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Peer Review: The History, the Issues, and New Directions

by Irving Rockwood (Editor & Publisher, CHOICE, 575 Main Street, Suite 300, Middletown, CT 06457) <irockwood@ala-choice.org>

Perhaps the very first question to be answered in an article on peer review is, “Who cares?” And in truth until several years ago when I casually agreed to moderate a panel on current issues in peer review, that would have been precisely my response. However, as I have since learned, peer review is a much more important and more exciting topic than it might first appear.

For one thing, there are a lot of folks interested in it. The topic of peer review has spawned an extensive literature and at least one major continuing series of conferences, the International Congresses on Peer Review and Biomedical Publication. The sixth of these gatherings, jointly organized by JAMA and BMJ, will be held in Vancouver this coming September, and if past experience is any guide, it will be well attended. The fifth Congress, which was held in Chicago in September 2005, attracted 470 participants from 38 countries who assembled to attend a program featuring 42 reports and 53 posters on editorial peer review. A similar group will presumably be gathering in Vancouver this fall. If this sounds appealing, you’ll want to visit the conference Website, http://www.ama-assn.org/public/peer/peerhome.htm, and you might want to hurry. Registration is now open. And if you can’t wait until September, there is at least one earlier alternative, the “International Symposium on Peer Reviewing,” which is being organized as part of The 3rd International Conference on Knowledge Generation, Communication, and Management: KGCM 2009 to be held July 10-13, 2009 in Orlando, Florida. For more information, see http://www.ICTconfer.org/kgcm.

Peer review, it turns out, also has a lengthy history. That history is generally traced back to Henry Oldenburg (1619-1677), the first Secretary of The Royal Society of London and the first editor of The Philosophical Transactions, the world’s oldest scientific journal in continuous existence, which he founded in 1665. Oldenburg, who founded The Transactions primarily for financial reasons (with disappointing monetary results despite a print run of over 1,200 copies — a result that would feel quite familiar to many contemporary scholarly publishers), found that he quickly received many submissions of dubious quality. In response, he began calling on colleagues who were subject matter experts — he was himself a trained theologian, not a scientist — for advice on the worthiness of papers submitted for publication. And so began peer review.

continued on page 16
Y'all, I like to cook but most of the time I am “cooking” on the computer instead. Let me tell you, cooking, especially Greek, is hard, back-breaking work. But it is great fun and now my husband Bruce is my able sous-chef (is that what you call it?) which makes it all much easier. So this summer, with lots of festivities and company, I got out my pile of Greek cook books and began. Haven’t tackled the baklava yet, maybe next year?

In between cooking endeavors, I have read this issue of ATG. And what a great issue it is, on the topic of peer review. Papers cover the history and new directions (Irv Rockwood), current peer review practice (Mark Ware), PLoS ONE (Peter Binfield), interactive open access peer review (Ulrich Pöschl), the open scholarship full disclosure initiative (Gary Hall), and book reviews (David Shatz). Our op ed is by Tony Horava, Tony Ferguson tells us about good turns in Hong Kong, we interview Meris Mandernach a wonderful collection management librarian, learn about a home-grown book order system (Biz of Acq), read about functional and transformative (From the University Press). Moving right along, Bob Holley talks about new models, Celia Wagner has a wonderful reminiscence about Yale, her alma mater, Donna Jacobs talks about translators, Mark Herrring is into print newspapers, Tom Leonardt talks about not blogging, Rick Anderson thinks library collections might be too risky. I will take a breath before I continue. Next, Arlene Sievers gives her perspective on building library collections in the 21st century, John Cox is all about authors’ rights, Richard Abel continues the approval plan story as does Rita Ricketts with Benjamin Henry. Ending it all, Michael Pelikan is talking about product announcements, Todd Carpenter is moving libraries into Web services, Greg Tananbaum talks to ProQuest at 70, Cris Ferguson mulls over the demise of the print newspaper, and Xan Arch helps with crowd control. And we haven’t talked about many other columns in this issue. Get busy reading right now!

Oops! Bruce wants to make baklava and I need to lie down first. Yikes! See y’all in Chicago.

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 Loyal ATG Fans!

It’s late at night and I need your letter/comments/issues! Are you there? Send me a letter, an email, a missive, whatever, right now!

Okay? Please! — Yr. Ed. 🍗

AGAINST THE GRAIN DEADLINES VOLUME 21 — 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Events</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Ad Reservation</th>
<th>Camera-Ready</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference Publishing</td>
<td>September 2009</td>
<td>07/8/09</td>
<td>07/29/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston Conference</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
<td>09/02/09</td>
<td>09/23/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT

Toni Nix <justwrite@lowcountry.com>; Phone: 843-835-8604; Fax: 843-835-5892 or Edna Laughrey <elaughrey@aol.com>; Phone: 734-429-1029; Fax: 734-429-1711 Address: 291 Tower Drive, Saline, MI 48176. 🍗

Rumors from page 1

a fake, computer-generated manuscript to The Open Information Science Journal and then withdrew it after acceptance. They produced the paper using software that generates grammatically correct but nonsensical text, and submitted the manuscript under pseudonyms in late January. The hoax has raised doubts about the open access author-pays model. The editor of the journal has resigned.

www.library.yale.edu/~license/ListArchives/scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2009/06/10/non-sense-for-dollars/

Talk about pertinent! This issue — on peer review — is guest edited by the amazing Irv Rockwood (Editor & Publisher, Choice). In his introduction, Irv says that peer review is more important now than ever. We couldn’t agree more!

And did you know that in the midst of it all, Irv was moving! Choice has moved. The new address is 575 Main Street, Suite 300, Middletown, CT 06457. Phone numbers and email addresses are unchanged.

Do you have an iPhone? Well if you do, Duke University Libraries now offers a comprehensive university digital image collection specifically formatted for an iPhone or iTouch device. It includes thousands of photos and other artifacts that range from early beer advertisements to materials on San Francisco’s Haight-Ashbury scene in the 1960s. Although a growing number of scholarly institutions offer images and other material online, Duke is the first to offer collections that take advantage of the iPhone’s design, navigation and other features.

www.youtube.com/watch?v=iHK3E4N7w6o. m.duke.edu.

Okay. We have changed the theme of the 2009 Charleston Conference to NECESSITY IS THE MOTHER OF INVENTION. Used to be “There’s a Whole Lotta Changing Going on.” But in reviewing the themes, I noticed that we had used the “change” theme in two other conferences — 1987 (Plus ça Change) and 2001 (The Trends They Are A’Changing). And this year we have changes but also changes to invent new solutions to our issues/problems/world. NECESSITY IS THE MOTHER OF INVENTION is from Plato’s Republic and since I am a Greek, it resonated with me. Not to mention there are a lot of corollary quotes that can build on that quote that seem relevant and may help in presentations. How about — “If necessity is the mother of invention, discontent is the father of progress;” (David Rockefeller) or “Necessity is the mother of taking chances;” (Mark Twain), “Necessity is the author of change;” (Tim Hansel) or “Discontent is the first necessity of progress.” (Thomas Edison).

If you turned in a request that used the old theme, please do not worry. You don’t have to change. The Charleston Conference is nothing if not flexible and dynamic.

Speaking of which, why not beat the rush continued on page 10

<http://www.against-the-grain.com>
Sad to report that the incredibly hard-working Sheila Seaman <Sheilaseaman@gmail.com>, Assistant Dean for Public Services at the College of Charleston has retired and her last day at Addlestone Library was Friday, June 5. She decided to retire quickly (a month ago) and didn’t stick around for long, sort of like when Dean Smith, the famous coach of North Carolina’s Tarheels basketball quit just like that! But there’s a silver lining in this cloud. Sheila is going to be one of our Mentors at the 2009 Charleston Conference so she will still be around for us to hear about her adventures in retirement. Speaking of which, adventures in retirement would make a good ATG column, wouldn’t it? Any retirees out there interested??

And our other new mentor at the 2009 Charleston Conference is Brenda Wright who just up and volunteered. Wonderful!

And Brenda’s email is <Brenda.wright@ famu.edu>. The mentors and emails are posted on the Charleston Conference Website so you can be in touch with Conference questions/issues. www.katina.info/conference

Plus REGISTRATION FOR THE 2009 Charleston Conference (November 4-7) is now open! REGISTER NOW! www.katina.info/conference

And, it’s goodbye to our first ever mentors — Pam Cenzer and Susan Campbell. Mentoring was their idea and it has been a wonderful addition to the Charleston Conference! Thanks, Pam and Susan, for all your enthusiasm and hard work! We will miss you!

Oh! Did you know that Sheila’s sister is Linda Nains (Acquisitions Librarian, Content Acquisitions Section, Library Technical Information Services, U.S. Government Printing Office) <linains@gpo.gov>. As you can see, Linda is also a librarian and comes to the Charleston Conference regularly! The family that librarians together, stays together, I always say.

What else? Let’s see. Heard recently from the elegant Martin Marlow <martinmarlow@ hotmail.com>. He has left Ingram Digital after being made redundant at the end of April following a re-structure of the company’s activities. Right now Martin is just starting to look around for his next role. Meanwhile, he has set up a group of associates and is taking on short term contracts and consultancy projects.

Crowd Control
from page 8

into their CRM for customer service response. So if you tweet that your Tivo stopped working, someone from Tivo will see this comment in their own customer database and can send a suggestion through Twitter on how to fix the problem.

How can we use this? We don’t need CRM software to use Twitter to monitor customer satisfaction. Search.twitter.com gives you the option of searching a keyword and then creating an RSS feed to monitor new tweets that include this keyword. I searched “Stanford Library” to see how much I found related to my workplace, and, amid some general comments, found some specific complaints. One user mentions a problem with Internet connection in the main library, another wrote “Had to jump through weird hoops to get access to net at Stanford library. Can’t register my machine, but can create myself a guest account.” Can we use this as a feedback mechanism? Not everyone uses the suggestion box or Web forms that we provide for feedback, but they may speak their mind on Twitter. A Twitter account so we can respond and an RSS reader to pull together the relevant tweets is all that is needed to keep an eye on how we’re doing and how we are seen in our community. There are also free applications like TweetBeep that will send you an alert when a keyword is mentioned.

Pulling together tweets on a company name could be even more helpful in a vendor or publisher setting. The commenters in these cases are most likely librarians, faculty, or students who are aware of the company and have reactions, complaints, or suggestions to share. They may not take the time to go to an official Website and look for a suggestion form.

Both Facebook and Twitter can be ways for a library, vendor, or publisher to push out information to those willing to follow their updates. Instead of just listening to customers, you can also send out information to your crowd. Wilfred Drew recently posted a Google spreadsheet (announced on the LITA listserv) that pulls together a list of library vendors using Twitter and Facebook. Some of them are just getting started, but others have mastered the new tools and are using them to provide information and news to their customers. Libraries are doing the same. Both Facebook and Twitter can also be integrated so one update can be used for both platforms, reducing the amount of time needed to update friends and followers on both sites.

It’s easy to discount Facebook and Twitter as just a bunch of chatter. However, they can be powerful tools for finding out what your users think of you or what they want to see in your service or product. The central problem, unsurprisingly, is filtering out the noise. Both sites will bring you more information about other people than is useful or interesting. Spend a little time learning how the sites work and who is using them effectively. When you see ineffective or pointless communication, it will help you to monitor new tweets that include this keyword.

And how do you do this? There are a variety of software tools to use with Twitter and Facebook. I have found a few of these which I will describe for you, but I know of many others. The most basic way is to monitor new tweets that include a keyword. You can create a suggestion box or Web forms that we provide for feedback, but they may speak their mind on Twitter. A Twitter account so we can respond and an RSS reader to pull together the relevant tweets is all that is needed to keep an eye on how we’re doing and how we are seen in our community. There are also free applications like TweetBeep that will send you an alert when a keyword is mentioned.

Pulling together tweets on a company name could be even more helpful in a vendor or publisher setting. The commenters in these cases are most likely librarians, faculty, or students who are aware of the company and have reactions, complaints, or suggestions to share. They may not take the time to go to an official Website and look for a suggestion form.

Both Facebook and Twitter can be ways for a library, vendor, or publisher to push out information to those willing to follow their updates. Instead of just listening to customers, you can also send out information to your crowd. Wilfred Drew recently posted a Google spreadsheet (announced on the LITA listserv) that pulls together a list of library vendors using Twitter and Facebook. Some of them are just getting started, but others have mastered the new tools and are using them to provide information and news to their customers. Libraries are doing the same. Both Facebook and Twitter can also be integrated so one update can be used for both platforms, reducing the amount of time needed to update friends and followers on both sites.

It’s easy to discount Facebook and Twitter as just a bunch of chatter. However, they can be powerful tools for finding out what your users think of you or what they want to see in your service or product. The central problem, unsurprisingly, is filtering out the noise. Both sites will bring you more information about other people than is useful or interesting. Spend a little time learning how the sites work and who is using them effectively. When you see ineffective or pointless communication, it will help you to monitor new tweets that include this keyword.

And how do you do this? There are a variety of software tools to use with Twitter and Facebook. I have found a few of these which I will describe for you, but I know of many others. The most basic way is to monitor new tweets that include a keyword. You can create a suggestion box or Web forms that we provide for feedback, but they may speak their mind on Twitter. A Twitter account so we can respond and an RSS reader to pull together the relevant tweets is all that is needed to keep an eye on how we’re doing and how we are seen in our community. There are also free applications like TweetBeep that will send you an alert when a keyword is mentioned.

Pulling together tweets on a company name could be even more helpful in a vendor or publisher setting. The commenters in these cases are most likely librarians, faculty, or students who are aware of the company and have reactions, complaints, or suggestions to share. They may not take the time to go to an official Website and look for a suggestion form.

Both Facebook and Twitter can be ways for a library, vendor, or publisher to push out information to those willing to follow their updates. Instead of just listening to customers, you can also send out information to your crowd. Wilfred Drew recently posted a Google spreadsheet (announced on the LITA listserv) that pulls together a list of library vendors using Twitter and Facebook. Some of them are just getting started, but others have mastered the new tools and are using them to provide information and news to their customers. Libraries are doing the same. Both Facebook and Twitter can also be integrated so one update can be used for both platforms, reducing the amount of time needed to update friends and followers on both sites.

It’s easy to discount Facebook and Twitter as just a bunch of chatter. However, they can be powerful tools for finding out what your users think of you or what they want to see in your service or product. The central problem, unsurprisingly, is filtering out the noise. Both sites will bring you more information about other people than is useful or interesting. Spend a little time learning how the sites work and who is using them effectively. When you see ineffective or pointless communication, it will help you to monitor new tweets that include this keyword.

And how do you do this? There are a variety of software tools to use with Twitter and Facebook. I have found a few of these which I will describe for you, but I know of many others. The most basic way is to monitor new tweets that include a keyword. You can create a suggestion box or Web forms that we provide for feedback, but they may speak their mind on Twitter. A Twitter account so we can respond and an RSS reader to pull together the relevant tweets is all that is needed to keep an eye on how we’re doing and how we are seen in our community. There are also free applications like TweetBeep that will send you an alert when a keyword is mentioned.

Pulling together tweets on a company name could be even more helpful in a vendor or publisher setting. The commenters in these cases are most likely librarians, faculty, or students who are aware of the company and have reactions, complaints, or suggestions to share. They may not take the time to go to an official Website and look for a suggestion form.

Both Facebook and Twitter can be ways for a library, vendor, or publisher to push out information to those willing to follow their updates. Instead of just listening to customers, you can also send out information to your crowd. Wilfred Drew recently posted a Google spreadsheet (announced on the LITA listserv) that pulls together a list of library vendors using Twitter and Facebook. Some of them are just getting started, but others have mastered the new tools and are using them to provide information and news to their customers. Libraries are doing the same. Both Facebook and Twitter can also be integrated so one update can be used for both platforms, reducing the amount of time needed to update friends and followers on both sites.

It’s easy to discount Facebook and Twitter as just a bunch of chatter. However, they can be powerful tools for finding out what your users think of you or what they want to see in your service or product. The central problem, unsurprisingly, is filtering out the noise. Both sites will bring you more information about other people than is useful or interesting. Spend a little time learning how the sites work and who is using them effectively. When you see ineffective or pointless communication, it will help you to monitor new tweets that include this keyword.
There are all sorts of new initiatives out there. Saw in the New York Times the other day (6-12-09) that Simon & Schuster is planning to sell digital books on Scribd. This is seen as an alternative to Amazon’s Kindle. Readers will be able to read up to 10% of the titles that are loaded on Scribd which will include best-selling authors among others. See — “Simon & Schuster to Sell Digital Books on Scribd.com” by Brad Stone. http://www.nytimes.com/2009/06/12/technology/internet/12books.html?th=&emc=th&tp=age

Let’s see. There is a fascinating article in the Chronicle of Higher Education (June 12, 2009). The author (Ann Kirschner) read Dickens’ Little Dorrit four ways (paper, Kindle, audiobook, iPhone) and outlines her reaction to the experiences. Definitely worth a read! See — “Reading Dickens Four Ways – How ‘Little Dorrit’ fares in multiple text formats,” by Ann Kirschner. chronicle.com/free/v55/i39/39b01601.htm

Speaking of content — Way back when I started life in acquisitions, I only worked with books. Ah, they were so simple to work with. Then they gave me the serials job too and I began to get chronic what I called “serials headaches.” Read about an example in Tinker Massey’s “Something to Think About,” this issue, p.48.

Are you going to ALA in Chicago? Just saw notice of the SPARC-ACRL Forum to be held Saturday, July 11 from 3:30 PM to 5:30 PM at the Sheraton Chicago, Ballroom II/III. It’s the ACRL Scholarly Communications discussion group. Ivy Anderson, Charles Lowry, Emma Hill, and James Neal will be speaking. The forum will be available via SPARC video-cast at a later date. And Ivy is one of our speakers in Charleston in November! http://www.arl.org/sparc www.katina.info/conference

I remember when I met my husband Bruce. He asked me what I did for a living. I said I was a librarian. He said back, “Oh, so you know about Dewey Decimal and all that.” I guess I laughed. I don’t remember. But anyway, Xan Arch’s call for help in this issue, p.8, recalls that incident. Help her out! Please!

I spent some time in April in Oxford England at a delightful conference called Exploring Acquisitions which was organized by Alice Keller of the Bodleian and David Swords of Blackwell. The hard-hitting Rick Anderson was just one of the many speakers! I will be writing the conference up for ATG shortly. Watch for it probably on the ATG NewsChannel! www.against-the-grain.com

What a great thing to do for your little girl — Rick brought his lovely 16-year old daughter Maggie to Oxford! Besides shopping and enjoying the sites, she was buying all kinds of books at the best book shop in the world, Blackwell’s Book Shop to take to her friends back home. I understand that Maggie’s next big adventure this summer will be participating in a three-day pioneer trek reenactment, complete with handcart! Rick says Maggie had a wonderful time in Oxford, and he particularly enjoyed watching her meet people whom he’s talked about at home — everyone was so nice and made her feel welcome and special. It was a great experience.

Speaking of which, I remember a great trip with my Dad from Richmond, Virginia, to Baltimore to the Federal Reserve Bank there. It was way back when I was a teenager and I loved Baltimore and the library at the Fed. I particularly remember the hamburger steak my Dad bought me in the Washington train station on the way back home to Richmond.

Speaking of little girls — the other day I met with John Baudassi (ProQuest). What a delightful man! (Truly, between us, when Debbie Hodes left ProQuest I was devastated) but John is just as great! What a gentleman he is. He has a daughter whose name is Danielle and she has been going to UC Boulder. She graduated last year and is employed as a graphic designer. Her employer said she could work at home so she decided to move back to Richmond where her mother and grandmother live. The family is very happy that she is going to be closer to home. And, the proud father, gets to drive the car with the trailer on it from Boulder to Richmond. He didn’t want his daughter to drive all that distance by herself.

And, speaking of driving a long distance, was talking to my favorite person in the world, Becky Lenzini, yesterday. She was driving from Denver to St. Louis all by herself. Her daughter, Sarah, is pregnant and is due July 5. Everyone (including me) is excited for the big event!

Heard recently from the fantabulous Jim Morrison <jmorrisonII@carolina.rr.com>, another one of my favorite people. Jim retired in Oct. of 2007, after 40 years on the road. He says he misses the regular paycheck and all the friends he made over the years. In May of 2008, he went to Duke for radiation & chemo and then surgery. Fortunately, the cancer had not spread, and the radiation had fried the tumor. After many hospital adventures, Jim is finally home regaining his strength. He even has his daughter’s 3-year-old twins (a boy and a girl) to play with to help him recover! And now his son’s wife is pregnant with twins. I tell you, when it rains it pours!

continued on page 16
While the mechanics of peer review vary, the final publishing decision, it should be noted, always rests with the editor or publisher. Nonetheless, the content of the review typically plays a major role. While it may occasionally happen that an editor or publisher chooses to publish an article, or book, that has been unanimously savaged by the reviewers, this is almost always a rare, and potentially newsworthy, event.

In short, peer review is a process in which scholarly manuscripts are selected for publication based on written evaluations by subject matter experts, or peers. Sometimes known as merit-based review, it ensures that scholarly articles and books are vetted for accuracy, relevance, and quality before acceptance by the publisher. In essence, peer review is a certification process in which scholars review the work of other scholars to evaluate its quality and readiness for publication. As such it is generally viewed as the “gold standard” by which a scholar’s publication record is judged. While there are outlets for scholarly articles and books that do not employ peer review, scholarly reputations are largely based on peer reviewed publications, the quantity and quality of which are a widely accepted measure of status within the field. Thus peer review as it has come to be practiced today performs two important functions. First, it provides a generally accepted framework for making scholarly publishing decisions, thus shaping the scholarly literature. In addition, it has become an intrinsic element in the professional certification process, a matter of no small importance to authors.

However, what makes editorial peer review truly interesting today is neither its history nor its mechanics, but a growing sense of concern about its adequacy as an impartial and accurate selection tool. While many, perhaps most, observers still view peer review as the “gold standard” against which to measure other evaluation tools, there has in recent years been a growing chorus of criticism, particularly — but not exclusively — from younger scholars and minorities. For one thing, as has long been noted, there is an inherent risk of conflict of interest built into the peer review process. As the science historian Horace Freeland Judson observed, “…the persons most qualified to judge the worth of a scientist’s grand proposal or the merit of a submitted research paper are precisely those who are the scientist’s closest competitors.”

Beyond this, peer review has been criticized as unreliable, idiosyncratic, and open to every sort of bias. It has also been repeatedly criticized for failure to validate or authenticate, as evidenced by any number of incidents involving the publication of invalid or fraudulent research. Furthermore, some critics have argued that peer review, rather than advancing science, stifles innovation, perpetuates the status quo, and rewards the prominent. In addition, they have charged that peer review causes unnecessary delay in publication, is very expensive, and insufficiently tested.

Proponents of peer review, while acknowledging the validity of some or all of the criticisms levied against it, have generally tended to respond that, for all its faults, peer review remains an essential cornerstone of the scientific and scholarly process. Peer review, proponents sometimes say, is like democracy, which, to use Winston Churchill’s famous phrase, “is the worst form of government except for all those other forms that have tried from time to time.” It is, in their view, easy to criticize peer review but much harder to come up with a better system.

Such arguments have neither satisfied nor silenced the critics, some of whom have called for the total elimination or replacement of the current system. Horrobin, for example, has argued that peer review “is a non-validated charade whose processes generate results little better than does chance.” More recently, in a provocative piece that became the most downloaded technical paper at PLoS Medicine, John P. A. Ioannidis, an epidemiologist at University of Ioannina School of Medicine in Greece and Tufts New England Medical Center, asserted that “There is increasing concern that most current published research findings are false.” Arguing that simulations show that “for most study designs and settings, it is more likely for a research claim to be false than true,” Ioannidis called for improved and more rigorous statistical analysis of research findings in order to provide a more accurate assessment of validity.

It is fair to suggest that the continuing debate over peer review is unlikely to be resolved anytime soon. It’s not as if we haven’t tried before.
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It is fair to suggest that the continuing debate over peer review is unlikely to be resolved anytime soon. It’s not as if we haven’t tried before.
solved soon. However, even as it continues, the Internet is providing the impetus for much experimentation and change. These experiments may be categorized in a variety of ways. The scheme advanced below has been adapted from one originally advanced by Matt Hodgkinson, a BioMedCentral Senior Editor. It classifies these efforts into five basic types:

• **Open peer review:** A variation of traditional pre-publication peer review in which the reviews are published along with the articles. In some cases, readers are allowed to post comments. Example: the BMJ-series medical journals.

• **Open and permissive peer review:** Articles are published if reviewed by some specified minimum number of reviewers. Example: Biology Direct.

• **Pre-publication community peer review:** A form of prepublishation review in which the reviewers are volunteers rather than having been selected by the editor or publisher. Example: Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, which combines a pre-publication quality check and community peer review with publication of a revised final draft following an interactive public discussion period. (See Pöschl article below.)

• **Pre-publication peer review coupled with post-publication discussion and commentary:** Combines a streamlined pre-publication peer review process with post-publication discussion and commentary that is facilitated by providing readers with the ability to comment on and discuss published materials. Examples: PLoS ONE. (See Binfield article below.)

• **Post-publication peer review:** This utilizes a streamlined pre-publication screening process in the expectation that peer review will occur post-publication as in the scholarly community comments on, evaluates, and annotates the published article. Examples: Nature Precedings.

The articles comprising this feature provide a variety of perspectives on the current status of peer review and its evolving role in scholarly communication.

• **Mark Ware,** former Director of IOP Publishing and currently principal of Mark Ware Consulting in the UK, reports on a recent major international survey of scholars attitudes toward peer review that is based on over 3,000 responses from academics around the world. “Overall,” he concludes “we see a picture of academics committed to peer review with the vast majority believing that it helps scientific communication.”

• **Peter Binfield,** the San Francisco based Managing Editor of the Open Access journal PLoS ONE, describes and explains PLoS ONE’s innovative editorial process and reports on its phenomenal rate of growth. He observes that he and his colleagues “believe that the PLoS ONE formula may have the potential to accelerate, and improve, the nature of research itself.”

• **Ulrich Pöschl,** a Research Scientist in the Biochemistry Department at the Max Planck Institute for Chemistry in Mainz, Germany, and Chief Executive Editor of Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, an Open Access journal founded in 2001, reviews and explains ACP’s interactive peer review strategy, ACP, he reports, has not only experienced rapid growth; it is financially self-supporting.

• **Gary Hall,** Professor of Media and Performing Arts at Coventry University in the UK, discusses the role of peer review in the humanities. He goes on to advance a provocative proposal for full disclosure in scholarly publishing, which he calls the Open Scholarship Full Disclosure Initiative. Designed to encourage more responsible behavior by journal editors, publishers, and the authors whose material they publish, it is, as the subtitle suggests, a potentially subversive proposal.

• Finally, **David Shatz,** Professor Philosophy at Yeshiva University in New York, examines a topic near and dear to this author located these and other similar examples is any indication, this is but the tip of a very large iceberg.

For a more comprehensive overview of the history, criticisms, and defenses of peer review, see Drummond Rennie, Editorial peer review: its development and rationale, accessed on May 6, 2009 at http://resources.bmj.com/bmj/pdfs/rennie.pdf.

**Rumors from page 16**

**Competition 2009.** Recognizing the best of craftsmanship and creativity in the contemporary art of bookbinding, the first prize was awarded to Alain Taral of France, for an extraordinary binding made of pear wood covered by a myriad of exotic veneers. **Taral** uses “fusion” marquetry as his cover decoration, utilizing many different precious wood veneers including palm tree, yew, bubinga, lati, plane tree, ambobina, elm burrs, thuya and faiera. The second prize went to Jenni Grey from the United Kingdom. Her innovative approach to the competition theme saw the pages divided into two bindings: “Water” and “Waterborn.” There were 25 distinguished winners representing nine countries: Germany (8), United Kingdom (6), France (4), Estonia (2), Belgium, Spain, Sweden, Italy, and Japan. In his Foreword to the accompanying exhibition catalogue, Mark Getty says: “My father began collecting bookbindings while he was still a young man. I am therefore delighted to have had the opportunity to sponsor this competition and in particular to have sponsored the top prizes in honour of my father. The Sir Paul Getty Bodleian Bookbinding Prize recognises the best current bookbinding in the world, and it is fitting that the Bodleian Library and the Library at Wormsley should continue on page 32
add these two prize books to their collections, and that the name of Getty should continue to be associated with the most creative work in one of the most compelling fields of contemporary art and craft.”

www.bodley.ox.ac.uk

In this issue, we have lots of observations and opinions as always. Don’t you love it! Rick Anderson (p.86) thinks we should consider buying an Espresso Book Machine instead of books, Bob Nardini (p.80) tells us that Special Collections is the place to be, and Cris Ferguson and Mark Herring (p.91, 64) talk about the demise of the print newspaper. You know what, we live in an exciting marketplace/world/community!

continued on page 36
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control infrastructure. The firm was brought in to assess how well the Army had achieved its goal of “battlefield digitization.” The United States Air Force, meanwhile, tapped Robbins-Gioia when it needed help improving its fleet management systems for U-2 spy planes.

It may seem unfair to single cultural studies out like this. After all, it’s not the only field to suffer from something of a blind spot when it comes to the politics of its own publishing practices. Far from it. What makes the existence of such a blind spot so noteworthy in this particular instance is that cultural studies prides itself on being a “serious” political project, as one of its most influential exponents, Stuart Hall, puts it. According to Hall, the political cultural studies intellectual has a responsibility to “know more” than those on the other side; to “really know, not just pretend to know, not just to have the facility of knowledge, but to know deeply and profoundly.” If so, then as far as Striphas is concerned, this injunction quite simply has to include knowing more about “the formidable network of social, economic, legal, and infrastructural linkages to the publishing industry that sustains” cultural studies and its politically engaged intellectuals, and shapes the conditions in which their knowledge and research “can — and increasingly cannot — circulate.” This is information that can be ignored only at the cost of the integrity of cultural studies’ politics, he insists.

As someone who identifies with cultural studies to a large extent, I’ve been concerned for some time now with the way in which many cultural studies intellectuals, who are otherwise keen to wear their political commitment on their sleeves, are noticeably less keen when it comes to interrogating their own politically-institutional practices. The marked lack of interest in the majority of those in cultural studies to actually bring about. Why, then, have those in the sciences, such as Stevan Harnad, proved to be the more apparently progressive, institutionally, socially and politically, in this respect?2

Interestingly, Goldacre and Striphas both end their articles with suggestions for future action. For Goldacre, the ideal would be for all drugs research to be made “commercially separate from manufacturing and retailing” and for all journals to be “open and free.” In the meantime, “I pledge to declare all significant drug company funding on all academic articles,” he follows Jefferson et al. in proposing that “since their decisions are so hugely influential,” all editors and publishers should be asked to “post all their sources of income, and all the money related to the running of their journal,” once a year. Striphas, in turn, emphasizes the importance of delving below the surface to discover just who the “parents and siblings” of academic journal publishers are, and what other activities they are involved in. To push the point home he cites as a final example Reed Elsevier, one of the main journal publishers in both the “hard” and social sciences. Until as recently as 2007, Reed Elsevier was facilitating the global arms trade through its event planning arm, Reed Exhibitions, who “staged the annual Defense Systems and Equipment International (DSEi) event in the London Docklands and seminar events worldwide.” Indeed, Elsevier was motivated to distance itself from the arms trade only after organized action on the part of “Campaign Against Arms Trade, along with groups of scholars associated with The Lancet, Political Geography,” and other Elsevier journals.” This leads Striphas to suggest that, by working collectively, it may be possible to put pressure on other academic journal publishers to change their practices, too, no matter how large they may be.

So, responding to both the political and pragmatic undertones of these two pieces, my own “subversive proposal” is as follows: that we, as academics, authors, editors, librarians,
The Encyclopedia of Gender and Society (2009, 978-1-4129-0916-7, $350) is another entry in Sage Publications’ growing list of social studies encyclopedias. Edited by Jodi O’Brien of Seattle University these two volumes contain more than 500 entries authored by scholars from academic institutions throughout the United States and the United Kingdom. This is a serious academic work and it is apparent that a major goal of this encyclopedia is to present gender as a primary lens through which society views itself. After spending some time with this set and examining its content, one is hard pressed to argue with that contention.

The Encyclopedia is divided into categories containing articles that reflect and highlight gender’s centrality in human social life. These categories are wide ranging and include art, popular culture, and sports, body image and health, crime, economics, environment and ecology, politics, policy and social movements, race and ethnicity, marriage and the family, relationships, religion and spirituality, education, science and technology, sexuality and reproduction and gender identity. The set also has a number of what are called “framing” articles that set the tone. Entries like Gender Identities and Socialization, Media and Gender Socialization and Sexuality and Reproduction provide overviews that point to the defining role of gender. Individual articles also address subjects ranging from chivalry to cybersex and from transgender studies to teen pregnancy. The set does not shy away from controversy providing coverage of issues like female circumcision and genital mutilation, sexual slavery, honor killings and sterilization. The articles are written in a straightforward and factual style while being grounded in recent scholarship, as the individual article bibliographies show. Each entry has “see also” references and there is a Reader’s Guide that groups related articles as well as an alphabetical list of all entries and a helpful general index.

Academic libraries supporting courses on gender and related studies will find the Encyclopedia of Gender and Society a highly valued addition to their collections. Not only does it stand on its own merits, with its focus on gender’s role in society, this set is an obvious value addition to their collections. Not only does it stand on its own merits, with its focus on gender’s role in society, this set is an obvious value addition to their collections.

Published by Facts on File, the Atlas of the North American Indian (2009, 978-0816068586, $85), last revised in 2000, is now in its 3rd edition. Although called an atlas and containing 120 color maps as well as an additional 140 photos and illustrations, this book is more than a mere collection of maps and illustrations. Author Carl Waldman’s descriptive text is equally valuable and together they combine to produce a highly informative reference.

Waldman organizes his book in seven chapters beginning with “Ancient Native Peoples” covering Paleo-Indians and Archaic Indians and then moves to a chapter on “Ancient Civilizations” where the focus is on civilizations in Mesoamerica, the Southwest, and the Mound Builders of the Midwest, South and Northeast. He then discusses “Native Lifeways” from a number of Native cultural areas followed by specific discussions of art and technology, clothing, forms of shelter, religion, languages, trade, transportation, and sociopolitical organizations. The fourth chapter deals with the relationship between native peoples and early European explorers while the fifth chapter revolves around the numerous Indian wars and their history. The sixth chapter covers the impact of all of these changes on the Native way of life finally leading to a discussion of contemporary Native North Americans with a stress on US and Canadian government policies, the Native activist response and the resulting Native Renaissance.

The maps and illustrations are strategically placed throughout the volume to integrate with the text. Maps range from plotting migration routes over the Bering Strait Land Bridge to profiling native population densities in 1500 to showing contemporary Native lands and communities in the U.S. In addition, there are drawings and photos depicting Native life from boats and canoes to masks and clothing. Taken together these maps and illustrations are visually compelling and they combine with the text to form an impressive whole. There are also numerous added features including a chronology running through 2008, a listing of Native Nations of the U.S. and Canada with languages and locations, major Native place-names in the U.S. and Canada, a list of museums, and historical and archaeological sites pertaining to Native North Americans, a glossary and a selective bibliography of overview studies.

The Atlas of the North American Indian is one of those single-volume references that cover a scholarly topic with enough appeal to be of interest to both public and academic libraries. Its reasonable price coupled with its subject coverage, makes the Atlas appropriate for either reference or circulating collections. (This is especially true given that there is a paperback edition available from Checkmark Books (978-0816068593, $24.95).)
There are many uses for this book. It will satisfy the curiosity of those interested in other cultures as well as help bring people of disparate faiths together. Arno Schmidt and Paul Fieldhouse are successful in demystifying the foodways of many of the world’s major religions. 289 public and academic libraries have already purchased this book, and it is available in electronic form from NetLibrary. It definitely fills a gap in the literature. Books like *The World Religions Cookbook* help to increase understanding across cultures, and this one is accessible and practical. It will serve libraries and readers of all types.


One of the most significant and emblematic monuments of classical antiquity, the Pantheon, has finally received its due in this masterful study by Gene Waddell, the fruit of three decades of painstaking research by an established architectural scholar. In fourteen chapters, divided into five parts, the author focuses in meticulous detail on the design of the Pantheon and the materials and methods of construction employed in its execution, and the general and specific sources of design and construction. In addition to the 136 pages of text, fourteen pages of endnotes and eleven pages of bibliography, we have 240 pages of illustrations (close to 400 in all) with a detailed listing of illustrations at the end of the table of contents for ready reference.

In the first sentence of the Preface, the author announces the scope of his study: “This book is about everything that was required to create the Pantheon.” Such an opening statement tempts the reader to suspect hyperbole, if not hubris, but the exhaustive presentation of his subject amply justifies the promise. The two-chapter introduction provides general background information on the Pantheon, including in chapter one a brief description of the building and illuminating discussion of the date of construction, about which there has been much disagreement in the past, and the purpose which the building originally served, as opposed to its later identification as a temple. Chapter two provides a survey of the more important earlier scholarship, beginning with the “first comprehensive treatise on the Pantheon” by Sebastiano Serlio in 1540. Two major monographs on the Pantheon appeared in the 20th century, one by Kjeld de Fine Licht, *The Rotunda in Rome: A Study of Hadrian’s Pantheon,* (Copenhagen, 1966) and William L. MacDonald, *The Pantheon: Design, Meaning, and Progeny* (Cambridge, MA, 1976). The author acknowledges his indebtedness to both, but using a different approach he has been “unable to accept” many of Licht’s conclusions, and with regard to MacDonald, he has “reached somewhat different conclusions” about the importance of the “sources for the building’s design and construction.”

The chapters that follow deal with the general issues of design and construction, the nature of the site and six chapters devoted to “concrete construction” and “embellishment,” subdivided into particular components of the building. No significant part of the Pantheon has been neglected, and the profusion of detail validates the author’s statement in the Preface that he has “examined most parts of the building carefully and repeatedly.” In the Conclusions section the author recapitulates his findings in a concise summary.

Notable among the illustrations are general views of the Pantheon dating from the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries and numerous photographs (many taken by the author), diagrams, and sketches of a great variety of structural details, as well as floor plans and architectural renderings covering the same period. In addition to the illustrations of the Pantheon in its many aspects, we are provided with a wealth of visual material relating to ancient structures comparable to the Pantheon dating from c.100 B.C.E. to c.307 C.E., enabling us to place the Pantheon in its proper historical context.

This volume represents a major contribution to the study of architectural history in its treatment of what the author has rightly characterized as “one of the most influential buildings ever created” and “one of the most controversial.” Although the technical material may be of use primarily to those already familiar with principles of architecture and construction, there is much that will serve the purpose of the general reader who may easily consult the elaborate Table of Contents and the extensive index for subject matter of particular interest. This is a book that is comprehensive, logically organized, and clearly written, a thorough analysis of a major architectural monument accompanied by a rich visual record and original interpretations. College and university libraries in general and especially those that support programs in architecture, art history, and classical studies should have this volume. Nor will it be out of place in the more serious public library.

Rumors

from page 52

rians choose the topic and provide suggestions regarding the types of questions that we should ask, we believe that the results of this survey will be of utmost value to librarians worldwide.”

“Over the past few years, *ebrary* has collaborated with librarians to learn their perspectives as well as those of students and professors with regard to the use of digital content,” said Christopher Warnock, CEO of *ebrary.* “We are proud to sponsor this survey and believe it will help vendors, publishers, agregators, and others who serve the library community better understand and address librarians’ issues and concerns in a difficult economic climate.”

www.ucf.ac.uk/infoservices/research/ciber/ www.katina.info/conference

Was visited recently by Steve O’Dell and Steve Strother of EBSCO. They gave us a demonstration of the EBSCO Discovery Service. Hear all about it at ALA! Anyway, after the presentation, everyone was remembering especially Steve O. Sorry, Steve, S. but how many people get to be in a *Geico Commercial*? And with Joan Rivers at that?

www.youtube.com/watch?v=42NceAL61WI8

Do y’all remember the glamorous Daryl Rayner? She used to write the charming *Rumours from Paddington* section in *ATG* way back when she was employed by *xrefer* which is now called *Credo Reference.* Anyway, Daryl and some of her colleagues have another company called *Exact Editions* which makes largely popular magazines, books, and other printed documents accessible, searchable, and usable on the Web in exactly the same version as the printed version. Each print page becomes a Web page, so printed pages can be bookmarked, cited, and referenced by other users or Web applications. Check it out!

www.exacteditions.com/

And, speaking of *Credo Reference,* did y’all see the great piece *Mary Ellen Quinn* did on the history of Credo in *Booklist?* www.booklistonline.com/default.aspx?page= show_product&pid=3367616

continued on page 65
We don’t like to be, or have our views, undermined. In fact, we avoid it at all cost. But on the Web, it’s all we do (Kristof calls this, ironically enough, “truth-seeking”). In fact, on the Web it’s all we can do because the search engines, all of them, look for materials the way we structure the searches: according to our prejudices.

I believe it was Blake who said “opposition is true friendship.” I’ve always thought that, even while I’ve been ready to tear into an opponent who held a view antipodean to my own. My fear is that with the loss of all these newspapers (and if newspapers are gone, will magazines soon follow?) we’ll all lose any chance to challenge ourselves. We’ll fall into our hidebound intellectual silos and never be able to get out again, nor will we want to. Once there, we’ll think the world is all about us, agrees with us, holds the same opinions as we do. Where else will you get the chance to be intellectually challenged on what you hold dear if not in a daily read that isn’t about you? You’ll not likely find it at your favorite bar, your workplace, your church or civic group because we choose those things precisely because they make us feel comfortable. With the loss of newspapers, what’s left to challenge us? And this doesn’t begin to touch the loss of truly investigative reporting that uncovers something important, like a Madoff or a Monica.

It’s not just the loss of newspapers, that I worry about losing. It’s the loss of really engaged, daily reading. Hardly anyone does that any more. We all read in bits and pieces. In starts and stops. In snatches and grabs. On the Internet. And for most of us, being able to really concentrate for hours on end is slowly slipping away with each page refresh. Try this the next time you’re around a teenager, Hand out The Wall Street Journal or The New York Times. But get ready to run. If caught, you’ll probably be arrested for child abuse.

I’m not saying that people do not read on the Web. Those who always have are now reading and will likely continue to do so. But even these folks, I fear, will read more and more only those things with which they agree if our only medium is the Web. If we think securing the peace in the Middle East is hard, wait a decade and try to find it in your own neighborhood, assuming anyone there is talking to anyone else. Kristof calls newspaper reading a “daily workout” as if at the gym. And he’s right. The trouble is that failing to do it is like letting that treadmill become a wardrobe. Pretty soon, you get short of breath and there’s only one thing worse:

Being short of thought.

If there’s any bailout money left, newspapers might be a good place to start. I’ve gotten more out of them than I ever did GM. I know Gordon Gekko was a terrible stereotype, and I really don’t favor greed. But I do favor one thing that sounds a bit like his famous line:

Read. Read is Good. ☁

And, coming up in July is the 11th Fiesole Collection Development Retreat. This time in Glasgow, Scotland. And, Derek Law tells us, one of the speakers, Malcolm Read, has been awarded an OBE in Queen Elizabeth II’s Birthday honours. OBE stands for Order of the British Empire and gives recognition for work well done. digital.casalini.it/retreat/

And heard recently that the bearded Ken Robichaux was featured in an article in the Charleston Post & Courier (6-11-09) about the Picture Show Man Website which he created several years ago and which covers the history of American film from its birth through 1960. Y’all will remember that Anne (Ken’s wife) Kabler Robichaux used to be Assistant Director of the Medical University of South Carolina Library and Ken used to work for J.A. Majors. No moss is growing under their feet! See — “Picture Show Man director takes film history personally,” by Jessica Johnson.

State University and now Executive Director of Networked Library Services at OCLC, was one of the earliest and most compelling of these visionaries. In 2004, Andrew wrote an article in Library Journal titled, “Dismantling Integrated Library,” (http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA374953.html) where he envisioned a structure of interoperable components operating in a Web-based environment. Fast forward five years and Andrew is leading a project to launch the first services of exactly this type of interoperable Web-based library management system.

Drawing from Andrew’s recent presentation on the topic during a NISO Webinar (http://www.niso.org/news/events/2009/interop09/interop09_web.pdf) and from the April 2009 OCLC release on their new strategy to move library management services to Web scale (http://www.oclc.org/us/en/news/releases/200927.htm), OCLC’s cooperative library management system is an extension of WorldCat local and the FirstSearch service. Their release states that the system provides “libraries a locally branded catalog interface and simple search box that presents localized search results for print and electronic content along with the ability to search the entire WorldCat database and other resources via the Web.” What is interesting is the combining of services with integrated holdings and search functionality in a Web-based environment. In addition to reducing the costs of operating these systems locally, the data can be combined with other organizations to further enhance end user services.

Issues to Consider Before Moving Your Services to the Web

It will be important for library managers to consider carefully a number of issues before proceeding down the “cloud” computing path. While the savings might be significant, turning over an organization’s information services to a third party can be fraught with risk. Will the service company provide the same level of service your organization is accustomed to? Management can dictate to its own staff and can dedicate resources to fixing, upgrading or enhancing an in-house system. However, once services are outsourced, there is a range of limitations that the organization needs to deal with. All of these issues can and are rightly dealt with in a service level agreement with the vendor.

Some of the most critical issues surround the data that is now stored on someone else’s computers. Obviously, an organization might not want the actual data to be shared or mingled with that of other organizations or competitors. There are certainly privacy issues surrounding data stored on third party systems, but there are contractual and technology solutions to address these concerns.

Ownership of data is another question. While obviously rights to one’s own data generally (though not always) is a given, who owns the data about the data, such as usage logs and transaction activity? Data aggregation can be a very powerful tool, even if anonymized. The meta-analysis possible when reviewing information across numerous institutions could prove extremely valuable to other organizations, or simply to the vendor itself. One need only look to the MESUR project underway at Los Alamos (www.mesur.org) and some of that group’s work on click streams and usage patterns to get a sense of the power (and financial opportunities) of large-scale meta analysis from crunching data in usage logs. What limitations (or lack thereof) are there on the uses the supplier can make with the data that is created from using its services.

This issue came to a head earlier this year with the release of OCLC’s new Proposed OCLC Policy for Use and Transfer of WorldCat Records (http://www.oclc.org/us/en/worldcat/catalog/policy/policy.htm). There was a significant outcry from many in the community about these proposed changes, including from IFLA (http://www.library.yale.edu/consortia/statement-oclcrecorduse.htm), ARL (http:// www.arl.org/news/pr/oclc-policy-20feb09.shtml) and others (http://dewey.library.nd.edu/mailing-lists/ngc4lib/). OCLC was forced by the community to withdraw the initial proposed terms and engage a Review Board on Principles of Shared Data Creation and Stewardship (http://www.oclc.org/us/en/worldcat/catalog/policy/board/default.htm). There is a wide range of applications for which OCLC would like to use the data that it has received from the library community and there is a need to ensure that they have the rights to do so. However, the library community also has a desire to take advantage of the data that they supply to OCLC and that of others, where appropriate. The library community and OCLC need to come to a common understanding about what is allowed and what is prohibited on both sides of the agreement.

OCLC is not alone in experiencing push back from a user community about revising terms of use for content. Earlier this year Facebook members were outraged at changed terms of service that implied Facebook retained the rights to archive in perpetuity any content users upload, even if the user later deletes his or her account. Facebook was forced to rewrite and re-issue its terms of service and the uproar is only now starting to subside.

On a more distant timescale, there are also lock-in concerns that are slightly more challenging than in a situation where the organization internally manages it’s solution. Software migrations are significant enough when one is dealing with an in-house system acquired from a vendor. However, moving from one Web-based service supplier to another might be significantly more challenging (and costly). Without access to the back-end of the system, customers would be forced into relying on the interfaces and conversion capabilities that a vendor supplies. It is likely that not all of the data (especially system-related metadata) might not be extractable in any usable format.

Many of these issues can be addressed in service level agreements, but they need to be carefully developed and attached to any contract for services. Librarians who have mastered the request for proposal and negotiation of license contracts for content now have an entirely new and complex area to learn about.

Why Should Publishers Care About This Trend?

Publishers and other content providers would do well to pay attention to these developments in Web services computing for library systems. At the very least, providing information that is compatible, interoperable and accessible by these next generation library management environments will be an important component of making publishers’ books and journals available to end users. Without easy integration into a library’s workflows, it is far less likely that content will be widely used. Certainly content is king and critical titles will be acquired when there is demand, especially from faculty. However, without integration into the library order processing and management systems and exposure through the discovery and delivery systems, content acquisition and usage could be in jeopardy.

Support of standards related to the exchange of data between publishers and library systems, such as SUSHI, COUNTER, CORE and ONIX-PL, will become even more critical. Their adoption by publishers will become increasingly important as tools to interoperate with and populate information in these new library management environments. Content providers who are already adopting such standards will be better positioned as the library Web services trend grows.

Rumors from page 65

And! Can’t believe it! Just learned that the DVDs from the 2008 Charleston Conference have been recovered and will be loaded up shortly as soon as we check with speakers to see if we can put them on the Web. You may or may not remember that we had DVDs made of much of the Conference (the Plenaries especially) but the sound was non-existent when we played them. Well, our wizard technoman, Chet Willis, has fixed all that! Can’t believe it! Hooray! Stay tuned.

www.katina.info/conference

Standards Column from page 77

<http://www.against-the-grain.com>