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One of my favorite TV sitcoms is Frasier, starring Kelsey Grammer as the pretentious but loveable radio psychiatrist who addresses each caller with “I’m listening.” These two words send a short but powerful signal: let it all out, because he’s ready to help. When given the opportunity to guest edit a special issue of ATG, I could think of no other topic nearer or dearer to my heart than communication between librarians and content providers. My first professional position as a freshly-minted MLIS graduate was a Collections Consultant for Coutts Information Services (formerly with Ingram, now with ProQuest). After four educational years with Coutts, I hung up my vendor coat and joined Rollins College’s Olin Library as their E-Resources and Serials Librarian.

I’ve been on both sides of the fence when it comes to library/content provider communication, so I jumped at the chance to edit a special issue of ATG on this timely and timeless theme. I was delighted to discover that I’m not the only one with an interest in exploring ways to make the library/content provider relationship a more fruitful and satisfactory one. Experts from both the publishing and library worlds generously authored the articles on this special issue’s theme, sharing their good, bad, and not-so-lovely experiences. As I became more familiar with these articles, I saw many of the same frustrations and hopes expressed among both librarians and content providers. Why does communication seem to be an afterthought when embarking on a new partnership (or fostering an existing one)? How can we simply communicate better? What does that look like? How does it contribute to our ongoing success?

I don’t know about you, but these are not questions that were answered when I went to library school. We learn to communicate on the fly, and unfortunately, much of our communication takes place when crises arise or when we have to work through frustrating negotiations or technological challenges. Even when both parties have the best intentions, when librarian/content provider relationships are based on putting out fires, we don’t build a foundation for successful partnerships. It’s easy to see why the “us vs. them” mentality perpetuates in conversations among librarians and content providers; but as someone who has been on both sides, I know it doesn’t have to be this way.

In my current position at Rollins College, I communicate with content providers on a daily basis. When working with Coutts, I communicated with librarians on a daily basis. Is/was some of this communication of the negative/frustrating/bang-my-head-against-my-desk variety? Sure. But a lot of it led to mutual respect, improved user experiences, innovative product development, and lasting friendships. It may seem like librarians and content providers are constantly working at odds with each other, but this is only true if we make it true. In reality, we share common goals and objectives. We share similar values and in some cases, institutional missions. Libraries
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**Speak Up! Communication between Academic Librarians and Scholarly Content Providers**

by Erin Gallagher (Electronic Resources & Serials Librarian, Rollins College, Winter Park, FL) <egallagher@rollins.edu>

---

First up!!! Well, I DID NOT send you that weird email with glasses. I don’t think you need new glasses. It was SPAM and I apologize! Facebook and I have never been friends the way so many of you are. Sorry sorry sorry for the Spam. I think it is fixed. ;(

Did you fill out an evaluation form for the 2015 Charleston Conference? We are happy to report that Nina Peri filled out a form and was the winner of the drawing for a free registration for the 2016 Charleston Conference! Congrats to Nina!

Speaking of the 2015 Conference, we want to know your reaction to the Conference in the Gaillard Center. The Performance Hall was an incredible venue and large which we needed, no question. We know there were some acous-

---
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there is so much to celebrate these days! The Charleston Conference is over for another year and seems to have gone fairly well in the new venue! Whew! Grandson George just had his very first birthday! He is walking all around and even trying to say a word or two. He only has one complete tooth but he loves to try to eat with it. Whew!

This issue is finished. It was hard to get it done on time with ALA being so early in January! Whew!

This issue is guest edited by the Poll-a-Palooza dynamo Erin Gallagher. Erin has called on colleagues to Speak Up! Talk about Communication between Academic Librarians and Scholarly Content Providers. This issue has articles by Meredith Babb and Judith Russell (turf wars), Kristen Ostergaard and Doralyn Rossmann (vendor guidelines), Sarah Forrest (do’s and don’ts tips), Stacey Marien and Bob Nardini (customer service), Michael Arthur and Stacy Sieck (cooperation), and Lindsay Reno (subscription agents and consortia).

This issue has two op eds, one by John Dove (open access) and one from Howard Lesser (flat discounts). Our Back Talk by Jim O’Donnell talks about Ulysses and Amazon. We have interviews with Franny Lee and Kurt Sanford as well as an equally intriguing one with Don Beagle, the Director of Belmont Abbey College Library. Book Reviews by Regina Gong are must reads and Tom Gilson is no slouch himself with reference book reviews. We have a Booklover by the learned Donna Jacobs about The Flight of the Zany and another one by Michael Zeoli about Academic E-Books. As always, Choice the key book reviewing tool comes through with the books that we all should be sure and collect in Collecting to the Core.

Our Legal Issues section includes a Legal Speaking article by Bill Hannay, the singing lawyer, a Cases of Note by Bruce Strauch, and Lilly’s questions and answers.

Myer Kutz lets us inside publishing with his wonderfully astute recollections. Anthony Watkinson tells us about the Frankfurt Book Fair while Ramune and her team of reporters wrap up their coverage from the 2014 Charleston Conference. And it’s definitely hard to keep up with Don Hawkins and all his travels so be sure to read his report on the NISO Forum as well.

Bob Holley talks about public library book buying, Scott Smith talks about business realities, and Denise Garogalo looks into her crystal ball. Allison and Alayne invite Sally Krash and Eric Wedig to tell us about the Tulane pilot DDA program. There is a ton more! Keep reading!

Meanwhile, there is a lot more celebrating going on! The Library is having a big party and I have to go get a passion fruit cake (mmmgood) from the Saffron Bakery! Whew!

Happy Holidays to all and a good ALA Midwinter! Love, Yr. Ed.

Letters to the Editor

Send letters to <kstrauch@comcast.net>, phone or fax 843-723-3536, or snail mail: Against the Grain, MSC 98, The Citadel, Charleston, SC 29409. You can also send a letter to the editor from the ATG Homepage at http://www.against-the-grain.com.

Dear Editor:

Letter to Leah Hinds — Thank you for the award for free attendance at the 2016 Charleston Conference! This is much appreciated. I love the Charleston Conference but can’t always find the funds to come every year.

Kind regards,
Nina Peri, MLS
(Collection Development Librarian for Licensed Resources, Project Coordinator, DigitalCommons@Fairfield, Fairfield University, DiMenna-Nyselius Library, CT 06824; Phone: 203-254-4000 x.2039) <nperi@fairfield.edu>

The Charleston Conference directors and staff congratulate Nina on winning this free registration! Nina was chosen from a drawing of 2015 attendee evaluation participants. We look forward to seeing her, and the rest of the attendees, next November for another jam-packed, informative, invigorating conference. Thanks to all who participate and present for making the event a success each year. — Yr. Ed.

Rumors

from page 1

tics problems depending on where you were sitting. I heard a sabbatical presentation last week about concert halls and acoustic design. The Gaillard seems to have passed the test, but it appears there is a difference between acoustics for music and concerts and acoustics for speaking at meetings. And this was the first Conference in the Gaillard Center. We all have a lot to learn for sure. Let us hear your comments! Please!

Speaking of the Gaillard Center, it was certainly wonderful to return to the Francis Marion Gold Ballroom for the closing session — the Poll-a-Palooza session in 2015. I thought no one would be there but I was pleasantly surprised! A ballroom full of tables and chairs and plenty of food! But the best part was the ending session! It was a contrast — the old guy (Derek Law) and the young whippersnapper (Erin Gallagher) — you had to be there! Next year!

OH! And I don’t think I told you that Martha Ingram is responsible for the new Gaillard Center Performance Hall and venue! Read all about it! https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Martha_Rivers_Ingram
www.forbes.com/

Was reading about Barnes & Noble and how profits are once again down. Over drinks
the road and upset the good customer service I have come to expect.

Bob’s Story

Every unhappy customer is unhappy in her own way. Tolstoy himself couldn’t have done a better job of showing how that is true than our partner and friend Stacey Marien has done. And in the early period she describes, Coutts gave Stacey and her American University colleagues plenty of ways in which to be unhappy. The famous Tolstoy quotation comes from Anna Karenina. Fortunately for us all, and unlike the novel, our story had a painful start yet ended well.

In fact, though, Stacey concludes with one last “if they could only” statement, and so the story hasn’t really ended at all. The scariest kind of customer, in a business where so many details can go wrong, and where all of us can see so many ways to improve how libraries acquire their books, are the “happy” customers you never hear from. For one thing, they are not helping you to improve. You might get the idea you’re doing pretty well. Never a good idea, this business, to get too satisfied. For another, that customer might be doing all her talking to your competition, and not to you.

We’re glad Stacey talked to us in 2010. A better Tolstoy reference for the book vendor world at the time would have been War and Peace. Blackwell customers had to move, one way or another, there was upheaval in all directions, and corporate change was only a part of it. 2010 was also a year when eBooks reached a certain tipping point and vendors had to get down to serious work to support integration with print books.

American was among the first of our customers to use the OASIS “Review Shell” for online selection of print and eBooks. We’d worked hard to be the first vendor to offer that service to academic libraries. Among the Blackwell customers who joined Coutts, American was the first to set up shelf-ready service for the print books they bought. So beyond the basics involved in setting up a new account, which can be complex enough, such as getting the invoices right, and the shipping details, and the customer service communications, there was an extra layer or two of complexity.

Did everything go smoothly? Just re-read Stacey’s contribution for the answer. Did things go terribly wrong? Read Stacey for that answer too. Where my Tolstoy referencing goes off the tracks is with the first part of that famous Anna Karenina quotation, that all happy customers are alike. They are not. Today, I count 28 active OASIS users at American University. These AU users have been trained to use a customized interface to support a particular workflow involving selections, record downloads, and EDI orders for print books as well as eBooks. Many of these transactions result from the outputs of the profiles we have established with AU selectors in 30 different subject areas. Some of these profiles prefer print books, some prefer eBooks. Some have variants in support of eBook and print book DDA programs. Some profiles support approval plans, others don’t. We maintain some 300 active AU standing orders for series titles and annuals, blocking these against each of the profiles. We record AU purchases under about 140 different funds.

This amounts to a substantial sum of money each year. We are glad to have that business, of course. And we are equally glad to have a librarian like Stacey as our principal contact at American University. “Stacey puts the facts on the table,” as one of my colleagues says. Stacey was not only organized, direct, persistent, and patient in her criticisms and suggestions, but she also offered all of this in a spirit, as she says, of partnership.

The business of academic book selling is always, it seems, in transition. In that year of Blackwell and eBook transitions, establishing a new account resembled R & D work. Later, Ingram moved the Coutts operation from Niagara Falls, Ontario to La Vergne, Tennessee and Fort Wayne, Indiana. That transition, as Stacey relates, was not always, as we vendors like to say, “seamless.” We are now a ProQuest company. Our principal competitor in North America, who is also our partner in the business of selling eBooks, has a new parent company too. Publishers, always our suppliers, now are both partners and competitors as well. We are all busy inventing ourselves, competing and collaborating with one another at the same time, while preparing for whatever comes next.

It’s not easy work. We need the help of librarians like Stacey, whose example shows that your best customer, despite what you’d like to think, might be an unhappy customer.

Rumors from page 6

last night, I was talking to my husband about Barnes & Noble and how I liked it. “I hate it,” he said. “everything is jumbled together with coffee and snacks and toys and all kinds of magazines and comic books. It’s not a serious bookstore.” “Yes,” I agreed, “but you can go in and see people reading and don’t have to be in front of the computer to find things.” Back Talk this month by Jim O’Donnell (p.78)

brought back memories of the now defunct Intimate Bookshop in Chapel Hill, NC back when I was an undergrad. Bookstores are wonderful, aren’t they?


http://franklinstreetstories.com/stories/intimatebookshop.html

I didn’t spend much time with her in Charleston. My bad! Regina Gong — isn’t she doing a fabulous job of book reviews for us librarians? As a technical services librarian, I am especially interested in Mary Beth Weber’s book on Rethinking Technical Services (see p.35). And aren’t you enjoying Stacey Marien and Aalyne Mundt’s regular column, Let’s Get Technical, see this issue, p.57.

Talk about “rethinking,” don’t miss our Biz of Acq column in this issue, p.70. It’s about continued on page 29

Pushing the Vendor to Improve ... from page 20

Against the Grain / December 2015 - January 2016
<http://www.against-the-grain.com>
Interview — F. Lee and K. Sanford
from page 28

with robust licensing arrangements with key publishers that they need SIPX?

FL: We’re still focused on higher education and enhancing schools’ efficiency and effectiveness for the benefit of students. Even libraries with robust licensing arrangements like Stanford benefit greatly from SIPX because it exposes these rich collections more widely to faculty and students. This generates a greater return on investment. For schools without many library resources SIPX offers easy transactional access to quality and open content, so that students can still connect to what they need for an effective educational experience.

ATG: Since we live in a global market, can you tell us what plans you have for international expansion? Will these plans be impacted by the extension of U.S. copyright protocols through TPP (Trans Pacific Partnership)?

FL: SIPX already services global MOOCs where we might interact with students from dozens of different countries per course, and with ProQuest’s impressive global reach, international expansion of SIPX as an institutional service is coming soon! We recognize that different countries have unique workflows and needs, and we’re fine-tuning to make sure SIPX can be configured to be useful and valuable wherever it’s used. We expect no direct impact between SIPX and TPP, however, I do think that technologies and solutions like SIPX can be a way to demonstrate to policymakers the changing needs and behaviors of users and provide guidance on current and/or healthy market practices.

ATG: How do you see the ProQuest-SIPX relationship evolving? What are your goals for the next year? How do you see the market for your services changing? What will SIPX services look like in two years?

KS: Looking at the upcoming year, our immediate focus is on giving SIPX the rooms and resources to grow. SIPX will stay nimble and be powered by the same entrepreneurial drive, but much more robust with the resources of ProQuest to rely upon. That said, we’ll see the touch-points I mentioned between SIPX and ProQuest start to spark change both within ProQuest and in higher education generally, to bring benefits and new opportunities to our customers, partners and everyone. We want to keep ProQuest and SIPX adapting and always open to finding new ways to provide value, which is especially important in the dynamic market we’re in. We will constantly change to meet the customer needs and user behaviors.

ATG: Franny and Kurt, thank you both for taking time from your hectic schedules to let our readers know how things are evolving between SIPX and ProQuest. We really appreciate it! 🎉

Rumors
from page 22

Training the new Acquisitions Technician.
As many of us know, there are fewer and fewer people with library acquisitions experience.

Speaking of which, Stacey has a feature article in this issue with Bob Nardini about Improving Customer Service, p.20. In fact this entire issue of ATG is about communication between librarians and scholarly content providers.

From James Joyce to Critical Insights about comic books (p.66) we librarians are trying to keep up with the present at the same time we respect collect, and digitize the past. A tall order to be sure.

Did anyone besides a few of us hear Bill Hannay’s session in Charleston 2015? He was speaking about the recent U.S. Court of Appeals case between Google and the Authors Guild. Google Books: It Ain’t Over ’til the Librarians Sings is the topic Bill spoke about during a concurrent session that was attended by librarians, many of whom bemoaned the fact that the digitization of books by Google had ceased. Bill wants to hear from librarians about Google Books, because in the end, the essential question to be answered is whether the Google Books project has been worth all the effort to create it (and to fight about it). Speak up! Be Heard! Email Bill Hannay about this! <whannay@schiffhardin.com>

continued on page 32

Against the Grain / December 2015 - January 2016
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Cohen failed to cite my paper when he published a much shorter piece with a suggestively similar title: “Course-Management Software: Where’s the Library?” for EDUCAUSE. Cohen’s failure to reference my earlier research in his text, or acknowledge its existence with a citation, even if not a deliberate omission, had a greater consequence than one might suspect. It had the more serious (if temporary) effect of splitting this subfield of inquiry into contrasting wide and narrow frames of reference. Subsequent authors citing only Cohen seem to have followed the narrow path; e.g., if you want to do a blog post about how to embed a library tutorial link in the Canvas LMS, for example, Cohen’s paper is your logical citation, while authors citing my article seem to be exploring far broader implications and issues. My article had carefully cast its net as widely as possible by using a title that could encompass not only learning management systems, but everything from digital humanities projects, online cultural heritage exhibits, big data analytical sites, and visualization interfaces. I was making the kind of argument that must already have been written as standard nomenclature, and because more LIS researchers are finally coming to the realization that Libraries really do need to “matter” — Cohen, by contrast, circumscribed the topic narrowly, and (to my view) a bit rigidly.

Google Scholar now shows my article as having been cited more often than Cohen’s in total, and through 2014, it continues to be cited at a faster rate than Cohen’s — in part, I suspect, because CMU (one of the (and more) qualify as Web-based learning environments; and b) ALL mark territories where Librarians and LIS professionals should indeed “matter.” Cohen, by contrast, circumscribed the topic narrowly, and (to my view) a bit rigidly.

Google Scholar now shows my article as having been cited more often than Cohen’s in total, and through 2014, it continues to be cited at a faster rate than Cohen’s — in part, I suspect, because CMU (one of the (and more) qualify as Web-based learning environments; and b) ALL mark territories where Librarians and LIS professionals should indeed “matter.” Cohen, by contrast, circumscribed the topic narrowly, and (to my view) a bit rigidly.

So my concluding point is that LIS R&D will likely remain short-circuited, and never will likely reach its full potential, until all of us, as both theorists and practitioners, do a better job of absorbing, interpreting, and appreciating our own professional and research literature.

BT: One thing that has always struck me is the lack of any R&D arm/think tank for the library profession as a group. If some company or group would invest in this, libraries would be and could be more prominent in the research landscape. Why has this not happened? Have we been too service oriented? I am not against service, but it seems to me that we should be thinking more toward the future landscape.

DB: Great question, and I totally agree. I think we need to recognize a bit of the history here. Looking back, I think the LIS community missed a golden opportunity for a quick lead out the starting gate when the Web first appeared. But I don’t personally think it was our service orientation. I think our R&D got delayed and detoured in the late 80s and 90s for two reasons: the delay, I think, was related to OCLC’s early visionary leadership in machine-readable cataloging to support ILL. When the Web appeared, I think many of us assumed that there must be some “skunk works” R&D department at OCLC covertly developing a leading-edge search engine. But Google’s explosion into the market revealed that whatever R&D OCLC might have been doing, it wasn’t sufficiently agile, opportunistic, or visionary. And that delay relates to my second point about the detour — our decade-long collective detour into the blind alley / dead-end street named MS-DOS. Of course, we weren’t alone in this agonizingly protracted detour. I recall sitting in on a class for County Planners and IT managers when I did my grad certification in public administration at UNC’s Institute of Government in 85. I had just bought a Mac for my library, and my comments about that brought the scornful and condescending reaction from a speaker that “mice, GUI’s, and pull-down menus are merely toys. They’ll disappear within a couple years.” I replied: “In my opinion, everyone in this room will be using mice and GUI’s within a decade.” I was nearly laughed out of the room. (Too bad I didn’t offer a wager on that prediction.) But I stubbornly pressed on and even learned Hypertalk, the scripting language for Mac’s HyperCard. Few people today appreciate how much of Hypertalk’s legacy went into HTML. For me, learning the first release of HTML was like brushing up on HyperTalk 2.5.

But enough of that backtracking. For now, I think we’re finally seeing some vendor-specific R&D that holds real promise. One example is the SirsiDynix partnership with Zephyria, now just reaching the market in the BlueCloud Visibility product. I’m not endorsing this over any other competition; simply pointing out that at least this is a coherently-articulated strategy to transform Marc21 records into linked data so that public Google searches can redirect users to library-owned resources. So it is another way of responding to the Schoenfeld / Lippincott point about ceding discovery to Google by responding “OK, if we can’t beat ‘em, let’s join ’em.” At first, this may sound like it contradicts my strategy of a library discovery layer highly differentiated from Google. But I don’t see it that way. BlueCloud Visibility currently enables a high-listed Google hit to redirect the searcher into the SirsiDynix OPAC. That’s probably sufficient for public libraries. But the same strategy could also be tweaked to redirect the searcher into an academic discovery engine yoked to a dialogic or personalized adaptive learning system. Over the long haul, I still see that as the single most promising R&D path for academic libraries. So for now, it looks to me like the best LIS R&D (such as it is) is happening via vendor partnerships like SirsiDynix with Zephyria, and then also in selected university-based LIS graduate schools. Chapel Hill is doing interesting R&D on digital curation, for example, and Michigan/Ann Arbor has some exciting R&D on a number of fronts, including a community engagement project with local government in nearby Jackson. MI (which just happens to be my hometown). I don’t mean to slight or overlook other R&D players here — either vendors or grad schools. We just don’t have time or space to fully explore them. The more R&D the better, so I would finish by saying that no matter how much we have, we probably need a lot more.

BT: But, following up on your last sentence, what more can we do to really facilitate (too weak a word) jumpstart industry-wide, collaborative R&D? It’s only happening in small group initiatives.

DB: Another great question. It might be politic for me to finesse my answer, but that would be a cop-out, so I’ll be direct and honest about this. A couple vendors have tried creating standalone “futurist/guru” positions, and have hired (at presumably good salaries) high-profile quasi-celebrity LIS speakers who are staples at LIS conference programs. That’s good PR, and raises the vendor’s brand identification, but while those folks have been good at image-projection (and that alone has benefits not to be dismissed), I’ve not seen much evidence that they have personally spearheaded much valuable R&D. So I have an alternate proposal: vendors (and/or LIS grad programs) could find a handful of practitioners with both years of strong management experience and a demonstrable track record of publication and/or consulting — yes, like me. Since these will be folks with stable nine to five management positions — again, like me — you don’t need to offer an executive-suite salary. Instead, extend a relatively modest annual retainer ($12-15K a year) for a set period, perhaps three to five years. And then turn them loose; also underwrite some travel to conferences, but not just LIS conferences. Send them to EDUCAUSE, to conferences for higher-end shows, to STEM-oriented data conferences, etc. I think this is a low-risk but potentially high-reward idea. We’re talking about a retainer that’s half the salary of an entry-level clerical position (or less), so if not all these LIS R&D “apostles” produce results after three to five years, nobody’s broken the bank. Perhaps each major vendor could underwrite one such “R&D idea person,” and if some major foundation would underwrite each major grad program to do the same, we could have a total group of maybe 15-25 veteran in-the-field R&D resource people generating and proposing new ideas. After five years, optionally renew any who have produced really promising ideas, publications, and results. Say “thanks” to the rest and replace them with a fresh group of R&D candidates. That’s my “immodest proposal” — and I say “immodest” because I think I’d personally flourish with this sort of opportunity. ✈️

Don Beagle’s LinkedIn profile is at http://linkd.in/rDKccu and his Google Scholar profile is at http://bit.ly/tP1l5X. His email address is <DonaldBeagle@bac.edu>.
also be of interest to libraries building minority and ethnic studies collections. In addition, it is one of those titles that could find a place in either reference or circulating collections depending on need. This work, as well as others in the series, is available electronically via Credo Reference at http://corp.credoreference.com/.

Extra Servings

SAGE has published some recent titles including:

• The SAGE Encyclopedia of Economics and Society – 4 volumes (Dec. 2015, ISBN: 978-1452262439, $650) is edited by Frederick F. Wherry and “explicitly approaches economics through varied disciplinary lenses. Although there are encyclopedias of covering economics (especially classic economic theory and history), the SAGE Encyclopedia of Economics and Society emphasizes the contemporary world, contemporary issues, and society…”

• The SAGE Encyclopedia of Pharmacology and Society (Dec. 2015, ISBN: 9781483350004, $585) is edited by Sarah E. Boslaugh and “explores the social and policy sides of the pharmaceutical industry and its pervasive influence in society. While many technical STM works explore the chemistry and biology of pharmacology and an equally large number of clinically oriented works focus on use of illegal drugs, substance abuse, and treatment, there is virtually nothing on the immensely huge business (“Big Pharma”) of creating, selling, consuming, and regulating legal drugs…”

Oxford University Press has also published two new titles:

• The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and the Arts – 2 volumes (Nov. 2015, ISBN: 9780199846511, $395) edited by Timothy Beal is “an in-depth, comprehensive reference work that covers the cultural history of biblical texts, themes, characters, images, and the Bible itself in the literary, visual, and musical arts. Appearing in response to the shifting landscape of biblical studies over the last decade, OEBART embraces the broadest possible definition of ‘interpretation,’ one that includes a cultural-historical perspective…”

• The Oxford Encyclopedia of Latinos and Latinas in Contemporary Politics, Law, and Social Movement – 2 volumes (Oct. 2015, ISBN: 9780199744619, $395) is edited by Suzanne Oboler and Deena J. González and “provides a comprehensive source of information on the diverse historical and contemporary experiences of Latinos and Latinas in the United States… addresses the significant ways in which the Latino and Latina populations have shaped the political, legal, and social institutions of the United States, with new and updated scholarship on political movements and organizations, important legal cases, minority-rights laws, and immigration legislation…”

Salem Press has a few new titles in the works:

• Great Lives in American History: American Women – 3 volumes (March 2016, ISBN: 978-1-61925-944-7; e-ISBN: 978-1-61925-945-4, $395) “This new addition to the Great Lives from History series features over 700 essays on women from the seventeenth through the early twenty-first centuries. Many individuals included in this multi-volume set have never been covered in this series before, notable for their work in such fields as politics, civil rights, literature, education, journalism, science, business, and sports…”

• Principles of Chemistry (March 2016, ISBN: 978-1-61925-501-2; e-ISBN: 978-1-61925-502-9, $165) “provides students and researchers with an easy-to-understand introduction to the fundamentals of chemistry, from elements and molecules to chemical reactions and properties of matter… This new resource introduces students and researchers to the fundamentals of chemistry. Entries are written in easy-to-understand language, so readers can use these entries as a solid starting off point to develop a thorough understanding of this often time confusing subject matter…”

• Music Innovators – 3 volumes (May 2016, ISBN: 978-1-61925-896-9; e-ISBN: 978-1-61925-897-6, $195) offers “biographies of over 350 individuals who had an innovative and influential impact on the development and evolution of the modern music industry… Each of these extended biographies offers concise and informative top matter that includes an introductory summary of the person’s significance; birth and death dates and places; and specialty fields. Biographies represent a strong, global, cross-genre focus, and each biography offers a sidebar focusing on the group(s)/achievement(s) for which the subject is best known…”

ABC-CLIO has a couple of new titles as well including:

• Asian American Religious Cultures (Sept. 2015, ISBN: 978-1-59884-330-9, $189; eISBN: 978-1-59884-331-6, call for pricing) edited by Jonathan H. X. Lee, et al. “examines the diversity of the Asian American and Pacific Islander spiritual experience… The coverage includes not only traditional eastern belief systems and traditions such as Buddhism, Confucianism, and Hinduism as well as Micronesian and Polynesian religious traditions in the United States, but also the culture and religious rituals of Asian American Christians…”

• American Indian Culture: From Counting Coup to Wampum (Sept. 2015, ISBN: 978-1-4408-2873-7, $189; eISBN: 978-1-4408-2874-4, call for pricing) edited by Bruce E. Johansen “provides a comprehensive historical and demographic overview of American Indians along with more than 100 cross-referenced entries on American Indian culture, exploring everything from arts, literature, music, and dance to food, family, housing, and spirituality… Examples of topics covered include icons of Native culture, such as pow wows, Indian dancing, and tipi dwellings; Native art forms such as pottery, rock art, sandpainting, silverwork, tattooing, and totem poles; foods such as corn, frybread, and wild rice; and Native Americans in popular culture…”

Rumors

Just saw on liblicense that The National Information Standards Organization (NISO) has published a set of consensus principles for the library, content-provider and software-provider communities (http://bit.ly/niso_patron_privacy) to address privacy issues related to the use of library and library-related systems. This set of principles developed over the past eight months focuses on balancing the expectations library users have regarding their intellectual freedoms and their privacy with the operational needs of systems providers. The twelve principles covered in the document address the following topics: Shared Privacy Responsibilities; Transparency and Accountability; Organizations and individuals are encouraged to support the principles, on the NISO Website. This project was generously supported by a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.


Ann Okerson’s popular panel in Charleston 2015 — The Long Arm of The Law — focused on the topic of Privacy and consisted of Gary Price (topic: Ignorance is No Excuse), Bill Hannay (topic: Privacy: A Legal Overview), Lisa Macklin (Librarians within the Higher Education Privacy Framework). Once again a fascinating panel!
The services academic libraries provide to their community will continue to change and grow as libraries move increasingly from centers of physical information bearing entities to entry points to greater information resources.” (Iglesias, 2013, p. 10), and libraries will continue to reach out to better engage with researchers, faculty, and students. “Libraries have repeatedly shown themselves able to respond to the changing need of their customers.” (Woodward, 2009, p. vii). Spend a little time gazing into that crystal ball; the focus will still be on the people of our campus, with the methods of meeting their information needs changing as required.
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Bob Holsley talks about the pleasure of reading in his column, this issue p.58. At our library, we have a Browsing collection of materials, books, DVDs, etc. Used to be that we professional librarians selected what was put in the collection. There was little circulation. So we decided to let the younger group of librarians and patrons take charge of the Browsing collection. We were not thrilled with the selections but they circulated wildly! Go figure.

Just heard that our long-time friend, colleague and vendor Jay Askovich is no longer with Midwest Library Service. We had a wonderful relationship with Jay. He was a wonderfully fabulous person, and he will be sorely missed. Midwest will have a hard time filling his shoes!

Another last minute rumor! Great news! I remember when Christian Boissonnas started Acqnet at one Charleston Conference! Acqnet will now be the new AcqNet list at lists.ala.org. All subscriber addresses have been moved to the new server. http://lists.ala.org/sympa/info/acqnet. Postings for the list may be sent to <acqnet-request@lists.ala.org>. The list will continue to be moderated. The moderators may be contacted at <acqnet-request@lists.ala.org>. AcqNet Moderators are Xen Arch, Dracine Hedges, and Keith Powell.

Have a good ALA everybody! Happy New Year! 🎈