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 lows each team member to self-monitor his/her work flow. Some tasks rotate on a weekly basis, others rotate bi-weekly and still others rotate less often. As each staff member moves to new assignments, he/she is motivated not to pass on a backlog to a colleague. The tedium of the more boring tasks such as opening and sorting mail or labeling is eased because responsibility for those tasks changes more frequently.

In any organization, change is difficult. The decision to discontinue serials check-in for certain categories of material served as the catalyst for a vigorous, ongoing process of review and evaluation. The staff embraced the need for change and viewed the changes as an opportunity to hone existing skills and acquire new skills, while simultaneously creating a flexible organization that adjusts more readily to constantly shifting requirements.

RESPONSE: Submitted by Andrea Christman (Catalog Librarian, Dayton Metro Library, Dayton, OH)

Dayton Metro Library recently decided to eliminate serial check-in for periodicals received by our 21 branches, although subscriptions for the Main Library will continue to be checked in. In considering this change, Technical Services asked for input from public service staff, including the branch staff. After examining staffing and reference needs, as well as patron utilization of the collection, it was decided that the library community and staff would be better served by eliminating magazine check-in for the branches.

Before January of 2006, all periodicals were checked in at the Main Library (except for newspapers). Issues were mailed directly to the Main Library, where a serials clerk checked them in, and then they were sent to the branches. Consequently, there was often a delay in receiving these publications at the branches; this was particularly noticeable for periodicals with timely information, such as U.S. News & World Report. Branch staff indicated that they would rather have the magazines faster than have them sent to the Main Library for check-in.

Having the magazines drop shipped to the branches meant that the branch staff would have to check the magazines in themselves, or not check them in at all. If they continued to check-in, they would also have to maintain the summary of holdings statements by editing them as old issues are discarded. Branch staff felt that patrons did not rely on the summary of holdings to tell them what was on the shelf; the magazines are primarily a browsing collection. Additionally, the summary of holdings did not always accurately reflect what was physically in the library because circulating copies are checked out by putting item records on "dummy" bibliographic records. Creating item records on the magazine’s true bibliographic record was considered, but most branches did not want the magazines to be reservable or to be subject to the wear and tear of increased delivery. Given the additional staff time and the fact that patrons did not truly use the summary of holdings, it was decided that checking in periodicals at the branches could be eliminated. We know that there are advantages and disadvantages either way and the decision was not unanimous; some branches wanted to keep periodical check-in.

Several things, however, have not changed. Most importantly, our catalog will still display which branches have subscriptions to a given title; there will also be a general holdings statement, such as "Library keeps current three years." We recently migrated to a new ILS and have not yet begun automatic claiming; branches are to notify our Acquisitions Department if an issue needs to be claimed. Additionally, issues for the Main Library will continue to be checked in. The Main Library staff felt that it was important to have a listing of what they own even if they are not charged with storing and binding the back issues of selected titles for the entire library system. Although it will take several years for this plan to be fully implemented (the addresses on some subscriptions can only be changed when they are renewed), Technical Services hopes that both the patrons and the staff will be better served with this new procedure.
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Two information industry gatherings, both held in Europe in April, addressed some of the most pressing challenges facing our industry at this time. At the University of Warwick, England, a capacity audience of over 600 delegates attended the 29th Annual Conference of the United Kingdom Serials Group (UKSG) from 3-5 April. While the leafy Warwickshire countryside looked its best in the bright spring sunshine, delegates were not tempted to linger out of doors for too long, as winter reminded us that she had not quite lost her grip, with biting northerly winds and occasional snow flurries. Inside, we were treated to a programme of plenary sessions and workshops/briefing sessions addressing topics such as the economic evaluation of the scientific publishing market, innovations in scholarly communication, the transition to e-only format, digital archiving, setting up an institutional repository, non-standard licensing models and journal article versions. A full programme of this conference is available on the UKSG Website (http://www.uksg.org/events/annualconf06.asp), while a new blog, “LiveSerials,” provides further information on presentations and discussions at the conference (http://liveserials.blogspot.com/).

Meanwhile, in a two day conference on 4-5 April, another group of industry leaders gathered in Berlin for APE 2006: Academic Publishing in Europe, the Role of Information in Science and Society. Jointly initiated by AKEP (Electronic Publishing Working Group) and ALPSP (Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers), and organised under the auspices of the European Commission (EC), APE 2006 brought together 160 participants from 15 countries, and included publishers, scientists, research funding organizations and librarians. The goal of the conference was to seek a common language on structural changes taking place in publishing, and science communication in the context of society at large.

In her opening remarks to APE 2006, Sally Morris, Chief Executive of ALPSP, struck an historic note, by pointing out that the heart of academic publishing is in Europe and that the advances in information technology and communication (ITC), to which European scientists have greatly contributed, are now of fundamental importance to the publishing industry. This theme was picked up by Dr. Nicole Dewandre of the EC Research Directorate General, who placed academic publishing at the heart of the European research effort and stressed the high priority given to research by the European Union (EU). She stated that, in her view, STM journals are an essential channel for the diffusion of scientific knowledge. She also drew attention to a study commissioned by the EC that investigates the perceived market imperfections of the current publishing system and evaluates alternatives made possible by the electronic revolution. This “Study on the economic and technical evolution of the scientific publication continuation on page 69
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markets in Europe” has been made publicly available (http://europa.eu.int/commission/science-society/pdf/scientific-publication-study_en.pdf) comments being accepted up to June 2006 and will be followed by a conference during the last quarter of 2006.

Dr. Jurgen Renn (Max Planck Gesellschaft, MPG) gave an address on behalf of the MPG President, Dr. Peter Gruss. In this he reflected on the current scientific journal, the MPG’s role and attitudes towards the existing academic publishing process. In the view of the MPG the costs for the dissemination of scientific information have become research costs and Open Access (OA) publishing is a paradigm shift of the same order as the Internet and the Web. He contrasted OA with the “toll access” model currently practised by publishers. In his view new media have not been used optimally by academic publishers; he suggested examples of systems developed and run by scientists themselves as alternatives. 

Dr. Renn stressed that new publishing models need to be sought and that if we keep mapping existing structures to a new medium, we shall create rather than cross boundaries. He further stated that OA is not directed against publishers, but is rather a transformation process towards a better infrastructure that publishers can also exploit. The development of OA should focus on long-term preservation and quality control.

In a session devoted to the Scope of European Publishing, Dr. David Hoole of the Nature Publishing Group provided an historic sketch to illustrate the changes in geographic centres and the circumstances under which publishers operate. World War II had a profound impact on culture, economy and publishing technology developments. The STM industry achieved remarkable growth after the War, but now faces an uncertain future. Research funding organisations are increasingly trying to protect their investments and to control publishing processes. A challenge for publishing, being a global business, is to cooperate with the nationally organised funding agencies. Asian input into the volume of papers published will grow rapidly, but for now the US still has the number one position. NPG envisages several development scenarios, but Dr. Hoole stressed that publishers need to build on experience, develop business in a global way and offer value for money.

Dr. Willy Stalman, formerly Chair of the FEBS Publication Committee, explained that from the point of view of learned societies, free access to all publications is not a priority. Current income for societies from publications can be very significant and is used to support other society activities. From the consumer perspective a policy of free access seems unfair. For authors it would mean an added burden to arrange and administer publication funds. Embargo periods as suggested by some funding agencies, which are stipulating free access after an initial period down to 6 months, are unrealistic for many high quality publications.

Dr. Peiro Attanasio (CEO of mEDRA) demonstrated the complexity of the value creation process in the publishing sector today. It is possible to envisage the elimination of various active groups in the chain, but at a price. In a situation where market conditions are affected by politics, new policies, including OA and copyright, may have the effect of strengthening the competitive advantage of large players. OA, under certain conditions, may promote market concentration. Dr. Attanasio thinks that smaller publishers need to create alliances with universities and authors, and invent a new business model.

In a session on Technology and Innovations, Hans Jansen, Acting Director of e-Strategy at the National Library of The Netherlands discussed large scale and long-duration archiving strategies, including migration and emulation, or the “Safe Place Model.” The latter is adopted at his library as the only fully acceptable solution. Within this framework, agreements are reached with publishers (around 20 of the largest publishers so far); in principle, every STM publisher is welcome. With the current system the National Library of The Netherlands can add up to 40k articles per day.
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The financial aspects of this model have yet to be fully worked out. As long as there is commercial interest among the publishers, articles are available on licence conditions. When demand declines for an article, it can be offered for free. Problems are foreseen, however, in the area of international electronic publications, which do not fall within the scope of a national library.

In a session on Strategic Change, Mark Seeley (Legal Counsel, Elsevier Inc.) illustrated how publishing functions are migrating far outside the traditional STM sector. Larger companies have invested in a variety of author support systems, but the offerings of new entrants—some of them companies that used to provide back-office services for publishers—make us aware of the changing roles of stakeholders. One central question is whether publishers should change their role. Some new services, like PatientInform, could easily be set up by publishers, but they will have to offer significant services to the community to stay competitive. On the other hand, it is not an easy task to develop easy-to-use systems.

In a Closing Panel discussion, chaired by Herman Spruit (Royal Brill Academic Publishers and IPA), a general debate followed introductory statements by the three panelists. In his remarks, Dr. Albrecht Hauff (CEO of Thieme Verlag) expressed doubts as to whether a change from a competition-based publishing system to a state- or university-run system would be a change for the better; in his opinion the neutrality of publishers with regard to content is very important. Moreover, he stressed the importance of copyright protection and reminded the audience that lower levels of protection would discourage publishing activities, especially the scientific monograph. He thought it highly unlikely that OA publishing would lead to a reduction in costs, but reminded the audience that publishers must add value to the dissemination of science or they would become redundant. Dr. Renn of the MPG agreed with Hauff that added value and investment are necessary and that there is no reason why the future system should be less expensive. On the other hand, he felt that it would be beneficial for the publishing business to be guided by the most innovative and advanced scientists. He urged the publishing industry to shift their investments from conserving the old system to infrastructure and value-added services in innovative scientific activities.

Dr. Klaus Saur (Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin) explained that publishers still play a very important role, but thinks this role is endangered by recent legislation and public funding policies. As a result of recent OA initiatives, he warned that many long-standing established publications may have to be discontinued. Unlike Renn he thinks that scientists do become competitors for publishers when they deliver all their content via OA channels. Saur thinks that these developments, combined with the budget reductions in libraries, will lead to a reduction in the quality of scientific information.

The ensuing general debate was largely driven by the issue of OA and a lively discussion revealed a wide spectrum of opinions. Renn reinforced his earlier championing of the OA model by stating that only is information held in a closed system at the moment, but publishers are investing to keep it closed. This point was supported by Mathew Cockerill of BioMed Central, who stated that “OA is the only way to allow full resources of academia to throw that creativity at finding the best ways to discover content and put that content in context.” Stalman reiterates the point that if scientific societies were to adopt OA they would lose income that currently funds courses, congresses and fellowships, leaving European biomedical scientists homeless and impoverished. In the best scenario, some of these activities might be taken over by, for example, the EU, but then scientists would have to face consequences that were eloquently stated by the physicist Sir Ernest Rutherford as long ago as 1926: “It is essential for men of science to take an interest in the administration of their own affairs, or else the professional civil servant will step in—and then Lord help you!”

In his closing statement, Panel Chair Herman Spruit pointed out that OA business models should not be confused with the effects of digital distribution already achieved: scientists have at their fingertips more information immediately available than ever before and we have experience with more than one business model already. The question is now: Who in the information chain should pay the bill? There seems to be an agreement that more than one model can exist and that an abrupt change is not the best solution for the academic community.

Despite all the energy and investments publishers are devoting to changing their role, if they are not seen as adding enough value and are not seen as proactive enough, authors, libraries and funding agencies will vote with their feet; technology is not the prerogative of publishers only but available to all players.

A full report on APE 2006, including the full conference programme and further details of the presentations and discussion is available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1477/5.814.