

April 2003

## Group Therapy

Rosann Bazirjian

*The Pennsylvania State University, rvb9@psulias.psu.edu*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg>

---

### Recommended Citation

Bazirjian, Rosann (2003) "Group Therapy," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 15: Iss. 2, Article 38.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.4048>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact [epubs@purdue.edu](mailto:epubs@purdue.edu) for additional information.

being used to help promote *Long Train*. Others feel that **Ms. Boof** is a fraud, since her life story is so inconsistent. But **Professor Bell** remains a supporter, saying "... I do recognize jive and I got no sense of that" with **Kola Boof**. By all accounts, however, her book seems to be a compelling read.


### THE THRILL IS GONE

**Clive Cussler** has told **Reuters** that after 35 years and 19 novels, his next book will be his last. His finely crafted thrillers were often made into movies after topping the bestseller lists. "I'm just tired of it all" he said.

### KNOPF PUBLISHES "UNPROFESSIONAL AND MISLEADING WORK" AS COLUMBIA WITHDRAWS BANCROFT PRIZE

In an earlier column I reported on the controversy surrounding *Arm- ing America* by **Emory** history professor **Michael Bellesiles**. When other

scholars checked his research supporting his assertion that early Americans owned much fewer guns than generally thought, they found that many cited sources either didn't exist or had been distorted. An **Emory** faculty review found **Bellesiles'** work so shoddy he was forced to resign from the university. **Columbia University**, which had awarded him the prestigious **Bancroft Prize** for important historical writing, has rescinded the award and asked that the \$40,000 prize money be returned. Nevertheless, **Knopf** has published the paperback version with a prominent cover display of the **Prize**. And, according to the *Wall Street Journal*, a California court decision on gun control recently cited the book in its ruling.

One of the most interesting debates in the library world centers on how to treat books or journals already in the collection that have since proven to be false or misleading. Should such books be removed, or stickered in some way to explain they convey inaccuracies or outright falsehoods? What if they contain dangerous information, such as the wrong formula for creating a drug compound that could result in sickness or death? What, if any, responsibilities do librarians have to correct mistakes if the publishers fail to do so? 

## Group Therapy

Column Editor: **Rosann Bazirjian** (Assistant Dean for Technical & Access Services, University Libraries, The Pennsylvania State University, 507 Paterno Library, University Park, PA 16802-1812; Phone: 814-865-0404; Fax: 814-865-3665) <rvb9@psulias.psu.edu>



**GRIBE:** (Submitted by **Barbara Porrett**, Electronic Services Librarian, International Development Research Centre)

I am writing to enquire about how libraries communicate with their users about use terms in licenses. Although this query was presented on **liblicense** back in July 1999, I would be very interested in an update.

**RESPONSE:** (Submitted by **Jill Emery**, Director, Electronic Resources, University of Houston Libraries)

My knee-jerk response is that you can lead the student to water but drinking tends to happen more in bars. So what is a library to do? Invest in your own best practice model. At the **University of Houston Libraries**, we do not require click-through license statements unless mandated by the information provider. There are a few out there and we have complied with their wishes when necessary to make important resources available to our community. However, we tend not to like this practice. It is annoying at best and highly unlikely that the student bothers to actually read the half-page to full page before clicking "I agree" and going on their merry way. Faculty and grad students on campus (and more than likely, students at home) skirt this issue completely by book-marking the Website directly and thus not having to bother with this additional nuisance.

Our best practice has been to write a Terms of Use statement, about a page in length, spelling out what is considered acceptable behavior. We've linked to our campus-wide Appropriate Use of Computing Resources statement and we also state that these resources are provided on an "as is" basis. This notice has been put at the top of all of our electronic resources pages to say, hey, there are these terms that you should be aware of but we're not going to force them down your throat.

There are those who would argue that this type of statement never gets a precursory glance, but our statistics say otherwise. Looking at our Web statistics from January through August 2002 showed the terms had an average monthly hit rate of 200 hits per month. Not a shabby hit rate in my book, considering the terms were viewed more than our Interlibrary Loan FAQ for seven months out of the same eight-month period.

At the **University of Houston Libraries**, this is our best practice and it works for us. We have a referral page when someone requests a use that is unauthorized and when users from other universities or the community at large attempt to say they are entitled to this access. In the end, though, each university or business has to determine what works at their institution/place of business and how such a statement fits into their campus-wide/business-wide computing policy as a whole.

**RESPONSE:** (Submitted by **Becky Albitz**, Electronic Resources and Copyright Librarian, The Pennsylvania State University Libraries)

Notifying patrons of use restrictions and copyright became a real issue after the passage of the 1976 Copyright Act. In Section 108, paragraph f, subsection 1, libraries are protected from liability if their users abuse copying facilities in their buildings as long as they display a notice informing users of the applicable copyright law. Libraries still post standard language on each photocopier, warning users that their activities might violate copyright law, and now we are being asked to inform our users of the provisions and restrictions outlined in electronic resource licenses. Unlike photocopiers, however, these electronic resources are not confined to the physical library building. How do we inform all our users of these restrictions, even those who might be accessing a title at 2 a.m.

from 20 miles away? This is the question asked three years ago on **Liblicense** and is still of great interest today.

In fact, it appears that little has changed. Some smaller institutions still post notices on their computers, much as we do on photocopiers. Others add a note to their **OPAC** record, stating that access is restricted to members of that institution's authorized user community. Others still provide links to licensing terms on publisher's Websites from a master list of licensed e-resources. Some institutions choose to link to a home grown e-resource management database which contains the terms of use for each product. A popular solution is the use of a splash screen that appears before the user can access any licensed resource, displaying, in general terms, licensing restrictions. Finally, one would hope that all libraries are integrating these issues into their library instruction programs

At **Penn State** we have implemented one of these solutions, and are developing another. Before any user can access a licensed database, they are faced with a splash screen that reads:

These databases have been licensed for the non-profit educational use of the **Penn State** community. The use of these e-resources is governed by copyright law and individual license agreements. Systematic copying or the use of an external search engine or robot to gather information from these databases is prohibited. Please contact the Electronic Resources and Copyright Librarian (rsa4@psu.edu) for specific licensing terms related to an individual product.

**Penn State** is also in the process of creating a database called **ERLIC2 (Electronic Resources Licensing and Information Center)**,

*continued on page 87*



# Issues in Vendor/Library Relations — So You're Buying a New Integrated Library System: Have You Told Your Book Vendor Yet?

by **Ann-Marie Breaux** (Systems Vendor Liaison, YBP Library Services, 999 Maple Street, Contoocook, NH 03229)

Column Editor: **Bob Nardini** (Senior Vice President & Head Bibliographer, YBP Library Services, 999 Maple Street, Contoocook, NH 03229; Phone: 800-258-3774 x. 3251; Fax: 603-746-5628) <[rnardini@ybp.com](mailto:rnardini@ybp.com)>

*"You don't have to say you love me, just be close at hand"*

— Lyric from "You Don't Have to Say You Love Me,"  
by **Vicki Wickham & Simon Napier-Bell**

Over the past couple of years, it seems that more libraries than ever before have begun the process of selecting and implementing a new integrated library system. The last NOTIS sites are in the midst of converting, or at least looking for their new system. Many DRA sites viewed the purchase of DRA by Sirsi and the phasing out of DRA's system as the opportunity to consider a new system. Large consortia in Florida, New York, and elsewhere are in the midst of converting to Ex Libris' system, Aleph. Almost all libraries are modifying their local system or purchasing additional software to facilitate linking of electronic resources. Change is everywhere.

In reviewing a potential new integrated system, most libraries spend a great deal of time considering the look and usability of the OPAC, how easy it will be to circulate items, what is involved in data conversion from the existing system, and increasingly, how the system links to external electronic resources. Many of these libraries have also developed complex technical services relationships with their major monographic and serial vendors. As a new system is considered, these vendor interactions must be reviewed, to determine whether the same capabilities are supported or not, and whether any enhancements to the connectivity are possible. Based on YBP's experiences in working through systems changes with our customers over the past few years, I'd like to highlight some questions and considerations that a library might want to review.

YBP faced a similar series of questions when we began to automate portions of our warehouse. Ten years ago, we used hundreds of book carts to shelve and pull books in the warehouse. Much overhead went into keeping track of what items were on what cart, whether they were going onto or coming off of our warehouse shelves, collating shipments that spanned multiple book carts, and the like. We moved from using carts to a conveyor, picking books from the shelves into cartons as the conveyor line wound its way through the warehouse. At first we sought to replicate our cart procedures on the conveyor line, but as we became more comfortable with the technology, we began to exploit the different opportunities offered by the conveyor. For example, we don't have to keep a multi-box shipment collated throughout the picking process anymore. We can quality check, seal, and ship the first box while its partners are still on the line, and then reassemble invoice data when we've filled the last box. Changing systems offered us a chance to reassess our processes, eliminate steps that had been rendered obsolete, and create a streamlined, more efficient materials flow.

Like a library system switch, YBP's warehousing switch put much stress on the current process. Our day-to-day business of receiving books and shipping them to customers cannot stop. Likewise, the day-to-day library technical services business of checking in journals, placing orders, paying bills, and cataloging books cannot stop — or at least not for very long — when a new system is installed.

Because of their breadth of experience with different integrated library systems, materials vendors can serve as a valuable resource to a library during system selection. I approach libraries' systems changes as an interested third-party observer, and have seen switches that have gone well and not so well. Standard technical services questions to discuss with a system vendor include whether their system offers the desired electronic ordering, invoicing, and workflow integration functionality, and whether that functionality is part of the base model or is a separately-purchased add-on. At certain points in the system selection process, libraries can gain useful perspectives from their materials vendors by discussing current implementations of the capabilities stated by the systems vendor. As materials vendors, we must maintain neutrality when discussing integrated library systems, but we are happy to share as much information as we can. We seek to provide information, not recommendations.

The two primary questions we hope a customer asks us during a system selection or conversion process:

1. Does my current workflow or set of services from you work with my new system?
2. What additional services might I be able to use?

As we step through a standard monographic workflow, various considerations arise at each point in the process. In terms of electronic ordering, different systems work with different standards, the most common in the US being BISAC, X12, and EDIFACT. Systems offer varying data output, such as how the purchase order numbers are structured, or whether details

*continued on page 88*

## Group Therapy from page 86

which is designed to store and provide access to licensing and acquisitions information. Because of the confidential nature of many agreements, the public will not be able to view the scanned licenses, but public service desks will be able to access licensing terms and convey this information to our users.

While much in the e-resources arena has changed dramatically over the past three years, it appears that the methods libraries chose to convey licensing information to our users are still appropriate. Whether or not our users are getting the message is another issue entirely.

**RESPONSE:** (Submitted by **Beth Bernhardt**, Electronic Journals/Document Delivery Librarian, The University of North Carolina)

Jackson Library at the **University of North Carolina** at Greensboro informs users on a need-to-know basis about license agreement terms and conditions when the user is preparing to authenticate. Our authentication screens alert users of any restrictions; for example, our screen states, "The service that you have selected is restricted. It can only be used by current UNCG students, faculty, and staff." These screens translate the license agreement for users into simple, easy-to-understand language.

Our university lawyers negotiate license agreements on behalf of the library and make sure that these agreements work best for our users. We use technology to provide users with access to electronic resources by either using a proxy server, authentication, username/password, or a combination. The authentication process requires that the user be affiliated with the university. Lists of our users are generated weekly from the registrar's database and entered into our authentication system. Our library in the past has decided not to purchase an electronic product if the access restrictions were too limiting. Jackson Library's goal is to provide our users with seamless and simple access to electronic resources. 