

February 2012

@Brunning: People & Technology: At the Only Edge that Means Anything / How We Understand What We Do

Dennis Brunning

Arizona State University, dennis.brunning@gmail.com

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



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

Recommended Citation

Brunning, Dennis (2012) "@Brunning: People & Technology: At the Only Edge that Means Anything / How We Understand What We Do," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 24: Iss. 1, Article 31.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.6101>

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.

tasks we would like to accomplish through the ERMS.

We started populating license records fields during our initial implementation with very basic information, but due to turnover in the Contract Specialist position, distilling license terms into the ERMS is currently on hold. Eventually we would also like to attach scanned licenses to the resource records to provide centralized access to authorized staff.

Currently we maintain usage statistics in a separate database for collection development and assessment. We have tested the Usage Statistics feature in our ERMS but due to discrepancies in the cost-per-use data and labor-intensive preparatory work of converting the files from providers for importing to the ERMS, we have not yet implemented this feature.

We have not yet started using the ERMS for eBooks management, as these collections are still an emerging concept, but have begun thinking about how we might do so. E-journal purchasing models were prevalent and operational when ERMSs were developed. Now that eBook packages are increasingly being marketed, we would like to be able to adapt the ERMS to manage them as well.

Integration of the ERMS with other management tools is a major shortcoming. Even though our ERMS integrates with our ILS, there are some pitfalls in interoperability with other systems. In a survey reported in *Against the Grain's* April 2010 special issue, 94% of ERMS libraries reported they still use spreadsheets to accomplish some e-resources related functions (Klusendorf 2010). ASU Libraries is no exception. We still use a separate intranet

database for performing workflows associated with selecting and acquiring new e-resources. An early idea to write a "crosswalk" script to automatically populate the ERMS from the CSC form unfortunately did not come to fruition. Various **SerialsSolutions** products serve as our link resolver, discovery interface, and A-Z e-journal list. HelpStar is used for reporting and resolving access issues. Excel spreadsheets are used to report database expenditures and usage statistics to subject specialists and to collate statistical data for local and national bodies. Integrating these important tasks into the ERMS would help centralize all e-resources functions into a single system.

We would also like to improve and customize the ERMS's public interface. Currently ERMS vendor enhancements focus on functionality for library staff, rather than improving public interfaces. For example, a tiered approach to display the ERMS subject list, and integration with public-facing applications such as LibGuides, would make the ERMS more powerful, flexible, user-friendly, and well-indexed with multiple points of access.

Recommendations

We took a significant amount of time in our ERMS implementation: fourteen months for planning, then another six months to populate the data before releasing it to our library staff and users. Libraries implementing an ERMS should not underestimate or stint on planning time before launching the product.

Collaboration among various library departments prior to and throughout the implementation process proved very valuable in the success of the ERMS. Including all campuses, libraries, and departments in our planning discussions provided a broad range of foresight and expertise to the experience.

Implementation and continuing development and maintenance of the ERMS are a full-time job. As with many technological innovations, the ERMS has helped centralize information, but it has not actually decreased staff work. It is important to have a designated position solely focused on managing the ERMS and coordinating projects and staff to expand it.

Just as ERMS implementation has been a continuous process, so too has collaboration become habitual at the ASU Libraries. After the planning workgroups dissolved, an ongoing Libraries-wide, multi-campus ERM Task Force was created to continue to address implementation and other issues. A separate E-Workflow Group focused on technical services meets monthly to establish workflow policies and procedures such as in-house and vendor-supplied e-resources cataloging and the implementation of patron-driven acquisitions services. The Collections Steering Council has reformed into several workgroups, including an E-Resource Discovery Workgroup co-chaired by the ERM Coordinator. These collaborative efforts ensure that all stakeholders remain informed of new e-resources developments and encourage continued planning and refinement to the ERMS public and staff interfaces.

References

- Collins, M., & Grogg, J. E. (2011). Building a better ERMS. *Library Journal*, 136(4), 22-28.
- Klusendorf, H. (2010). Electronic resources management systems: Still trying to hit the moving target. *Against the Grain*, 22(2), 1, 16.
- Silton, K., & LeMaistre, T. (2011). Innovative Interfaces' electronic resources management system: A survey on the state of implementation and usage. *Serials Review*, 37(2), 80-86.

@Brunning: People & Technology

At the Only Edge that Means Anything / How We Understand What We Do

by Dennis Brunning (E Humanities Development Librarian, Arizona State University) <dennis.brunning@gmail.com>

Google Zeitgeist Report 2011

In the public interest, Google annually analyzes keyword searches which rise to the top of popularity among billions of searches. We learn, for instance, that none of us are especially profound in our search terms. Our keywords look like morse code in brevity and our interests are mundane. Nevertheless, Google divines great meaning in trends like "Justin Bieber" or "J.Lo's rear."

What Google doesn't care to reveal are the millions of other more specific and telling searches. From brilliant to dull, stellar to base-

ment, sublime to trivial — these searches are locked away in Google servers. For Google's eyes only.

For librarians, this isn't good, right, or helpful. Google Analytics, geared to our own users, would form the holy grail of knowing. With just an ounce of this data, we could transform our own search tools and practices to provide our users with data and research that would easily trump claims made by open access as far as "knowing" goes.

We can imagine similar keyword data collected by other search giants like Yahoo, Bing, and Ask. We wouldn't need personal information, simply the same sanitized data they've gathered for "better more personalized searches."

Google's Zeitgeist is our Zeitgeist. It's both a public utility and good.

Your links:

<http://www.google.com/zeitgeist/>
<http://www.bing.com/community/siteblogs/b/search/archive/2011/11/28/2011trends.aspx>

Branding 101 for Librarians...

What's in a name? A few of us may ponder this each time we land on Yelp, Twitter, or even Google. Facebook makes sense, sort of. **Apple** or **Amazon** — well, they benefit from their position in the sort; for who among us can resist names that start off the alphabet? Librarians

continued on page 49



The Acquisitions Institute at Timberline Lodge

May 19-22, 2012



www.acquisitionsinstitute.org

@Brunning: People & Technology
from page 48

have always preferred the **American Library Association** alphabetical sort anyway.

What's at stake these days is the "library." It needs quotation marks because we are losing mind share, especially among younger people.

Some believe we can transform the library into a newer, more modern term. As the kids like to say, the library and "more." Since **New Coke**, though, no one wants to put new in front of library as a transformative branding move. The new library came and went with new republicans. It's just not clever. As for labels like Library 2.0, well that was just a nonstarter.

The problem may be the library as we know it never had brand power in the sense of a **PepsiCo** or **Proctor and Gamble**. If so, we'd be able to sell and resell the idea no matter what.

Hope on the horizon comes from all those public library people buying readers and wanting freebies from the library. Patron-driven academic book selection is hopeful. Anything that spells out the unique relationship we have with our patrons is golden.

We need "library" to mean more to all of us. For our users, we need it to mean — we've got your back, we're still here for you despite

all those readers, all those advertisements, all those nay-sayers predicting our demise.

Oh Analog

We've become a nation addicted to tiny backlit screens. All those smartphones and tablet computers. These screens are bright and eye straining. They're great for light therapy to beat the winter blues, but we've got to accept the possibility that our brains are being fried by digital excess. Seasonal affect disorder cure gives way to retinal dysplasia.

In **Brad Eden's** Charleston rant chant we may need to: stop, stop, stop.

Now **Brad** meant you need to stop being a certain librarian he didn't like or agree with. One who doesn't "get" technology and keeps getting in its way. What we mean here is a simple momentary pause from being digital, especially if it involves backlit screens. Find the off switch as it were.

Of course, users of black ink technology display screens like those used in some **Nooks** and **Kindles**, well, you are exempt. Pass Go and click "Buy another eBook." Or better, take advantage of those public libraries who've cobbled together an eBook program delivered by **Overdrive**. You will be reading something like a normal analog-era book. As a result, your eyes, brain, and mind will be safer. You won't be safe from what you learn, but that is the case with books no matter what format.

But is the eBook really a book? Just ask any standard **Kindle** or **Nook** owner if the books — or especially the magazines — read like books. For one, you don't have page numbers. And when you come down to it, you don't have margins to doodle in and easily return to. And you can't easily read with one hand, in the dark. Moreover, the pleasure of trading the book in for credit at a secondhand bookstore, well, that era is over.

Ironically, to get an edition that looks and reads like the real thing, you have to go to a browser, IOS, or droid-based app that lights up the manuscript in the white light of a digital display. Here you will get natural reproductions in **Kindle** apps for **iPads**, and **iBook** apps for **iPads**. Your **Kindle Fire** with its color graphics, touch technology, and incredibly discounted price (compared to the costly **iPad**) is extremely library friendly in features and price. Yeah baby, this is something a librarian can afford.

But can librarians, especially the mid- to later-aged folks, afford the strain on their eyes? Can they afford the strain on their brains as they multitask their way out of utter distraction brought on by the innate ADD of the digital content and digital-consumed world? Can they survive the cervical stenosis of bending the head over in that I've got many messages on my device so I don't have to deal with you, the world outside? The analog world?

continued on page 50

Of course, as another *ATG* columnist often toots, the train has left the station. It seems like we may need a new metaphor that suggests how we use.

What is a Book Exactly These Days?

In a recent essay in the *New York Times Book*, **Joshua Cohen** describes print books he schlepped to an art book conference in Berlin. The books, bundled heavily in an old travel suitcase, were an aggregate of essays that originally appeared online. And not any old online, but a site dedicated to exploring the Print-into-Web and the Web-into-Print world.

The books were aimed at the art and book markets in Europe which the author noted plays differently than U.S. publishing. In Europe, where eBooks are only 1% of books sales, and reader and consumers seem largely indifferent to all the hubbub about eBooks in the U.S. In Berlin people read books, books with paper pages, and they are happy. And they read a lot, and books sell.

Germans joke that Americans just want to buy books and not read them. And what easier way to buy them but at half the hard-cover price?

We might consider the implications of how we think and act about eBooks — as consumers or librarians. For once, let's get ahead of the Annoyed Librarian in telling us what to do.

Let's allow it to suggest to us the book is larger than any momentary version of it. What we mean by the book is only in its infancy. Let's make it our major goal to give each reader a book whatever format it ends up in.

Your links;

<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/15/books/review/my-berlin-airlift.html>

Books, Cancer, and Open Access: An Observational Therapy

When you or a loved one is diagnosed with cancer, what you need are answers and explanations. You need easily understood stuff. You do not need the research which requires an expert to synthesize and an MD to put into action.

The Open Access movement assumes a citizen's right of access to federally-funded research. If true, this right is vast. There might be a taxpayer's right to just about everything.

This is a loose argument to base all claims. As law it would be hard to enforce. And why do taxpayers have a right to view the published article? An abstract, the data, a report — all would qualify as a way of disclosing the taxpayer's supported research.

Librarians do not have much role in any of the open access models. Slightly in the gold, some in the green. Many librarians do not need to be hired to run an open access operation. As search experts we are easily dismissed as func-

against the grain people profile

Assistant Professor / Liaison Librarian, Colorado State University
Morgan Library, 1019 Campus Delivery, Fort Collins, CO 80523
Phone: (970) 491-4326 • <amy.hoseth@colostate.edu>

Amy Hoseth

BORN AND LIVED: I was born in Evanston, Illinois, but I grew up in Bloomington, Minnesota.

PROFESSIONAL CAREER AND ACTIVITIES: I worked in public relations and employee communications for a DC-based telecom firm from 1995-2002. In 2002 I joined the **Association of Research Libraries (ARL)** and handled communications for the **LibQual+** project while simultaneously pursuing my MLS degree at the **University of Maryland**. I received my degree in 2005, and in the spring of 2006 I accepted my current position with the **Colorado State University Libraries**.

FAMILY: Husband, **Chad** (also employed at **CSU**) and two sons.

IN MY SPARE TIME: Running, high-altitude baking, and spending time with my family and friends.

PET PEEVES: Bad grammar.

FAVORITE BOOKS: *Personal History*, by **Katharine Graham**; *The Road*, by **Cormac McCarthy**; *The Passage*, by **Justin Cronin**; *No Ordinary Time*, by **Doris Kearns Goodwin**.

HOW/WHERE DO I SEE THE INDUSTRY IN FIVE YEARS: I think we're at a very interesting point in the information industry. I expect current trends (online access to resources, growing demand for eBooks, etc.) to accelerate in the next five years. I don't expect library budgets to increase much, if at all, during that same period, so libraries will have to be increasingly selective in terms of what they purchase, and what they make available to users through interlibrary loan and other methods. I suspect that libraries are in the process of a shift away from owning content, and towards facilitating access. It will be interesting to see how that plays out, especially as non-library entities such as Amazon, Google, Apple, and Facebook shape user expectations regarding access to information in the digital environment. 🌱



tionally irrelevant. Economic obsolescence follows. Pushing hard for open access — it doesn't do our profession any favors.

The thinking behind open access won't stop at journals. That's the problem from a broad social economic view.

The squirm factor among high management in libraries is huge. They ignored open access for many years before they started to fall in line urging open access declarations. They pay lip service to the politics but deep down they must sense the contradiction. There is no need for big bosses if all the minions are eliminated.

Good medical information, based on the latest research, is everywhere on the open Web. Government Websites like those at the **NIH** provide consumer-directed guidelines and research updates. It abstracts or distills information and makes it knowable. Even scholarly and commercial publishers have made loads of useful information available.

In other words, there are other ways to communicate useful medical information based on taxpayer supported research. Credible, helpful, medical information, based on government-funded research, is a click or two away.

A secondary benefit, a mitzvah so to speak, is work for librarians. If you are laid up with a major disease or caregiving for a loved one, you now have time to use your skills. Health practitioners want to publish. They want good research, do not have time to find it themselves, and want someone to filter the good from the bad, the relevant from the irrelevant. Money is usually not an object and strikingly they want you to filter out open access journals.

In time we may all need to consider this employment alternative. If open access becomes the model in journals there is no reason it won't move to other areas of academic publishing. Then, some clever tea party person is first going to eliminate librarians who have no role because of open access publishing. And those library administrators, well, they will face their own obsolescence when their minions are no longer there to be managed.

Your Links:

www.cancer.org

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/> 🌱