November 2013

Adventures in Librarianship -- Haiku

Ned Kraft

U.S. Department of State, kraftno@state.gov

Adventures in Librarianship — Haiku

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

Who would have imagined that the **2nd Triennial *ATG* Haiku Contest** would bring such genius to the fore? The breadth of talent in our profession is truly staggering.

This years judges included, along with myself, **LeMoyne Leeper**, winner of the **1971 Buddy Hacket Prize for Poetry**, and **Sherman Strep**, Poet Laureate of Arlington County, Virginia. We had a difficult time, I can tell you, choosing from so many beautiful works.

Katy Bluff, Assistant Director for the **Hareless County Library System**, submitted what the judges considered the "Most Poignant" poem. Here is her *Exasperate*.

Committee, task force,

In whose name we bash large rocks

On our willing heads.

The Most practical haiku was sent in by **Noam Brusky**, a front-desk assistant at the **Bourbon College Library**. It is entitled *Get Away from the Front Desk*.

It won't circulate

Without a barcode, stupid.

Why did we hire you?

The judges especially liked **Mr. Brusky**'s use of the question

ending, leaving readers with a sort-of puzzle; and leading the second two lines with W while the first leads with a seemingly contradictory I.

For "Most Sentimental," the judges went with *Little Bird*, by **Bertha Schwnk**, a volunteer at the **Somerset High School Library**. I think you'll agree that **Ms. Schwnk** captures the essential sentiment in any lost-book tragedy.

Little bird, come here.

Lost or missing or withdrawn,

Time to check you out.

Finally, our winning haiku for 2007, comes from **Dusty Beet**, a cataloger with **Darkmound University**. It is called simply *Where?*

If I could come back

As a book or a journal

Where would you class me?

The judges agreed that **Dusty**'s use of imagery was superb. One could almost picture the book and the journal. It is moving yet sublimely still, grandiose yet self-effacing. We hope to see more of **Ms. Beets** work in the future. Perhaps another submission in 2010? 🦢

And They Were There
from page 64

- OA articles are generally considered reliable.
- Opinions are split about the future of OA vs. published materials.

Survey respondents to the study were divided by professional positions:

Acquisitions	9%
Senior management	35%
Collection development	11%
Reference	13%
System or technology	2%
Electronic resource management	13%
Other roles	17%

Only about 60% of the respondents to the survey gave regional information to the study. Responses by known region are:

North America	41%
Europe	40%
Australasia	6%
Asia	6%
Rest of world	7%

Overall, the study shows that librarians are likely to choose OA materials when they are assured of reliability, peer review, and currency of the articles. However, the study also showed that other factors have an important part in influencing the selection of OA articles over journal articles.

Session — Thursday, November 9, 2006 — *Resources for College Libraries: Up Close and Personal* — Presented by **Marcus Elmore** (Project Editor, Choice), **John Krafty** (Product Manager, R. R. Bowker)

Report by **Colleen M. Conway** (Associate Professor and Head of Technical Services, Hope College) <conwayc@hope.edu>

Resources for College Libraries is the successor to the third edition of *Books for College Libraries* last published in 1988. It is available as

a multivolume set of books, each volume of which may be purchased separately; as a Website which can be used by librarians and patrons alike; and as a datafeed which is run against electronic files sent from your catalog. The change in name from books to resources was made in order to reflect the fact that the list was made from scratch and was not just a revision of the 1988 list. There are no video or audio resources in the bibliography but there are CD-ROM databases, Webresources and eBooks. **Marcus Elmore**, Project editor at "Choice" described the history of the resource. **John Krafty**, product manager at **R. R. Bowker** described the functionality.

Where *BCL* was organized on the LC classification system, *RCL* is organized "following the contours of an undergraduate curriculum." Sixty-two subject editors covered 58 subjects and worked with multiple bibliographers within each subject. **Andrea Twiss Brooks**, science bibliographer at the **University of Chicago** described the process she followed as a subject editor for geology. More information is available at *www.rclinfo.net*.

Session — Friday, November 10, 2006 — *Open Access — Beyond Declarations: What Steps Towards What Future?* — Presented by **Anthony Watkinson** (University College London and Blackwell Publishing), **Mark Patterson** (Public Library of Science), **Scott Plutchak** (University of Alabama at Birmingham), **Astrid Wissenberg** (UK Economic & Social Research Council)

Report by **Charlie Rapple** (Head of Marketing, Ingenta) <charlie.rapple@ingenta.com>

Mark Patterson attempted to focus on OA benefits by separating them from OA funding. However, given that his cited examples (linkage between papers; power of text mining; interactivity of content) are all achievable with "traditionally" published literature, the only distinct advantage of OA is that content is free at the point of use. And since free-at-the-point-of-use has to mean paid-for-at-the-point-of-publishing, the funding model cannot be disengaged. That increased access to the literature empowers each of these processes was nonetheless well demonstrated.

Astrid Wissenburg raised the unavoidable issue of corporate revenues, which currently comprise 20.3% of the STM market and which