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modules which a library can license independently to meet document delivery or current awareness needs in the most effective way. And of course, libraries and end users are the customers whom our publisher partners want to serve through the publication platforms we build, so all of the services I’ve just talked about are ultimately designed to meet their needs — whether it’s by integrating software and content with the tools used by these groups (such as bibliographic managers or RSS readers), or by adhering to industry standards such as COUNTER and OpenURL.

In a world where technology is easier to manage and increasingly inexpensive, why do publications work with companies like Ingenta?

We’re increasingly finding that the evidence does not bear out the assumption that technology is becoming easier to manage. In a world of evolving industry standards, demand for more advanced “bells and whistles”, semantic Web developments and visibility amongst the vast array of content on the Web, publishers are under pressure to conform to the latest standards, regularly roll out new features and functionality in line with technical advances as well as ensuring their technology is robust, scalable and future proof. A challenge which can be a distraction from publishers’ core area of expertise (publishing) which in turn can impact on ROI as technology choices are critical to the success of publishers’ businesses. As a result, we’re finding that demand for the support of an established technology partner remains strong.

Technology for publishers is Ingenta’s core competence, our sole focus, which is why a growing number of publishers (more than 250 now) are seeking Ingenta’s support for their technical strategy.

Rumors from page 71

and information on the site, though the material created by contributors and the user community, which each member will control and be credited for, will be published alongside the encyclopedia. Encyclopaedia Britannica itself will continue to be edited according to the most rigorous standards and will bear the imprimatur ‘Britannica Checked’ to distinguish it from material on the site for which Britannica editors are not responsible.” See “Encyclopaedia Britannica Goes – Gasp! – Wiki,” by Josh Fischman, Chronicle of Higher Education, June 6, 2008. www.chronicle.com britannicanet.com?p=86

Tis the season to be collaborating … Look at our interview with the astute Remmel Nunn about Crossroads in this issue, p.56. And, another interesting development. The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and SPARC (Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition) have released a new series of bookmarks in the Create Change campaign, which targets scholars in different disciplines with messages about the benefits of wider research sharing. Librarians can use these freely available files to enhance their efforts to engage faculty interest in changing the way scholarly information is shared. The Create Change Website emphasizes the rapid and irreversible changes occurring in the ways faculty share and use academic research results. www.createchange.org www.acrl.org www.arl.org www.arl.org/sparc

Did you see the information that we posted on the ATG News Channel (5/13/08)? I am posting a Rumor most every day. Bad, bad, if you didn’t!! Anyway, there was a lawsuit filed against Georgia State University by three publishers – Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, and Sage Publications. The publishers take issue with how Georgia State is handling electronic reserves. The Chronicle of Higher Education interviewed Lolly Gasaway, ATG’s expert on copyright, about this lawsuit which alleges that Georgia State professors infringed publishers’ copyrights by “inviting students” to download, view, and print material from thousands of copyrighted works. The outcome of this lawsuit could have implications for how colleges distribute course material online.

We told you last time about Choice’s move into new digs in late 2008 or early 2009 (ATG, V.2008, p.12). Check out these photos of the construction project and see how Irv looks in a hard hat! www.flickr.com/photos/acrl/sets/72157604368374700/

And – last but not least – wanted to let you know that the New England Journal of Medicine has selected Atypon for its new integrated content delivery platform. There is a certain symmetry to this which is why I picked it as our last Rumor. ATG has interviews in this issue with both Tom Richardson of NEJM and Chris Beckett of Atyon. Like, cool! www.atypon.com content.nejm.org/ www.massmed.org/
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I don’t know if we at the University of Hong Kong Libraries should feel violated or elated. At the moment I think we are feeling more the former than the latter.

In the spirit of the Open Web and the digital future, we made the decision several years ago to go electronic for theses and dissertations (http://etd.lib.hku.hk/). From then on most students were required to submit their theses (Hong Kong English for theses and dissertations) to us in electronic form. We also subsequently tried to communicate with all former students to seek their permission/acquiescence so that we could scan and put up digital versions of their theses. The program has been a smashing success. Borrowing statistics for the printed versions have gone down into the basement and the opposite has happened for their electronic versions.

Our most popular electronic dissertation, according to our Systems Librarian and Head of the Technical Support Team, David Palmer, is that of one time student and Hong Kong pop singer super star James Wong’s “The rise and decline of cantopop” or, “粵語流行曲的發展與興衰.” There have been 4,500 downloads since it was put online in 2003. So, this is cause for “elation” — right? Yes, of course but we recently discovered we should feel “violated” for “elation” — right? Yes, of course but we agree to these terms.

First of all, I will quote three:

3. I agree to use this thesis under the terms of the Hong Kong SAR Copyright Ordinance. (http://sunzil.lib.hku.hk/hkuto/agreement_form.jsp)

Based upon this wording, my guess is those who downloaded and uploaded the Wong dissertation did so thinking “Since I won’t charge anyone for using it and the purpose is for research (in its loosest sense), it is OK to do it.” This is fairly logical thinking unless you have read Templeton’s observations, e.g., download it for your own research but you don’t have the right to upload it and share it with others.

Let’s now turn to the matter of Web etiquette. Suggestions about what is proper behavior are of course highly subjective. A 2001 posting on the UseNet Replayer by Cherri Stryker from the dancingbones.org list suggests that because members of that community all spend lots of energy producing images, those who want to post one of their images should “try to include in the filename either some initials or other recognizable code so that people who use the pictures later can keep track of where they got them. [and] When posting a finished piece of art, please credit the person who produced the original images...” Regarding downloading say to the person doing so to “DO NOT try to sell any of this stuff, in any way, either individually, or by putting it in a compilation and selling the compilation...” In essence what is being suggested is the golden rule to treat others like you would like to be treated.

But where does all of this leave us at Hong Kong University’s Library. Should we be elated that we have contributed to the Web and the world of pop music by allowing them all to download this thesis and its 14,000+ mates? Or should we feel violated, angry, and call the Internet police (if there were such)?
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