and pick out patterns in conversations which indicate needs or failures and respond directly or in kind by creating a supportive environment which would address the implied need. Libraries can also use social media marketing to expand their reach beyond their walls as well as reduce barriers to the delivery of their services. Such barriers currently include limited opening hours, inappropriate physical spaces, inadequate collections, constrained human resources, the inadequate number of libraries, and inappropriate attitudes of librarians. Social media marketing can also enable libraries to deliver services on portable devices which are generally owned by individual library users. This reduces the need to come to the physical library or use its inadequate information technology infrastructure. Another associated benefit of library services on portable digital devices is enhanced accessibility. Libraries can also use social media marketing to create compelling brands with a clear, meaningful, unique message; an attention-grabbing visual identity; consistent use of identity cues; and an ongoing effort to keep the brand honest. An effective brand can have an immediate and emotional impact on the customer. The goal of library...
branding is to make library services distinct from the competition. Thus, social media marketing facilitates the rebirth and strengthening of the library brand as progressive, personable, liberal, democratic, adaptable and engaging. Libraries can use social media marketing tools and techniques to co-create, communicate and deliver the brand promise in partnership with the users and relevant stakeholders. Similarly, social media marketing enables libraries to reveal their human side thereby appealing to more people. This appeal is largely because human beings desire to connect and listen to other human “voices.” This enables libraries and their users to connect at a higher emotional level and create unique bonding which enhances their engagement.

There are endless social media marketing techniques that exist which libraries can utilize. Top among these is electronic Word of Mouth (eWOM). This involves passing messages orally and informally between people. Although word of mouth has obviously been a valuable marketing approach for a long time, its power seems to have increased in the recent past with the emergence of social media. eWOM communication exhibits unique characteristics which distinguish it from traditional WOM. First, unlike traditional WOM, eWOM communications possess unprecedented scalability and speed of diffusion. Second, the sharing of information in eWOM is between small groups of individuals in both synchronous and asynchronous modes. Third, eWOM communications are more persistent and accessible since most of the text-based information presented on the Internet is archived and thus made available for an indefinite period of time. Fourth, eWOM communications are more measurable than traditional WOM since the presentation format, quantity and persistence of eWOM communications have made them more observable. Fifth, eWOM information available online is far more voluminous in quantity compared to information obtained from traditional contacts in the offline world.

Libraries may also use Consumer’s Online Brand Related Activities (COBRAs). These are the complex activities which consumers of services and products engage in through social media which intentionally or unintentionally support particular brands. The concept covers diverse forms of consumer-to-consumer, consumer-to-message and consumer-to-brand communications happening online. It encompasses consuming, contributing to and creating brand-related content passively or actively. COBRAs may also include posting brand-related videos on YouTube, photos on Flickr or comments on Facebook and status updates. Target audiences may consume the content passively, for instance, by watching brand-related movies, reading product reviews or brand-related comments. They may also contribute brand-related content by reviewing or rating products or brands, engaging in brand conversations, joining a brand profile on social media networking sites, or commenting on brand-related content on social media channels. People who engage in COBRAs do so to gratify several needs which include entertainment, integration and social interaction, personal identity, information, remuneration and empowerment. Libraries can launch COBRAs in various ways. Academic libraries, for instance, can create interesting videos on library products and services which they can post on YouTube and invite students and faculty to watch, recommend or share. They can also announce new services or titles through tweets which the library users can consume and retweet for maximum impact. Public libraries can also share sound-bites of their music collections on SoundCloud and invite users to comment, rate and share the same in their own networks. Similarly, they can record videos of testimonials of satisfied library users and share the same on YouTube. The libraries engaged in COBRAs are likely to reach more new customers while retaining existing ones; enhance their brand perception and visibility; increase usage of their information services and products; enrich the information experience of their users; create strategic networks and communities of library users, stakeholders and librarians; understand and respond to customer complaints in a timely manner; enhance stakeholder participation in the development and sharing of library information services and products; understand the emerging trends and preferences of information usage; as well as detect and pre-empt negative buzz which may affect the libraries in an adverse way.

Content marketing is another social media marketing technique. Libraries may use to promote their services and products. It involves the creation and sharing of valuable and relevant content as a means of attracting, acquiring and engaging customers. Content marketing creates interest in a product or service through educational or informative material. Successful content marketing relies on providing consistent and high quality content which solves people’s real problems. The content, if properly packaged, will not only attract potential customers but will also engage them in activities which are beneficial to the organization. Content marketing has emerged to address the inadequacies of advertising as more users shy away from direct marketing. It is subtle and seeks to influence customer behaviour indirectly. Content marketing seeks to influence customer behaviour by making them more intelligent and informed about specific issues of interest to the marketer. Libraries are in the business of selecting (or creating), acquiring, processing, storing and disseminating relevant information. Therefore, they have a higher chance of succeeding in content marketing than profit-making organizations.

Libraries can also use social media advertising. They can use promoted posts in newsfeeds or sponsored video adverts on Face-
The 3rd Annual Joint Conference of the Art Libraries Society of North America (ARLIS/NA) and the Visual Resources Association (VRA) took place on March 8-12, 2016, in Seattle, Washington. This year’s theme was “Natural Connections,” and coincided with the 2016 Annual Conference of the Association of Research Libraries Librarians (ARLIS/NA) and the Visual Resources Association (VRA). In order to capitalize on the natural connection between professions and disciplines, some AASL programming was offered to ARLIS/NA-VRA Joint Conference participants and vice versa. The conference offered an opportunity to consider the possibilities between visual resources management; art, architecture, and design librarianship in a variety of institutional settings and organizations; Web and digital archiving and preservation; programming, outreach, and assessment; pedagogical practices across the disciplines to include the Information Literacy Framework and Visual Literacy; new methods for cataloging and metadata practices to enhance collections and discovery interfaces, including RDF and Linked Open Data; innovative trans-disciplinary, inter-disciplinary, and digital humanities projects; and bridging resources, services, and outreach across the GLAM (galleries, libraries, archives, and museums) communities. The conference was preceded by a Digital Humanities unconference, called THATCamp, which was well-attended, and generated ideas from across the Galleries, Libraries, Museums and Archives professions about emerging challenges affecting these fields.

There were 813 attendees to the ARLIS/NA-VRA 2016 Joint Conference, many of whom contributed to a diverse and stimulating program. By the numbers, there were 39 sessions, which emerged from 95 submitted paper or session proposals. Topics included digital humanities, visual literacy, geospatial and visualization projects, image rights and reproductions, new technologies, museum education, environmental design, makerspaces, eBook publishing, materials education and research, diversity within the visual resources and art librarianship professions, RDF and LOD, metadata and cataloging, crowdsourcing, archives, open access, and more. Six workshops emerged from 15 submissions, ranging from hands-on workshops in RDF cataloging, project management, and Wikipedia edit-a-thons, to tools for professional development for student members and emerging professionals. Of the 55 submitted poster proposals, 40 posters were accepted, with a well-attended poster session. Posters presented case studies in collection building and assessment; programming and initiatives to engage constituents; fair use and appropriation on social media outlets like Pinterest and Instagram; connecting resources and collaborating across organizations; alternative formats and digitization efforts; marketing, promotion and partnerships with user communities; and deselection projects. The core 4.0 project, a chapter, planning, and special interest meetings were held, showcasing innovative projects such as the Artist Books Thesaurus Project and Material Order, a consortium for materials collections, among many others.

At the Presidents’ Session on Friday, March 11, Presidents of ARLIS/NA and VRA presented a conference capstone session, focused on the digital realm and the overlap and strategic direction between the two organizations. Also presenting at that session were representatives from the Digital Library Federation (DLF), the Council for Library Information Resources (CLIR), the Digital Preservation “Train the Trainers” program from the Library of Congress, the Kress Foundation, and from the National Digital Stewardship Residency Program. The Presidents’ Session offered a unique opportunity to consider commonalities and differences, strategic planning for the future, and how organizations such as ARLIS/NA and VRA can most effectively meet the current and future needs of its members. Past President of VRA, Elaine Paul, and ARLIS/NA President Kristen Regina framed the session around considerations of the digital realm, core competencies, opportunities beyond the two organizations, and future collaborative possibilities between ARLIS/NA and VRA. Jen Green, President of VRA and Co-Chair of the VRA Professional Status Task Force, addressed the Visual Resources Profession and how VRA might respond to changes within the profession. Likewise, Tony White, Chair of the ARLIS/NA Strategic Directions Committee, presented on ARLIS/NA’s strategic planning to date. George Coulbourne represented the Library of Congress programs on Digital Preservation Train the Trainers and the National Digital Stewardship Residency programs, speaking to the importance of internships and preparations for librarians entering the field, as well as continuing professional development. Louisa Kwasiogcho presented on the opportunities offered by CLIR and DLF, including the CLIR post-doc program. Max Marmor presented on behalf of the Kress Foundation, elaborating on where the Kress sees trends in libraries and cultural heritage institutions heading.

Members from both organizations were honored with awards at the Annual Conference, including the creators of VRA Core 4.0, a metadata schema which is now hosted on the Library of Congress Website and implemented internationally. The Nancy DeLaurier Award was presented to VRA Core 4.0 creators Kevin Esmé Cowles, Janice Eklund, Benjamin Kessler, and Trish Rose-Sandler. In her letter of support for the recipients, Elisa Lanzi writes, “I’ve just returned from the Digital Library Federation conference. I love the fact that VRA Core 4.0 is mentioned in presentations right alongside Dublin Core. Trish, Jan, Ben, and Esme made that happen by signing on for the long haul and applying brilliant and strategic thinking to improve access to cultural heritage content.” During the acceptance speech, Trish Rose-Sandler gave a special thanks to the many members who’ve contributed to VRA Core 4.0 and also recognized the diligent work of VRA Core Oversight Committee members. Trish, Jan, Ben, and Esme have exhibited particular leadership, expertise, determination, and vision to ensure that the talented contributions of many are focused and sustained.

For her many years of remarkable dedication, leadership, and service to both VRA and ARLIS/NA and to the visual resources and library professions, VRA and ARLIS/NA presented the 2016 Distinguished Service Awards to Ann Baird Whiteside. In addition to serving as President of both organizations, Ann has been an initiator and leader on numerous projects such as CCO, SAHARA, and VRA Core 4.0 and has made significant contributions to ARTstor’s Shared Shelf Platform. Ann has also worked effectively across multiple disciplines and organizations. In her letter of support, Jolene de Verges comments, “As a leader in both ARLIS/NA and VRA, Ann has built bridges between the visual resources professional and traditional librarianship. She chaired the ARLIS/NA-VRA Joint Conference Task Force which led to a set of recommendations for streamlining the process of planning all future joint conferences between the two organizations.”

Sarah Bergmann, this year’s Convocation speaker, is the design thinker and founder of the Pollinator Pathway. She spoke of building and maintaining pathways to support relationships across disciplines and professions, emphasizing the importance of symbiosis, sharing her reflections on the plight of the honey bee, which led her to build pathways to connect city dwellers to existing green spaces. Bergmann’s talk was a compelling way to draw our 3rd Annual Joint Conference to an end.

Papers and presentations will be available via the Visual Resources Bulletin, Art Documentation published by ARLIS/NA, and through the conference Website, VRA and ARLIS/NA Websites. Four conference sessions were recorded live and are now available, in Spanish and in English, via the ARLIS/NA Learning Portal (https://www.pathlms.com).
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 Needle-Moving Collaboration: From Act to Impact — Presented by Katherine Skinner (Educopia Institute)

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

Skinner started with tips from an October 18, 1984 New Scientist article (by David Challinor), entitled “Better bred than dead,” that highlighted isomorphism (“stuck in habits”). Changes are plentiful, involving aligning technological changes, new competitors, political shifts, economic concentration, information deluge. Fields tend toward stasis, while innovations happen on the fringes, she reminded, and field-wide changes depend on networks. There is a progression from “act” to “impact” that involves a common agenda, shared management, mutually reinforced activities, continuous communications, and backbone support. A month prior to her talk, the Institute seed-funded Project Meerkat, a publishing analytics data alliance, https://educopia.org/research/meerkat, that will seek to set community standards. Academic integrity, she opined, is under fire and communities invest in what they are interested.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2015

NEAPOLITAN SESSIONS

Don’t Get Married to the Results: Managing Library Change in the Age of Metrics — Presented by Corey Seeman (University of Michigan); Anthony Watkinson (Moderator, CIBER)

Reported by: Crystal Hampson (University of Saskatchewan) <crystal.hampson@usask.ca>

In 2015, the (legal) focus has been on privacy, and this year’s “Long Arm” session didn’t necessarily have the humorous overtone of years past. Information industry analyst Price talked about awareness discussion and education, work underway at NISO, ALA, the Library Freedom Project. Encryption is taking place at Project Muse, OverDrive, Bibliocommon. But, privacy is more than encryption. It can involve the transmission, opt in services, correctly configured technology. Some eye-opening examples that he described illustrated how much personal data is tracked. What is a role for libraries? In his opinion — inform people, become privacy literate, be aware of tools and concerns, stay current, discuss with colleagues and users and teach them. Look at analyses such as the 2015 article “Exposing the Hidden Web” (Timothy Libert, International Journal of Communication). Hannay posed the question, “is privacy the wave of the future?” He overviewed the different view on the subject in Europe, where the aim is to protect individuals, and he gave specific examples of how decisions in EU courts differ. RIBF is going global. Macklin discussed privacy and libraries, federal and state. She advised becoming familiar with the ALA Guidelines for Developing a Library Privacy Policy. Users have a right to privacy and confidentiality, but privacy is not absolute. There are efficiencies, laws, Internet security. A privacy audit is helpful. Privacy rights, she encouraged. During the question and answer period, Price aptly equated the realm of privacy issues to a cat and mouse game. 
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THE CHARLESTON CONFERENCE

Issues in Book and Serial Acquisition, “Where Do We Go From Here?” — Charleston Gaillard Center, Francis Marion Hotel, Embassy Suites Historic Downtown, and Courtyard Marriott Historic District — Charleston, SC, November 4-7, 2015

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 2015 Charleston Conference. All attempts were made to provide a broad coverage of sessions, and notes are included in the reports to reflect known changes in the session titles or presenters, highlighting those that were not printed in the conference’s final program (though some may have been reflected in the online program). Please visit the Conference Website at www.charlestonlibraryconference.com, and https://2015charlestonconference.sched.org/, for the online conference schedule from which there are links to many presentations’ PowerPoint slides and handouts, plenary session videos, and conference reports by the 2015 Charleston Conference blogger, Don Hawkins. The conference blog is available at http://www.against-the-grain.com/category/chsconfblog/. The 2015 Charleston Conference Proceedings will be published in partnership with Purdue University Press in 2016.

In this issue of ATG you will find the third installment of 2015 conference reports. The first two installments can be found in ATG v.28#1, February 2016 and v.28#2, April 2016. We will continue to publish all of the reports received in upcoming print issues throughout the year. — RKK

In 2015, the (legal) focus has been on privacy, and this year’s “Long Arm” session didn’t necessarily have the humorous overtone of years past. Information industry analyst Price talked about awareness discussion and education, work underway at NISO, ALA, the Library Freedom Project. Encryption is taking place at Project Muse, OverDrive, Bibliocommon. But, privacy is more than encryption. It can involve the transmission, opt in services, correctly configured technology. Some eye-opening examples that he described illustrated how much personal data is tracked. What is a role for libraries? In his opinion — inform people, become privacy literate, be aware of tools and concerns, stay current, discuss with colleagues and users and teach them. Look at analyses such as the 2015 article “Exposing the Hidden Web” (Timothy Libert, International Journal of Communication). Hannay posed the question, “is privacy the wave of the future?” He overviewed the different view on the subject in Europe, where the aim is to protect individuals, and he gave specific examples of how decisions in EU courts differ. RIBF is going global. Macklin discussed privacy and libraries, federal and state. She advised becoming familiar with the ALA Guidelines for Developing a Library Privacy Policy. Users have a right to privacy and confidentiality, but privacy is not absolute. There are efficiencies, laws, Internet security. A privacy audit is helpful. Privacy rights, she encouraged. During the question and answer period, Price aptly equated the realm of privacy issues to a cat and mouse game.
The University of Michigan’s Ross School of Business’ vision is expressed in the words: Positive, Boundaryless, Analytic, and Action. Ross has recently been profoundly reshaping Kresge Library Services. The library’s former 27,000 sq. ft. is now less than 5,000 sq. ft. with almost no stacks (about 200 books). Ninety percent of the collection did not have a digital counterpart. Other campus libraries took the unique content. The shift at Ross is from library as a space to library as a service or, as Seeman describes it, a library that is “etheral” rather than physical. Even the name is deliberate: “Kresge Library Services” rather than “Kresge Library” which connotes a space. The library now provides e-resources for what the school needs today. Taking a positive, entrepreneurial perspective and using a retail-like approach to shape thinking, Seeman concentrates on the “High Class Problem,” i.e., how do we achieve more capacity, rather than the “Low Class Problem” of offering a particular service and trying to get people to use it. Seeman recommends taking risks as well as doing what the users need rather than aiming to fulfill our own predetermined success measures.

GOBI, YBP & Overdrive: Changes in the Book Distribution Landscape — Presented by Nancy Herther (University of Minnesota); Steve Potash (Overdrive); Kari Paulson (ProQuest Books); Dan Tonkery (Content Strategy)

Reported by: Marty Coleman (Mississippi State University) <mcoleman@library.msstate.edu>

In the past few years, we have seen several consolidations in the book industry. Panelists were chosen to give their perspective of the current landscape. Potash discussed new access models for content and the change of ownership at Overdrive. New access models include classroom sets, book club sets, cost per checkout and recommend to library. Foremost in all new models is to make content available in the format the customer wants. Overdrive has built its platform by asking librarians “How do you want it to work?” Earlier this year, Rakuten purchased Overdrive. Potash has remained as CEO. Rakuten has a long term commitment to Overdrive and e-content distribution. One of the fastest growing segments in the U.S. is non-English materials. Paulson gave a history of ProQuest’s acquisitions and explained the reasoning behind each. The end game was to allow ProQuest to fill in gaps for their customers. She made the point that “When we talk about journals it is not electronic or print — just journals. We are moving toward books with no distinction between e(lectronic) and p(print).” ProQuest maintains partnerships with OCLC, YBP and other vendors and suppliers. When asked about the relationship between EBSCO and ProQuest, she used the analogy of divorced parents that must get along for the children. Tonkery discussed his view of the distribution landscape stating that consolidations will continue as like buy like. Venture capitalists are driving up the prices of distributors and money for platform development is held by them. There must be a return on investment for them to spend on improving infrastructure. On Open Access, the question is distribution and avenues are still developing. Seventy five percent of all eBook revenue is controlled directly by the publisher. Overall, this session enlightened attendees to recent changes in the book distribution landscape and there was sufficient time for questions and answers.

The Young and the Restless: Fresh Eyes Scan the Library-Publishing Landscape — Presented by Jack Montgomery, (Moderator, Western Kentucky University); Mark Sandler (CIC Center for Library Initiatives); Hannah Scates Kettler (University of Iowa Libraries); Dan Valen (Figshare); Jen Maurer (Cambridge University Press); Mara Blake (University of Michigan)

Reported by: Mari Monosoff-Richards (Michigan State University) <monosoff@mail.lib.msu.edu>

This panel was an opportunity to hear what newcomers to the library and publishing world have to say about the world as they see it. Sanders served as moderator. Kettler and Blake spoke from the library perspective and commented that in the library change often moves very slowly, through committees and other organized systems. It can be supportive for a new librarian because systems are in place but also difficult because change has to be justified and failure isn’t acceptable. Maurer added that things are similar in a traditional publishing house but there is rapid change in the industry so opportunities to try new things do occur. Valen spoke about “start-up land” being different in that failure is accepted as an opportunity to learn and grow.

All four were influenced by mentors but had various degrees of success in finding one. Maurer had difficulty finding one but has learned from many people. Kettler said that no one made it obvious to her that they were open to being a mentor but she found someone who was receptive to it. Blake felt lucky because her colleagues made it obvious they were open to mentors. Lastly, Valen said that in “start-up land” there is a collaborative support network that mentorship happens through. All would encourage institutions to set up mentorship for new and young librarians.
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MORNING CONCURRENT SESSIONS

Collections as a Service — Presented by Daniel Dollar (Yale University Library)

Reported by: Beth Bohstedt (Hamilton College) <bbohsted@hamilton.edu>

This session gave a new perspective on collection development and management. Dollar from Yale encouraged us to view this issue strategically, explaining how Yale had developed a philosophy of collection development. The primary purpose of collection development is to provide support for learning and teaching; all of our decisions should be based on this. As the world of information changes, we need to be prepared to offer appropriate materials in various formats. This may be achieved through patron-driven acquisition, thoughtful purchases in anticipating future needs, and resource sharing through collaborative networks. Data on usage of online and print collections, as well as materials accessed through open source or consortial networks should always inform decision making. Yale uses the data visualization application Tableau as one tool in this process. Providing for the information needs of our patrons will grow increasingly complex as technology and scholarly communications continue to transform in ways we can’t yet imagine. We need to be poised to adapt flexibly to these yet unknown changes.

Developing Collaborative Connections— Faculty, Researchers, and Librarians — Presented by Beth Sandore Namachchivaya (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign); Kelechi Okere (Elsevier); Jan Fransen (University of Minnesota); Ashley Znau (UTA Libraries); Gretchen Trkay (UT Arlington)

Reported by: Mari Monosoff-Richards (Michigan State University) <monosoff@mail.lib.msu.edu>

The presenters of this session all had experience using Pure, a research management system created by Elsevier. They all found that the library was a great place to manage the system as librarians are familiar with partnering with other groups across the campus. The campus marketing group at one institution was very excited as it highlighted the great work being done. It also showed that the institution was doing more globally focused research than previous thought.

A downside to Pure is that the system unintentionally favors the profiles of people in the sciences over those in the humanities because the data is drawn from Scopus. One of the universities dealt with this by hand entering the CV’s of humanities faculty. They also quality controlled everyone’s by initially checking against submitted CV’s.

continued on page 65

<http://www.against-the-grain.com>
Improving the Availability of ISSN – A Joint Project — Presented by Laurie Kaplan (ProQuest); Gaëlle Béquet (International ISSN Centre/CIEPS)

Reported by: Laurie Kaplan (ProQuest) <Laurie.Kaplan@proquest.com>

There was good attendance at the session led by Béquet and Kaplan, discussing a joint project between their two organizations. The purpose of the project is to improve the assignment rate of ISSN for periodicals worldwide. This particular project arose out of research that Béquet was conducting using Ulrichsweb. The pilot project, launched in February 2015, focused on active print and online titles without ISSN from the Netherlands, and has added over 100 ISSN to date, raised some good conversations about monographic series, and started the conversation regarding how to get publishers to use these new ISSN and their ISSN in general when posting titles online and when transferring titles among various parties. The benefits from the project will extend beyond the ISSN Centers and ProQuest — publishers, libraries, catalog databases, subscription agencies, retailers and wholesalers all rely on ISSN as an identification point for serial publications. One attendee suggested two white papers that could be written by the presenters about ISSN for monographic series and the need for publishers and those involved in data exchange to use ISSN. Another attendee remarked how proper ISSN help improve linking in online journals.

Stop Looking Over My Shoulders- A Consensus Framework for Patron Privacy — Presented by Todd Carpenter (NISO); Nettie Lagace (NISO)

Reported by: Chantal Gunn (SILS Student, University of South Carolina-Columbia) <cgumm@email.sc.edu>

Do the third party organizations have the same expectations for patron privacy as your library? For most libraries the answer is “no.” This is one of the reasons why Carpenter and Lagace of the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) have helped to develop a set of privacy principles designed to provide guidelines for how best to work with third parties to respect patron privacy while providing the personalization and enhancements that result from data collection.

This framework was the result of conversations with various library stakeholders and which culminated in a lively discussion between individuals with strong views on privacy matters. Although originally projected to be completed, the developers took more time to consider the previous discussions and revisit certain elements of the guidelines. The final version will be available soon.

During the Q&A portion of the presentation, an audience member asked about overlap with existing privacy laws in other countries. The presenters explained that the NISO guidelines were developed intentionally around the legal framework of the United States. They acknowledge that the NISO principles may not necessarily align with certain international privacy laws and stress that local jurisdiction and mandates supersede this document.

What Goes Around, Comes Around: Calibrating the Academic Research Life Cycle to the Open Access Life Cycle — Presented by Graham Stone (University of Huddersfield); Jill Emery (Portland State University)

Reported by: Crystal Hampson (University of Saskatchewan) <crystal.hampson@usask.ca>

Publications are the outputs of research but the research process itself goes well beyond the point of publishing output. Taking the research life cycle from its beginning rather than just from the point where a publication is produced, Stone and Emery are leading a crowdsourcing initiative to develop visual maps of the research life cycle, based on the life cycle for sponsored research, and the OA life cycle. Additional maps, using the tube map style, are also being developed to show the connections between the processes of the researcher, the research manager, the library and the publisher. Workflow maps become the basis for programming to automate processes ultimately. Not new to crowdsourcing workflows (TERMS, OAWAL) Stone and Emery welcome input on this mapping project. Input, critique and contributions from librarians and publishers from the UK, U.S., Europe and other parts of the world are welcome: https://library3.hud.ac.uk/blogs/oawal (see Conferences and Papers). Maps for data, as compared to publications, also need to be developed.

That’s all the reports we have room for in this issue. Watch for more reports from the 2015 Charleston Conference in upcoming issues of Against the Grain. Presentation material (PowerPoint slides, handouts) and taped session links from many of the 2015 sessions are available online. Visit the Conference Website at www.charlestonlibraryconference.com. — KS
Today I’m venturing to offer a column that comes as close, I think, as highlighting a trend ever gets to being a true “lead pipe cinch” — so much so that you’ve probably already thought of it, considered it, and are planning for it. Ah well, just in case...

The sensing of trends is not often a “knock you out of your seat” kind of experience. The traces of trend threads are often quite faint, or even disjointed from direct connection by a series of sideways lurches. Sometimes, what makes a “thing” a “coming thing” is nothing about the thing itself, but about an unmet need or desire in the population taking up the thing and trying it.

As ever, I’m fascinated by the forms that early emergent technologies and media appear in. Often, the significance latent in a newly emergent form of media is NOT discernible in the outward appearance of the early devices required to access it. No, what’s important over time is whatever remains constant over time. What’s important is what the technology or medium enables.

If what it enables is significant, users will adopt the thing, despite awkward or laughable traits resulting from the early adopted technological expression. I recall a photograph of a Victorian family in their ornate drawing room, gathered around an early wax cylinder player, each holding an India rubber tube to an ear.

What’s essential to remember, of course, is that we ourselves live in an equally laughable, backward time. We struggle constantly with early technologies, ill-adapted for their intended purposes, and just like our ancestors, we try to look smooth about it! Our kids and grandkids will look back and laugh at us.

For quite some time there have been breathless accounts in the chattering corners of the tech-Web about Virtual Reality, or VR. Accompanying them have often been photographs of the prototype devices they propose that we strap to our faces. These look something like a cross between a diver’s mask and a Waring blender base. Sure — no problem looking smooth sporting one of those!

A little while back, at a conference floor exhibit hosted by a nearby state’s university, I had the opportunity to give VR a try. The experience surprised me, for it left with me a dawning impression, one that’s stronger grown as time has gone by: Virtual Reality gear, and more importantly, the programs or media that drive it, will become part of our libraries’ media collections, and sooner than we might think.

The head gear is really a kind of glorified View-Master rig, with a pair of fairly-high resolution digital eyepieces, one for each eye, mounted in the housing. That housing also contains motion sensors, so the headgear can keep track of what direction it’s pointing — and that’s the key. The experience places you at the center of a spherical display “space.” Turn your head to the right, and the point of view follows: you’re looking toward your right, and the scene has shifted seamlessly as you move your head. You can look in any direction — hence the swivel seat they put you on.

The first program I got to try employed a “look to navigate” scheme. It placed me in a sometimes realistic, sometimes fantastical environment. Moving from place to place was accomplished by looking in a particular direction: you moved in the direction you looked. If you wanted to stay still, you could stop and look around, up, down, behind you. The stereo headphones they strapped on also kept pace with the visuals, panning and tilting with your movement.

The graphical quality was equivalent to that of a contemporary video game, with comparable frame rates. In other words, you knew it was a display. It seemed a bit cartoonish.

After asking me how I was doing, the exhibit folks asked me if I wanted to try something more adventurous. Well, I seemed to be doing alright, so, Sure, I said. A moment later I was sitting in a roller coaster that hadn’t started moving yet. Uh-oh.

Well. It started up, and after a few preliminary, gentle curves (no problem, I can handle this), it began to climb. I look ahead and up: we were climbing up, up, up an absurdly, improbably steep, long, high roller coaster climb. It was as impossible as something out of a Warner Brothers cartoon. I knew the thing was a sham, but as we approached the apex, I felt a familiar sense of disquiet, entirely reminiscent of the real thing. The climb slowed way down as we got to the very top, and then there was a momentary pause, what Gandalf may have called the “deep breath before the plunge…”

Ohhhmmigosht! I made it all the way down with white knuckles gripping the arms of the chair, and through about two or three hurtling curves before I indicated to the handlers that it was time to stop. The dissonance between what my inner ears and my eyes were reporting to my poor noggin had resulted in a physical sensation of nausea.

No. That’s untrue: it did not border. Had I persisted I’d have lost the lovely canopy I’d indulged in earlier. Note to self: be prudent around virtual reality.

But here’s the thing: even as I knew full-well that I was sitting in a swivel chair on a conference display floor, the realism of the experience was sufficient to short-circuit my rational response and plug directly into the primitive brain, which rejected any wise council from my higher-order cognitive processes. No, that primitive, lizard-like bundle of nerves knew that I was hurtling through space toward near certain destruction, and it responded with full fight-or-flight instinct!

 Afterwards, they wisely advised me sit quietly for a few minutes and look gently around reality to reorient myself. I thought that was a friendly gesture...

But what purpose does this medium serve, and why do I think we’ll have VR setups in our libraries? Because the potential for transporting you is enormous. When combined with true photographic, cinematic media, live action, and professional production values, this medium will enable you to travel to the ocean floor, the Roman Forum, the Great Pyramid of Cholula, or the surface of Mars.

I’m a person who grew up loving maps, atlases, and globes. As an avid amateur astronomer, celestial globes are among my most favored objects — I have several. The trick with a celestial globe is to understand that they depict a sphere around your point of view — you’re looking in at a surface depicting what, if you were inside at the center, you’d see if you were looking out. Combine a VR headset with planetarium software (frequently employed on laptop or table computer as a kind of field atlas) and you’d have the starry sky above you, as seen from any point on earth (or any other spot, for that matter), at any point in time you’d wish to visit.

So imagine an adjunct to your media library, somewhere in between or alongside your stereo recordings, your videos, your GIS data sets. Imagine library-durable equipment, ridiculously spendy at first, but becoming more reasonable and accessible over time.

And most of all, imagine a curated collection, selected by subject domain specialists, with all the historical, geographical, and cultural richness and diversity of our existing multimedia collections, growing richer over time, enabling us to go places we’ll never be able to visit, or to prepare for places we may in fact someday see.

The content industry must be gearing up for this in a big way. Let’s beware the turn-key solutions that will attempt to lure you and lock you in with the Easy button, at a cost. For when it arrives, this technology will be the thing that everyone will have to have, or to nay-say.

“Virtual Reality Arrives” will say the journal covers! Expect papers on “Virtual Reality Reference Services.” Virtual Reality in the library will become the library conference paper fodder for a generation of tenure-seeking aspirants. It will be the magic amulet that is shaken at every existing and perennial library problem. It will be the headache of space aspirants, the hope of relevance-seeking library advocates who count door traffic, the bane of budgeters.

In short, it will become an integral part of our entire library world, already complex and diverse in its demands as it is, but certain to become more so.
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In negotiating, one must always be thinking of how the product under consideration will ultimately look once it has been bought. Before the final sales or any monetary considerations are exchanged between the buyer and the seller, many questions need to be answered.

By purchasing this product, will it save time and money? Will it serve the widest populace of users at the library? Is the price reasonable? And ultimately, will I, as the purchaser, have done my job and as a result satisfy the expectations of the patrons of the library and my boss. Because, the bottom line is that we all work for someone. The supervisor has to be pleased and if that person is happy, then the employee can expect continued employment with the expectation of being possibly promoted in the future within the organization.

To set the stage for WIIFM to work for both parties, the buyer has to be transparent in relating the needs of the library to the seller. For example, the conversation between a buyer and seller of e-content at a University library may be:

“We have a visiting professor here from Argentina. She is well known as an expert in pre-Columbian history and we need better resources than the ones that are currently housed in the library. Given that she is a highly visible expert, we need to make sure our collection meets her requirements. The library director has made the enhancement of this collection a priority.”

The salesperson now knows that providing resources will not only enhance the library’s collection, but also make the buyer a hero in the eyes of the library director and the professor. If the salesperson’s company has the right resources, then a sale is likely. WIIFM works for both if the seller can produce viable materials at a reasonable price to fit the informational needs of the library on a timely basis.

In this case, the information professional is quite clear as to the most immediate needs that the vendor needs to fill for the library. Clarity of purpose is most essential if WIIFM has any chance of working for both the buyer and seller.

For sales reps, being aware of WIIFM is a major factor toward achieving their sales goals. It really doesn’t matter what product or service is being sold. In the final analysis — no matter the cost, the complexity of the product, or the people in the conversation — every customer wants the same thing: to gain professional success and approval from their supervisors, staff and peers. A successful salesperson understands this concept and does everything possible to make the customer look good within their organization.

Likewise, if the customer determines that the product and price presented meets all the needs of the organization, then the information professional must “coach” the salesperson as to how to navigate through the process of final approval. Because in the end, the salesperson must get that signed order form, purchase order number or whatever it is that makes the sale final. In sales, we say that we pay commission to salespeople when they bring in a “signed” order. We never pay commissions on a “mind” order.

For the buyer, WIIFM means understanding what the purchase means for not only the library, but more so, for the furthering of the purchaser’s career.

For the seller, WIIFM means presenting and selling a product that has benefits for BOTH the purchaser and the purchaser’s organization.

Mike is currently the President of Gruenberg Consulting, LLC, a firm he founded in January 2012 after a successful career as a senior sales executive in the information industry. His firm is devoted to provide clients with sales staff analysis, market research, executive coaching, trade show preparedness, product placement 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, Information Today in print and eBook, Amazon Kindle, B&N Nook, Kobo, Apple iBooks, OverDrive, 3M Cloud Library, Gale (GVRL), MyLibrary, ebrary, EBSCO, Blio, and Chegg. www.gruenbergconsulting.com

Pelikan’s Antidisambiguation from page 66

I almost forgot: want to give VR a try? Try googling “Google Cardboard.” This will get you to google.com/get/cardboard. There, you’ll laugh, and wonder why you or I didn’t think of this...

In the meantime, I just took delivery this week of another celestial globe, my third, if you don’t count the one we had as kids (and which my older brother grabbed when we were divvying stuff up). That’s one for the office, one for the living room by the shortwave radio, and one to offer on eBay to defray the expense and to enhance domestic placidity. I just still like the format of the globe. It’s comforting, pleasing to the eye, requires no batteries, and has never once made me feel as if I might lose my canapés! 🍴
Recently there was a query on the ACQ-L listserv from an exasperated librarian whose Accounts Payable Department insisted on paying the invoices on the calendar year, instead of the fiscal year, causing ILS fund accounting issues with split payments. This sparked comments from a number of librarians who shared their experiences with that system and those offering helpful advice.

The University’s Business Services Department is a vital partner in the library acquisitions process because it is they who process the purchase orders and payments that go to the vendor. Without a good working relationship with Procurement and Accounts Payable, it can be difficult to get books, periodicals, databases and other library resources processed for payment in a timely manner.

For the first half of my career, the Business Services Department was like my neighbor at the end of the block. We would occasionally acknowledge each other’s existence, but communication was infrequent. During the second half of my career, I have run into some different experiences.

When I began a new position several years ago, I soon learned that the Purchasing Services Department was like a kingdom unto itself and was impervious to Chairs, Deans and Vice Presidents. My first inking that there was a problem came when I noticed that our requisitions languished past thirty days and I was asked for payment updates from the vendors. Emails and voicemails to Procurement did not get a response. When I complained to the Library Dean about bringing this issue to the attention of the Vice President over that area, she told me that “it will only make them mad and they won’t process our stuff — it will take even longer.” Purchasing was also capricious, because they would process the subscription renewal without any problems one year, and the next year refuse to renew the subscriptions to the same vendor for a lesser amount.

The department may have been understaffed, but it was also overwhelmed by the increased demand for electronic resources and the requirement of having licenses and contracts. Nowhere was this more apparent than in the procedure for buying databases. The library got a generous infusion of funds to purchase databases, especially STEM databases in the early to mid-2000s. The licenses and the requisitions went to Procurement as a packet. They would sometimes be allowed to sit on a desk for months and the vendors would grow weary of waiting for payment to the point where they would cut off our service. A “Contracts Officer” was hired, which added another layer of procedure, but not much improvement in the glacial pace of the approval process. We would have meetings with the Procurement Director to discuss the reasons for the delays, but whatever resolution came out of them was only good for that fiscal year and the next year we would be in the same predicament.

In the meantime the stress on the library staff, especially the librarians managing the acquisitions process, was enormous. The Assistant Director of Public Services, passed it on to the Technical Services Software Librarian which brought the problems to my area of supervision. The pressure of dealing with vendors demanding payments, angry faculty who had given assignments that required a database that had been shut off and ignored communication with Procurement, took its toll. We eventually had to split the job between two positions. Lasting relief came when a new president moved the Procurement Director and sent the Contracts Officer to the University Counsel’s Office. Streamlined and efficient procedures were created which allowed the database contracts and ejournal licenses to be processed on a timely basis, thus getting payments to the vendors in a reasonable amount of time.

Accounts Payable Departments can be just as imperious to common sense reasoning as Procurement. At my current job, the library’s allocation for databases, print and serials, and electronic books was assigned to the capital outlay budget for decades. Two years ago the Associate Vice President for that department directed that those expenditures had to come from the Operational budget which has equipment, office supplies, telephone charges, etc. The administration continued to allocate the funding for electronic resources to the capital outlay budget line. This forced us to process a major budget transfer each year, to place the funds in Operational before we could begin to pay invoices pending since July 1. When he retired recently, we took the opportunity to ask his successor if we could move the funds back to capital outlay. He rejected that request, but did offer to assign the library’s electronic resources allocation to Operational, so we would not have to process the yearly budget transfer.

When purchasing and payment processing procedures are developed in Business Services, those offices do not think about the extra work or the wasted time by personnel in the library or other academic departments. However, if the procedures seriously affect workflow and efficiency, it’s worth the effort to try to discuss the issue with them, to see if some reasonable accommodation can be made.

Business Services Departments are not always the villains. Sometimes they get caught in the middle of bad management decisions by the library’s administrator. At one university I was employed at for a short time, my supervisor managed the serials and warned me that the Library Dean refused to ask for an increase in funds, so every year they would run out of money in the serials budget and he would take it from the book allocation. Midway through the school year, we processed a purchase order to a vendor and it was sent back because our funds were depleted. Our ledger showed we still had money, so I called the Purchasing Office and was politely informed that the Dean had moved the money, which effectively closed out our budget for the rest of the year. Rather than tell me himself that he was taking away all of the book money, he let the clerk in the Purchasing Office be the bearer of bad tidings.

A good working relationship with Business Services is required at all times, because problems arise which require cordial contact such as vendors who claim they have not been paid, when the check is at their office and sitting on somebody’s desk or it has been processed but not acknowledged, which requires a copy of the check, or when odd charges show up on the university’s accounting system that need clarification. The library’s Acquisitions Department and Business Services have a common taskmaster — the auditor! It’s important that they cooperate on procedures so that neither one of their operations get cited for not performing according to guidelines.
Transfer continues to make progress over the years by communicating with stakeholders, making improvements to the Code and increasing access to the Transfer data and how it can be used. It also has been a collaborative effort between librarians and publishers for over ten years. Today, it continues to be increasingly collaborative within the industry adding notable shared work with organizations such as National Information Standards Organization (NISO) and work with other organizations such as the Clearinghouse for the Open Research of the United States (CHORUS).

The Transfer Code of Practice addresses the technical and communication best practices for when a journal is transferred to a new publisher, both for the transferring publisher and the receiving publisher. The Code is continually reviewed and revised by the standing committee, and is currently in its third iteration.

Organized by Nancy Buckley of Blackwell (then Wiley-Blackwell, then Burgundy Consulting) who had brought the Transfer group together in 2006 and chaired it under the United Kingdom Serials Group (UKSG). The Transfer Code of Practice was originally established to address the challenges presented by scholarly journals moving between publishers. Its initial development was by a cross-party working group comprising librarians, publishers and intermediaries to resolve problems encountered by subscribers when journals move from one publisher to another. Issues such as continuity of access during a transfer or perpetual ongoing access to articles, resulted in frustration for end users and librarians as key e-journals became temporarily or even permanently unavailable. The UKSG continued to host the project with Ed Pentz chairing the group as it moved forward. In 2010 the idea to have publisher and librarian co-chairs to keep things moving forward with the two largest constituent groups was started, then Alison Mitchell and Elizabeth Winter agreed to take over as co-chairs. The group continued their work and in 2014 it was discussed with NISO as a Recommended Practice. The NISO Transfer Standing Committee (formerly a working group) is comprised of individuals from the publishing, agent, and library fields.

When the current co-chairs Elizabeth and Allison began their work, they were able to share the leadership responsibilities and keep The Transfer Code of Practice on a regular cycle of review, have a regular agenda, action items, and meetings. They also led the group to foster more of an outside collaborative environment. One of the larger projects that the group has undertaken was the Publisher and Librarian Survey in 2011. The survey itself provided important information confirming the difficulty in the transfer of titles and the results were used to consider some improvements to the Code and also fostered new ideas. “The surveys did confirm what the Transfer Working Group was thinking, that 1) there continue to be outstanding issues regarding the transfer of journal titles and 2) there is still a need for increased awareness of the Code. For the Publishers, the survey showed that internal communication and providing more accurate subscription records are the biggest hurdles in the transfer of journal titles. For the librarians, the survey showed that there is increased need for more timely management and communication of subscriptions and access to journal titles when they transfer publishers. Although there seems to be some awareness of the Code and its best practices by some of the survey respondents, there still remains a need for increased awareness of the Code for both Publishers and Librarians.” One idea as a result of the survey, was to make improvements to increase the marketing and communication efforts with both librarians and publishers. Currently, another survey has been released as a follow up to gather more information about how Transfer is used and who is using it.

Another improvement was to enhance the Electronic Transfer Alerting System (ETAS), to increase the marketing of it and the variety of methods for users to obtain the title transfer information that they need. The Electronic Transfer Alerting System, is a “searchable database [that] helps publishers communicate journal transfers and makes it easy for librarians and readers to be notified of journal transfers and to search previous journal transfer alerts. The ETAS is currently offered through collaboration among UKSG, Journal Usage Statistics Portal (JUSP), JISC, and Cranfield University with JUSP and Manchester Information and Associate Services (Mimas) providing the hosting environment. The current hosting arrangements for the ETAS service will remain in place for the foreseeable future.”

The Electronic Transfer Alerting Service enables publishers to post standardized metadata about journal transfers as required by the NISO Transfer Best Practice. The metadata is stored in a database and distributed in many different ways which provide all parties involved more than one option to access the data and information that they need to do their work. The options include: on the Website there is a search page (http://etas.jusp.mimas.ac.uk/search/), a notifications page (http://etas.jusp.mimas.ac.uk/notifications/) that can be filtered in different ways and an RSS feed (http://etas.jusp.mimas.ac.uk/rss/). There is a separate Jiscmail email list (http://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/transfer) where the transfer notifications are automatically posted. Updates to ETAS continue and are ongoing.

Transfer itself and the ETAS has changed and transformed the workflow procedures and processes with both librarians and publishers. But it has also changed how subscription agents provide updates, changes and transfers to their customers through their own systems. Not only do librarians and publishers alike benefit from Transfer and ETAS, but also subscription agents. “The Manager of the Content Team that has managed the knowledge base for EBSCO A-to-Z and LinkSource said, ‘The Knowledge Base team is signed up for the TRANSER alerts and uses them to help maintain the data within the Knowledge Base.’ The General Manager of Publisher Operations, who manages the title information for subscriptions ordered through EBSCO, said, ‘We are also in receipt of the transfer alerts. We review the information to ensure we have the most up to date information regarding all changes for journals.’ Transfer keeps progressing, creating new ideas and finding new collaboration opportunities. The biggest opportunity that recently happened is with NISO. Discussions began in early 2013 between Ed Pentz from Transfer and Todd Carpenter of NISO. At that time, the UKSG Research Subcommittee and KBART had planned to transfer to NISO, which prompted discussions about whether the Transfer Code would make sense as a NISO Recommended Practice. The Transfer working group discussed this in February 2013 and agreed that we should explore it, so the Transfer co-chairs began talking with representatives from NISO to begin the collaboration.

With the NISO Transfer collaboration announced in February 2015, Transfer now has support, maintenance and marketing provided by NISO http://www.niso.org/workrooms/transfer/. The most recent update to the Code of Practice has been republished Transfer version 3.0 as a NISO Recommended Practice (NISO RP-24-2015). The Transfer working group has now been established as a NISO Standing Committee to manage the ongoing support of The Code. One of the marketing improvements made as a result of the collaboration was to create a new logo. Keep an eye out for the new logo on NISO Transfer marketing materials and communications.
Morley, C.S. Forester (his Hornblower books), John Steinbeck, and Armed Services editions, perhaps in abundance given the number of Yanks stationed in England during World War II.

Not on my want lists and more likely to turn up, even or especially with twenty-one shops at my disposal, were those books that I didn’t know I was looking for. They would find me and several did.

A late addendum to my list were two titles by Wilkie Collins — A Woman in White and The Moonstone, either first or early contemporary editions. A bookseller friend, unable but not unwilling to accompany me to Hay, had asked me to seek, find, purchase, and bring home a couple. I didn’t ask him why he wanted them. He is a bookseller but also a consumer so it could just as well be that he wanted them to satisfy a personal craving or else he had a customer in mind who would buy them with an appropriate finder’s fee tackled on. Fair is fair and we need to support our local bookshops and those far away.

During my two days in Hay I had numerous conversations with booksellers but none so sustained and agreeable as those with Brian Tevidtale, owner of Belle Books.

He immediately greeted me when I entered his shop and asked if he could help me find something. I said that I was looking for some W.W. Jacobs books and was immediately led to one of the intimate aisles that had scattered Jacobs titles on them. He began pulling them off the shelves. We began talking books. If I like W.W. Jacobs, I might enjoy the stories about the men who shipped on Glasgow Clyde puffers. I soon held a paperback called Para Handy Tales by Neil Munro added to my Jacobs books, Methuen editions in distinctive green and white dust jackets. We bandied about several other authors and books we like and then Brian really impressed me. When I mentioned the Hopalong Cassidy novels and he immediately followed with “Clarence Munford.” How many Americans could name the author who was responsible for William S. Boyd’s great success on the movie screen but without Munford’s realism and charm? From there we covered Edgar Rice Burroughs and his Tarzan and Martian series, H.G. Wells, books about the sea, and on we would go. I would mention an author or a title and on we went, till for tat. I’ll see you that author and raise you one title.

As we talked books, I mentioned my interest in William McFee. He regretted that he didn’t have any by McFee but later, as I was browsing his shop, Brian approached me and said, like the true booksman that he is, that he just remembered that he had a William McFee book at home. He consulted his database and announced that the title was Letters from an Ocean Tramp. 1928. I consulted my desiderata list and under Letters from an Ocean Tramp I saw 1911. Then I noticed that below was a note: “Subsequent English edition Cassell’s Pocket Library 1928.” Bingo!

“Yes, it’s on my want list!”

“Stop by tomorrow and I’ll have it for you.”

“Fine. I’ll call again tomorrow.”

I thanked him and paid him for my Jacobs and Munro, all the while anticipating receipt of Letters from an Ocean Tramp the next day.

I left Belle Books and wandered the crooked streets of Hay and entered Hay-on-Wye Booksellers. I found a couple of Penguin paperbacks by Anthony Powell and was exploring another section of the shop when Brian breathlessly approaches me saying that he had looked in every other bookshop in Hay for me. Brian had been diagnosed with cancer three years earlier and still treads easily but that didn’t deter him. He was worried that he might not be in his shop when I returned the next day, so he had gone home, retrieved the McFee book, and then hunted me down. He made the sale in someone else’s book shop but no matter in such a close book-bound community. Before we left he introduced me to Hay-on-Wye Booksellers, an antiquarian, he told me, and we puzzled over the lack of Wilkie Collins early editions. Brian returned to his shop and I finished browsing and paid for From a View to a Death and A Question of Upbringin’. Laid inside the latter was a small sheet of paper (3¼” x 5”) containing a hand-written recipe for Egg & Prawn Curry, not worth mentioning of itself but in conjunction with the hand-written recipe for Yorkshire Cake on the last page [blank] of Go She Must. I somehow feel the spirit of previous owners when I find such notes and artifacts. I am reminded of another Anthony Powell title, Books Do Furnish a Room. Amen.

As an aside, while in Brian’s shop the next day (he did open as usual), he shared with me the story of the scale model, authentically colored Polish tank of WWII that perched on a shelf behind Brian’s desk and point of sale. He had made it from the get-well cards he had received when his friends learned of his cancer. Some of the odd pieces were made of match sticks and other small odds and ends but the bulk of it was from the cards and when turned upside down, the handwriting of well-wishers continued on page 71.
was visible next to printed text. It turns out that Brian had an engineering background before buying Belle Books to have something to do upon retirement, something he loved.

As in the States, several of the bookshops carry postcards, bookmarks, stationery items, and other souvenirs to help make ends meet. I did my best to help keep them afloat and came away with more than 60 post cards (42 have already been written and posted as I write this) and a dozen note cards, each with an association with Hay or books or both. Long adept at using email, I tend to eschew it except in certain circumstances when it suits the recipient best or when I want to convey something sooner than later. This is not a knock of the USPS, either, for it has to convey something sooner than later. This when it suits the recipient best or when I want the bookshop to have something to do upon retirement, something he loved.

If I collected early editions of British children’s books, I would have been in heaven, for almost every shop I visited had rows of William books, Noddy, Boys’ Annuals, Girls’ Annuals, Beatrix Potter, and Biggles, to name just a few. I looked at them, however, in hopes of finding some Uncle Wiggily titles or some of the tramper steamer adventures written by Howard Pease. The closest I came was finding a children’s book by Howard R. Garis but it was not one of his beloved Uncle Wiggily tales.

On my first day I purchased ten books including Fred Bason’s Third Diary, inscribed by the author. I have yet to see one of his diaries not inscribed. He wanted purchasers of his titles to get top value. If you have never heard of Fred Bason, I encourage you to read his diaries and tell me that you don’t find him interesting and likable. For more

Information, see https://paulrobinsonbooks.wordpress.com/2013/02/17/fred-bason-cockney-bookseller/.

The bookshops in Hay vary greatly in size and book stock as one might imagine. Some are bare bones shelves and books while others have inviting chairs and couches. Richard Booth’s has a table service café and a cinema. I did not see where the cinema is but I had the best and largest scone (not triangular but round like an American biscuit only larger) ever topped with cream and rhubarb jam. I needed two cups of coffee to wash it all down. It was the perfect nourishment in a land of books. As I sat there, with my purchases at my side, I was reminded of Kramerbooks & Afterwords in Washington, D.C. and the café in Blackwell’s nonpareil bookstore on Broadstreet surrounded by Oxford University.

On my last day in Hay, I began by visiting The Honesty Shop situated among the ruins of the castle. The shop, so-called, was unenclosed and the shelves of books were in disarray. I had heard tales of valuable sleepers being found among the common titles but there were none when I visited although I was intrigued by the number of books by Rita F. Snowden. Who was she and why the 14 hardbacks and 5 paperbacks scattered around. They should all be together so that an interested party (I wasn’t) could eliminate duplicates and compare condition. It turns out that Ms. Snowden, 1907-1999, was a New Zealander and a Methodist missionary who began writing in 1933 and churned out an average of one a year, 68 books in all. I was not in the market for devotional literature but hoped that I had made it easier for those who were. Just before leaving, I moved William Styron’s This Quiet Dust so that it sat next to his friend James Jones’s The Merry Month of May. But who would notice? 🕳️

Another possible opportunity is with CHORUS, the Clearinghouse for the Open Research of the United States, “is a suite of services and best practices that provides a sustainable solution for agencies and publishers to deliver public access to published articles reporting on funded research in the United States.” CHORUS and Transfer have talked briefly on how we could possibly assist in their process.

Transfer has proven over the last ten years to be a very valuable and significant resource for the library community. Utilizing information gathered from surveys, continuing to provide transfer title data in a variety of ways, and updating the Transfer Code of Practice are a few ways that Transfer stays relevant. Transfer today, as always, has been a very collaborative endeavor between librarians and publishers, and continues to be as it progresses forward. 🖼️

Please direct any comments on NISO’s Transfer to Alison Mitchell: <a.mitchell@nature.com> and Elizabeth Winter: <elizabeth.winter@library.gatech.edu>

Endnotes
2. NISO Website http://www.niso.org/news/pr/view?item_key=a6d43901fbfd-7674d20a780f6e7b590149a86.
3. Interview quote from Allyson A. Zellner, MLIS, Senior eLearning Specialist, EBSCO Information Services.
4. CHORUS Website http://www.chorus-access.org/.
Editor’s Note: In the February 2016 (v.28#1, p. 73) installment of this column, I ran a piece by Mike Garabedian in which he made a case for considering the proximity of the volume to its as-published state as a criterion for retention in shared print agreements. In this column, he reports the results of a survey that he performed to gather evidence in the stacks of several Southern California academic libraries about the condition of volumes as he defines it. Whether you agree with Mike about applying his definition of condition in making retention decisions, his work is useful in the more general argument about making retention commitments in the absence of in-stack verification. Along with the work that CI-CCI (Central Iowa Collaborative Collections Initiative) reported in this column in v.26#6 and the work that EAST has undertaken with a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation (I hope to publish a report from EAST in the fall of 2016), Mike’s findings about presence on the shelf and usable physical condition suggest that in the absence of at-shelf verification any given volume is 98-99% likely to be on the shelf and usable. That finding, if borne out by EAST and by the University of Virginia libraries under grant from CLIR (see this column in v.27#5 by Prof. Andrew Stauuffer), will help the shared print community better shape programs in the future. — BK

Introduction

In the February 2016 (v.28#1) installment of this column I argued that the condition of circulating books in academic libraries should be used as a “criterion when we consider which copies we should retain and which we should deselect to create shared print collections.” I suggested this idea probably isn’t too controversial to the extent that most librarians probably prefer to retain those book-copies whose boards aren’t falling off, for example, or whose pages haven’t been ravaged by any of the various enemies of books. However, I also made a somewhat more polemical proposal, arguing that because the books in any shared print collection “will have to be all things to future researchers, including researchers interested in books as primary documents and artifacts,” general collections librarians ought to expand their definition of condition such that it aligns more closely with what their colleagues in special collections have in mind when they use this term. In short, if we’re going to rid of a bunch of duplicates, I argued, we ought to make certain that the one(s) we keep for posterity are the most “artifactually complete” copies in a group, by which I meant those copies closest to a book’s as-published state.

As I noted last time, the polemical aspect of using condition so defined as a criterion for retention and deselection has little to do with this notion as a theory — indeed, all things being equal, who wouldn’t want to retain only the “best,” most artifactually complete copies? — and nearly everything to do with putting it into practice. Currently no catalog records for items in circulating collections effectively include condition metadata, and in the main general collections librarians have neither the tools nor a standard vocabulary to describe condition. Thus, if condition were to be considered as a criterion for shared print, then librarians would have to develop tools to assess and procedures to record condition, and then actually deploy those tools and procedures. In the minds of practitioners unused to thinking about the value of print books’ being located in anything beyond the information they contain, the idea of spending time and money to figure out which copy among several is in the best shape is a controversial notion that hardly seems worth it — and perhaps especially not in an era of ever-strained and shrinking library budgets.

Convinced that identifying the most artifactually significant items in our custody in fact might be a more workable, less expensive prop-osition than some might think, in summer 2014 I developed and then undertook a multi-collection condition analysis in order to understand better the time and labor this kind of validation might entail. In this column I describe this survey and its outcomes.

Definitions, methods, and sample

For the first part of my pilot project I needed not only to define the physical attributes condition validation would include, but also to undertake the more difficult tasks of developing the procedures by which condition would be assessed and recorded. For the second part, I actually put these procedures into practice by assessing the condition of mutually-held copies at several member libraries within the State-wide California Electronic Library Consortium (SCELC). With the artifact-focused view I have described previously, I developed my project’s survey instrument, seeking to gather information not only about completeness of and damage to mutually-held book-copies in SCELC member library collections, but also about key artifactual elements of these items. I sought above all to keep my apparatus complex enough to capture significant artifactual information, but simple enough for work study students to deploy, and short enough to make analysis efficient and cost-effective. To help shape my questions I looked to some of the well-known published condition surveys undertaken in circulating collections at Yale, the University of Illinois, and Syracuse in the mid- and late-1980s; more recent surveys from the Universities of Kansas and Southern Mississippi; and a condition survey apparatus employed by the preservation unit at the University of California at Los Angeles.

In part because my goals of hypothetical deselection of mutually held copies for shared print were different than the goals in previous surveys (i.e., extrapolating conditions about entire collections, and prioritizing volumes in a single collection for preservation) without exception the survey instruments in these studies comprised far too many questions. However, the responses in the published studies informed my ultimate apparatus, which represents a kind of stripped down version of these more complex surveys. See http://tinyurl.com/conditionsurvey to view the instrument itself.

It is beyond my scope here to describe the survey instrument in detail, but it bears noting that leveraging Google Forms to design a survey instrument that fed directly into a Web-based database, in addition to using barcodes as unique identifiers, made the process of data collection and analysis far easier and more efficient. Scanning barcodes rather than inputting this information manually (or inputting another kind of unique identifier like call number, title, author, or imprint information) saved significant time. It also allowed me to draw out information about book-copies from existing ILS item records, and to manipulate this data for the purposes of comparing mutually held titles.

From an existing dataset of OCLC holdings at SCELC member libraries, I derived a convenience sample of nearly 42,000 titles at Whittier College (my home institution) published before 2010 and held at two or more other SCELC libraries within 25 miles. To generate statistically significant results, I wanted a final sample of around 4,000; and because the seven institutions I selected hold the 42,000 titles to varying degrees, I sorted items into categories based on the number of libraries in which they appear (3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8). I sought to examine titles from each category in equal amounts, requiring the sample to include approximately 667 items per category. This evenly distributed final sample was achieved by sorting the existing sample of available titles at the selected institutions by imprint date followed by call number, and then selecting every nth title in each category, where n was determined by dividing the total number of
Following a first survey conducted at my institution, I visited the remaining seven SCELC libraries between July 14 and 27, 2014, armed with a laptop, barcode scanner, and a list of books to examine. At each institution I located each duplicate copy in the stacks, scanned its barcode, examined the book to record the data in my form, then re-shelved the item before moving on to the next title.

After data collection, from the survey results spreadsheets I isolated the barcodes for the items I scanned at each institution. I then emailed these barcodes back to staff at each of the eight survey institutions, where systems librarians used review files to associate the correct author, title, and OCLC number with the barcodes, as well as the circulation data for these items, and then exported this information into a text file which they sent back to me. Next, I imported this information into the survey results spreadsheets from Google Forms and aggregated all the survey results in one spreadsheet. Arranging the data by OCLC number resulted in groupings of mutually held copies whose conditions could be easily compared.

### Into the Stacks

In total I examined 3,429 book-copies, spending two days at six libraries and one day at two, where the average time to find and examine mutually-held book-copies was 90 seconds, or around 40 books per hour (I excluded Loyola Marymount University from this calculation because the staff there pulled duplicates prior to my arrival, making the average time to examine copies just 30 seconds). The majority of book-copies I was not able to verify (i.e., unable to locate in the stacks) were checked out to patrons, or as in the case of Azusa Pacific University, in the midst of a relocation. After examining and recording the conditions of these 3,429 copies, I compared mutually-held titles in my aggregate spreadsheet. I think three findings are worth sharing:

First, as figure 1 shows, I discovered that the vast majority of the copies I examined are in what general collection librarians might call “good shape.” Only 2% of all books I examined had external conditions I regarded as poor, and only 1% of all books I examined had poor internal conditions (e.g., the egregiously coffee-stained and highlighted). In other words, if our concern is merely with the so-called intrinsic value of a book as a packaging for text, 98% of all the books I looked at could be candidates for use in a shared print repository.

Second, as indicated by figure 2, there was a correlation between the frequency a copy circulates and the extent to which it is damaged — though perhaps not as strong a correlation as some might imagine.

Third, and to my mind most importantly, when I plotted total copies against those copies that had what I designated artifactual (or what I have called “paratextual”) value (i.e., original dust-jackets, original paperback binding, or facsimile paperback binding), then grouped by “total copies,” a clear trend emerged (traced in figure 3): Overall, 31% of the copies in the groupings have artifactual value. Thus, statistically speaking, if in the sample group a title existed in less than three copies, any random deselection had the potential to remove artifactualy valuable copies from the shared print collective.

Before I undertook the condition survey project, by far the question I heard most often from practitioners was some version of this rhetorical one: “Do you really think it’s worth it to spend all the time and energy and money it would take to figure out whether one duplicate has a dust-jacket when another copy doesn’t?” I still maintain — as I did before starting — that ultimately librarians must decide for themselves whether it will be worthwhile to locate and retain these volumes. In the previous installment of this column I attempted to argue why I think...
The 11th Electronic Resources & Libraries (ER&L) Conference drew about 800 attendees — a record number — to Austin, the capital of Texas, on April 4-6, 2016.

They represented libraries, museums, hospitals, publishers, and aggregators in 49 states (all except South Dakota) and 10 countries. The conference featured the usual mix of pre-conference workshops, plenary and breakout sessions, as well as a tabletop exhibit hall. The conference venue was the AT&T Executive Education and Conference Center on the campus of the University of Texas.

The first ER&L Conference, which attracted 200 attendees, was held in March 2006. It was organized by Bonnie Tijerina, formerly at Harvard University, and now Fellow at the Data & Society Institute, “to facilitate communication and foster collaboration among information management professionals working to manage electronic resources.”

Still the convener and driving force behind ER&L, Bonnie is largely responsible for its success. Since 2014, presentations focusing on the user experience in libraries have been collected into a separate conference, Designing for Digital (http://www.designingfordigital.com/) that immediately follows ER&L. This year, there were 150 attendees at Designing for Digital.

Finding Time: The Opening Keynote

The opening keynote by Professor Dawna Ballard, College of Communication, University of Texas, was entitled “Finding Time: From Industrial Mythology to Chronemic Literacy.” (Chronemics is the study of time as it is bound to human communication.) She said that time is a silent non-verbal body language. Everyone knows time differently, and it is central to our quality of life, assuming two forms:

1. Industrial time — what is measured on a clock. We need to step back and look at the hidden assumptions that we unconsciously use to manage our time.

2. Pre-industrial or post-industrial time — based on an event. There is a particular time to do things (for example, planting and harvesting in agriculture).

Here are three myths of the industrial world:

- **Better time management skills and tools will make you more productive.** But we often do not realize that time management is usually oriented with factory work. We are not in factories! The reality is that time management is not related to productivity.

- **It is not true that if you love what you are doing, it doesn’t feel like work.** Be wary of language that tries to mask work as something else. The human relations tradition was based around the idea that people love working. But there are human limits to work. Parenting is an example: we love our children, but caring for them may feel like work.

- **Focusing on work-life balance will lead to greater well-being.** The reality is that focusing on balance can create undying frustration. The idea of balance is something that machines do; the term does not apply to human beings. We are not trying to measure which is “heavier”: work or life. In our minds, the ideal could be represented by a person standing balanced on one leg, which would not be work because the person would not be moving. Instead, the reality can be pictured by someone standing on a tightrope and juggling several balls in the air. In such a situation, we feel that we cannot cope, get frustrated, and drop everything but the “work” ball. That seems like a choice but it really is not because we must have a job to support our families.

Open Content in Knowledge Bases

Jane Burke, VP of Customer Success at ExLibris, described the acquisition of ExLibris by ProQuest and said that the amount that libraries spend on licensed content is rapidly increasing. No library can manage e-resources on its own — working with multiple vendors is challenging, tedious, and time-consuming. ProQuest recently did a study of the ten databases to which libraries frequently subscribed and found that it requires about 81 hours/month to keep them updated.

ProQuest and ExLibris both have legacy databases. As part of their integration, a new combined knowledge base will be built. It will be relational, designed to support the future of libraries and research, and provide for interoperability and “temporal logic,” thus allowing studies on the development of the database over time.

Search, Serendipity, and the Researcher Experience

Lettie Conrad, Executive Manager, Product Analysis at SAGE, said that when considering serendipity, there is an important distinction between the chance encounter itself and realizing its relevance or importance, then turning it into insight. (Think of Alexander Fleming’s discovery of penicillin. It took understanding to recognize that the substance growing on a contaminated Petri dish had antibiotic properties.) Publishers are often more focused on the first aspect, the stumbling upon something new, but they are less concerned with the second aspect, where the “ah-ha” moment happens. Serendipity matters because online systems allow researchers to reframe their information need as they proceed. Designing search systems for serendipity may be the Holy Grail of the search experience.

Key principles incorporated into “SAGE Recommends,” a new capability on the SAGE Knowledge platform that suggests items for further reading, were:

- Academic research is personal and content-focused (not behavior-focused).
- The point of serendipitous discovery is the user’s current specific information need, and
- Serendipity should be unexpected.

Building a New Digital Library from the Ground Up

What would you do if you had nine months to build a complete digital medical library? That was the problem that Elizabeth Lorbeer faced at Western Michigan University’s School of Medicine. Lorbeer made the following observations of the current signs of the times that influenced her thinking as she was setting up a digital library for the School:

- The “library” has no fixed space and is everywhere. The same is true of the librarian.
- New programs are attracting students at all learning levels.
- Learners are increasingly using mobile devices.
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but constrained by costs, it could represent a middle way forward.

isn’t a guaranteed one, but for practitioners interested in preservation artifactually significant in one way or another. Of course this approach statistically speaking, it is likely that one of the retained copies would be

selection”

libraries agreed to save at least three copies in each grouping with collective. Thus if in my hypothetical grouping/scenario, participating had the potential to remove artifactually valuable copies from the group a title existed in less than three copies, any random deselection to do a copy-by-copy analysis. Again, in my findings, if in a sample some duplicates we retain in particular as a way to increase the chances that in any grouping of my project are more typical than not, then we might look to one finding expensive a proposition.

As a cost-saving measure, even spending $0.25 per book would be too

a shared print agreement in the hopes of deselecting duplicate copies

for Collections John McDonald and SCELC Program Manager Jason Price. For a map of the collections I visited and surveyed, see http://tinyurl.com/kjos29w.

This is not to suggest that a condition survey similar to my project would be free. For example, presuming a work study student earning $10 per hour proceeds at the rate I did (i.e., 40 books/hour), then labor-wise, each book examined in a given collection would cost a library $0.25 (and of course, this figure increases somewhat when we factor the time required for professionals or paraprofessionals to aggregate, analyze, and/or record this data in the item records within an integrated library system). Undoubtedly for some practitioners considering a shared print agreement in the hopes of deselecting duplicate copies as a cost-saving measure, even spending $0.25 per book would be too expensive a proposition.

However, presuming the sample institutions/collections utilized for my project are more typical than not, then we might look to one finding in particular as a way to increase the chances that in any grouping of duplicates we retain some artifactually significant copies without having to do a copy-by-copy analysis. Again, in my findings, if in a sample group a title existed in less than three copies, any random deselection had the potential to remove artifactually valuable copies from the collective. Thus if in my hypothetical grouping/scenario, participating libraries agreed to save at least three copies in each grouping with more than three duplicate book-copies (call it “random selection”), statistically speaking, it is likely that one of the retained copies would be artifactually significant in one way or another. Of course this approach isn’t a guaranteed one, but for practitioners interested in preservation but constrained by costs, it could represent a middle way forward.

Endnotes


2. For this portion I had significant help from USC Associate Dean for Collections John McDonald and SCELC Program Manager Jason Price. For a map of the collections I visited and surveyed, see http://tinyurl.com/kjos29w.

3. In this project I neither included nor attempted to calculate costs associated with post-survey tasks. However, it is worth noting that as Wardman Library Systems Librarian Nick Velkavrh has demonstrated, once condition data is aggregated into a spreadsheet, within most ILSs and utilizing load/import tables, it would be a relatively routine matter for a systems librarian or cataloger to import this information and map particular data elements onto a predetermined MARC field within the catalog records of surveyed books.
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from page 74

• Systems have become demand-driven.
• We have fewer staff available to organize and manage collections.
• We must rethink how we buy content.

The digital library that Lorbeer designed is all digital, and its Web site is designed to be mobile-centric. Products from Serials Solutions run the “back office,” and Springshare’s “Lib Guides” are used on the public Website. The collection began with access to 10,000 e-journals and 17,000 eBooks and has grown to about 74,000 unique titles through shared systems. Articles not available in the collection can be ordered through the library’s subscriptions to the Copyright Clearance Center’s “Get It Now” service [http://www.copyright.com/rightsholders/get-it-now/], the R2 Digital Library for health science professionals [http://www.r2library.com/], or by renting articles from ReadCube [https://www.readcube.com/].

Hard Data for Tough Choices: Electronic and Print Books in Academic Libraries

Matthew Connor Sullivan and Katherine Leach from the Harvard University Library said that there are two “givens” about academic eBooks:

1. eBooks have not supplanted printed books. They are used for quick reference and lighter reading; print books are used for deeper reading and research, and
2. Providing access to both is not possible, even for Harvard University, so purchasing decisions need to be made with care, and clear guidelines are necessary.

Users want and use both printed and electronic books; the challenge is to better understand user behavior.

Harvard has a huge collection of nearly 30,000 books, over 20,000 of which were published before 2012. The general patterns of usage for both printed and electronic books align closely. Most of the books in the collection were used at least once. Only 5% of the titles were used in both printed and electronic formats, leading Sullivan and Leach to conclude that eBooks were not being used for discovery of printed books.

Conclusions and questions from this study are:

• Users in the humanities and social sciences do not want the library to decrease their purchases of printed books.
• How do we work with publishers to avoid purchasing the same content twice?
• How can we serve users in different ways; what will be the effects on circulation desk staffing?
• What will be the effects on research, teaching, and learning?
• How can we shift money to purchasing e-books?

Alternative Avenues of Discovery: Competition or Potential

What does discovery mean and what do libraries need? Do library discovery systems make a difference? Michael Levine-Clark, Director, University of Denver Libraries, said that 39% of the referrals to a publisher from the University of Denver come from the library. A study that he and two colleagues conducted compared journal usage before and after a discovery system was implemented and found that libraries implement discovery systems for a several reasons:

• To improve the user experience by providing a Google-like interface,
• To provide a single starting point when the user does not know where to search,
• To replace the catalog,
• To reduce the number of individual A&I databases (and possibly reduce costs), and
• To compete with Google and increase the number of users starting their searches at the library.

We should be asking ourselves these questions:

• Is there a future in search and content for libraries? What value is the library adding?
• What would happen if we just cede discovery to Google Scholar and similar systems? Do we even need to be using discovery systems?
• What is the promise and threat of open access?

Ido Peled, VP, Solutions and Marketing, ExLibris, said that wherever users are, we should reach out to them; be proactive and find out where they do their research. Here are three inseparable components of a discovery system:

1. Make sure that information is available everywhere and that it has maximum functionality.
2. Provide a simple and intuitive design of the interface. What can we do to make sure that access is simpler through all interfaces (80% of consumption by today’s younger users is via a mobile interface)?
3. Analyze students’ behavior and usage to facilitate a better interaction. Take risks, and if something does not work, try something else—today’s users are very accepting. Students will use library services because of personalization and serendipitous discovery.

Jason Price, Director of Licensing Operations at SCEL, described three emerging startup companies that have developed alternative avenues of discovery:

• 1Science OA Solutions [http://www.1science.com] finds all OA papers by an academic author wherever they are archived and allows users to easily download them and their metadata.
• Zepheira [https://zepheira.com/] allows a user to search for a full picture of a university’s content regardless of where it resides. It is a founding sponsor of the LibHub Initiative [http://zepheira.com/solutions/library/libhub/].
• Yewno [http://corp.yewno.com] is a discovery firm based on ideas. It allows users to find associations between concepts and display them visually through its Hyperassociation of Related Instances (HARI, http://search.harisce.com) tool.

When E-Resources Are Used “Too Much”

What do you do when you observe excessive use of your e-resources? Laura McNamara, Electronic Resources Librarian at Thomas Jefferson University (TJU), was faced with that situation when a vendor detected unusually high downloading of items from a database to which TJU subscribed. Previous security procedures must be adapted to today’s changing environment. It is important to proactively monitor logs rather than wait for the vendor to contact you. View server status to find open sessions and terminate them if necessary. Learn how to communicate technical language to non-technical staff and train them to find intrusion attempts by detecting multiple failed login attempts. Suspicious events include use far above what is possible with ordinary browsing, all downloading directed to PDFs, and sessions with no browsing activity.

It is important to cultivate interdepartmental relationships and make the library’s privacy policy available without giving the impression that the library is trying to restrict access to information. Vendors should be cultivated to establish a partner relationship so that access is not shut down without warning and so that they are willing to provide log data in the event of a breach.

As always, prevention is better than a cure, and here are some lessons learned from TJU’s experience:

• Document everything; sometimes you must prove that you have not had a security breach.
• Establish security procedures before a breach occurs.
• Monitor system activity.
• Use two-factor authentication.
• Communicate with your users and recognize that libraries are at risk.

When Numbers Don’t Lie

Nobody likes to be the bearer of bad news, but sometimes it is necessary. Richard Wisneski, Assistant Director, Cleveland State
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University Library, said that when downward trends occur, library administrators, provosts, and faculty members need to know. His advice is to provide an honest and transparent assessment of the collection’s strengths and weaknesses, deliver an accurate measurement of what users are and are not using, and identify the most important resources. Retention decisions should not be based solely on cost per use data because platform design affects usage, subjects and content types are not the same, and usage spikes may be anomalous — see Bucknell’s article in The Serials Librarian.

Changing Your Environment to Support Library Research

Some information professionals, particularly in academic libraries, conduct research. A panel of three of them responded to questions about related issues:

What is your role as a researcher rather than someone that helps others in their research activities?

- Research is a requirement for promotion and tenure, so think about members of the committee evaluating you. Make it easy for them to understand what you do and how it is similar to what they have done in the past.
- Many researchers are very open to having a librarian collaborate with them. Research allows me to bring expertise to them and not be seen as simply a service person. Partnering with researchers helps me to learn about ways I can improve my own work.

Why do you do research?

- It is important to fill in the gaps of knowledge in our profession.
- It is an opportunity to share ideas, publish results, and be an active member of the community.

How do you get support for your research (emotional, funding, or time)?

- The institution supports my time for research, but there is never enough.
- The research community outside the library shares common experiences in research.
- You may need to seek out support. Have open conversations with supervisors and get good mentors to give you honest feedback about what will and will not work.
- Ask for time off to do your research; get the Dean’s support.
- Advocates outside of the library are invaluable.
- Get quick feedback from student assistants. Ask them to ask their roommates who don’t work in the library (but treat their roommates with dexterity of a monkey, visual acuity of an eagle. (For a fanciful image of such a user, see https://www.flickr.com/photos/julenemmy/68666664/).

Conrad suggested using a “Sankey diagram” to chart workflows (see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sankey_diagram). A study of graduate students showed that many of them used PDF versions of documents and did not interact much with the HTML versions, despite the large effort that most publishers put into creating them. And once they downloaded an article, they usually did not double check to see if it was still relevant before publishing their results.


Deirdre Costello, User Experience Researcher, EBSCO Information Services, said that we should be focusing our energy on the search results page. Google and Wikipedia are the foundation of how students do research. We are in an “eye byte” culture — the way we read is changing our attention spans, which are getting shorter.

Students trust Google to surface the most relevant results first. Typically, they only look at the first five results and if they do not see anything relevant, they change the search. They scan results, look for their search term in the title of the snippet, and use Google to create a “constellation of buzzwords.” Sometimes they use URLs to judge a site’s credibility; .org and .edu are good when writing a paper, but .com sites are regarded skeptically.

Students do not want the library to be like Google; instead, they want it to be a place where they can find relevant content and not be criticized for using it. They generally go directly to the library’s search box, do a search, and look for search terms in the title of the snippet. Authors and databases mean little to them.

Lisa Hinchliffe, Professor/Coordinator for Information Literacy Services and Instruction at the University Library, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) noted that UIUC’s library users consume information voraciously using its discovery service (Easy Search — see http://library.illinois.edu), which provides a single search box and presents results either as a classic list of hits or a “Bento display.” Transparency, predictability, and discoverability are important. Users want seamless digital delivery, coherent pathways to information, an interface that is as simple as possible (but not simplistic), and easy access to “My Everything.” They want the system to treat them as intellectually robust users. Easy Search is aligned with the library’s values and expectations and provides better content coverage than commercial discovery indexes. Detailed reports on many of UIUC’s analyses are available at http://www.library.illinois.edu/committee/ddst/discoveryresearch.html.

“Doing Media” — Learning Futures in a World of Change: The Closing Keynote

Professor S. Craig Watkins, from the department of Radio-Television-Film at the University of Texas, presented some of his research on young people and how they spend their lives as they interact with media. TV is no longer their dominant medium; they spend up to 13 hours a day online. They do not simply consume media but are participating in a media world; they are “doing media.” Watkins listed the following observations:

1. Doing Media. Young people’s relationships with media are complex and changing. Their use of social media is high; according to the Pew Research Center, here are the percentages

continued page 78

S. Craig Watkins
of teens age 13 to 17 who use various services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th>Google+</th>
<th>Instagram</th>
<th>Vine</th>
<th>Snapchat</th>
<th>Tumblr</th>
<th>Twitter</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. We live in an area of demographic explosion. The face of young America is changing; some teens are exposed to media as much as 13 hours a day.

3. The digital divide includes access to social and learning resources that support an ability to use digital media to design, innovate, and intervene in the world around them. Young people have increasing aspirations of doing this.

4. Design disposition. Young people want the Internet to be a resource for technology.

5. The “Age of Average” is over. Change is constant. Being average is no longer good enough. We are in a world of two classes of people: those whose skills are being replaced by smart machines and those whose skills complement smart machines.

6. Design literacy. What does it mean to be literate in a knowledge-driven economy or in a world where smart technology is pervasive in our lives? Is it the capacity to respond to adversity of complexity. We must bring those skills into learning spaces that we create.

---

**true stories at the smoky view**

By Jill McCroskey Coupe

The lives of a librarian and a ten-year-old boy are changed forever when they become stranded by a blizzard in a Tennessee motel, join forces in a very personal search for justice, and eventually confront the tyrant responsible for two suspicious deaths.

“With intricate story lines involving murder, library research, road trips, and Vrai’s and Jonathan’s quest for justice, and math including motherhood, love, marriage, betrayal, and true friendship, there is something for everyone in this light/dark Southern novel by a writer to watch.”—Library Journal

“This exhilarating debut novel brims with honesty, charm, heart, and good humor.”—John Diables, author of No Regrets, Coyote

“This is a story that creeps up on you, charming at first, then wrapping you in its spell until you truly feel the characters’ losses and what they have at stake. The plot is something you could almost imagine happening, yet just quirky enough to leave you with a frisson of escapism delight. Couple’s work is reminiscent of such varied sources as The Decameron, private eye stories and the films of Woody Allen. But ultimately, it’s its own amiable and poignant self.”—The Ivy Bookshop blog

---

7. **Paradigm shift for libraries.** Here are the key questions:

- Are your library and electronic services built to catalyze design literacy?
- Does your space welcome “design disposition” (making and sharing in a media world)?
- Do you think of libraries as social hubs and laboratories for producing knowledge? Think of them as spaces encouraging collaboration and interaction, not the traditional quiet study space.
- Do your services make learning authentic, resonant, meaningful, and production-oriented? Young people use resources that libraries make available and create their own learning ecology. Libraries provide a vital function in a learning ecosystem.

For further information, see Watkins’ book, The Young and the Digital (http://theyoungandthetradigital.com/) and his Website http://doinginnovation.org/.

The 2017 ER&L conference will be held in Austin, TX on April 2-5.

---

**Endnotes**


---

**Rumors**

from page 46

Hmm... was reading an article the other day by Joe Wikert (How Sirsi, Alexa, and Other IPAs will Revolutionize Publishing). IPAs (intelligent personal assistants) — Apple’s Sirsi and Amazon’s Alexa are gimmicks right now it seems like. I know people who use Sirsi religiously but I don’t have a need for it, at least not yet. And I have never used Alexa. Wikert likes IPAs because he says they will “enable us to have conversations with the most knowledgeable experts we’ll never meet and who really don’t even exist.” Will the book and the journal and containers go away? Does anyone want to guest edit an issue of *ATG* on this topic? The evolution or is it demise of the “container” for content/information? www.Bookbusinessmag.com/
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For many years, the Resource Description Unit at American University kept track of cataloging and related statistics using Excel spreadsheets, a frequently used method for tracking statistics in units across our library. As Resource Description staff members are increasingly working in more customer-service focused roles and performing work that is unique to their position, tracking and reporting of an individual’s statistics in spreadsheets has become more cumbersome. The accumulation of statistics on a spreadsheet does not always fully capture the scope of the work being performed. The Resource Description Unit wanted to brainstorm alternate methods of capturing information about our work. A Resource Description Specialist who had previously worked in the Reference and Circulation departments in the library suggested that we consider trying Desk Tracker to document our unit’s work. Desk Tracker is a commonly used tool in public services departments that tallies statistics about reference and other customer interactions. Our Resource Description Specialist thought that with some customization, Desk Tracker could become an easier, more efficient, and standardized way to capture detailed statistics about the work we perform.

The Trial
When we initially set up Desk Tracker, we agreed to also keep statistics in our regular spreadsheets for three months. This gave us ample time to be sure information was being captured accurately and no data was lost in case we made any modifications to how we input information over the course of the trial. Our first act was to meet as a group to decide specifics of what we wanted to track. These include the layout of the input page, what elements would be required, and new items we weren’t currently tracking. We wanted to be able to record the amount of time spent on specific types of work or collection. Additionally, we wanted the option to document specific cataloging issues such as which MARC fields were edited or languages cataloged.

We also wanted to be able to capture non-cataloging related data that was not always easily captured in a spreadsheet. Since the Resource Description Unit has two positions that have large customer-focused elements in the campus community, we felt it was important to record the types of customer interactions and time spent on those interactions. Other examples of information to record include the ability to add ancillary information about trips to the stacks, consultations with other library staff member performing the work, or even specific MARC fields in the cataloging record that needed editing. Desk Tracker allows for visualization of data in a variety of formats. This includes pie charts and line charts that can show, or percentages and quantities of types of work performed over time. This functionality has a great deal of potential as a tool to show the value of cataloging, trends, the amount of time spent on different types of work, or almost anything else to library administration. This has made analyzing trends in our work much easier.

With the ability to log specifics, we have been able to observe trends over time.
Examples include volumes of materials being cataloged in foreign languages, particular fields needing editing and ebbs and flows in quality of vendor-provided records. This information is very useful in regard to allocating staff time to particular workflows, identifying areas of work that need specific expertise or attention, and quantifying how staff is using their time. For example, our library has three separate rush workflows — one each for 4-hour Interlibrary Loans, Rush Reserves, and Hold/Notify. We have been able to determine when each of these separate types of rush book workflows is heaviest, and have allocated or adjusted staff time accordingly. There is a great deal of potential in using these types of analytics in determining where staff training is needed most, in terms of what formats or workflows are taking the most time or are heaviest. See Screenshot 2 and 3.

**Challenges**

There have been a few challenges and some tweaking regarding how we have input data since we began trialing this tool in spring of 2015. First, when there is staff turnover, one cannot delete an individual’s profile without deleting his or her statistics, which we need to have for library-wide annual reports. So we must keep logins for staff who have left their positions, at least until the end of a fiscal year. Secondly, tracking statistics for work performed in batch has required special customizations. When we originally set up Desk Tracker, we had it configured to track statistics for batch adds or edits in the catalog by creating multiple duplicate entries. When we realized that this created difficulties in both running reports and adding any notes in the “Additional Information” field, we changed this to a single entry with an option to input how many records, which is, in fact, easier to input. The system requires an initial investment of staff time to set up and configure the tool to work per a particular department’s criteria, as well as the requirement of the unit head or another designated person to serve as an administrator.

After using Desk Tracker for a year, the Resource Description Unit staff has been mostly happy with the transition to a new statistical tracking tool. It is worth the investment in time it has taken to set up and modify the tool to make it function for our unit’s cataloging and related work. Since adopting the Desk Tracker, staff has reported that they can enter data quickly, and modifications such as custom time stamps and adding multiple entries at once are very efficient. We have presented on the customizations and reports we have been able to run to other departments in our division and have encouraged them to try it out.

**Screenshot 2:** Example of chart created from a report of all original cataloging performed between June 1 and December 31 2015, broken down by format.

**Screenshot 3:** Example of chart created from a report of amount and type of rush cataloging performed between June 1 and December 31, 2015.
Little Red Herrings — Patrons, Patron Saints, and Pew

by Mark Y. Herring (Dean of Library Services, Dacus Library, Winthrop University) <herringm@winthrop.edu>

St. Jerome, the patron saint of librarians (and of translators and archivists), worried that he, a man of towering faith and obedience, would be found wanting at the end of his days. So taken was he with the literature of his day that he worried that he would be found more a “Ciceronian” than a Christian. In one of his letters to a correspondent, Eustochium, Jerome tells the story of spending much of his time reading Cicero, in lieu, one supposes, of the Scriptures, to the extent that he would fast simply in order to be able to read him. Indeed, he could give up anything, he remarked, but the library he had built for himself in Rome. When he presented himself at the so-called pearly gates, he claimed to be a follower of Christ. Alas, he was barred from entering, as the voice of God boomed out, calling him a liar and a follower of Cicero, not a follower of Christ. Jerome, thankfully, then woke from his nightmare.

I recall the story because it strikes me as emblematic of what is at the heart of libraries. Those of us who work these intellectual mines fill our buildings with the good, the bad, and the ugly of human endeavor, preserving all that chronicles everything that is right about us, and all that may well be wrong with us. If ever libraries were more torn between two lovers, as it were, it is now, when we are pressed on every side to be all things to all kinds of people. The question is, will it ever be enough? Will we be found wanting by the very patrons we seek to serve?

Yes, and no. The Pew folks who do a wonderful job of tracking what’s going on in libraries today released another report about libraries, patrons, and library usage (http://www.pewinternet.org/2016/04/07/libraries-and-learning/). On the one hand, patrons say we are doing a pretty good job (the Pew folks term it a “decent” one) of serving the educational and learning needs of our communities. Seventy-six percent say libraries do that job “very well” or “pretty well.” Moreover, 71% of our patrons say that libraries serve them and their families, again, very well, or pretty well.

Those who use us regularly tend to think of themselves as “lifelong learners,” and that’s another feather in our caps, another filigreed bookmark for our pages. Those of us who work in libraries would like nothing more than to be thought of as helping others become lifelong learners. Of those who have used a library or a bookmobile in the past year, 97% (“very well” or “pretty well”) of them think of themselves as lifelong learners. A whopping 98% of those who regularly use library portals say this term — lifelong learners — applies to them also. All this sounds like libraries are well on the way to reestablishing themselves as the intellectual cynosure of every community, and reclaiming ground lost over the years as noted in previous surveys. All is very well, or pretty well, right?

Not quite. It’s after all this that things begin to get a little mephitic, or, well, the pee-yew part of this post. In 2012, only 53% of all those surveyed had visited a library or a bookmobile in the past twelve months. In the most recent survey, that number is down to 44%. Those using library portals have gone up from 25% to 31% in 2015, but only one percentage point increase since the last such survey in 2013. In other words, things have leveled off. Many of those surveyed are still not fully aware of what libraries have (for example, in addition to books, eBooks, laptops, career counseling materials, etc.), of services they offer, how they can better the lives of those who use them, and much more.

Although we have a captive audience in academic libraries, our usage depends largely on what faculty assign and how much library research is required by those assignments. Usage among undergraduates has changed with the advent of electronic access. But even with electronic access, higher usage doesn’t always follow. Moreover, faculty continue to use us, but in falling numbers, many of them relying on other avenues or portals to address their needs.

Anecdotally, the usage in the academic library I am privileged to work in continues to increase. We have, however, noted a growing reliance in our building on group study and social collaboration. This isn’t a bad thing necessarily. But when even a medium-size library turns into an out-sized study hall, a redoubling of efforts must be made if for no other reason than to placate the bean-counters.

The professional literature continues to push marketing on us, and marketing is certainly important. Higher education is awash now in marketing schemes, some of which have been found to be more than wanting after millions have been spent. But most academic libraries are still recovering from the 2008 economic downturn and dollars are scarce when present at all in quantities enough to be counted. I suspect many librarians find themselves in the unenviable position of knowing that if they choose to buy X they are not going to be able to afford Y. Consequently, a marketing budget is not really a line item, however much it may be needed.

continued on page 83
Big news! **Springer Nature** has created a new scholarship for librarians to honor **Cynthia Hurd**, a dedicated librarian, whose career spanned more than 31 years in Charleston public and academic libraries, including the **St. Andrews Regional Library** and the **College of Charleston**. On June 17, 2015, **Cynthia Hurd** was killed along with eight other people at the historic **Emanuel AME Church**. The **Cynthia Graham Hurd Memorial Scholarship** for attendance to the **Charleston Library Conference** provides $1,500 to a librarian who has demonstrated an active interest in the profession, but has not had an opportunity to attend the annual gathering of librarians due to lack of institutional funding. The scholarship is to be applied to the costs of registration, travel, accommodations and meals. See more information and details on how to apply at [http://www.charlestonlibraryconference.com/springer-nature-creates-new-scholarship-librarians-honor-cynthia-hurd/](http://www.charlestonlibraryconference.com/springer-nature-creates-new-scholarship-librarians-honor-cynthia-hurd/).

**HARRASOWITZ** is accepting applications for its annual Charleston Conference Scholarship as well. Pursuant to the 2016 Charleston Conference theme of “**Roll with the Times, or the Times Roll Over You**”, applicants are asked to write an essay of no more than 1,000 words on the following topic: What does “Roll With the Times or the Times Roll Over You” mean to libraries and vendors? Application details are online at [http://www.charlestonlibraryconference.com/participate/scholarships/harrasowitz/](http://www.charlestonlibraryconference.com/participate/scholarships/harrasowitz/). Other scholarship opportunities are in the works, so check our Website at [http://www.charlestonlibraryconference.com/participate/scholarships/](http://www.charlestonlibraryconference.com/participate/scholarships/) for more info as it becomes available.

2016 conference registration is now open as of June 6, and the early bird discounted price will be available through Friday, September 16. Hotel group rate information has also been posted. Rooms always sell out quickly, so book yours asap! [http://www.charlestonlibraryconference.com/conference-info/hotelstravel/hotels/](http://www.charlestonlibraryconference.com/conference-info/hotelstravel/hotels/)

We’re working on several new ways to make the conference more fun! We will be bringing back the **Culinary Tours** we offered last year, but with expanded offerings of dates, times, and themes, including a **Mixology Tour, a City Market Tour, and an Upper King Street Tour**. **Broad Street Tours** will offer historic walking tours of the downtown area on topics such as the **Charleston Renaissance, Ironwork of the Holy City, the Civil War, Ghostly Stroll**, and more. A “Speed Networking” event is under discussion to liven up the **Happy Hour Networking** hour on Thursday and Friday afternoon at the **Courtyard Marriott Historic District**.

I’m super excited about this year’s **Closing Session** on Saturday, November 5, from 12:30-1:30 pm! **Erin Gallagher**, Electronic Resources & Serials Librarian at **Olin Library, Rollins College**, has agreed to host another **Poll-a-palooza**. You really missed out if you didn’t attend last year’s session, but there’s a video online so you can get a sense of the fun: [https://youtu.be/TTa40YPdU_M](https://youtu.be/TTa40YPdU_M).

**David Worlock**, Digital Information Services Strategist and Co-Chair of Oustell’s Leadership Councils, will wrap up with a summary of the conference. **David** did the closing session at this year’s **Fiesole Retreat** ([http://www.davidworlock.com/2016/04/with-milton-in-fiesole/](http://www.davidworlock.com/2016/04/with-milton-in-fiesole/)) and we’re honored to have him reprise the role in Charleston.

The **Charleston Premiers**, Five Minute Previews of the New and Noteworthy, will be moved to Friday afternoon, November 4, this year. We hope this change will better accommodate travel schedules for presenters and allow a larger audience to hear about all new companies, content, or technologies that are not widely known by the general library population and that will be of interest to the Charleston Conference audience. The format will remain the same, with five-minute “lightning round” talks presented back-to-back. The session will be moderated and organized by **Trey Shelton**, E-Resources & Acquisitions Librarian at the **George A. Smathers Libraries at the University of Florida**. More information on the **Premiers**, including how to apply to present, is online at [http://www.charlestonlibraryconference.com/conference-info/events/charleston-premiers/](http://www.charlestonlibraryconference.com/conference-info/events/charleston-premiers/).

If you have things to say, our **Call for Papers, Ideas, Panels, Debates, Diatribes, Speakers, Poster Sessions, etc.** is open through July 15 at [http://www.charlestonlibraryconference.com/participate/call-for-papers/](http://www.charlestonlibraryconference.com/participate/call-for-papers/). And as always, please let me know if you have comments, questions, or suggestions for the conference. I’d love to hear from you! 🍾

---

**Future Dates for Charleston Conferences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preconferences and Vendor Showcase</th>
<th>Main Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Conference</td>
<td>3-5 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Conference</td>
<td>9-11 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Conference</td>
<td>8-10 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Conference</td>
<td>7-9 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 Conference</td>
<td>5-7 November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Couple all this with the downturn in students choosing a four-year degree and the picture gets very murky very quickly. While 18-22 year olds may still want to spend four or five…or six years pursuing a college degree, Mom and Dad may not want to pay for it. To be honest, not many of those 18-22 year olds may want to, either. With most students incurring a minimum of $20,000 in debt on graduation (in many places nationwide it’s much higher), some sort of apprenticeship looks more and more inviting, especially if it ends in a steady, even modestly well-paying job. In the Palmetto State the average college debt is $29,163 with almost 60% of all graduates incurring that debt (http://ticas.org/posd/map-state-data-2015).

Meanwhile, the cost of scholarly communication continues to rise, open access slogs along going somewhere but where is unclear. Personnel costs mount, and healthcare costs are not only increasing, but so also is the burden to be shared by states and those covered. Then there is that factor no one talks about much anymore: the greying of the professoriate. Although it’s true that many in the professoriate will work not only beyond age 65 but even beyond age 70, the eventual reality is that the huge numbers of faculty hired in 1960s and 1970s will step down. Whether we like it or not, that will open the door for many changes to occur. While we await that eventuality, state legislators, parents and taxpayers are calling on higher education, its practices and its practitioners, to give an account of their reasons for being.

Frankly, when it’s all added up, the good news and the not so good news, even the most agnostic library lovers among us may be led to utter a cry to St. Jerome. 😌
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I know this is controversial and all that but I am fascinated by the initiative. (Opening Up the Repository by Carl Straumsheim). University of Florida and Elsevier are beginning a project to connect the university’s repository of scholarly works to the ScienceDirect platform. Despite publishing thousands of articles a year, the visibility of the university’s intellectual work was not good. According to Judith C. Russell, dean of University Libraries UF hasn’t had a culture of authors depositing their articles in its institutional repository. Getting faculty to deposit articles in an IR is not easy. We are finding that out at the College of Charleston. Judith C. Russell will join us in Charleston at the 36th Charleston Conference to discuss this innovative move. I can’t wait to hear all about it! Stay tuned! https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/05/25/university-florida-elsevier-explore-interoperability-publishing-space

Another of our speakers in Charleston is Anja Smit <H.P.A.Smit@uu.nl>, university librarian, University of Utrecht. She joined Utrecht University in 2010, after an international career of over 20 years in library management and library automation. Formerly she was a library director at two Dutch Universities (Nijmegen and Maastricht) and spent three years in the U.S. As an Executive Consultant for a non-profit library service organization she helped libraries on strategic and tactical planning, human resource management, facilities renovation, and other topics critical to library administrators. I first heard Dr. Smit speak in Berlin at the 17th Fiesole Retreat. Her topic was “Thinking the Unthinkable, A Library Without a Collection.” http://libraries.casalini.it/retreat/retreat_2015.htm

Another fantastic speaker is Kalev Leetaru, Leetaru co-founded a Web company in 1995, while still in middle school. His first product was a Web authoring suite. Leetaru’s undergraduate thesis at the University was a detailed history of the University of Illinois, and formed

Endnotes
1. Everything you ever wanted to know about the project: https://scopap3.org/.
7. “I’d like to teach the world to sing,” https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ib-QijkliQ-Q.
Altmetrics and Books: Bookmetrix and Other Implementations

by Donald T. Hawkins (Freelance Conference Blogger and Editor) <dthawkins@verizon.net>

We are beginning to see more frequent use of altmetric “donut badges” to measure the impact of scholarly journal articles, particularly in the STEM fields. By including data from social media platforms on numbers of downloads, readers, and even mentions in other publications, altmetrics are a significant enhancement of well-known citation and impact counts.

Altmetric data for books and especially individual chapters is rare. But now a new groundbreaking service has appeared, and it is showing significant promise in measuring the impact of books and book chapters. Just over a year ago, Springer, a leading publisher of STEM books, formed a partnership with Altmetric (http://www.altmetric.com) to develop a platform to display title and chapter level metrics for its large book collection. The result, Bookmetrix, presents data on

- Citations, based on Digital Object Identifier (DOI) data from CrossRef (http://www.crossref.org),
- Mentions, collected by Altmetric from blogs, tweets, and other social media data,
- Readers, organized by country, from Mendeley (http://www.mendeley.com) data,
- Reviews, collected by Springer from the literature, and
- Downloads of Springer’s eBooks.

The Springer Bookmetrix platform is an important addition to scholarly book publishing. For the first time, an easy method of obtaining quantitative usage data measuring the impact of a book is readily available. Authors and readers can obtain a view of not only how a book is faring in the market, but for the first time, data on individual chapters is also available.

In a press release issued at the 2016 London Book Fair, Springer said that the Bookmetrix feature has been well received and has received over 750,000 pages views per month. Over 1,500 authors have tweeted about their Bookmetrics scores.

Below are some screenshots of the implementation of Bookmetrix on the Springer Website (see http://www.springer.com/us/book/9783642248252). These data are all freely available on Springer’s Website, although that for many books is not as complete as the example shown here. The interface is well designed and easy to use and understand. Of course, the data are limited; at present only Springer’s books are in the system, and readership data is limited to that by users of Mendeley.

At the London Book Fair, Altmetric announced “Badges For Books,” a program similar to Bookmetrix and has received expressions of interest from publishers. These data are all freely available on Springer’s Website, although that for many books is not as complete as the example shown here. The interface is well designed and easy to use and understand. Of course, the data are limited; at present only Springer’s books are in the system, and readership data is limited to that by users of Mendeley.

Catalog Page for Digital Libraries: For Cultural Heritage, Knowledge Dissemination, and Future Creation on Springer’s Website. Note the Bookmetrix summary data at lower right.

Download Data for Digital Libraries...

Mendeley Readershhip Data for Digital Libraries... By Country, Reader’s Discipline, and Professional Status.

These data are all freely available on Springer’s Website, although that for many books is not as complete as the example shown here. The interface is well designed and easy to use and understand. Of course, the data are limited; at present only Springer’s books are in the system, and readership data is limited to that by users of Mendeley.

At the London Book Fair, Altmetric announced “Badges For Books,” a program similar to Bookmetrix and has received expressions of interest from publishers.
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of interest from several publishers. (Book data are based on ISBNs.) Routledge Handbooks Online (https://www.routledgehandbooks.com/), published by Taylor & Francis, is the first implementation of Badges For Books. And Brill Publishers (http://www.brill.com), a scholarly publisher focusing primarily on humanities books, has expressed interest in adding the Bookmetrix capability to its online catalog. These developments are a significant expansion of the Bookmetrix service because Routledge Handbooks focuses on the social sciences and humanities — disciplines which up to now have not been well analyzed because their research results are published mainly in books instead of journal articles. The addition of altmetric data on humanities and social science books will be an excellent expansion of our understanding of research trends in those fields.

I found the Bookmetrix system interesting and enjoyable to use. As an Editor of two recently published books (Personal Archiving: Preserving Our Digital Heritage and Public Knowledge: Access and Benefits), I would find it fascinating to learn the impact that my books are having! 📚

Donald T. Hawkins is an information industry freelance writer based in Pennsylvania. He holds a Ph.D. degree from the University of California, Berkeley and has worked in the online information industry for over 40 years.
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the basis for the University of Illinois Histories Project. Leetaru’s research has focused on the use of big data and networks and their utility in prediction.

And last but not least — tada — let’s not leave out the President-elect of ALA, James G. Neal who has agreed to take time out of his busy schedule to be our keynote speaker! Jim also answered the consolidation in the industry question and his provocative answer is in this issue, p.33.

There are many other fantastic and famous speakers. Search our Website for even more info!

And be sure and register for the Charleston Conference ASAP! See you soon! Love, Yr. Ed. 💌
I’ve never mastered flipping pancakes or eggs, so the thought of flipping an entire classroom is terrifying. But now the *moi du jour* is “flipping the model” for journal article publishing. The flipping discourse has moved into the library and information space.

How did we get to the age of flipping? Most librarians who’ve worked near serials have heard or given “The Talk.” You know how it goes: 17th century scientists invented the journal; the 1950s post-war boom innovated the commercially published scientific journal (a miracle of quick, cheap, and easy access in its time); late 20th century bloat brought about awareness of the serials pricing crisis (where I came in, writing a report for ARL in the late 1980s); then the Internet brought the e-journal; and quickly thereafter the Big Deal; and just as quickly thereafter the ideal of Open Access.

If ten years ago Open Access was for idealists, now it’s mainstream. How do we get there, at a greatly increased pace, is today’s question. These days, we have many OA business modes and models, for example the article processing charge (APC), institutional subsidization, freemium, green, and numerous variants. With a lot of setup and outreach work, the modest-sized but interesting SCOAP³ project (high energy physics)¹ has broken ground in flipping those subscriptions to an APC model.

Recently, analytical work of the Max Planck Institute² and others has raised the profile of “flipping.” Ralf Schimmer et al. reason that there is enough money in the scholarly publishing system, via subscriptions and other funds, to pay APCs — and possibly reason that there is enough money in the subscription system for large-scale implementation of free online access to, and largely unrestricted use and re-use of scholarly research articles.”⁴

The Berlin proposal has generated numerous comments and discussions. European organizations and institutions were quick to support it, with 46 signatories as of 30 April 2016. However, recently, ARL staff, via an unpublished briefing paper⁵, expressed numerous concerns from the U.S. side. In turn, Jeff Mackie-Mason, economist and university librarian at UC Berkeley, wrote in his blog expressing “skepticism or downright opposition” to these concerns. He stated that many are unsupported “by either facts or simple economic principles.”⁶

Hmm, well, how would it work? These days, “flip” (in journals publishing) points to a particular kind of change, from subscription to APC. What’s flippy is this: The premise so far has been that publishing is for the benefit of readers, and thus readers (or their libraries) should pay for subscriptions. Instead, we may assume that published articles are as much for the benefit of authors, many of whom are grant funded, and so those (fund) authors should pay the costs of publishing their articles, which become OA immediately at time of publication.

Still, the scholarly journal business is a distinctive one. The transaction for both authors and for users is of high value. Who benefits most? There can’t be a single answer to that question. The same article in the same journal may be breathtakingly valuable to the author (if the article helps her to win the Nobel Prize) and radically valuable to the reader (if the idea it triggers produces new work that earns another Nobel Prize). Not many articles come within a thousand miles of the Nobel Prize ceremony, but the example captures just a bit of the highly irregular, asymmetrical, unpredictable value transfer that happens when fresh new knowledge “goes public.”

Two aspects of a flipped model are key. The first, theoretical one is that we can change the value proposition and concentrate further responsibility for the scholarly publishing system into the hands of the institutions that do research (via their authors). The second is that changing that proposition will not be easy. Short of a magical Kumbaya moment that has the research, publishing, and library worlds singing in perfect harmony (see the old Coca-Cola ads), there must be a period when old and new models coexist — the gymnast moment when the feet have long since left the ground and lost the ability to be helpful, but the hands aren’t yet in a position to offer support if something goes wrong. We have to hope we don’t break what we started with, nor break the bank.

All that sounds scary. But our experience with the SCOAP³ project (today’s sustained example of flipping success and cost savings) convinces me that if we take bite-sized chunks, we can by this means advance OA, at least in certain funded scientific disciplines. Much more importantly, if we can build discourse between author, publisher, and library representatives, we can take the possibility a long way. This is where publisher-bashing doesn’t help. If we think we will negotiate with someone, excoriating them publicly doesn’t make them more open-minded or more trusting. Real success in the OA movement will come when and where an outbreak of trust occurs.

What happens after the gymnast makes the great landing and glides into the next move? By then, unanticipated consequences can emerge. What might we anticipate if we attempt to flip a number of key journals? There could be downsides — search online for negatives posted by various critics. For example, flipping is an imperfect idea, doesn’t work for all research/scholarly fields, too complicated, not radical enough, requires further study, and so on.

How about some upsides: There certainly is enough money in the subscription system for libraries to experiment with this type of change. Via APCs, journals might compete even more for quality authors and articles. More aware of publication costs, at least some authors might become more (different?) strategic about where they communicate the results of their work in possibly fewer articles. And if flipping to APCs were to bring some control over the Malthusian growth of journal publication — even a little — we might flatten the curves of growth of costs for formal publishing. The best fruits of research become openly available to all who would benefit.

For Advertising Information Contact: Toni Nix, Ads Manager, <justwrite@lowcountry.com>, Phone: 843-835-8604, Fax: 843-835-5892.
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¹ The Planck Institute ² and others has raised the profile of “flipping.”
² Ralf Schimmer et al. reason that there is enough money in the scholarly publishing system, via subscriptions and other funds, to pay APCs — and possibly reason that there is enough money in the subscription system for large-scale implementation of free online access to, and largely unrestricted use and re-use of scholarly research articles.²
³ The Berlin proposal has generated numerous comments and discussions. European organizations and institutions were quick to support it, with 46 signatories as of 30 April 2016. However, recently, ARL staff, via an unpublished briefing paper⁵, expressed numerous concerns from the U.S. side. In turn, Jeff Mackie-Mason, economist and university librarian at UC Berkeley, wrote in his blog expressing “skepticism or downright opposition” to these concerns. He stated that many are unsupported “by either facts or simple economic principles.”⁶
⁴ The Berlin proposal has generated numerous comments and discussions. European organizations and institutions were quick to support it, with 46 signatories as of 30 April 2016. However, recently, ARL staff, via an unpublished briefing paper⁵, expressed numerous concerns from the U.S. side. In turn, Jeff Mackie-Mason, economist and university librarian at UC Berkeley, wrote in his blog expressing “skepticism or downright opposition” to these concerns. He stated that many are unsupported “by either facts or simple economic principles.”⁶
⁵ The Berlin proposal has generated numerous comments and discussions. European organizations and institutions were quick to support it, with 46 signatories as of 30 April 2016. However, recently, ARL staff, via an unpublished briefing paper⁵, expressed numerous concerns from the U.S. side. In turn, Jeff Mackie-Mason, economist and university librarian at UC Berkeley, wrote in his blog expressing “skepticism or downright opposition” to these concerns. He stated that many are unsupported “by either facts or simple economic principles.”⁶
⁶ The Berlin proposal has generated numerous comments and discussions. European organizations and institutions were quick to support it, with 46 signatories as of 30 April 2016. However, recently, ARL staff, via an unpublished briefing paper⁵, expressed numerous concerns from the U.S. side. In turn, Jeff Mackie-Mason, economist and university librarian at UC Berkeley, wrote in his blog expressing “skepticism or downright opposition” to these concerns. He stated that many are unsupported “by either facts or simple economic principles.”⁶
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