The creative Scott Smith tells me he has finished library school at Kent State. His column this time is about Curious George.  

And Dennis Brunning sent me this picture of his granddaughter all dressed up in St. Patrick’s Day garb. Isn’t she cute?!

And Roger Schonfeld and his wife are expecting a second baby this summer.

Ran into the magnificent Bob Schatz at one of the meetings I have been going to and he told me his daughter is married and he has grandchildren of his own. He showed me pictures on his iPhone or was it a BlackBerry? See Bob’s Op Ed (this issue, p.48). He says that libraries are losing valuable real estate on the their institutional homepages. I remember when that tried to happen to us at the College of Charleston but thanks to great leadership it didn’t happen. Still, Bob is right at least from my experience. As I search the Web looking for library staff I find it harder and harder to find the library homepages.

Some people have all the fame! Becky Lenzini’s great movie Website http://serious-movielover.com/ has been discovered. She is now movie reviewer for a Website in Chicago http://www.snspost.com/. Plus she was interviewed for their radio spot http://www.snspost.com/sns-04022011-rango-reviewed/.
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Is Selection Dead? The Rise of Collection Management ... from page 42

the titles that patrons get to choose from, or approving titles that they have chosen. Selection thus appears to be alive and well rather than dead and is simply assuming new and different forms.

Response #2 – David Magier (Princeton University)

Some provocative propositions deployed to promote PDA and hasten the death of selection are based on false distinctions, library caricatures, and rhetorical strawmen. Outmoded libraries with “traditional,” “local” collections — consisting of printed books selected “one at a time,” “just in case” someone might ever need them and without regard to the information needs of users, and created, furthermore, with wanton abandon in an unmanaged era of plenty, for the purpose of organizing a “wonderful collection” of content that no one else needs and is anyway hard to discover or use — are contrasted with proposed patron-driven, cost-effective, “just in time” libraries responding digitally to users’ needs, providing Web-scale discovery and instant delivery, where libraries themselves “pale in comparison to what is available on the Web.”

Both sides of that contrast are far from reality, and betray a fearsome lack of understanding of what collection development (and selection) really are. No library (since Alexandria) tried to collect “everything.” Libraries scalably deploy limited resources. Selection — print and electronic — has always been “patron-driven”: understanding and balancing priorities among current and potential future trajectories of need of constituencies and fields is the keystone of collection development, driving acquisition decisions. Ignoring the long tail of need, abdicating subject knowledge, liaison, and the means of collectively shaping shared collections, turning over all selection to users (and expecting “the Web” to supply whatever else is needed) will surely save space, reduce payrolls, and win the hearts of administrators. The resulting libraries, though, will be incapable of supporting research, and are likely to be cut off from access to collections of research libraries that collaborate to deploy their limited resources for that serious purpose.