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Remembering 1968 ....

by Bruce Heterick (Director, Library Relations, JSTOR) <bruce.heterick@jstor.org>

With the pending national election in the U.S., it’s popular to wax nostalgic about one of the most volatile and influential years in the brief (by most measures) history of the United States, 1968. Forty years ago. In a year characterized by tumultuous change, 1968 was also the year that Garrett Hardin published his famous essay in Science, “The Tragedy of the Commons,” as well as the year that Elvis Presley starred in the musical comedy, Live a Little, Love a Little.

It should not be lost on us that the year that “The King” on film. It should also not be lost on us that neither Hardin’s article nor Elvis’ movie were “born-digital,” and as we continue the shift from paper and film to ones and zeros, access to the born-digital content is not guaranteed.

In September 2005, a number of academic librarians, university administrators, and other interested individuals met at the offices of The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to discuss the conundrum that the academic community was facing with regard to the long-term preservation of electronic journals. Coming out of that meeting was a statement, edited by Don Waters of the Mellon Foundation, entitled, “Urgent Action Needed to Preserve Scholarly Electronic Journals.” The “Urgent Action Statement” — as it was to become known throughout the library community — became a seminal reference point for the scholarly community in its effort to raise awareness of this important problem with a variety of stakeholders; including librarians, university administrators, scholarly publishers, faculty, and funding agencies.

The statement was formally endorsed by ARL, ACRL, ALCTS, and IOC, as well as being adopted informally by a myriad of other organizations. It spurred tremendous interest about the topic over the next year (2006) with college/university libraries. Nearly every library/scholarly communications conference entertained presentations and panels on the topic of e-journal preservation. Preservation initiatives such as Portico, LOCKSS, and CLOCKSS received a great deal of attention, and the publishing community began to give earnest attention to the issue.

It has now been three years since the “Urgent Action Statement.” There are many

continued on page 16

If Rumors Were Horses

So much is going on that it’s hard to keep track of it all! Gosh! Where to start. And, you know, we are posting Rumors on the ATG News Channel — http://www.against-the-grain.com — frequently, nearly every day. It’s impossible to put all of those Rumors in print so you need to go to the Website to keep up!

First up, Deb Vaughn, our book review editor, has a baby girl!!! Congrats to Deb and her husband, Bo Crader, on the birth of their daughter, Helen Katherine Crader born August 12th, 2008, at 9:50 PM weighing in at 7 lbs. 2 oz. Deb is on maternity leave at the moment but she is still working on ATG. See this issue, p. 63.

Speaking of new babies, Cullen Ferguson just turned one year old! How time flies!

Remember last year when he was just born? And exposure to chicken pox kept them away from Charleston in 2007?

And speaking of Cris, her report on the 8th Annual Mid-South E-Resource Symposium will be loaded on the ATG News Channel shortly, before it appears in print. www.against-the-grain.com/...

And some non-baby news for a change of pace. Congratulations! Andrew Hutchings has been appointed Blackwell Group Chief Executive Officer. In his new role Andrew will have full responsibility for both Blackwell Book Services and Blackwell UK Ltd. Andrew takes up his new role with immediate effect and the BUK Board now report directly to him. Andrew joined Blackwell’s Oxford office in 1987 when he led both the Information Technology and Marketing departments in Oxford while also completing the Blackwell’s Management Training program. After a three-year assignment in Blackwell USA Oregon offices leading the integration of the global
Letters to the Editor

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

Dear Editor:

Greetings — I just had an opportunity to read Mark Herrings’ June 2008 “Little Red Herrings” column for ATG (n.20#3, p.75). I wanted to thank Mark for providing a fair and balanced look at the Blended Librarian approach that John Shank and I have been sharing the last few years. We’ve never been evangelistic about the ideas or the community. We simply put it out there as something that our colleagues may find of interest to them. If it doesn’t appeal to you (a “naysayer” I guess), feel free to find whatever works for you. John and I respect that there are other librarians out there offering their own solutions that might have more appeal for some librarians than what we have to offer. We do find that our ability to offer ongoing free Webcasts on topics related to improving ourselves and our libraries continues to be popular among our colleagues.

Aside from Mark’s mentions of BL, I really enjoyed what he said in the column this time. We are certainly of a like mind with respect to our concerns for this profession and those we serve.

Thanks again. I hope that as a result of Mark’s column some new colleagues will take concerns for this profession and those we serve.

Regards,

Steven J. Bell (Associate University Librarian for Research and Instructional Services, Temple University Libraries) <bells@temple.edu> http://library.temple.edu

Tananbaum’s Back Talk

Helmets are getting on my nerves. I recently attended a conference where a panel of speakers discussed the future of libraries. It was fascinating to hear about the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead. But it was also jarring to hear a speaker call for the need for more technology and less human interaction in libraries. I believe that libraries should continue to be places where people can connect with each other, share ideas, and learn together. Technology can be a tool to help us achieve these goals, but it should never取代 human connection.

Helen Parr

Ejournals are among the most popular as well. I tell you, it is impossible to keep up with the Energizer Buzzy!

Ruth Fischer

AGAINTHEGRAIN DEADLINES

VOLUME 20 & 21 — 2008-2009

2008 Events | Issue | Ad Reservation | Camera-Ready
--- | --- | --- | ---
Charleston Conference | November 2008 | 09/03/08 | 09/17/08
ALA Midwinter | Dec. 08/Jan. 09 | 10/29/08 | 11/19/08

2009 Events | Issue | Ad Reservation | Camera-Ready
--- | --- | --- | ---
Annual Report, ACRL | February 2009 | 12/10/08 | 01/07/09
MLA, SLA, Book Expo | April 2009 | 02/11/09 | 03/04/09
ALA Annual | June 2009 | 04/08/09 | 04/29/09
Reference Publishing | September 2009 | 07/8/09 | 07/29/09
Charleston Conference | November 2009 | 09/02/09 | 09/23/09
ALA Midwinter | Dec. 09/Jan. 10 | 10/21/09 | 11/11/09

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT

Toni Nix <justwrite@lowcountry.com>; Phone: 843-835-8604; Fax: 843-835-5892 or Edna Laughrey <elaughrey@aol.com>; Phone: 734-429-1029; Fax: 734-429-1711 Address: 291 Tower Drive, Saline, MI 48176.

<http://www.against-the-grain.com>
Several readers have asked about the composition and purpose of the “Library Justice and Universal Protection Task Force.” From their Website we’ve learned that they prefer the shortened moniker “The Protectors,” and their mission statement is “the guarantee of universal library services, the return of lost or stolen books, and the general defense of the planet against invaders of any sort.” Though not otherwise well known, one publisher, Marvel, has covered “The Protectors” extensively and the following biographical sketches were gleaned from Marvel publications.

Dr. Hans Schneider received his MLS degree from Universität Stuttgart in 1981, and his PhD in Hazardous Chemical Management from the Max Planck Institute in 1996. After a brief illness in 2002, Dr. Schneider began disintegrating distant objects using a beam of dark light projecting from his right index finger. Making the most of that ability, Dr. Schneider managed to prevent the allusive, and subjugating all humanity from his island compound in the South Atlantic. Dr. Schneider also retrieved several long-overdue books from the compound. Though his talents are many, an aversion to creamed corn turns the otherwise good-natured doctor taciturn and seemingly unable to lift his finger.

Miss Molly May was raised an only child on a Minnesota farm, just a stone’s throw from the Massahapoc Nuclear Power Plant. While working on her MLS at the University of Illinois, Miss May discovered she could see through walls and other sorts of visual obstacles. She famously used that ability, working with the aforementioned Dr. Schneider, to disable several alien spacecraft during a short-lived invasion attempt in the summer of 2004. Since then, Miss May has been serving as ALA’s Vice-Chair for Book Fines and reading to children at the Evansburg County Library. Her unique visual abilities are rendered useless by the presence of her mother, Anna Belle May, who is outspoken in her belief that Molly should be married and raising children.

Vance Clarkson, after a short stint with the Defense Intelligence Agency, became Head of Technical Services for the Buddy Hackett Memorial Library, Constant College, in 1997. Mr. Clarkson later used his uncanny mind-reading ability to assist counter-intelligence efforts in Afghanistan, and to press for greater library funding in his home state of Ohio. For his efforts, Clarkson was given ALA’s prestigious Hugo Boss Award in 2003. It should be noted that his mind-reading ability fails him when his subject is watching television. Vance Clarkson currently serves as Secretary for the Library Justice and Universal Protection Task Force, a rotating chair.

Henrietta Means learned at an early age, and through many hours searching through her public library, how to focus her incipient anger and frustration toward impressive acts of physical strength. While working toward her Master of Information Studies degree at State University, Ms Means did her internship in Costa Rica battling a gigantic half-man-half-serpent creature that had risen from the sea. After a few years at the Library of Congress, she was hired by the Institute of Museum and Library Services where she reviews grant requests. Though she still enjoys saving the world from supernatural creatures, Ms Means spends much of her time reading and making small decoupage lapel pins as gifts for her friends. And every urge toward focusing her incredible strength is sapped when faced with a really good Jimmy Stewart movie.

Rumors
from page 6

selection of more than 170,000 eBooks and other titles from more than 300 publishers and aggregators. www.absbook.com www.library.com

WT Cox Subscriptions has entered into an agreement to purchase Journal Finder from The University of North Carolina Greensboro. Journal Finder, the first OpenURL Link Resolver to go into production in the United States was created, designed, and has been maintained by the Electronic Resources and Information Technology staff of UNCG. The product gives library patrons easy access to the electronic resources the library subscribes to. Journal Finder has continually been enhanced from the early days with additional usage reports, expanded linking, ERM, the inclusion of over 11,000 free and Open Access titles, along with many additional features. Journal Finder is now being used by over 40 libraries and has a solid reputation because of the dedication and expertise of the Electronic Resources and Information Department at UNCG. Leading the Journal Finder team for WT Cox Subscriptions will be the awesome Michael Markwit, who is currently responsible for Academic Sales for WT Cox Subscriptions. Before working with WT Cox, Mike was President of TDnet; Vice-President of Academic Sales at Swets Blackwell; and CEO, Swets & Zeitlinger (USA & Canada).

www.wtcox.com

Kent Watson (Executive Director, Publishers Association of the West) sends word that the incomparable legend Richard E. Abel has been selected as the recipient of the 2008 Jack D. Rittenhouse award. This award honors those individuals who have made outstanding contributions to the book community in the West. Richard Abel was selected from a slate of nominees for having established vibrant and profitable publishing businesses that serve as a model to his colleagues. The award will be presented to Richard at the Publishers Association of the West’s National Publishing Conference and Book Industry Trade Show which will be held on Saturday November 15, 2008. There will be a special luncheon to present the award to Richard E. Abel, known as the “father of the modern day library approval plan” and founder of numerous publishing presses including Timber Press. As we know through Richard’s serialized and continuing “Tale” in ATG, Richard worked in a bookstore, became a bookstore owner, started a private press for limited edition books, founded a company that grew into an international library distributor, founded a book marketing and distribution company, started a trade publishing company that has grown into a multi-sized publisher, and is the author of numerous articles and a forthcoming book. The Rittenhouse Award is given annually in memory of Jack D. Rittenhouse, the West’s consummate bookman. During his long career, Rittenhouse was a writer, bookseller, publisher, lecturer and mentor. He left a lasting mark on the book community, both in his work and with the people who followed him and this award was established as a way to honor those who have made outstanding contributions to the book community in the West. Prior winners of the Rittenhouse Award are Jane and Jeff Lyon (1991), Fred Pruett (1992), David Flaccus (1993), Dwight and Carol Myers (1994), Gordon Saull (posthumously in 1995), Tom Auer (1996), Joyce Meski (1997), Tony Hillerman (1998), Katharine J. McCanna (1999), Lisa Knudsen (2000), Robert C. Baron (2001), Mary Powell (2002), Frederick A. Praeger (posthumously in 2003), Dick and Judy Noyes (2004), Elizabeth A. Geiser (2005), Linda Lyon (2006) and Gibbs Smith (2007). www.pubwest.org.

Amazon has acquired twelve-year-old Canadian company AbeBooks (formerly the Advanced Book Exchange), the companies just announced. As we all know, AbeBooks is an online marketplace for books focusing on used, rare and out of print titles for sale by independent booksellers — it currently has 110 million books for sale from 13,500 sellers. The company has been around since...
1996 and fills a niche for Amazon in hard-to-find or out-of-print books. Rather than hold its own inventory, AbeBooks acts as a digital marketplace for established booksellers. On a related note, AbeBooks also owns 40 percent of LibraryThing (a social app for keeping track of your books and finding other like-minded book lovers). Whereas Amazon is an investor in Shelfari, now Amazon will own a piece of both of those competing startups.


And, speaking of Librarything — the fantastic Glenda Alvin has single-handedly arranged for Tim Spalding of Librarything to speak to us in Charleston on November 7. Come on down!

And speaking of the Charleston Conference, I was poking around the Web the other day and came across Sue Polanka’s fantastic moderated discussion list — No Shelf Required. Sue says, “Anyone interested in eBooks should take a look at the Charleston Conference Program November 5-8!” Have you done that? Have you registered? And Sue herself will be presenting in Charleston in November. Check this out! www.libraries.wright.edu/noshelfrequired/ www.against-the-grain.com www.katina.info/conference

The Berkeley Electronic Press (bepress) has appointed Alison Denby as a new Publisher. Alison will be responsible for the bepress journals publishing program, which includes 42 owned and scholarly society journals. She will report to the CEO of bepress, Gordon Tibblitts, and will be based at bepress headquarters in California. Commenting on the appointment, Gordon Tibblitts said, “Alison is one of the industry’s leading journal publishers... ...Alison’s... skills and experience are a perfect fit with bepress’s strategy to continue to drive the growth and development of our journals program and bepress’s broader suite of services.” Alison brings close to 20 years of journals editorial and sales experience in the publishing industry to bepress. She has held senior positions at John Wiley & Sons and Blackwell Publishing, where she worked closely with academic societies and journal editorial teams. www.bepress.com/journals

Charlie Rapple has been appointed Head of Marketing Development, a newly-created position, at TBI Communications, Ltd. Charlie will lead the expansion and development of TBI’s marketing services for academic and professional publishers and societies. TBI offers both strategic consultancy and outsourced marketing implementation to publishers and societies, around the world. As you will remember, Charlie joins TBI from Publishing Technology (previously Ingenta), where she held the post of Head of Group Marketing. And did you know/remember that Charlie was part of the original team at Catchword before they were acquired by Ingenta? Melinda Kenneway is Director of TBI. For more information, contact Joanna <cross@tbicommunications.com>.

And an update on the industrious and no-grass-grows-under-my-feet Bob Schatz <everbob@yahoo.com> <bob@impact2info.com>. Bob has left Coutts (amicably). He says he just celebrated 30 years in the business and realized that there are other things he wants to explore, hopefully allowing him to stay a part of the library/vending community, but allowing him to travel less. (He was a bit burnt out on 120+ nights a year on the road.) Anyway, Bob has begun his own business — Bob Schatz, Business & Professional Writing Services, adding impact to information — and is a writing consultant to libraries, publishers, and vendors. Bob is offering research, editing, and writing services for anything from single brochures to major communications campaigns. So far, he has produced a library market report for a publisher in California, assisted vendors in evaluating RFP responses, and put together an effective writing workshop. Bob will be attending the Charleston Conference and says he is looking forward to seeing who would like to utilize his skills. And do you remember his fantastic Sotto Voce columns in ATG? I sure do.

www.impact2info.com

This from the Chronicle of Higher Education (9/16/08) — “Feminist Magazine with Academic Following Faces Financial Crisis,” by Robin Wilson. Bitch magazine (which our library takes as well as nearly 200 other libraries) is a quarterly publication that needs $40,000 by October 15 or it will stop publishing.” This is on the Chronicle higher education news blog and there is continuing discussion there. chronicle.com/news/article/5156/

Susan Campbell and Pam Cenzer are gearing up to mentor at the 2008 Charleston Conference and what a great job! But in the meantime, Susan was on NPR. Yes, you heard/read it right! — On Thursday, June 26, at 11:50 AM, our very own Susan appeared on “Voters Group Reflects Hurdles Facing Candidates.” Like WOW! Here’s the URL to hear it all for yourself. www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=91906446

And more celebrity appearances! This time by Mark Herring <herringm@winthrop.edu> on the Learning Times network. Mark’s column in the June 2008 issue of ATG (v.20#3, pp.75-76) was on blended librarianship (“How do you Like Your Librarianship: Straight-up or Blended?”) and is praised by Steven Bell <bells@temple.edu>. If you continued on page 16

<http://www.against-the-grain.com>
Editor’s Note: Thank you, Helen, for your answers. Good luck with the latest redesign and have fun planning future enhancements. — RKK

Rumors
from page 10

haven’t read this article yet, check it out. Bell and John Shank have come up with a “redeigned” librarianship. Is blended librarianship a model for proactive librarians? home.learningsites.net/library/go=1854668

My bosom swelled with pride (à la Gilbert and Sullivan’s HMS Pinafore) when the alert Joyce Ogburn sent me the URL to this write-up about the AAUP (American Association of University Presses) recent meeting in Montreal. (“Digital Daze” by Scott McLeemee). Reported by the Charleston Conference and ATG were reported on this topic. The Charleston Conference and ATG were mentioned repeatedly in AAUP meetings, panels, and less formal discussions. ATG was hailed as a “must-read for anyone in academic publishing who wants a glimpse of how their colleagues across campus are discussing the new information tools.” But then, you knew that already, didn’t you? www.insidehighered.com/views/2008/07/02/mcleemee

And more praise for the Charleston Conference courtesy of the alert Dr. Elaine Yontz <eyontz@valdosta.edu>. It’s a paper on an MLIS’ student’s attendance at the Charleston Conference_final.pdf

Remembering 1968 ...
from page 1

accomplishments that we — as a community — can point to and say “good job.” Most of the major publishers (commercial, university presses, and societies) have adopted a long-term preservation strategy for their e-journal content and a few are getting out ahead of the issue with eBooks. “At-risk” content is getting some focus, as are open-access journals. Third-party preservation initiatives have moved from infancy to early adolescence, and important lessons have been learned and shared with the community. Preservation choices have emerged for libraries and publishers: commercial vs. not-for-profit; 3rd-party vs. national vs. local solutions; migration strategies vs. emulation strategies, etc., etc. And, for the first time, academic libraries in particular are beginning to see that there is a sustainable migration path from print to electronic.

But the work is not yet done. Preservation and archiving is a community-wide problem that requires contributions from across the community, lest we endure a tragedy of the commons. There are still too many free riders relying on the work and contributions of the few; too many libraries allowing a small number of their colleagues to carry the “preservation freight” on behalf of the entire library community; too many institutions talking about the importance of the long-term preservation of born-digital content, but still too few willing to ante up and support the still-nascent initiatives that are attempting to address — collectively — this preservation challenge. It is a classic manifestation of the “commons dilemma” that Hardin described in his influential 1968 article.

There is no doubt that this remains fairly new and complex territory. While there has been good progress, we are not yet near the point of having the robust, comprehensive, and multi-layered solution we need to have in place to confidently make the complete transition to electronic access, with all of its benefits. And, the long-term preservation of electronic journals is not, and cannot be regarded as, just a “large research library problem.” It is a community problem that requires broad support across the spectrum of libraries — higher education in particular. Every survey that I have seen on the topic — including the Ihaka/Portico survey outlined in this issue — leave no doubt that librarians philosophically believe that the long-term preservation of these assets is incredibly important. However, as they say, the road to hell is paved with good intentions. So, as Elvis sings in his 1968 classic, “a little less conversation, a little more action please.”

Whod’ya thunk that Garrett Hardin and Elvis Presley had so much in common? 🎶

Endnotes

<http://www_against-the-grain.com>
The report then goes on to suggest other filters which can be deployed by libraries once a decision has been made to invest in an archiving solution, to assist in selecting which is most appropriate for their specific needs. These filters include the range of content covered, costs and the basis of charging, and whether post-cancellation access is offered and if so, how and when it is provided. It recognizes the complex permutations that exist, so that a “one size fits all” approach is not possible, while at the same time provides some guidance for making responsible and defensible choices.

Conclusion

Finding practical, cost-effective solutions to e-journal archiving and preservation which are acceptable to both publishers and libraries has become of pressing importance as the trend to e-only access accelerates. Over recent years, there has been significant progress in e-journal archiving solutions which are gaining the trust of both publishers and libraries. The JISC funded study focused on six e-journal archiving solutions which appeared to be of particular relevance to the needs of the UK library community. Four of the six e-journal archiving solutions assessed by the study are able to satisfy at least some of the needs of the UK library community. This is a considerable advance on the situation a few years ago and so is an extremely encouraging sign. The choices libraries make will be based on a mix of factors and risk management will help to determine which e-journal archiving solution they should support. The decision-making process will be considerably simplified as more publishers participate in e-journal archiving, thereby increasing the volume of e-journals safely archived for current and future use.
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Endnotes

The next set of questions needing exploration then, was: what could be leading to this gap between what library directors say they know is important, and what they are actually doing? What could explain why librarians would acknowledge the importance of e-journal preservation but not act on it?

Who Acts and Who Does Not?
While libraries of all sizes voiced their support for e-journal preservation initiatives, perhaps unsurprisingly taking action correlated strongly with size of the institution, as measured by either enrollment (FTE) or materials budget (LME). Similarly, those institutions which identified themselves as either research-focused or research and teaching-focused, were more likely to also be taking active steps towards digital preservation. These institutions have clearly stepped up to the preservation challenge. While nearly half of those libraries which described themselves as research or research and teaching focused also reported participation in an e-journal preservation initiative; only 24% of those institutions which described themselves as primarily teaching-focused had taken action.

What Was Learned About Non-action Takers?
Looking more closely at just those institutions which had not taken action, it was noted that a large majority (74%) of those not yet taking action agreed that “libraries need to support community preservation initiatives because it’s the right thing to do.” What could be causing this disconnect?

Lack of Urgency
While there is widespread agreement on the overall importance of the issue, respondents to the survey were split on just when that action needed to be taken. The distribution of responses to the statement “E-journal preservation does not require any action from our library today or within the next two years” creates a nicely symmetrical graph, but in essence illustrates that most institutions who have not yet acted do not feel compelled to act anytime soon. It would be important to better understand why this many do not feel the “urgency” of the Urgent Action statement: might they feel that other institutions — the ‘early adopters’ — have already taken care of this responsibility for them? If so, do those libraries that have taken action understand that they are shouldering this responsibility for the broader community?

Responsibility
Over half of the respondents who have not yet taken action felt that “research libraries should be taking care of e-journal preservation on behalf of the entire library community,” as opposed to less than a quarter of those participating libraries. Specifically, among the non-action-takers, 59% of the teaching-focused institutions felt that preservation was the responsibility of the research institutions, while only 38% of research institutions agreed. These provocative findings suggest that there may need to be more dialogue about how the digital preservation responsibility could be distributed across the library community. Are the research institutions funded at a level sufficient to carry this burden for all others? As digital collections grow — and become more similar — across the library spectrum, are preservation obligations more broadly shared?

Budget is a Concern
Budgetary concerns are common in libraries of all types. About half of those libraries not yet participating in an e-journal preservation initiative agreed that budgetary constraints limited them from “adopting new products or approaches until we see they are broadly adopted by the library community.” This hesitation, likely borne of a need to allocate scarce resources to known quantities, is also underlined by the way the library directors characterized their institutions: those already participating in e-journal preservation initiatives were nearly twice as likely to consider themselves “trailblazers” than were those who had yet to take action.

The funds allocated for e-journal preservation activities are found in a range of places in a library budget...

“The funds allocated for e-journal preservation activities are found in a range of places in a library budget...”

The funds allocated for e-journal preservation activities are found in a range of places in a library budget...

The Influence of Campus Stakeholders
It was also noted a significant difference regarding the interaction with faculty on the question of e-journal preservation between those libraries which had taken action and those which had not yet. The former were nearly twice as likely to report that they had been approached about e-journal preservation than those who had not yet taken action. At some level it isn’t at all surprising that librarians respond to faculty requests, but is there an opportunity for proactive campus leadership here? Do libraries have an opportunity to get out in front of faculty or administrator queries and proactively lead conversations on this issue? Is there an opportunity to position the library as a campus leader ensuring long-term access to critical scholarly content?
resources to allow the university to be certified by professional associations. Although the materials are not unique, the individual titles have more weight than general materials because they support researchers who are doing more thorough and exacting research.

- Finally we acquire materials in support of advanced degrees in subject fields that the university has defined as its core areas of expertise. While some of these materials may be older, they still provide historic context for the discipline. Every title in support of these subjects is unique and special; each is irreplaceable. Many organizational libraries have these same basic, intermediate and advanced collection levels although specific subject areas are defined differently according to the mission and identity of the organization. For example, we understand that the discipline of Expressive Arts Therapies is far more important at Lesley University than at other schools and that Mathematics is far more important at other schools than at Lesley University. For us, all Expressive Arts Therapies materials are critically important.

To support the physical preservation of these materials we define as part of our core areas of expertise and that support programs that are certified or monitored by outside organizations, we have tried to create an environment that is controlled for temperature, light and humidity. We also bind journal issues for durability. Because we don’t physically segregate our collections by category of importance to the university’s mission, we are preserving all of our acquisitions, not just the mission critical materials. In this way, we feel that we have some control over the continued availability of these materials for our patrons over time.

But how can we create a preservation environment in the digital realm? In order to preserve our digital materials, we would have to “capture” them since we don’t have actual possession of this content. This means gathering text files, graphics files, audio and video files, possibly data files. And it means putting the pieces back together to form a coherent replication of the original digital work. It would also entail finding a way to keep the materials readable in appropriate configurations no matter how formats or software packages or hardware platforms change over time. It sounds like a rather daunting task that would take time and money and staff and technical expertise and hardware and software. Or we could choose to outsource the preservation and archiving of digital materials.

To meet our needs in this area, the Lesley University Library looked for an archiving service that was wholly focused on archiving born digital materials, that was actively replicating and participating in the development of industry-wide digital preservation standards, that could be monitored or certified in some way, that had a demonstrable track record for meeting expectations and that required no technology commitment from us since we do not control our own technology services. And the outsourcing solutions needed to be affordable now and for the foreseeable future.

Portico met our needs as an outsourcing service. The organization is associated with JSTOR and has background, growing expertise and a proven track record. Portico staff members have participated in the development of industry standards and have designed the ingestion, manipulation, storage and future migration of content according to these standards and industry best practices. Portico has also participated in the development of auditing and certification procedures for archives. Finally, Portico requires no technological solutions on the library’s side.

All that’s left then is to determine if Portico is an affordable solution. In FY2007, Lesley University became one of the Portico Archive Founders. Aside from the honor, this has netted the university a 10% savings for each year of the next five years. We have assumed that over time, the archive would grow to include more titles, and the more titles covered by the archive, the more titles from the Lesley University collection will be covered. In December 2006, when Lesley University joined the program, Portico had committed to archiving approximately 5,300 journals. As of this writing, there are over 7,600 journals in this category. In our first year of membership, the archive was committed to preserving 23% of the titles in the Lesley University Library collection. This worked out to $18.71 per title per year for the service of preserving and archiving titles in the collection. In FY2008, Portico was committed to preserving 24.6% of the titles in the Lesley University Library collection. The cost per title per year fell to $17.64. This is only slightly higher than the cost per title per year for binding, which is only one of our preservation expenses in the print environment. Portico does, truly, offer us an affordable solution for a significant portion of our digital archiving needs.

Until recently, the solution Portico offered us applied only to journals in digital formats. In June 2008, Portico announced that it would begin archiving eBooks also. As our library acquires more eBook packages and individually purchased titles, this new initiative is a welcome addition to the archiving effort. One concern we still have regarding the archiving of digital materials is that many of publishers of more esoteric titles in our core areas of expertise are smaller operations and may not have the technical or financial ability to join an archiving initiative like Portico. We would encourage Portico to find a way to reach out to these publishers whose digital content may be more at risk than content from larger and more robust publishing organizations. This concern aside, we believe that we have made a sound financial decision in selecting our preservation and archiving choice for materials in the Lesley University Library digital collection.

---

**Rumors from page 28**

...and I spent a delightful afternoon with Leslie Abrams and her talented and heading-to-college-soon son Nick in San Diego a few months ago. Turns out, Nick and I are big horse-racing fans and we commiserated on the loss of the Triple Crown by Big Brown in the Belmont Stakes. Anyway, getting back to business, Leslie way back when was Head of Reference at the College of Charleston and she is now in charge of the Art & Architecture Library at UCSD.

Continued on page 40
Was talking to Janet Flowers the other day. Janet has retired after 38 years at UNC-Chapel Hill (!) but not really if you ask me. Janet and her husband Eddie are coming to Charleston in November AND Janet is doing a Lively Lunch at the 2008 Conference called “Web 2.0 Tools for Newbies.” This program (Thursday, from 12:30-1:40) will provide an orientation to the 23 Things approach to learning Web 2.0 tools. Boy, you talk about taking a “glass half full” optimist’s approach. Instead of being old, we are newbies. I like it! www.katina.info/conference

And speaking of UCSD, the incredible Brian E. C. Schottlaender, the Audrey Geisel University Librarian at UCSD, is our keynote speaker on Saturday, November 8! Don’t forget to be there! And, did you know that Brian once worked for Harrasowitz? www.ucsd.edu/

We’re truly thrilled to have Ned Kraft back with his Adventures column. And the one in this issue is about Heroes, p. 8.

From the New York Times, August 24, 2008 — A group of scholars are trying to make George Orwell more relevant to the younger generation by creating a blog of his extensive diaries. For example on September 7, 2008, Orwell’s entry for September 7, continued on page 44

What About eBooks?

by Toni Tracy (Director, Publisher Relations, Portico) <toni.tracy@portico.org>

In response to a growing number of requests from the publisher and library communities to preserve non-journal scholarly literature, including eBooks, Portico developed a study in late 2007 to help offer insight to the community about the current eBook landscape, including business models, data formats, and preservation needs. The study was designed to understand what level of need and support for eBook preservation exists in the scholarly publishing and academic library communities and to analyze the structure and preservation requirements of eBooks to determine the operational and technological infrastructure required to offer eBook preservation.

Portico invited eleven publishers and eBook aggregators to participate in the study and nine accepted. These organizations all participated in an interview, and the publishers supplied eBook content for technological and preservation assessment.

- American Mathematical Society
- Elsevier
- Morgan & Claypool
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
- Royal Pharmaceutical Society
- Taylor & Francis
- ebrary
- MyiLibrary
- NetLibrary

Portico also invited eleven libraries and one consortium to participate in the study and all accepted. These organizations also participated in an interview about eBooks within their own institutional setting, or those of their members in the case of the consortium.

- California Digital Library
- Case Western Reserve University
- Cornell University
- McGill University
- Quinnipiac University
- SOLINET
- University College of London
- University of Montana
- University of New England (Australia)
- University of Texas
- Yale University
- York College (PA)

continued on page 42
but the reliability of implementation methods is regarded as unknown.

- **Preservation Concerns/Solutions:** All libraries reported that preservation arrangements needed to be more robust. Several noted that they do not (yet) raise this issue with publishers routinely but expect to do so as eBooks become a more permanent part of the collections.

- **Role of Portico in E-Book Preservation:** All of the libraries interviewed expressed a desire for Portico to undertake eBook preservation as a way of facilitating a more secure transition to reliance upon eBooks and permanent inclusion of this content into the collections, but the expressed urgency of this need varied considerably across institutions and disciplines. The greatest sense of urgency was expressed by librarians responsible for medical collections.

### Technical and Preservation Summary

The publisher participants in the survey provided sample content for the technical portion of the study. One reason these particular publishers were selected is that each had substantial content and an active preservation program to take part in the study. The publishers were all involved in project of this type will require a custom arrangement needed to be more robust. All libraries reported that preservation methods is regarded as unknown. What About eBooks?

... libraries are still experimenting with eBooks and how to properly include them in their collection development strategies ...

### Technical Findings:

- **Content in Standard eBook Reader Formats:** There are a number of standard eBook readers and formats, including Open eBook Publication Structure (OEB) and its successor, the .EPUB family of standards which has been recently released. eBook content produced for eBook readers is inherently standards-driven and highly uniform across publishers; this is in contrast to e-journal content which is designed to work specifically in the publisher’s own Website or delivery platform of choice and can be highly idiosyncratic.

- **Content Created or Hosted on e-journal Systems:** This content is typically PDF plus HTML with XML source files behind the HTML. It is similar to the vast majority of the content in Portico’s current e-journal preservation program. It may present some metadata challenges as a number of publishers may be offering monographs via a journal delivery system, bending the metadata structures in the process.

- **Content on Custom Websites:** This was the most problematic data in the study as there were no other data formats beyond the Website HTML available. HTML Web pages are notorious for lack of standards compliance and none of the sites examined had fully valid HTML and many suffered from hard-coded relative file paths.

- **High-end Reference Works:** These are, in effect, custom-designed and semantically-rich databases and they do not lend themselves to generic preservation approaches, at least not without serious loss of meaning. Each preservation project of this type will require a custom preservation plan.

In comparison to the current e-journal content seen by Portico, the best eBook content is much more straightforward: the eBook standards have jumped ahead of the e-journal standards and provide a more robust basis for content management and long-term content preservation. The worst eBook content is no worse than the messiest e-journal content — the difficulties that may arise for preservation will be due to lack of scale and resulting costs. For journals, the significant variations in data tend to be between titles, not at any smaller levels; in contrast, some of the eBook data studied varied from monograph to monograph.

### Conclusions

While libraries are still experimenting with eBooks and how to properly include them in their collection development strategies, the eBook publishers are immediately ready to implement a preservation strategy. The technological analysis of the study shows that even the more difficult eBook content will be no more difficult than e-journals. 

---

**Rumors**

from page 40

1938, will be posted from his political diary when Orwell was “consumed by the clouds gathering” for the second World War. Jean Seaton, a professor at the University of Westminster in London, had the idea for the blog and administers the project. Seaton says the site will be publishing at least until 2010 and has received many visitors. The original material can be found in University College London where many of our ATG friends are located — Anthony Watkinson, David Nicholas, Liz Chapman are just a few of them. But. As we all know, putting the material on the Web will make it more visible and accessible. See — “What George Orwell Wrote, 70 years Later continued on page 55
Near Virtual Silence
That’s right, $100 million has been, essentially, handed to us to infuse new blood into our graying and some would say, dying, profession and we have greeted it with our hands over our mouths. The usual suspects, such as those on library juice (http://www.libraryjuice.com), have nothing at all to say about the program. Some contend that the program is really the Higher Education Act of 1965, Title-B, Fellowship Program resurrected. If true, why, until this program, was our profession like the Cheshire cat, but with only itsrown remaining? One would engage any substantive disagreements (as opposed to hysterical screeds), but there simply aren’t any. These are, however, partisan-political ones, and often of the wing-nut variety regularly found among the far left and the far right.

It would be one thing if our profession took equal opportunity shots, but it doesn’t. During the Clinton administration I often read near hagiographic assessments of what the Clintons had done for libraries though I could find no programs that really benefited us and certainly none that supported our profession into the next generation. Of course many who were then swooning over the Clintons every move are, today, Obama supporters and excoriating the Clintons almost mercilessly. How soon they forget. I should not be surprised, of course, because our profession has been racked by such partisan political nonsense since the late seventies.

It’s too bad, too, because the Bush administration deserves both respect and loud applause, at least on this matter. Our profession has been quick to criticize almost all Republican administrations for just about anything and slow and shame-closed to give credit when appropriate. Given our reaction to this one so far, don’t be shocked if the next one ignores us altogether, and with good reason.

In any event, I could not let pass the opportunity to give three cheers to the Bush administration and I do so now. Disagree if you will about the war, taxes, the budget and so on. But be fair. When something good comes our way by whatever hand, give credit where credit is due. I for one am not looking this gift-horse in the mouth.

Op Ed — Little Red Herrings

Endnotes
1. Full disclosure: the author is a member of the IMLS board. Neither he nor his institution has, however, ever received an IMLS grant. Dr. Herring contributed to this article in his personal capacity. The views expressed are his own and do not necessarily represent the views of Institute of Museum and Library Services or the United States Government.

Rumors
from page 44


And speaking of blogs, the industrious Eleanor Cook (Assistant Director for Collections and Technical Services at East Carolina’s Joyner Library) has a blog on the ATG News Channel. She lets us in on happenings in her new position which we told you about in June (v.20#3, p.1).

www.against-the-grain.com/d/blog/199

continued on page 61

THE JOURNALS
of The Endocrine Society
World leaders in diabetes, endocrinology, & metabolism

Renew Now or Begin Your Free Trial!
- Free Trial Offer for New Institutional Subscribers—Get 4 months of free online access to any of our four journals. Offer expires June 30, 2008. Available to new institutional subscribers and qualified former institutional subscribers.
- Two-for-One Offer for Institutional Subscribers—Purchase a 1-year institutional subscription to Endocrinology or Molecular Endocrinology and receive a 1-year subscription to the other research journal for one bundled, discounted price.
- Tailor-Made Pricing for Institutional Subscribers—Starting in 2008, subscription prices for institutional and multi-site subscribers will be based on the type of organization (tied pricing).

For more information about these offers or a tailor-made price quote, contact societyservices@endo-society.org.

The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism—The Must-Read Clinical Journal in the Field
In-depth coverage of the latest developments in diabetes and obesity; pituitary, adrenal, and thyroid disorders; metabolic bone disease; pediatric endocrinology; and other key areas of endocrinology and metabolism.

Endocrine Reviews—An In-depth, Enduring Resource With the Highest Impact Factor in Endocrinology and Metabolism
In-depth reviews on clinical and research topics in endocrinology and related areas, including diabetes, thyroid, pediatric endocrinology, growth factor, and reproductive medicine.

Endocrinology—The Endocrine Research Authority
6,000 pages annually of the highest quality original work, covering subcellular mechanisms to whole animal physiology, with topics including calcium regulation, growth factors, energy balance-obesity, diabetes, steroids, renal cardiovascular, development, cancer, neuroendocrinology and signal transduction, and physiology.

Molecular Endocrinology—On the Cutting Edge of Endocrine Research
Original mechanistic studies examining the actions of hormones and related substances on the molecular biology, structural biology, and genetic regulation of gene expression, using the techniques and methods of molecular research, recombinant DNA, protein structure, and membrane structure.
Notes from the Field
from page 60

Discussion
Comments from the surveyed librarians suggest that collection development, library instruction, specialized reference, and keeping faculty abreast of changes in library resources and services were the duties and responsibilities shared by most of them. When questioned about the best practices they had used to identify core/classic titles and what suggestions they had for other librarians attempting to identify these titles in their own libraries, there was considerable overlap in their responses. Consulting unspecified best book lists, other librarians, psychology faculty, and specified resources such as Books for College Libraries and CHOICE’s Outstanding Academic Titles were frequently mentioned. The methods that librarians have used to publicly identify core/classic titles have varied, from placing notes in the item record to stamping books as classic titles. When asked how often psychology collections were weeded and the methods that were used, the responses revealed that the frequency varied widely and that common methods used were circulation/usage statistics, appearance/condition of the book, and the removal of duplicate copies and outdated materials.

Although the responses from this survey will be of interest primarily to psychology librarians, many of the suggested resources, such as Books for College Libraries, CHOICE’s Outstanding Academic Titles, Reference Sources for Small and Medium-Sized Libraries, American Reference Books Annual, and Balay’s Guide to Reference Books, are certainly valuable to collection management librarians who work with other disciplines such as the humanities or the sciences. Likewise, even though some of the best practices cited in this article are most relevant to librarians working with psychology collections, many would still be useful to those undertaking collection management projects in disciplines such as the humanities, the sciences, or the social sciences.

Conclusion
This article fills a niche in the library literature concerning best practices of librarians who work in psychology collection management. The sixty-four survey respondents represent only a small sampling of the total number who work with psychology collections, yet their responses provide a revealing snapshot. Perhaps some of the responses may provide “food for thought” to librarians liaising with disciplines other than psychology.

Status of the USC Upstate Project
With faculty retirements and new faculty hires, identifying core/classic psychology titles in the USC Upstate Library has been an ongoing process that has been recently completed. The remaining part of the project concerns identifying the books so that they will not be inadvertently withdrawn and so that librarians and library users will recognize them as core/classic books. I plan to have notes placed in the item records alerting the library staff that, per my instructions, these books should not be withdrawn. To benefit library users, there will be notes placed in the library catalog records, and the books will be stamped as core/classic titles.

Endnotes
1. Core/classic titles referenced in this article are defined as ones cited often within the psychology literature and those that are included in recommended works such as Balay’s Guide to Reference Books, Resources for College Libraries, the third edition of Books for College Libraries, and the Harvard List of Books in Psychology.
2. When the librarians participated in this survey, Resources for College Libraries, 2007 had not yet been published.

Rumors
from page 55

And still speaking of blogs, inspired by Eleanor and the George Orwell project (above) I have begun a lesser blog. Have you seen it? www.against-the-grain.com/d/taxonomy/term/13

And speaking of the ATG News Channel, we are no longer requiring user names and passwords in order to access the Website so visit it and see what you think. We would love your input.

www.against-the-grain.com/

Was talking to the incredible Ann Okerson (who WILL be at the Charleston Conference in November — hooray!). Ann was talking about peaches and I was telling her that SOUTH CAROLINA is really the peach state, not Georgia. Did you know that? (I guess it depends on where you’re from.) But I think that peaches will never replace chocolate in Ann’s heart!

Speaking of the Conference, have you registered yet? The Early Bird Deadline is September 26!

Am hoping to have some obituaries and reminiscences about the wonderful Matthew J. Brucoli in an upcoming issue of ATG. If any of you are interested in writing something, please let me know <kstrauch@comcast.net>.

continued on page 81
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ers. They are presented with theoretical reference questions and several options for answering the reference question. Students are asked to select the best option for addressing the reference question using the clicker. If the students select different resources / options they are invited to discuss their various approaches and the merits of each approach.

The clickers "add a dimension of interactivity to class that makes things a little more interesting. Expecting a group working with a group you don't know, the clickers help get discussion going. A student who might not raise his/her hand to answer a question will gladly 'click'," says Libby Young, Government Documents/Reference Librarian at Furman. Young emphasizes that clickers are not appropriate for every circumstance. “You just don’t want to overuse them to the point they drag down the presentation,” she says.

Texas A&M University (TAMU)
Texas A&M University Library has experimented with the use of clickers in three different types of instruction sessions: faculty and staff training instruction, instruction during Academic Integrity Seminars, and instruction for English Composition classes.

While clicker systems allow instructors to track individual responses and comprehension, at TAMU “the sessions were designed to keep student responses completely anonymous in order to encourage maximum participation.” (Hoffman and Goodman, 430). Hoffman and Goodwin observed several benefits of the use of clicker technology. They found that the clickers served as ‘an ice breaker’ in instruction sessions. “Before the first clicker question was even asked, students were engaged and curious about the clickers and what the instructors were about to teach.” (430). It was also determined that the clickers helped to keep students focused, increase participation, promote discussion, and increase retention. (Hoffman and Goodman, 430)

Brigham Young University (BYU)
Librarians at Brigham Young University play an active role in preparing students for a research project as part of a required First-Year writing course. Students attend two library instruction sessions, “which are weighted toward demonstration and hands-on practice.” (Julian and Benson, 258). Beginning in the fall of 2006, library instructors began using clickers during these information fluency sessions. “Because they spend considerable time watching demonstrations, some students lose focus during the session and miss important information. Clickers seem to increase attention through active participation and provide valuable feedback in the session.” (Julian and Benson, 258).

Using the data from the instruction sessions where the clickers were used, BYU identified three advantages the clickers offered: instantaneous assessment of student progress (how far along students are on a particular assignment), assessment of learning comprehension throughout the instruction session, and students’ opinions of their own learning comprehension. (Julian and Benson, 258).

Julian and Benson offer this advice when implementing clickers into information fluency instruction: “Carefully worded questions that fit the context of the instruction provide the best experience for students and the most valuable data for teachers.” (260) [For further information on best practices when incorporating clickers into the classroom, see the articles by both Caldwell and Martyn.]

What Do Clickers Cost?
There are several audience responses systems available on the market. Turning Technologies (http://www.turningtechnologies.com) offers TurningPoint, which can be configured for a variety of settings: higher education, K-12, or corporate applications. According to the Tech-Knowledge section in the August 2006 issue of School Library Journal, a 32-seat student response system from Turning Technologies runs $1,483. (Staino, 25) Dickinson College reported paying $2800 for its TurningPoint system. (Bombo, 298)

Texas A&M University (TAMU) Libraries selected the InterWrite PRS system (http://www.interwritetechnologies.com/) from GTCO Calcomp, which is also used at the University of Nebraska. “Given a small budget, it seemed to be a cost-effective, bare-bones system that also offered several special features relevant to TAMU Library needs: it can create questions ‘on-the-fly’ and has interoperability with WebCT, Microsoft PowerPoint, and Microsoft Excel.” (Hoffman and Goodman, 427-428)

Ultimately the price for any ARS will vary based upon the application of the system (academic, K-12, public library, etc.), the number of clickers purchased, and the features the organization desires.

When used effectively, Audience Response Systems have the ability to engage students actively in library instruction sessions. They foster anonymity, garnering responses from students that might not otherwise participate, and providing a “safe” way for students to respond when dealing with touchy issues, such as academic integrity. At a price between $2000 and $3000 for an ARS installation, the cost of the clickers is not terribly expensive. In the same neighborhood as an electronic reference resource, it is an expense well worth the end results: active user engagement and positive publicity for the library.

Rumors
from page 61

Speaking of Dr. Brucolli, Joel Swardlow wrote to obtain a PDF copy of the essay “The End of Books and the Death of Libraries” (ATG, v. 19(4), February 2007) with his students at the U. of Texas in Washington, DC this fall.

And, speaking of PDFs, Felicia M. Cleburn, <fcleburn@mail.twu.edu> who works for Texas Woman’s University as a library assistant in Electronic Resources participated in an online class in August called Fundamentals of Electronic Resources Acquisitions, sponsored by the American Library Association. Turned out the course reading list included an article from ATG — “Biz of Acq – A Database By Any Other Name” (ATG, v.14(2), April, 2002). And Felicia’s was just one of many requests that ATG received for the article! Sue Wiegand, the author, gave us permission to post this online so it is now available for all to see on the ATG News Channel! Thanks to Sue and to Felicia. And, let us know if there is a specific article that you would like to see online and we will do our best to comply.

www.against-the-grain.com

And, last but not least, if you have time (Friday 2:15-3:00), please stop by for a discussion of The Charleston Conference Observatory — A Proposal by David Nicholas (UCL). Currently there is no mechanism by which the exciting ideas and challenges raised can be tested or researched further and the results reported back to the Charleston Conference to ensure or build continuity and dialogue. The Charleston Observatory will provide a mechanism by which this can be done. The Observatory will be the research adjunct for the Conference, the medium by which the ideas generated are turned into robust research projects, which provide the evidence base for strategic planning. The Observatory will be a place where information experiments can be undertaken continued on page 88
There are several ways to control collection size, of course. One is to reduce the amount of incoming material, e.g., by cancelling print subscriptions in favor of securely archived e-journals. This approach is increasingly being adopted. For current US Federal Government documents, more than 95% of new titles are available in electronic form, allowing receipt of tangible items to be dramatically reduced. For monographs, eBooks are gradually assuming a role in new title decisions. Some enterprising librarians, such as Peter Spitzform at the University of Vermont, are experimenting with a purchase-on-demand approach for new titles from major publishers — deferring purchase until a title is requested by a user. Collaboration can also help control collection size. Consortia such as the Orbis/Cascade Alliance have initiated “distributed print repositories,” in which member libraries divide responsibility for last print-copy archives of major journal backfiles — allowing other members to withdraw their copies, releasing valuable shelf space. The Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries is in the third year of testing a shared approval plan, which will reduce the aggregate number of copies held by participants.

But the problem is bigger than any of these solutions. Even if the incoming volume can begin to be controlled, our collections overflow with the results of past decisions and deferred maintenance. Ultimately, libraries really do need to weed. It’s like dieting or cleaning out the attic, though. We know it’s the right thing to do, but as Slote notes “It is hard to find practicing librarians who feel that their collections have been weeded sufficiently.”

It’s time to usher in a Golden Age of Weeding — i.e., to de-select from collections built over the past 40 years with the same dedication with which we selected for them.

6. Permit us a note of pre-emptive defense: We are not advocating the abolition of print. We are not advocating that research libraries abandon their mission of collecting for the ages. While we believe that it is possible that some content has no value, we are not even advocating withdrawal and discard of that. We are simply suggesting that little-used content need not be so widely held, especially in print form, and that the space occupied by the miles of shelving now required can be used more effectively. There is far more redundancy in the current system than is needed, even for the most ambitious collectors.

Why focus on weeding? First, it benefits libraries and users. Slote and others cite five major benefits:

1. To save (or recover) space
2. To increase book usage
3. To increase reader satisfaction
4. To save staff time
5. To make room for new technologies

Why now? Conditions are currently better for weeding than at any time in recent memory.

Consider how the following factors a) reduce the cost of weeding; b) increase accuracy and efficiency in weeding; and c) reinforce the need to start now:

1. More content is accessible digitally. Print is more often the format of last resort.
2. The infrastructure for resource sharing has improved. Couriers, union catalogs, direct borrowing, ILL, and shared print repositories all allow timely access to shared print titles.

3. Withdrawn content is easier to access or replace if needed. Google Book Search has 1 million digitized full-text titles; the Open Content Alliance 750,000. Lightning Source has 400,000 print-on-demand titles. Commercial eBook providers collectively offer more than 200,000 titles. WorldCat holdings are easily visible to members. Out-of-print or used book dealers can provide millions of older titles.

4. Circulation statistics are easy to retrieve from most library systems.
5. Volume count is becoming a less important metric in assessing collection strength. ARL and other statistics have begun to use materials budget rather than volume counts as a measure of collection strength (although accreditation boards for specific disciplines may not).

6. New tools are being developed to support rules-based weeding and batch maintenance transactions. R2 has a patent pending on a “Sustainable Collections System” that we hope to introduce in 2009.

7. Space for collections is becoming a lower priority. University and college administrators are more reluctant to build and maintain space for “warehousing” printed books and journals.

8. We can’t (and shouldn’t) afford to keep doing what we’re doing.

Yes, there are plenty of issues to resolve, even after we accept the need to weed. Complaints surface regularly about relying on other libraries’ collections: timeliness of access or delivery; inaccurate or disparately expressed holdings; missing issues in runs that are purportedly complete; the relative condition of materials; the effect of constant transport on their longevity; restricted access to some titles. But these can and should be managed, through standards and service agreements. Over time, digitization will ameliorate some of these problems — and create some new ones. There are also some ironies here. Better discovery tools such as consortial borrowing, ILL, Google Book Search, and WorldCat Local may actually increase print usage of older titles, even as they are being withdrawn or moved offline. This long tail effect may be especially pronounced in research libraries, where unique content abounds.

But while all of these issues must be monitored and addressed, there remains an enormous problem, and an equally sizable opportunity. As with the making of books, there is no end to their weeding. It’s time to consider what level of collection is sustainable, and to take steps to manage accordingly. It’s time to move vigorously in this direction, as responsible stewards not only of our collections, but of our space, talent, and other resources that also belong to our host institutions and users.

Column Editor’s Note: This is the first of several articles on this topic. In future issues, we will consider A Rules-Based Approach to Weeding: Sustainable Collection Development; and De-Selection Workflows... — RL
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