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What’s the Use? Perspectives on Usage Statistics Across the Information Industry

by Rossi Morris (Media Relations Coordinator, EBSCO) <rmorris@ebsco.com>

Librarians are dedicated to making sound collection development decisions that are in the best interest of the communities they serve. But with the explosive growth of electronic resources and widespread budget and staff cuts, collection development has evolved into a laborious and complex process for librarians tasked with providing the most valuable resources to their users.

In response to these increased demands, innovative tools have been created and new standards have been established to help librarians better measure the value of the resources within their collection — and gathering and analyzing usage data are the staple measures for making well-informed collection development decisions.

The role of usage in collection development is not news. What is noteworthy and worth discussing, however, is the story behind each collection development decision — the challenges, the successes.

Usage remains part of the ongoing dialogue on discussion lists and blogs, and there is no shortage of conference tracts and sessions focused on how to manage, collect, and base decisions on it. When I approached Against the Grain Editor Katina Strauch earlier in 2012, my goal was to share with ATG readers how EBSCO continues to work alongside librarians to help them get a better handle on usage gathering, loading, and reporting so they can devote more time to building a collection that will meet the objectives of their institutions and meet the research needs of their end users.

Katina had a bigger idea, however. Her suggestion: for the September 2012 issue of ATG, pull together a collection of articles with usage as the prevailing topic. It could feature articles from individuals in the various information industry sectors — libraries, vendors, and publishers — all of whom would provide unique perspectives about usage and the role it plays in their day-to-day functions. It also could include results and commentary from a survey of ATG readers on a variety of topics concerning usage.

This issue aims to do just that. It goes behind the scenes to show what librarians are doing to make well-founded collection development decisions, particularly in terms of usage analysis. It explains some of the motivating factors for beginning a usage-analysis strategy and the groundwork necessary for implementation. It also notes what librarians are measuring and why, in addition to collection goals; the challenges encountered; and the tools, methods, or systems employed to track usage and gather data. Ultimately, this issue aims to reveal what librarians do with this data after it is collected — and the benefit it provides to the library and its users.

continued on page 12
From Your (grandmothering) Editor:

Summer is over but wasn’t it glorious! The grandkids visited and had a wonderful time in boats, beaches, and water around Charleston. We spent a lot of time under the sprinklers and in the kiddie pools!

Meanwhile, a trusty group of ATG editors, worked away. Rossi Morris and Liz Lorbeer were our guest editors and what an issue they have given us. This issue has articles by Rossi and Liz, as well as Hilary Davis and Annette Day, Elizabeth Hoppe and Courtney Seymour, Lorri Huddy, Jennifer Lin, Oliver Pesche, and Russell Richey who winds it all up with a summary of an ATG survey.

We have interviews with Martha Kyriillidou, the GIST team, and Timo Hannay. Donna Jacobs talks to us about summer and shrimping. Leila Salisbury tells us about the AAUP meeting, Richard Brown about the Code of Best Practices for Fair Use, and Caroline Hassler talks about classification and tag clouds. Tinker Massey is looking for answers and Mark Herring concludes his three-part series on Ten Reasons Revisited.

Capron Hannay Levine talks about loss prevention and insurance, and if it’s high-tech solutions and knowledge that you seek, be sure to read Richard Abel’s Op Ed, Pelikan’s Antidisambiguation, and Dennis’ @Brunning columns.

And, of course, there’s much more. But time for me to get back to the kiddie pool! Happy fall!

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:

I am writing you as a nit-picking, OCD reference librarian. And I realize that you do not do the copy editing of Against the Grain. But when two headlines, a few pages apart, say:

Dan Stave — In Memorium

... The Tale of A Band of Booksellers, Fasicle 18

I feel obliged to at least mention it to someone who can effect change.

I very much enjoy your publication and learn cool things from it. Keep up the good work, and thanks for listening.

Mark Schumacher, Art and Humanities Librarian, Jackson Library
UNC Greensboro, Greensboro, NC 27402-6170 <m_schuma@uncg.edu>

Editor’s Note: Thanks, Mark! Our glasses must need changing! Are you interested in a proofreading job? Really! Katina 🦂

AGAINST THE GRAIN DEADLINES

VOLUME 24 — 2012-2013

2012 Events Issue Ad Reservation Camera-Ready
Charleston Conference November 2012 08/22/12 09/12/12

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT
Toni Nix <justwrite@lowcountry.com>; Phone: 843-835-8604; Fax: 843-835-5892; USPS Address: P.O. Box 412, Cottageville, SC 29435; FedEx/UPS ship to: 398 Crab Apple Lane, Ridgeville, SC 29472. 🎯

Rumors from page 1

September 15 print LJ. And you can be sure that ATG will be keeping an eye out for her next new new thing!

Went to a fabulous launch party last month for BiblioLabs. Prominently displayed were copies of Inc magazine which has announced BiblioLabs as the No.7 fastest-growing private Media company in the country, as ranked on the 2012 Inc. 500/5000 list. The company, based in Charleston, SC, made the exclusive list with a three-year growth rate of 1,111.9 percent. The list represents the most comprehensive look at an important segment of the economy — America’s Independent entrepreneurs. “The last few years have been incredibly exciting, and we’re glad to see the work pay off in achieving this ranking,” said Andrew Roskill, Chief Executive Officer of BiblioLabs. “It’s particularly satisfying to see us in such good company, sandwiched in between Facebook (No. 6) and Business Insider (No.8) in the Media category.”

http://www.bibliolabs.com/bibliolabs-ranked-no-7-fastest-growing-media-company-by-inc-magazine/

Moving right along, you know there’s a library story somewhere, right? Keep reading. ; ) Y’all should know that BiblioLabs was started by the founders of BookSurge, which was later rebranded as CreateSpace after being acquired by Amazon.com. There’s more. BiblioLabs works with organizations around

continued on page 12
Also, as part of our goal to report on trends and issues related to usage analysis, we will share perspectives from several ATG readers in an article that outlines the results of a recent survey on usage. EBSCO consulted Todd Carpenter, National Information Standards Organization (NISO), and Peter Shepherd, Counting Online Usage of Networked Electronic Resources (COUNTER), to assist ATG with creating and conducting a survey to poll librarians on usage statistics and metrics in their day-to-day workflow and within their institutions.

With such a wide variety of experts and authors willing to contribute to this special issue, it quickly became clear that many in the industry have invaluable knowledge and insight on usage that should be shared. Because there is not enough room in a single issue for each account, Katina suggested an ongoing column on usage to ensure that all voices are heard.

In each upcoming issue of Against the Grain, we will continue to share informative articles on usage in “Analyze This: Usage and Your Collection.” Upcoming installments of this column will address some of the topics covered in this issue and answer questions related to them:

- The effect of usage analysis on staff structure and budgeting. Is the library creating new staff positions to specifically handle usage analysis, or is an already overburdened staff or staff member taking on the task? Budget cuts may be the impetus for beginning usage analysis, but do budgets undergo further reductions after usage data is calculated?

Vendor-provided usage tools and what a library should look for when choosing such a tool. Is the library relying more on its own usage data, vendor-provided usage reports, or the comparability and/or combination of the two? Are there variations in library-collected usage data versus vendor-provided usage data?

Maximizing usage data findings. Once the analysis is complete, at what point and how does the library decide on consolidation of resources, acquisition of new resources, or implementation of a new service?

Combining usage data statistics with other statistics, such as impact factor or learning outcomes. How does the library rely on user feedback when making collection decisions, where does it rank, and how reliable is it?

In the next several installments, look for these features: Cheryl Highsmith, Chapman University; writes about implementing a genre-specific approach to usage analysis; Gracemary Smulowitz, Rutgers University, offers insight about discoveries made in a subscription analysis project; Loraine “Lorri” Huddy, The CTW Library Consortium, assesses the libraries’ eBook pilot.

Publishers, vendors, and other industry experts also weigh in: Jennifer Lin, Public Library of Science (PLoS), discusses Article Level Metrics; Martha Kyrillidou, Association of Research Libraries (ARL), sits down for an interview about her valuable contributions to the industry through innovative assessment products and services for libraries; and Oliver Pesch, EBSCO, explains the vision behind the development of EBSCONET Usage Consolidation.
is the Eigenfactor (www.eigenfactor.org), a metric that measures the influence of scholarly journals and is also included in Thomson Scientific’s Journal Citation Report. It is based on an algorithm that evaluates the networks between journals and attempts to “identify the most influential journals, where a journal is considered to be influential if it is cited often by other influential journals.” Two other tools that challenge the JIF, found in the Scopus database, are Source-Normalized Impact per Paper (SNIP) and SCImago Journal and Country Rank (SJR). Using the SNIP and SJR metrics theoretically offers a more normalized approach to selecting journal titles, but both have not been widely marketed to librarians as more effective than the JIF. In April 2012, the latest contenders from Google Scholar emerged: the $h_5$-index and the $h_5$-median. Based on the $h$-index, which was developed by Jorge E. Hirsch to measure productivity and impact, both are Google Scholar’s attempts to help authors “gauge the visibility and influence of recent articles or scholarly publications.” The top scholarly publications in English, in addition to other languages, can be found on the Google Scholar Metrics Website. What makes this list interesting is its inclusion of open electronic print Websites, such as arXiv.org and RePEc, as well as titles published by STM publishers. With the prevalence of social media, this has led to journals and their publishers being able to market and deliver their content faster than the traditional online abstracting and indexing services. Publishers are marketing their authors by producing podcasts discussing their research. The tables of content services are being replaced with Facebook profiles and the sharing of citations at online reference manager websites. Reading has become more intimate, in that you now know what your peers and students are reading by their digital footprint and thumbs up or down. Most sites allow users to comment on a paper and reaffirm the findings or refute the methodology or results. I recently read an article in the Journal of Medical Internet Research about Tweets having the ability to predict citations. The author, Gunther Eysenbach, writes that “twimpact factor may be a useful and timely metric to measure uptake of research findings and to filter research findings resonating with the public in real time.” Social media is changing the dynamics of scholarship in that scientific authors have alternative venues in which to publish their research in progress.

As authors work to craft their final manuscripts for publication, they are using online reference managers to store articles and share data and ideas with one another. Altmetrics, a new contender in the metrics field, is measuring the impact of an author’s paper in the social networking sites. This new metric goes beyond the traditional publication-vetting process and captures a paper’s impact in the peer-reviewed crowdsourcing realm. It reports the influence of an author’s work or parts of his or her work in the semantic Web. The authors of the Altmetrics: A Manifesto believe their measurement will replace the JIF as a better representation of scholarly output. However, Altmetrics has yet to be proven and vetted as reliable. I see it being used alongside other metrics of scholarly validity and finding its place in P&T decisions in determining the effectiveness of scholarly discourse contributed in the social network. Academia has relied on the JIF for several years, and it is a metric that authors, librarians, and publishers understand and know how to use. It will not be disappearing or supplanted anytime soon.

Rumors from page 12

Just heard from the incredibly energetic and smart Karen Christensen that the entire six-volume Berkshire Encyclopedia of World History is going to be published in Chinese, for distribution in print throughout the People’s Republic of China. This is no small matter, and no small translation job. Only two major English-language reference works, according to librarian advisors, have been translated continued on page 26

<http://www.against-the-grain.com>
Purchasing-demand (POD) via Interlibrary Loan (ILL) is a hybrid model of collection building and borrowing that can serve library users on at least two levels: providing just-in-time resources to a single patron, and (if the items are added to the library’s holdings) growing the collections for use by future researchers in similar subject areas. Each library must evaluate its own population to develop an approach to POD, if one is warranted at all, but speedy turnaround times and relevant acquisitions would seem to be two reasonable goals of such a program.

At Schaffer Library, we performed a case study in POD collection development and an exploration of whether these goals were met by this experimental project. This study investigated turnaround time and undergraduate interdisciplinary research applicability of print monographs purchased during a two-year pilot POD project.

POD programs generally cite speed of delivery as an important, if not essential, element. Perdue and Van Fleet’s (1999) 1990 POD study, the first on the topic, involved rush ordering of in-print titles. “Shipment within one week from an online bookseller” was a criterion of Purdue University Libraries’ landmark Books on Demand program (Anderson, 2002), and one they maintained through a decade of POD ordering (Anderson, 2010). Bracke (2010) also set a one-week shipping cap, and a publication date requirement, the latter being a parameter other institutions have used to target recently published (i.e., immediately shippable) materials (Anderson et al, 2002, 2010; Ward et al 2003; Comer and Lorenzen 2005; Campbell et al, 2006; Coopey and Snowman 2006; Gibson and Kirkwood 2009; Fountain and Frederiksen 2012; Herrera and Greenwood 2012; Schmidt 2012).

Recorded turnaround times, vendor selections, and the extent to which they are described in the POD literature vary. Before the availability of online ordering, Bucknell’s average delivery of in-print and in-stock rushed items in 1990 was 2.5 weeks (Perdue and Van Fleet 1990). Amazon was the preferred vendor for several individual projects (Ward et al 2003; Comer and Lorenzen et al 2005; Coopey and Snowman 2006); average delivery times ranged from 3.88 to eight days. Amazon was also the top bookseller for POD programs in the Pacific Northwest’s Orbis Cascade Alliance, with Abibis and “Other” tied for second (Fountain and Frederiksen 2012). The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign rush-ordered available YBP items in an average of three days (Wiley and Clarge 2012). Anderson et al (2010) and Hussong-Christan and Goerget-Doll (2010) employed patron satisfaction surveys to assess turnaround times; the majority of responders agreed that their items arrived in a timely fashion.

Borrower type and disciplinary use are other ways of evaluating POD programs. Ward et al (2003) and Anderson et al (2002) found that the overall distribution of POD user statuses was comparable to patterns seen for traditional ILL at their institutions. Bracke (2010) discovered that many POD volumes at Purdue were interdisciplinary between two subject areas, applied to a wide range of disciplines, or addressed an emerging area of study. POD patrons were also unexpectedly borrowing outside of their designated disciplines with greater frequency than they were within them, suggesting an interdisciplinary component to research and highlighting the way POD can uniquely address cross-departmental studies (Anderson et al 2002). Bracke (2010) and Tyler et al (2010) observed that the majority of POD borrowers were graduate students in the liberal arts; for the latter, “interdisciplinary studies” was a category of disciplinary affiliation recorded in their purchase statistics.

Anderson et al (2010) hypothesized that graduate students may be exploring more cutting-edge research than their faculty counterparts and are fueling the trend in interdisciplinary book requesting.

Background
Union College is a small, private, liberal arts college in Schenectady, N.Y., specializing in undergraduate research and interdisciplinary programming. Union serves 2,133 full-time undergraduates on a ten-week trimester system. With strengths including “close faculty-student interaction; emphasis on student scholarship …; strong departments in liberal arts and engineering; [and] interdisciplinary programs and majors” (Union College 2008), Union promotes original undergraduate research via its mandatory Sophomore Research Seminar (SRS) and cross-curricular senior theses and capstone projects.

At Schaffer Library, our service goals are centered on meeting the information needs of undergraduates. As a curricular support center at a fast-paced trimester institution, we are always looking for fast and reliable ways to connect our patrons to valued resources. While for borrowing through the ConnectNY Consortium we have a dedicated courier that promises delivery of print materials within three days, the majority of our print ILL requests are filled via UPS or USPS. Over the period from 1 June 2008 to 1 June 2010, the average turnaround time for loans through ILL was 10.78 calendar days, or around a tenth of our trimester length. Premium acquisitions services offering rush shipping are becoming more common and at more affordable price points. We suspected that we could reduce the turnaround time on certain ILL print titles by purchasing them in this manner, and we were willing to spend more for the added-value service. Thus began our POD pilot project.

continued on page 28
Figure 5: Disciplinary matches by individual POD title
A desired outcome of the pilot was to acquire content in a cost-efficient manner. The Consortium was accustomed to purchasing eBooks on a title-by-title basis, so prices were gathered to learn how eBook prices compared to print. The intention was to control title costs by embargoes publishers whose eBook prices seemed “too high” given a title’s availability in print (CTW defined “too high” as eBook prices based on hardcover when softcover was available, or if eBooks were priced three times higher than softcover). Although CTW purchased titles that were perceived as “too high,” this was mitigated by two facts: the titles were used by patrons, and the costs were shared across the Consortium.

Assessing the value of one-time views: If CTW had to purchase all titles viewed once, what would it cost? What was the value of these titles compared to the cost of purchased titles?

• Data Collected: Prices of Titles Viewed Only Once (not purchased)
• Success and Limitations: OASIS provided prices of titles viewed once, which were easily tallied and tracked over time in the master usage spreadsheet. The overall value of one-time views is a source of satisfaction, as it consistently equals the cost of purchased titles.

Assessing the cost of the two-view purchase trigger: How many titles have not been used since purchase? How frequently were purchases triggered “accidentally” (as indicated by minimal pages viewed during the first two sessions)?

• Data Collected: Titles Not Used Since Purchase, Titles Purchased Due to One-Page Views
• Success and Limitations: Usage since purchase was easily tracked in the master spreadsheet. Titles used after purchase had three or more sessions; titles not used since being purchased had only two sessions.

• Using two years of data, CTW learned that 34 percent of its MyiLibrary titles were not used after purchase. This led us to look at purchases triggered by usage that could be accidental (i.e., one-page views). Of purchases due to one-page views, 4.5 percent were triggered completely (both sessions), while 27 percent were triggered partially. We determined this by manually reviewing pages per session for each new purchase — time-consuming, but worth it, when we learned that, of the titles triggered from one-page views, 60 percent had subsequent usage. Knowing this — that two-thirds of these purchases were merely delayed — could persuade MyiLibrary to change CTW’s terms to three views before purchase.

These insights were used in conjunction with information learned at conference presentations on eBooks: other MyiLibrary customers had a three-view purchase trigger. CTW attempted to negotiate for this, but discussions failed to reach mutually agreeable terms. Given the relationship that had developed with our PDA partner, this was an unanticipated setback but did not end CTW’s program with MyiLibrary. Due to our satisfaction with titles purchased and MyiLibrary’s access model, it will stay in place while other programs are implemented.

Closing Remarks

The constantly-changing eBook market indicated a need to thoroughly re-evaluate the Consortium’s options. Based on information gathered during the MyiLibrary assessment and a need to consolidate selection and acquisition workflows, CTW looked at other PDA possibilities and is implementing a new eBook pilot with YBP Library Services (YBP) and Ebook Library (EBL). One of its appealing features is the libraries have the ability to avoid accidental usage that may trigger purchases. Users may browse for a short period of time without this counting toward the title’s purchase. If they stay in the eBook long enough, a STL will provide longer access to the title. Selectors will choose titles to be added to this PDA program using our YBP collection development profiles, and GOBI (Global Online Bibliographic Information), YBP’s online acquisition and collection development tool, will provide title notifications and pricing across all available versions.

Assessing the MyiLibrary eBook PDA pilot proved challenging because, as is often the case, it was time-consuming to collate useful pieces of information into a more complete picture for assessment purposes. From the start, it was known that gaining insights into users’ online behaviors would be difficult. MyiLibrary reports may lack data on platform feature use, but given our experiences with other e-resource statistics, this was not entirely unexpected; however, as platforms are created and modified, information-gathering mechanisms, similar to Google Analytics, should be considered. The data gathered would provide insights into users’ behaviors that would benefit publishers, vendors, and libraries.

With respect to the viability of PDA as a collection development model, redacted content from eBooks is problematic. The transition to eBooks is still underway; proper disclosure is needed for eBooks to become a trustworthy substitute for print. Libraries have a legitimate need to know which titles are affected, as an assurance that eBooks purchased via PDA (and ordered title-by-title) are equivalent to their print counterparts. A solution is the provision of such information from publishers to vendors and, ultimately, to their primary customers: libraries.
EBSCO Brings Integration to the Forefront with EBSCONET Usage Consolidation

by Oliver Pesch (Chief Strategist, E-Resources, EBSCO)

In working with librarians, EBSCO spends a great deal of time talking about the ways their libraries are addressing current problems and the products and services they need. The transition to online-centric collections has basically turned librarians’ worlds upside down. Management tools and techniques that were appropriate for print collections have proven ineffective when applied to electronic resources. Librarians are asking for services and tools created specifically for the evolving world in which they find themselves.

EBSCO’s challenge is to respond with effective solutions that offer the appropriate amount of sophistication without the added complications that can sometimes come along with it as an unwanted byproduct.

EBSCO began adding e-resource capabilities to our systems more than a decade ago, when publishers first began offering online versions of their journals. Since that time, we have worked with librarians to improve how they acquire, manage, and access their online collections. Today, EBSCO offers a complete, comprehensive range of products and services related to information management and discovery, and we continue to evolve. The breadth of our offerings also allows for the added efficiencies that can come with integration among products — integration that eliminates redundancies in both effort and information managed. Our goal is to make librarians more effective by providing them with ready access to the information they need to do their job, so they have more time to focus on building better collections and serving their constituents.

A common theme in many requests we received from librarians was to provide a better way to handle usage statistics, not only to simplify the gathering of usage statistics but also to allow the collected usage statistics to be applied in a way to efficiently inform collection analysis decisions (whether a library renews or cancels a journal, for instance, or moves to alternate methods of access). As a result of this feedback, we recently deployed EBSCONET Usage Consolidation. This latest addition to our family of products provides a key component in addressing the library’s need to quickly and effectively assess the value of a given electronic resource.

Effective management of any resource starts with measuring its use, which is definitely a challenge with online resources where usage information is collected by the content provider and not the library. The value of an e-resource is often judged in terms of usage and cost-per-use. For any product related to usage consolidation, the primary function should be to make it easy to collect usage data and to combine that usage with cost data so cost-per-use analysis can be performed. EBSCO’s approach with Usage Consolidation is somewhat different from other such tools on the market.

Virtually all usage management products help librarians collect the usage data, and Usage Consolidation is no exception. Where EBSCO differs is in how we provide cost-per-use analysis. Rather than requiring cost data to be loaded into the same system as the usage data, our solution makes the usage data available to the system where the cost data is managed. Librarians who use our EBSCONET Subscription Management system now have instant access to usage and cost-per-use information as part of their normal workflow. Our unique approach to managing usage allows us to keep Usage Consolidation affordable and easy to use. Its focus, after all, is collecting usage.

But the real power comes in how that usage data is integrated with our other products. Imagine you are responsible for managing e-journal renewals in a tough budget year, and you have to make some difficult collection decisions. As you scan the list of titles that are up for renewal, you find one title that you feel is questionable. With a simple positioning of the mouse, you can instantly see that this title was used only a few times last year, and the cost-per-use was approximately $45, which is higher than you would like for your institution. As you consider your options, you wonder if this title is available through one of your full-text databases. With a single click of the mouse, you are presented with the complete list of online holdings, which reveals that this title is, indeed, available in one of your full-text databases but has an embargo of 18 months. Since this particular title is one in which access to current content is required, you decide to proceed with the renewal. You managed to do all of this without leaving the renewal list within EBSCONET, and reaching the renewal decision took you less than 30 seconds. This description may sound like some promise for a future application, but it is not. It is exactly how EBSCONET Usage Consolidation works today in conjunction with EBSCO’s subscription management tools.

As described in the example above, the integration goes even further than just usage data. With Usage Consolidation, librarians also have instant access to holdings and coverage data in their EBSCO A-to-Z list. It is this deep integration that sets EBSCO’s products apart. Our philosophy is that usage should be easy to obtain and should also be made available in those tools where librarians are making decisions.

Librarians also have told us that they just don’t have the time to spend gathering and loading usage data. EBSCO responded to this need by introducing our Usage Loading Service as an optional companion to Usage Consolidation. With the Usage Loading Service, a dedicated team of highly-skilled representatives handles the gathering and loading of COUNTER usage reports, leaving the librarian with more time for analysis and collection development activities.

Usage Consolidation and the Usage Loading Service were initially released in January 2012, after a beta test period of approximately six months, during which more than 20 institutions from all over the world had an opportunity to test the service and provide valuable product input. This type of customer feedback drives our development. In fact, the next release of Usage Consolidation, scheduled for a late-2012 release, will include features based on such input — support for eBook usage, improved reporting capabilities, improved SUSHI support, and several other improvements — in order to further increase productivity. Also in our sights will be full support for Release 4 of the COUNTER Code of Practice, which becomes a requirement of content providers by the end of 2013.

Our approach to Usage Consolidation gives us tremendous flexibility in how we can employ the usage data in other services. The instant display of usage and collection holdings within EBSCONET Subscription Management is just the beginning. We have some very interesting features planned that will provide extremely advanced point-of-need analysis capabilities. The future is quite exciting as we continue to strive for solutions that allow librarians to do their jobs better.

Speaking again of the Charleston Conference, we are running ahead with registrations based on same time last year (over 100 strong) so be sure and register soon and definitely be on hand for Early Bird ends which is supposed to be September 14. http://www.katina.info/conference/registration.php continued on page 53
The science of service.

At Eastern Book Company, we’ve spent more than half a century shaping our first step is fulfilling our customers’ orders with unmatched speed and accuracy. Then we custom-fit our operations to our customers’ needs, allowing libraries to streamline processes and maximize budgets. And finally, we cultivate next-generation technologies to help our customers build the libraries their users need.

Pelikan’s Antidisambiguation from page 52

for the epic battle in the Great Race) broke out. All lines between types and classes of devices became blurred to the point of disappearance. A year or more of total hilarity ensued.

Then a funny thing began to happen to smartphones. Some of them started to get bigger. Not as big as a tablet, but incrementally larger — never to the point of market rejection, but just to the edge of inducing an initial response such as “Good Grief! Look at the size of that phone!”

As well, a few tablets began to get smaller. The much overlooked Nook Tablet was not much bigger than a standard Kindle — thicker, heavier, battery life measured in hours not in weeks, etc., but it was a tablet that reached down into the form factor space of the eBook reader, even as the smartphones were edging up in size.

The Asus-built, Google-branded Nexus 7 is the present culmination of all this development. It looks like a huge smartphone. You can hold it in one hand like a phone, cradled in your hand with your thumb on one edge and your fingers on the opposite edge. You almost find yourself wondering why it isn’t a phone. Well, the answer is that is isn’t a phone — it’s a tablet. You can run Skype on it, so you could teleconference with your colleagues wherever — almost anywhere, actually. But it’s primarily a tablet. The screen is extremely high-resolution. The processor is running four cores. It has a 4325-milliamp-hour battery (comparatively huge). It should run all day, doing whatever you want, and often several things at a time. The bloody screen is still way too shiny — nobody touches e-Ink for general reading — but the appeal of the form factor combined with its significant computing power and its access to the entire Android OS universe of applications would make it a very serious contender at almost any typical price — even the price of an iPad.

And there’s the catch — for Apple, at least. The Nexus 7 is selling for $200 for the 8Gb model, $250 for the 16Gb version. Suffice it to say, they are flying off the shelves. Many retailers have sold out of their initial allocation and are waiting on it…

Rumors from page 48

This issue of ATG is ably guest-edited by the effervescent team of Liz Lorbeer and Rossi Morris. What a group of great papers they have put together! The article on the Impact Factor by the glamorous Liz (did you know she misses the snow and she is living in Alabama?) covers many of the issues regarding this controversial metric. (this issue, p.14) Related — I noticed an article in the Wall Street Journal the other day (“Journals’ Ranking System Roils Research” by Gautam Nauk) about the same impact factor and journal metrics when what to my wondering eyes should appear but a reference to the famous Phil Davis a Charleston Conference regular when we can get him!

While we are on Against the Grain, we have a letter to the editor in this issue from Mark Schumacher about a couple of misspellings we overlooked. And Ranune Kubilius points out that in the June 2012 ATG, in a few places, J. Michael Homan’s name became J. Mitchell Homan…(e.g., p. 1 and in the TOC on p.4) Related — I continued on page 85
claims to serve more than 10,000 libraries in 46 countries, and that it processes 9.6 million requests with 95% fulfillment. It lets individual libraries hold onto their print books while sharing them with others if they want, but it also enables regional or multi-library repositories to share their collections with libraries outside their groups.

The authors don’t jump right out and say this, but I wonder if this wasn’t their underlying intended message. [This is probably the time that I need to remind you that I am a member of the OCLC Board of Trustees but also state that I have no insight into the intents of the authors other than to cast light on this important topic.]

Personally, I have an idea that while it isn’t too early to pose the question about the implications of eBooks and regional collaboration for the management of print book collections, I suspect we are indulging in a rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic exercise. We begin this exercise by accepting that print books will always be needed and that access to the entire corpus of recorded knowledge is important. If we suppose that all that libraries will provide access to is the HathiTrust corpus then perhaps that will be true since it focuses on dead (out-of-print) books. But that isn’t the case as access to new eBooks and commercial super collections will be there for readers. And as for access to the entire corpus of recorded knowledge, we need to remind ourselves of the 80/20 rule. Libraries at a relatively few super research universities actually need to try to own more than 20 percent of the monographs that have been published, if that much. Most academic libraries just need to understand and meet current needs.

I suggest that we try to minimize our efforts to rearrange the deck chairs and instead focus on building digital collections while continuing to collaborate with each other where it makes sense. One only needs to look at the value of the RapidILL program (http://rapidill.org/Default.aspx) to see the value of libraries working together to provide access to journal articles. The value of super quick collaborative user-initiated interlibrary loan systems is also undeniable. And yet where such programs fail to meet all needs we have the WorldCat Resource Sharing system as a backup. But our focus needs to be on further developing digital collections. Readers want to read. Let’s forget about the safety of our biblio Garden of Eden with its “books, bricks, and mortar” and “head into the wilderness” to electronically give them what they want: reading material. I think this needs to be the focus for publishers, vendors, and librarians alike. This has already happened for academic journals, let’s make it happen for books.

Rumors

Speaking of conflicts with Charleston, George Machovec tells me he’ll be missing Charleston this year because of the Colorado Alliance’s quarterly deans/directors meeting right in the middle of the Conference. George says that it’s his favorite conference and he hates to miss it!

Moving right along to misses, Scott Plutchak will not be in Charleston this year either because of an important medical meeting! Fiddlesticks! Scott says he will definitely be back next year, (hopefully with his group The Bearded Pigs) but, hey, y’all, let’s start a petition against any meeting other than Charleston the first two weeks of November!!

And yet another voice from the past! Remember Daryl Rayner? I sure do! Daryl used to write Rumors from Paddington (British Rumors) for ATG many years ago. What fun they were! At that time Daryl was working for xref (which is rebranded now as Credo). In 2006, Daryl and several of her colleagues started Exact Editions which works with magazine publishers to sell subscriptions and produce app versions to digital editions and their archives. In fact turns out that this month, they are launching the full archive of Granophraphone which began back in 1923.

And speaking of 1923. That reminds me of your friend and mine — Copyright (that would make a great kid’s book, wouldn’t it?) can’t you see Mother Nature explaining copyright to the Lorax? As we all know — books published before 1923 pass into the public domain! http://www.unc.edu/~uncng/public-d.htm

The famous chart referenced above was created by Lolly Gasaway who has been writing copyright questions and answers columns for ATG for the past 15 plus years (see her column this issue, p.66).

DRUMROLL!! We are happy to announce the publication of Copyright Questions and Answers for Information Professionals: From the Columns of Against the Grain, by Laura N. Gasaway. This is the first book in an exciting new series called “Charleston Insights in Library, Archival and Information Sciences.” You can order the book online through Purdue University Press, and copies will be available for purchase on site at the Charleston Conference. A separate “buy the book” link is at: http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/titles/format/9781557536396.

PS — The Charleston Conference is pleased to announce that through our publishing partnership with Purdue University Press, the 2009, 2010, and 2011 Conference Proceedings will be available online for free, and print copies will be available for purchase on site at the 2012 Conference. http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/charleston/...

As always I seem to be running out of room, but a few tidbits before I sign off. Deb Vaughn, our fabulous book review editor has a new baby boy! Little Edward was born on July 10. Sadly, Deb is leaving the College of Charleston, but she plans to continue to write book reviews in between feeding the kids! Family of five! Hooray! Oh! Her new email is < Vaughn.deborah@gmail.com >.

Second tidbit — Xan Arch had her new baby. She is just as gorgeous as ever! See Facebook! http://www.facebook.com/photos.php?bid=10190308692434683&set=a.729213722693.2315868.222150&type=1&theater

And talk about gorgeous! Barbara Casalini’s daughter Arianna and her husband Michele (who restored Barbara’s 35 years old Vespa for the occasion) are pictured above. As Porky Pig would say .... that .. that… that’s all, folks! (for awhile!).
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