November 2011

Library Perspective, Vendor Response

Robin Champeix

Ebook Library, Robin.Champeix@eblib.com

Steven Carrico

University of Florida Smathers Libraries, stecarr@uflib.ufl.edu

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

Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Champeix, Robin and Carrico, Steven (2011) "Library Perspective, Vendor Response," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 23: Iss. 5, Article 37.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.6011>

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

Under the Hood — Adopting & Adapting

Column Editor: **Xan Arch** (Collection Development Librarian, Reed College Library) <xanadu@reed.edu>

Moving from a large institution to a small one, my management responsibilities have changed. From managing a group of people who all perform similar tasks, I've moved to managing two people with completely different responsibilities. I manage far fewer people now, but in some ways it's more difficult. If you have something new to introduce, a change in workflow or a new tool, a larger group can learn together and use their peers as models, while an individual may feel like they are being judged by the speed at which they comprehend the process or feel that they are being singled out as the only one who needs to learn a new task. They may have created their own procedures, and these new processes and tools are disruptive to established work patterns. Libraries are changing rapidly, and much of the brunt of the change falls on the long-time staff members. How do we manage them through this kind of disruptive change in their work?

First of all, I have learned in the last few years is that not everyone is an experimenter. When I look at a new tool or process, I want to try it out, hopefully without the risk of breaking anything. I want to poke it, play with it, click the random buttons to see what happens. Sometimes I assume other people are like me. I have presented new tools to staff members and said "try it out and let me know what you think," assuming that the ability to experiment would be exciting for them and a good way to learn the new tool. Not all people think like that, however. For some people, it's not a liberating experience to play around with a new tool; it's a waste of time until they understand how it fits into their work. They want to know why and how and when. With a group of staff members, a manager can pick the person who will like to try out a new tool and will provide valuable feedback. Then the new tool can be rolled out to the group more fully-formed. Sometimes the group's adoption may happen over time and the manager can have a subset of the staff perform the new process until the

whole group is comfortable. With a single staff member, however, their adoption is crucial, as is their opinion about the process or tool. If experimenting with a new process is intimidating, not fun, it may be harder for them to be willing to adopt it.

One way around this is to present the new process or tool as a fully-formed idea. Working with someone who doesn't want to experiment may mean that you are providing training and documentation along with the new process or tool. If presenting it half-baked, as an experiment, leads to confusion or fear, then don't ask your staff person to experiment. Use it yourself, decide how it will be used in the department, and then roll it out with documentation and training.

The drawback is that if a process feels finished, it is assumed to be finished. How do you ask for feedback and find problems in the process? In the same vein, while the idea behind experimenting is that it's ok to make mistakes, just because you have provided training and documentation to your staff, they may still make mistakes as they learn the new process. Often mistakes are what they are most worried about. They wanted to know exactly what to do from the beginning because they didn't want to do it incorrectly.

As a manager, accepting mistakes and correcting them without visible frustration is an important part of helping the staff person feel ready to try the new tool again. And maybe, just maybe, you didn't provide everything they needed. I've often felt frustrated when it seemed like someone didn't listen to me, or read the document I created, only to find that they have identified a bug in the process or a gap in the documentation. The process might have been clear to me, since I wrote the document, but much less clear to anyone else reading it. If the way to encourage adoption is to present a process with documentation and training, rather than as an experiment, it has to be accompanied by a request for feedback. Often I explain that while I have outlined the process, they know the

intricacies of their workflow best, and they can help me correct anything I might have done wrong. And if they make mistakes, everything is fixable.

It's also important for our staff to know that they are not alone in their work changing. They know how their everyday tasks have evolved, but often they are a lot less clear on the changes in the library as a whole. If your staff members feel like they are the only ones that have to make changes in their work or learn new processes, they may feel picked on or singled out. Managing larger groups, my remedy for this is to provide an update of my ongoing tasks at group meetings. This usually sparks discussion of how these tasks fit into the library's upcoming projects and goals, and what might be coming down the pike for that group. Since my tasks often involve other departments, I can give the group a wider appreciation of the library's workings. This is not as easy with a solo staff member, however. There may not be an opportunity to discuss ongoing projects without group meetings as a container. It's just as important, however, for these staff members to understand what's going on in their workplace. If they understand the bigger picture, they will understand the institutional changes that make changes in their work necessary. They aren't being picked on, they are being asked to contribute to a movement that is larger than themselves. In one-on-one meetings, I often talk to my staff about my own new tasks, and my concerns or frustrations with those tasks. Sometimes they have suggestions for me. Sometimes they could care less. But they realize my job is changing, just as theirs is, and just as rapidly.

New processes and tools are an inevitable part of working in a library. Providing context for these changes and understanding how people react to these changes, whether in groups or as solo staff members, can make the adoption process easier for staff and managers. 🌱

Library Perspective, Vendor Response

Column Editors: **Robin Champieux** (Vice President, Business Development, Ebook Library) <Robin.Champieux@ebilib.com>

and **Steven Carrico** (Acquisitions Librarian, University of Florida Smathers Libraries, Box 117007, Gainesville, FL 32611-7007) <stecarr@uflib.ufl.edu>

Column Editors' Note: This column for *Against the Grain* is devoted to discussing issues affecting library acquisitions, library vendors and the services and products they supply to academic libraries, and the publishing marketplace as a whole. It is an ongoing conversation between a book vendor representative, **Robin Champieux**, and an academic librarian, **Steven Carrico**. — RC and SC

Robin: Hello again, Steve! In our last column we touched upon the complicated issue of eBook preservation and long-term access, especially when aggregators are involved. I'd like to use this month's column to explore this important topic. Currently, as far as I'm aware, a comprehensive eBook preservation solution does not exist. By comprehensive, I mean one that addresses not only technical and legal needs, but also one that addresses the myriad of ways libraries acquire content. **CLOCKSS** and **Portico's** eBook preservation

initiatives, for example, do not address aggregator content and collections. Generally, agreements between aggregators and their publisher partners participating in third-party preservation services do not address corresponding library rights. And, there is no standard language to address the use of third-party preservation services within aggregator agreements and licenses. Given this environment, how does your library approach eBook preservation, and what developments would you like to see?

continued on page 91

How to avoid that empty-shelf feeling

EMERY-PRATT'S EARLY RELEASE PROGRAM HELPS YOU AVOID EMPTY SHELVES — AND UNHAPPY PATRONS — BY GETTING THE NEWEST RELEASES TO YOU ASAP.

It's probably happened too many times. An eagerly-awaited release date for a new title comes and goes — yet you're still waiting for your copies to arrive. But now there's a way to prevent missed releases, empty shelves, and disappointed patrons. It's Emery-Pratt's *Early Release* program, and it will help put the latest release onto your shelves faster than ever before.

With *Early Release*, new titles are shipped to you as soon as we get them from the publishers. So they'll be on your shelves when your patrons expect them, and in advance of official release dates.

There are no hidden charges or fees, and you can still take full advantage of any and all discounts.

Sign up is easy. Simply call our toll-free number at 1.800.248.3887

THE NICEST PEOPLE IN THE BOOK BUSINESS

1966 West M-21, Owosso, MI 48867-1397

Phone (toll-free) 1.800.248.3887

Fax (toll-free) 1.800.523.6379

E-mail: mail@emery-pratt.com

Emery-Pratt[®]
Book Distributors since 1873

www.emery-pratt.com

6146

Library Perspective, Vendor Response from page 90

Steve: Mainly our eBook preservation policy revolves around our own content; that is, digitized books from UF collections as offered through our **Digital Library Center**. Currently the UF libraries have no systematic policy or strategy to archive eBook content purchased from aggregators or publishers, so thousands of eBooks UF "owns" is entirely in the hands of our aggregator or publishers; and if one of the aggregators goes out of business, what happens to the eBooks we've purchased and are made available on their platform? It's a scary thought and makes me think the issue needs to be addressed by my library and soon! Going forward, I suppose it would be beneficial for UF to push for modifications in our eBook license agreements, making archival and preservation an essential piece to the negotiations. I'd be interested in hearing what other academic libraries are doing to establish archives of their eBook content. As an aggregator how do you deal with this issue?

Robin: We try to be proactive, and I believe this to be true of all of aggregators. However, the landscape is complex and can be very time consuming and expensive to navigate. Aggregator agreement and licensing language about preservation must be legally interoperable with the agreements we have with publisher partners. Making minor and major changes to how we facilitate preservation can necessitate negotiation with hundreds of publishers. While it is a highly-competitive marketplace, I do observe an eagerness among the aggregators to collaborate on advancing preservation and creating viable solutions. At the **Charleston Conference**

last year, for example, **EBL**, **Coutts**, **Portico**, and **Oxford University Press** participated in a session in which some very concrete ideas were generated for integrating and addressing aggregator content within third-party preservation services. That said, those concrete ideas still need to be developed into concrete services. I believe I mentioned in our last column that one of my concerns is that preservation rights and solutions might be leveraged in ways that do not benefit libraries, such as driving eBook sales through particular channels and models. In this sense, the connection between preservation and access becomes even more entwined and immediate. Given what is at stake, I don't think libraries or aggregators can afford to be passive about eBook preservation.

Steve: Wish I'd caught that session last year — this issue is really big and doesn't seem to be talked about a lot at either conferences or in the library literature. I hope we see more programs with forums that include eBook preservation and archiving as topics. So how come eBook archiving is so different from the issue of e-journal archiving? And when you say one of your concerns is that preservation solutions might not benefit libraries, I'm reading "additional costs passed to libraries." Isn't that always the case even for e-journal archiving, especially for libraries using a third-party service?

Robin: I am not sure eBook archiving is so different from e-journal archiving, but the infrastructure to support e-journal preservation is much more developed. This is not a bad thing, what has been done and what has worked for e-journals can be applied to eBooks and help the library community move faster towards a more complete preservation solution for eBooks. But, that solution needs to fully address how and from whom libraries

buy content. For example, the trigger events that qualify content for archival access need to address not just publisher activity, but also aggregator activity. And, to address your concern, I do not think the cost of such a solution should be passed on to libraries. Rather, I believe in a solution in which the cost and support of preservation is distributed across community participants.

Steve: Good to hear! That seems to be one of our column's prominent themes (or messages): vendors, publishers, and librarians need to work together to make inroads on issues that affect us all, such as developing affordable and sensible long term eBook preservation models. I'd like to see this topic covered more in depth at future library conferences. Speaking of, the **2011 Charleston Library Conference** online program is now available and I see that you're part of a panel presenting on the consortial demand-driven program set up with **Orbis-Cascade**. That should be interesting — and timely. Multi-library eBook plans are getting a lot of attention from libraries and consortia looking to reduce duplication and share content.

Robin: Yes, thanks for the plug, and you remind me of another important development affecting preservation needs. With content being purchased at the consortial level and in electronic format, traditional, built-in infrastructures that benefit preservation — multiple copies owned by multiple libraries — are not available. Additionally, there are likely new and specific archival access triggers to be considered in a consortial context.

Steven: Whoa, as if putting together a shared or consortial eBook acquisitions plan isn't challenging enough, let's roll in the archival issue and really make it complicated! Good luck with your program, and I'll see you in Charleston. 🍷