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Adventures in Librarianship — Selling Your Soul

by Ned Kraft (Ralph J. Bunche Library, U.S. Department of State) <kraftno@state.gov>

I recently had the pleasure of sitting down with Susan Doorslamm, Assistant Director of Libraries for Hardly County. Ms. Doorslamm made news at a poster session for this year’s MLA convention when she announced her Library’s new marketing and fund raising strategy. Entitled “I Went Down to the Crossroads,” the session made more than a few senior librarians blanch and junior librarians sign up for nursing school.

[For the sake of full disclosure, Ms. Doorslamm agreed to be interviewed only after ATG committed to a profit-sharing arrangement with the Friends of Hardly County Library.]

ATG: You caused quite a stir at MLA with your new approach to fund raising and marketing. Can you tell us what inspired you?

SD: Well, first was the desperation. That, followed by the County Commissioner sending out an appraiser to size-up the library’s property. Then there was the six hour “Apprentice” marathon on cable.

ATG: I see. May I ask, your “Adopt a Librarian” program, has that started and is it going well?

SD: Yes and yes. At first the librarians balked at having their salaries and benefits paid by wealthy benefactors. Most of them didn’t care much for the “I belong to….” so-an-do-t-shirts, especially when bathing. And for a few, the groveling wasn’t at all comfortable. But most of the staff has adapted quite well and no longer mind living in the basements of other people’s houses. There are some benefits, you know. Cool, dark humidity is good for the skin.

ATG: Ah, right. And I remember you saying something about stapling notices to telephone poles. How would that work?

SD: It’s not just the stapling. There’s no money in that. We will be stapling flyers offering seasonal services.

ATG: What do you mean by seasonal?

SD: Well, gutter cleaning, tree pruning and other hard-to-reach type jobs. The library happens to own several extra-long ladders and they shouldn’t go to waste.

ATG: But most of your staff is some-what elderly. Are they going to be able...

SD: They don’t know about the ladder business yet and I appreciate it if you didn’t tell them.

ATG: Well, okay. Mum’s the word. Finally, you outlined a plan to rent out the library space for wedding receptions, theme parties, raves, and a few events of question-able legality. Were you able to follow through on that plan?

SD: I was. And it’s working out very well. We’re now operating in the black. No more layoff threats. A full book budget. And the librarians find that checking coats and serving drinks is no more demeaning than shushing teenagers and escorting the incontinent. We’re booked solid through November.

ATG: But what about your library functions?

SD: Not much time for that, is there?

ATG: So you’re keeping the library open by keeping it closed?

SD: Therein lies the genius of the whole thing.
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grand projects to aggregate back runs of the most vital scholarly literature.

There are other new sorts of entities out there — Dan Lee describes Sophie, with which we will all be able to create our own networked books — or to participate in the networked books of other authors. Amanda Maple sorts out new modes of access to music and its scores and recordings. Katherine Holvoet asks if access to government documents will be easier or more difficult. She answers, “Yes.”

Johann van Reenen quotes our researchers — “If it’s not digital it does not exist for me” and “Everything I need is free on the Internet.” Rather than arguing this point, he suggests we strive to make it so with behind-the-scenes CD and digitization. Help customers be better users of Google Scholar and look for joint-venture opportunities with commercial players.

I asked Tom Sanville of OhioLINK if we still need consortia. He thinks so. “No matter how you choose to cope, you can succeed better within a group than on your own.” Tom wants us to reinvent ourselves. “If we do not change ourselves, we ultimately will see steady, slow deterioration in our capabilities. The scary thing is that only by looking back will we see how much ground we have lost. The slow decline is deceptively painless and even rewarded in our institutional cultures. If we wait too long, we will be unable to reverse the decline.” I think this is right. And pretty scary.

Publishers face challenges — can they meet the needs of born digital scholars and also reach all of those who need access to their publications? Without going out of business? New publication models come from three groups — Cecile Jagodzinski, Indiana University Libraries and Colin Allen, a philosopher and SEP editor, write about SEPIA — a support group for the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. The libraries liked the idea of partnering with faculty to create an Open Access tool they needed and wanted. And they wanted SEPIA’s developers to start thinking about how the project can have broader applications to other disciplines.

Oxford University Press, has been trying out and studying whether or not Open Access publishing can work for mainstream journals and what has been learned from putting NAR (Nucleic Acids Research) online and try out mixed models with other mainstream OUP journals. (See Richard Gedge’s article in the upcoming issue of ATG.)

Stephen Rhind-Tutt of Alexander Street Press writes about a new publication model which creates something I can best characterize as a peer-reviewed wiki.

To round this off, Rick Anderson inquires as to whether, “If the purpose of a permanent collection is to solve problems that have now largely been solved by forces outside the library, does it still make sense for us to build and maintain permanent collections?”

On one point, I suspect all of us would agree with Tom Sanville’s assessment of what is most difficult. “That’s easy. The hardest thing is to decide what not to do, or what not to do anymore. But under limited resources, it is critical to do the much harder thing, which is to decide what not to do. We are all creatures of habit. Breaking those habits is the key.”
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by Albert Henderson who was editor at Johnson Reprint Corporation from 1964-1966. It’s the eleventh in a series depicting the impact of European emigres on British and American publishing in the twentieth century. Fascinating. Highly recommended.

Another interesting article “A Google Librarian Gets into Print,” by Ben Bunnell who is a trained librarian (went to Michigan’s School of Information). Ben talks about the many Google initiatives that we are familiar with including www.google.com/librariancenter. Says continued on page 34
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