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the University of Pittsburgh. And though she just had serious back surgery, I tell you it didn’t slow her down a bit. She just kept working and working and working and tried to ignore the pain. Like I said, read her first column, this issue, p.74 and send her ideas for more columns from the end user perspective.

I guess this is old news now, but it’s still shocking! Microsoft never quits, right? From the New York Times, May 24, 2008 — “Microsoft said Friday that it was ending a project to scan millions of books and scholarly articles and make them available on the Web, a sign that it is retrenching in some areas of Internet search in the face of competition from Google, the industry leader.” See “Microsoft Will Shut Down Book Search Program,” by Miguel Helft. Microsoft was partially funding the Internet Archive but Brewster Kahle says they have enough money “...for a while and [eventually] funding will come from the public sphere” U Of Toronto and other libraries plan to continue with the project. And this from Techdirt, the Insight Company for the information age — “... Microsoft ... is handing over the scanning systems it put together to its various library partners and hoping they’ll continue scanning on their own, saying: ‘Based on our experience, we foresee that the best way for a search engine to make book content available will be by crawling content repositories created by book publishers and libraries.’”

www.nytimes.com/2008/05/24/technology/24soft.html?_r=1&th&emc=th&.techdirt.com/2008/05/24/ittoolbox/58690.html

Just heard right now from the awesome Pete Binfield <pbinfield@plos.org> (once with Sage). Well, as you can tell from his email address, Peter has moved on, as they say, and is now working for the Public Library of Science. He is Managing Editor of PLoS ONE (their largest journal). Peter says he is planning to come to Charleston in November and is hoping to submit a paper proposal shortly. By the way, have you submitted your paper proposal yet? www.Katina.info/conference

And, wonder of wonders, the fantastic Lolly has given us permission to post her copyright columns on the ATG News Channel. We hope that will be happening shortly! Stay tuned! www.against-the-grain.com

And the always on the ball John Riley sends us this link about the Microsoft book search project. www.oregonlive.com/business/oregonian/index.xsf?/base/business/121167533184710.xml&coll=7 And be sure and read John’s column, Library Marketplace in this issue, p.55. It’s truly fascinating. Want to know all about algorithms, making print books from the Web, PODs, and ghosts in libraries? See this issue, p.55.

Speaking of PODs (Print on Demand books), as John points out, Amazon.com is in the news for its announcement that from now on all print books for sale on their Website must be printed by BookSurge, the Charleston, SC-based company which Amazon bought back in 2005. Moving right along, on May 20, BookLocker.com filed a class action lawsuit against Amazon.com in response to their attempts to force all publishers to pay Amazon to print their books. Booklocker is a POD publisher based in Maine. antitrust.booklocker.com/booklocker-files-class-action-lawsuit-ag...

continued on page 26

The Google Effect — Part 2

Publishing to the Web. Lila also discusses her work with Google’s customized search engine (CSE) to limit search results to her chosen resources and references.

Nathan Rupp (“Original Proposal: Developing a Business Library Collection in the Age of Google”) provides an interesting story on how a class assignment and ingenuous students presented new challenges for the collection development librarian. Google provided these students with easier access to expensive, market reports and the information providers themselves. Rupp notes that libraries are no longer the only folks that can play a role in negotiating, collecting, and providing access to information, and suggests that the sooner we realize this, the more relevant librarians will be to their students.

John Wenzler (“Keeping the Enemy Close: Integrating Google Scholar into the Online Academic Library”) suggests that libraries should “domesticate” Google Scholar to make the most of this tool, add it to the proxy server, and treat it the same as other library databases. Libraries should add it to the library “toolbox” to ensure library credibility and provide search exposure to their resources. He also leaves us with a question — Is Google Scholar a disruptive innovation with ambiguous implications for the future of academic libraries?

Finally, Bruce Heterick (“Measuring the ‘Google Effect’ at JSTOR”) shares the effects of allowing Google to index the journal content preserved in JSTOR. Google has increased the “girth” of the linking Web and in doing so, increased the exposure and use of JSTOR content. He concludes that we are just beginning to see institutions, publishers, and providers begin to measure the “Google Effect” and distill useful lessons from those experiences.

Thanks go to all of you for contributing to these last two issues! Here are the things that we have learned from this project:

1. There is indeed a “Google Effect,” and it is far-reaching!
2. While Google can be perceived as a threat, our writers have suggested that libraries and vendors take a proactive approach. For vendors this means additional resources to support content exposure and meet user expectations. For libraries, this means embracing Google tools, integrating Google Scholar into library resource lists and offer search options on our library home pages. Google and similar tools can also be used to promote information literacy, additional information resources and services and our own expertise.

3. Finally, as information professionals, we must become experts on Google just as we strive to be with all of our information offerings. This means not only understanding the content & features of Google Tools and “databases,” but also their shortcomings, particularly in regard to searching and linking.4

We thank you for the opportunity over the last two issues, and we welcome your comments! (Please send to <kstrauch@comcast.net>.)
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