

# Technicalities™

Information Forum for the Technical Services Professional

## Reality Check.....→

### Lost and Found: Have We Given up on Discovery (Yet)?

By David Banush

I typically prefer to begin these columns with a short quote or anecdote to set the stage for the discussion that follows. But the topic I want to address this time—library discovery systems and our relationship to them—seemed to resist that approach. No pithy words from any quotable notable appeared up to the task. Perhaps that is fitting, because the issues surrounding resource discovery and librarians' role in it are not amendable to easy encapsulation.



David Banush

Perhaps, somewhat more pessimistically, it is because the questions have already been settled, however disquieting the conclusions may seem: Google won the war for users' attention; what else is left to discuss? Rehearsing tired arguments about how (or whether) to provide our users with systems that attempt to lead to trusted resources in a comprehensive way are still tired, regardless of how memorably introduced or framed.

At the risk of losing the reader's interest before I have piqued it, I want to suggest that there may still be some life in this topic yet. At the very least, the fact that many libraries continue to spend considerable sums and staff resources on discovery systems—to say nothing of the data that feed them—and that the market continues to produce

(continued on page 6)

## Dollars and Sense.....→

### My Dream Catalog

By Sheila S. Intner



Sheila S. Intner

Library catalogs have been changing rapidly for the last 25 years. I remember some early online catalogs that displayed screens that looked like catalog cards, complete with a little round hole at the bottom of the image where the rods that used to secure the cards to the drawer were inserted. Fortunately, images that made a computer screen look like a catalog card faded rapidly, adopted for a short time mainly by libraries that catered to the very young in elementary schools or the least knowledgeable searchers in small

(continued on page 4)

**September/October 2014**  
**Volume 34 No. 5**

**Interfaces**

See page 9

**Continuities**

See page 12

**Book Reviews**

See page 15

**News From the Field**

See page 23

## Table of Contents

### Reality Check

*Lost and Found: Have We Given up on Discovery (Yet)?*  
By David Banush ..... 1

### Dollars and Sense

*My Dream Catalog*  
By Sheila S. Intner ..... 1

### From the Editor's Desk

*Evaluating the Big Deal*  
By Peggy Johnson ..... 2

### Interfaces

*A Nonagenarian Remembers*  
By Jean Weihs ..... 9

### Continuities

*The Debate over Short-Term Loan Pricing*  
By C. Derrick Hiatt ..... 12

**Book Reviews** ..... 15

**News From the Field** ..... 23

#### Editor

Peggy Johnson

#### Publisher

Michael Cavanaugh

#### Managing Editor

Elizabeth Cavanaugh

#### Contributing Authors

David Banush

C. Derrick Hiatt

Sheila Intner

Jean Weihs

# From the Editor's Desk.....

## Evaluating the Big Deal

By Peggy Johnson



Peggy Johnson

This editorial takes as its starting point a fascinating report of research conducted by four economists who examined Big Deals and disparate pricing.<sup>1</sup> A Big Deal is a publisher's license agreement, often multiyear, that provides access to all or a substantial portion of titles at a cost less than the sum of the titles purchased individually. Cancelling titles before the end of the contract period (typically three to five years) usually results in financial penalties.

The challenge of comparing Big Deal costs is complicated because such deals often come with nondisclosure agreements. Although the Association of Research Libraries encourages its members to refrain from signing nondisclosure clauses, many libraries continue to do so.<sup>2</sup> Some publishers have tried to block the release of subscription terms, claiming these are trade secrets. Without ready access to the subscription amounts paid by other institutions, libraries have difficulty determining if they are getting a good (Big) deal or a bad deal.

Bergstrom and colleagues first tried to get data from universities and library consortia in the United States, but only half shared their terms. Subsequently, the researchers were able to obtain 360 contracts from 55 university libraries and 12 library consortia by requesting subscription contracts through Freedom of

Information Act laws covering each state. The analysis looked at prices charged by publishers in 2009.

Bergstrom and colleagues compared the cost of access to journal bundles, measured in dollars expended and as the cost per citation of articles in the journals, for large research universities, small PhD degree-granting universities, and predominantly master's degree-granting institutions. They also compared prices per citation charged by major commercial publishers and major nonprofit publishers to determine value for money spent. They compared practices by different publishers, both commercial publishers and non-profits. The analysis was further complicated by variations in how non-profit publishers set prices. Some used negotiated pricing (as the commercial publishers do), some used tiered pricing (bundle prices differentiated by the size and nature of the institution), and some used uniform pricing.

The researchers found that commercial publishers charged large research universities between three and ten times more and small PhD-granting institutions between two and

four times more, compared with non-profit publishers. They determined that Elsevier's cost per citation was nearly three times that charged by non-profit publishers. Other commercial publishers (Emerald, Sage, and Taylor & Francis) had prices per citation approximately ten times those of non-profits.

Variability in pricing could not be explained solely by the nature of the publisher or by institution characteristics (enrollment and number of PhD students). Reading the article's supporting information (available in a PDF that can be downloaded without a pay wall) is revealing.<sup>3</sup> For example, the University of Wisconsin and University of Michigan, which are of similar size, paid Elsevier \$1.22 million and \$2.16 million, respectively, for the same Elsevier Freedom Package in 2009. The University of Texas, Austin (with 647 PhD students) paid \$481,932 for the Springer Journal Collection, while the University of Miami (with 155 PhD students) paid \$553,923. The smaller University of Oklahoma (21,965 students) paid more than twice as much (\$500,744) as the University of Missouri (24,903 students), which paid \$233,659 for access to Wiley journals.

A few caveats apply. A university may have a lengthy prior history with a publisher that can be part of the negotiation and affect the final price. Further, cost per citation is an abstract calculation and does not reflect actual institutional use of a title. The latter would consider cost per use as a local cost/benefit measure. This cannot, however, be considered without the context of the entire journal package, which almost always included little used titles.

Nevertheless, the findings presented by Bergstrom and colleagues suggest that some institutions, even without access to the prices their peers paid for journal bundles, have been more successful than others in negotiations with publishers. And that brings me to my concluding point: everything within a contract can be changed through negotiation. By its nature, a contract must be mutually acceptable before it is signed. Research has now clearly documented the power of negotiation when libraries and consortia are willing to persist in securing a fair exchange for product and services.

### References

1. Theodore C. Bergstrom et al, "Evaluating Big Deal Journal Bundles," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 111, no. 26 (2014): 9425-30.
2. Julia Blixrud, "ARL Encourages Members to Refrain from Signing Nondisclosure or Confidentiality Clauses" (June 5, 2009), [www.arl.org/news/arl-news/3062-arl-encourages-members-to-refrain-from-signing-nondisclosure-or-confidentiality-clauses#](http://www.arl.org/news/arl-news/3062-arl-encourages-members-to-refrain-from-signing-nondisclosure-or-confidentiality-clauses#). U9fxsrHG98E (accessed July 29, 2014).
3. Theodore C. Bergstrom et al, "Supplemental Information for "Evaluating Big Deal Journal Bundles," [www.pnas.org/content/suppl/2014/06/11/1403006111.DCSupplemental/pnas.1403006111.sapp.pdf](http://www.pnas.org/content/suppl/2014/06/11/1403006111.DCSupplemental/pnas.1403006111.sapp.pdf) (accessed July 29, 2014).

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License.



## Letter to the Editor

I am writing in regards "Reality Check: The Big Deal—Dead or Alive" (*Technicalities* 34, no. 2 (March 2014)). Thank you for organizing the discussion on a topic that I have fortunately not had to deal with. I have, however, repeatedly written and talked about journal pricing and especially on cost/page and cost/article comparisons.

Universities that have neither a medical school nor a law school quite likely have never felt the need to seriously consider a Big Deal. This because it is widely recognized among scientists that *Nature* and major society published journals (APS, ACS, AMS, etc.) are generally the appropriate venue for reading and publishing important articles. Thus, I have long been concerned that, in discussions about "The Serials Problem," there is generally a complete absence of any distinction between "commercial" and "society" journals.

Many Big Deals are sold on the basis of the library receiving a substantial discount, but after comparing their cost/page or cost/article, and factoring in their lower Impact Factors (IF), many presumably discounted commercial Big Deal journals are still substantially overpriced compared with their society counterparts.

I wish more recognition would be given to the pricing policies of the American Physical Society (APS), who have long been very open about their publication costs and even with a small built-in profit, their pricing should be an example for all.

(continued on page 5)

## Dollars and Sense ..... My Dream Catalog

(continued from page 1)

public libraries that the vendor thought were least likely to warm to computers. As it turns out, they were the ones who leaped most enthusiastically onto the computer bandwagon and needed no traditional-looking imagery. Even now, when both young students and community members of all ages are eagerly using all kinds of electronic devices, good advice for first-time buyers of a new one often is to ask a child to show them how it works.

Nevertheless, catalogs have not changed as much as one might expect. Catalog records look almost exactly the same as they did when MARC was introduced in the 20th century, with a few new wrinkles like the 33X fields describing carriers (and about which non-cataloger searchers are not aware). In your columnist's humble opinion, the adoption of *RDA*, which was supposed to make catalog data more readable and understandable, may actually have the opposite effect.<sup>1</sup> But, instead of railing at the inevitable, in this column I want to explore the possibilities that technology affords us, if only we decide to employ our efforts toward those goals. Perhaps, instead of spending many thousands of dollars and countless hours of work thinking up and accommodating new rules and methods of describing carriers, we could employ that money and those hours trying to figure out how to present information that people would really use in comparing resources and choosing the ones they wish to borrow. What might library cataloging look like if that happens?

### Words and Pictures

For starters, let us consider tables of contents. Current cataloging rules

and MARC fields already provide for the inclusion of tables of contents in our records. Ideally, they would appear in the cataloging for every resource containing them. However, this element is optional and takes time to enter into records. Making tables of contents an essential part of cataloging does not take much of a rule change or technological advance—it merely takes commitment to the idea and the establishment of policy to do it. The former is easy; the latter takes years of hard work. My ideal catalog would always include tables of contents.

Then, think about pictures. Pictures are easily reproduced online and we know that a picture is worth a thousand words. Yet the routine inclusion of images of cover art for the kinds of library resources for which this is an important identifying feature—for example, children's picture books and popular fiction—is absent from catalog screens. Okay, you might say, people looking for these resources do not rely on using library catalogs to find them, and, even if they do, many are barred from being sent out on interlibrary loan, so who needs to include that stuff? But, how about adding sample maps from atlases and sample illustrations from books about art and artists? Aren't images critical for the selection of those kinds of resources? Biographies could routinely include pictures of their subjects. Science resources might include sample graphics and other images. Pictures like those are important features of the resources that catalog records represent, useful for knowledge seekers at all educational levels, up to and including university faculty and post-doctoral researchers.

Another omission from catalog records my ideal catalog would

include is visual images of musical incipits along with links to their aural versions. These are powerful aids for selecting music and other sound-based resources. While the incipits alone might be enough for musicians, music scholars, and music teachers seeking new pieces for their students, links to their aural counterparts are essential for non-musicians who cannot "hear" an incipit simply by looking at it. Similarly, cataloging for moving image resources—films and videos—ought to have images of associated posters and links to their trailers when they are available. In today's electronic environment, turning catalog records into multimedia products is not a big technical leap. It is a big philosophical and psychological leap for librarians to go from catalog records that contain only words and a few numbers to records that include words, numbers, images, sound, videos, and more.

### Expanded Tags

Over the last century, subject specialists have made many improvements over Mr. Cutter's subject-related objects to display what a library owns on a subject and in a genre. In recent years we have begun to recognize the value of form and genre headings; we allowed the assignment of more than one or a few headings per resource (in Mr. Cutter's day catalogers thought one would do); and, more recently, we accepted the potential value of using subject headings from multiple sources in the same catalog. Although we have always admitted there is no single type of catalog user, we are parsimonious about expanding the vocabulary of subject access.

Sometimes, while writing a piece, I cannot think of the right word to

express an idea, so I Google synonyms for whatever it is I am trying to say, starting with whatever word has come to mind. Several websites provide neat lists in alphabetic order, with additional links for some of the words in the list and antonyms for searchers who are interested in them, too. Why cannot subject headings operate similarly, offering the option of clicking to get lists of related headings, nearby headings, synonymous keywords, and so forth?

Studies have shown that the use of both subject headings and keywords retrieve a greater proportion of relevant resources listed in a catalog than searching by either type of subject term alone, so why not take advantage of the possibilities offered by pushing that envelope a little further? If summaries were a required cataloging element and the words in them were searchable, what additional titles might be presented to searchers who do subject searches? My ideal catalog would have both features: required and searchable summaries.

Other ideas that are now old hat in websites like Amazon.com could and should be incorporated into library catalogs. For instance, library catalogs could routinely suggest titles a reader might want based on their borrowing histories. They could solicit reviews and offer them at a click to searchers who click on a title. They might provide titillating excerpts that invite searchers to borrow resources. They might permit viewing the front matter of books and linking directly to electronic versions of texts, videos, music, etc., and suggest related resources, particularly when a resource was retrieved based on its subject content or genre.

## Conclusion

Once upon a time, linking a library's holdings, authority files, circulation files, and acquisition files with bibliographic records were considered valuable feats afforded by computing. Now, it is way past time we thought more ambitiously about catalog records, both for the data within individual resources they might contain to help users find what they want as well as the whole array of services designed to lead users to want to borrow more—much more—than just the hit that answered a specific query.

## Reference

1. *RDA: Resource Description and Access* (Chicago: American Library Association; Ottawa: Canadian Library Association; London: Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals, 2010- ).

---

*Sheila S. Intner is Professor Emerita, Simmons College GSLIS at Mount Holyoke College; she can be reached at shemat@aol.com.*

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License.



## Letter to the Editor

(continued from page 3)

For example (using the APS Large Research Institution pricing):

APS: *Physical Review C*  
2013 = \$1,940; 2013 articles = 1,146; Price/article = \$1.69; 5 year IF = 3.34; cost/article/IF = \$0.51

Elsevier: *Nuclear Physics A*  
2013 = \$6,138; 2013 articles = 545; Price/article = \$11.26; 5 year IF = 1.39; cost/article/IF = \$8.10

On the basis of the price/article, a reasonable subscription price (based on APS pricing) for Elsevier's *Nuclear Physics A* should be ~\$920. Assuming that Elsevier's publication process is as efficient as that of the APS, Elsevier is achieving a profit of over 560 percent on this title.

Thus, in answer to Jeffrey Carroll's question "could the Big Deal really just be a symptom of a larger issue?", I would suggest that the larger issue is the gross overpricing of journals from commercial publishers. And building on Tom Sanville's final paragraph "Dare I suggest. . ." and "Until we can move the conversation to a different plane . . .," I think there has to be a serious threat of significant cancellations of commercially published journals with responsibility transferred to individual research groups for the cost of obtaining the grossly overpriced journal articles.

*Dana Roth  
Pasadena, CA*

## Reality Check..... **Lost and Found: Have We Given up on Discovery (Yet)?**

*(continued from page 1)*

and enhance such systems, suggests that the question of discovery is far from settled. Here I want to explore a bit of the background on library resource discovery, the current state of affairs, and the question of whether Google really has won the search war. Finally, I want to spend some time on how we might change the conversation about discovery and move our collective energies into new and interesting ways of connecting users with the content that they need for teaching, learning, and scholarship.

### **History Lessons**

When talking about resource discovery in libraries, some historical perspective may help set the context. We sometimes hear librarians harken back to a golden era, a fondly-remembered past when users had little choice but to rely on librarians and the physical library to conduct research. Discovery tools such as the vast card catalogs, with their intricate rules for description, indexing, and classification, were the sole means of discovering the richness hidden in the miles of stacks. They were also the exclusive purview of the library community, which created and distributed the surrogates required to find needed items. Other tools, such as printed indexes of journal literature, may not have been developed by librarians, but libraries held the necessary volumes and librarians understood the structures used to compile them. But the era was hardly a golden one for discovery. In addition to the hundreds of oak card drawers to be mined and the large, heavy indexes to be paged through, a myriad of other cumbersome tools were required to engage in comprehensive research.

Verifying the holdings of current, unbound issues of journals, for example, may have required a lookup in yet another source, while other tools, like finding aids, may not have been available to users without making previous arrangements—if they existed at all. No tool was available off-site or after hours. Resource discovery in the golden era was a clumsy, laborious process and all nostalgia aside, very few users or librarians would ever truly want to return to it.

The introduction of online catalogs and early electronic indexes made searching more convenient, though CD-ROM-based tools common to that era still required a user to be in the library and, in any case, most of the content indexed was still in print form. Only when the World Wide Web appeared in the 1990s and libraries and publishers alike began to leverage its capabilities, did scholarly resource discovery become a more integrated, seamless process, freeing users from the limits of the physical library and allowing at least some research to be conducted mostly or entirely online.

Networked e-resources were certainly a huge leap forward in user convenience. As it turned out, convenience was apparently more important than many librarians previously thought. Web searching brought to the lay user a level of capability, speed, and ease unmatched by clumsy printed indexes and dusty catalog drawers. That web search results were spotty and unreliable seemed a secondary concern.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps even more disconcerting, the integration of search and discovery brought about by the web held a greater and less well-understood, consequence for librarians: the self-reliant user. After holding a de facto

monopoly on the tools and techniques of scholarly research, the web was turning library users into the resource discovery equivalent of excited teenagers with freshly-minted driver's licenses.

Many librarians responded with the complicated mix of denial, relief, pride, and anxiety often felt by the parents of such teenagers. Those feelings became even more complicated with the introduction of and rapid adoption of Google in the late 1990s. Though early web search engines like Lycos and AltaVista had been embraced by many library users as alternatives to the hodgepodge of library-supplied search systems, their various limitations were such that librarians could rightly claim that users relying on those tools were missing much of the quality content purchased or licensed on their behalf. But Google was another story. That search engine's perceived speed, quality, and accuracy allowed it to quickly eclipse its many forebears and competitors. Its proprietary search algorithms offered faster, more comprehensive results, and many users quickly made it their default discovery tool. The company's later introduction of tools like Google Scholar that specifically targeted the academic community only deepened its inroads into the discovery landscape. So prevalent has Google become in discovery that the company name has morphed into a neologism, a verb synonymous with searching on the web.

### **Library Vendors Strike Back**

E-resource search tools provided by library systems vendors at the time of Google's early days relied primarily on federated search based on the Z39.50

protocol. Z39.50 offered the potential for sophisticated, highly-directed queries, but its complexity and inconsistent application across a variety of provider databases fell far short of its theoretical capabilities. It was a pre-web technology that often suffered from slow response times and failed searches. Hardly surprising, then, that many users, novices and more sophisticated searchers alike, took to Google for faster, reliable searching needs, even though it was searching primarily non-scholarly sites with a high degree of imprecision. The preference for Google's speed, recall, and convenience demonstrated the axiom that (to paraphrase an old Apple television commercial) the most powerful tool is the one people actually use.

Libraries and systems vendors eventually responded with newer, more sophisticated search options that made use of more modern technology to rival the speed and comprehensiveness that Google provided. The earliest attempts, such as North Carolina State University's adaptation of Endeca, a non-library discovery layer capable of ingesting MARC data, promised to "search and browse [the] . . . collection as quickly and easily as searching and browsing the web, while taking advantage of rich content and cutting-edge capabilities that no web search engine can match."<sup>2</sup> While Endeca and its ilk offered more visually interesting and helpful ways of finding library content, the universe of content searched was still restricted to those things covered in the library catalog. Just as in the pre-networked era, users who wanted to find journal literature or other electronic resources had to resort to other tools, completely separate from the catalog, to do so. The "rich content" that "no web

search engine can match" was, in fact, far poorer than advertised for many; though the content was doubtless more consistently scholarly than what the open web had to offer, speed, comprehensive recall, and convenience remained more important than many librarians wanted to acknowledge.

Contemporary commercial tools, such as ProQuest's Summon and EBSCO's EDS, offer a more expansive approach. These systems rely on a more Google-like method of harvesting and indexing content, with the promise of faster, more comprehensive results. In many real and meaningful ways, they do represent a significant advance. They are able to retrieve vetted scholarly resources from across disparate sources and display them in a variety of ways to users with many options for faceting and tailoring the result sets to the searcher's particular needs. Yet for all of their virtues, these systems still have serious limitations, many unknown to their users. In some instances, the search tool and the indexed content are both the property of the same company. Not all content available may be indexed by the particular search tool due to contractual limitations on data harvesting and there is also a natural incentive for the search tool to highlight the resources provided by the parent organization. Thus content weighting may skew in odd, unpredictable ways, highlighting newspaper articles, for example, when scholarly journals would better suit the user's needs, based on a formula that is either not transparent, not easily understood, or both. Moreover, few of these tools can index sources of content that are often of prime importance to undergraduate students in particular—items

created or shared by faculty on personal web pages or through course management systems like Blackboard or Canvas. While library vendor tools have come a long way indeed, the quest for a single-search solution that matches the perceived ease and recall of Google with the precision and quality of traditional library tools remains somewhat elusive.

## Changing the Conversation

I want to suggest that libraries are actually ill-served trying to compete with Google and that doing so is a tactical and strategic error. Google works remarkably well for finding answers to research questions at a certain level and pulling together large quantities of data on a topic. Indeed, Google and the resources it enables users to find have rendered our old ready-reference collections and services largely obsolete, although whether all of us wish to concede that is another matter. Rather than condemn Google or try to compete with it head to head, we should instead be grateful that it has relieved us of certain tasks that offered little value (even if they made certain librarians feel otherwise) and for following one of Ranganathan's five laws: Save the time of the reader. Some libraries have decided to leverage the power of Google to expose their libraries' catalogs in new ways. Wayne State University's libraries have been indexing millions of online catalog records into Google to make such resources easier for general web searchers to find. They report that catalog usage has increased threefold since the project began and are looking at Bing and Yahoo search engine

*(continued on page 8)*

## Reality Check..... Lost and Found: Have We Given up on Discovery (Yet)?

(continued from page 7)  
indexing in the future.<sup>3</sup>

Marshall McLuhan once noted that obsolescence never meant the end of anything; it is just the beginning of something else. Making peace with the reality that Google is, and will remain, the principal search tool for the largest number of researchers is not the same thing as giving up on the quest to provide good discovery tools. Instead, it is the recognition of a reality that should enable us to direct our energies and talents in different directions where they are more likely to have impact and benefit. One of the best ways for libraries to improve discovery, particularly of unique resources such as digitized or born-digital assets, is to create and expose good metadata for those items in the broadest possible way. Such items often represent some of the most unique and valuable scholarly resources in our collections, but limited web exposure through inadequate or inconsistent metadata hinders or even prevents discovery of these treasures. Librarians, working with scholars and students, can provide the necessary tools and techniques to help leverage Google or other discovery services to maximum effect.

Going forward, the library will need to set its sights on web-native technologies and new approaches to metadata that favor machine manipulation over traditional, less scalable means. Linked data, the management of research data sets (of any variety), electronic records management, and other growing areas of need will all require the best metadata for discoverability and long-term storage. Librarians' talents are better spent shaping initiatives like the

Bibliographic Framework Initiative (BIBFRAME) and working with new forms of authorities like ORCID than in chasing the chimera of the perfectly integrated discovery system that trumps Google.<sup>4</sup> That is not to say that we should let go of the notion of aiding discovery. Our institutions entrust us to spend vast sums of money on high-quality resources that our users should be able to find and access readily at the point of need. We have a professional obligation to make that happen as seamlessly as possible. But we certainly will not help users by offering tools that fall short of user expectations. The best course of action is to help the resources we provide find their way into users' discovery methods, whatever they may be.

[www.orcid.org/content/about-arcid](http://www.orcid.org/content/about-arcid)  
(accessed July 26, 2014).

### References and Notes

1. For more on this topic, see the the OCLC study *Perceptions of Libraries and Information Resources: A Report to the Membership* (Dublin, OH: OCLC, 2005), [www.oclc.org/content/dam/oclc/reports/pdfs/Percept\\_all.pdf](http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/oclc/reports/pdfs/Percept_all.pdf) (accessed July 25, 2014).
2. North Carolina State University Libraries, "Endeca at the NCSU Libraries," [www.lib.ncsu.edu/endeca](http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/endeca) (accessed June 24, 2014).
3. Wayne State University Libraries, *wsulibraries #wsulibraries #2013 #yearinreview*, [www.lib.wayne.edu/blog/files/2014/04/wsuls\\_annual\\_report\\_2013.pdf](http://www.lib.wayne.edu/blog/files/2014/04/wsuls_annual_report_2013.pdf) (accessed July 1, 2014).
4. "ORCID is an open, non-profit, community-based effort to provide a registry of unique researcher identifiers and a transparent method of linking research activities and outputs to the identifiers." ORCID,

---

*David Banush is Associate University Librarian for Access Services and Collection Management, Brown University Library, and can be reached at [david\\_banush@brown.edu](mailto:david_banush@brown.edu).*

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License.



# Interfaces .....

## A Nonagenarian Remembers

By Jean Weihs

I have been sent a book privately printed by the University of Toronto (U of T) Libraries for review in a Canadian periodical—the autobiography of a 95-year-old eminent retired Canadian librarian. Although I understand copies have been sent to the Canadian Association of Research Libraries and selected research libraries and some other libraries in the United States, few U.S. librarians are likely to read it. I decided to discuss some of its content in this column because it gives a picture of the enormous growth of university libraries in North America. It tells the story of the U of T Library housed in one building in the 1950s to the library system that is the third largest university library in North America today (Harvard and Yale are the largest).<sup>1</sup> The change in name from University of Toronto Library to University of Toronto Libraries reflects this growth.

The book is *From Barley Field to Academe*, an autobiography by Robert Blackburn, who was the assistant librarian at the University of Toronto from 1947 to 1954 and its chief librarian from 1954 to 1981, a period that set the stage for the library's enormous growth.<sup>2</sup> Some of the content relates to U.S. libraries as he studied at Columbia University for his master's degree and was fortunate in having Dr. Alexander Flexner (who had a cottage at Magnetawan, Ontario) arrange a grant from the Carnegie Corporation's Commonwealth Fund to go on a six-month tour of libraries—broken into two parts of three months each: an

American tour in 1951 and a European tour from November 1951 to January 1952.

In his American tour, Blackburn saw some 60 academic libraries in more than 30 cities and met many prominent librarians, such as Dr. Julian Boyd at Princeton, Dr. Keyes Metcalf at Harvard, and Donald Coney, University Librarian Emeritus, University of California at Berkeley. One of the important topics discussed in his American tour was whether to allow open access for students.

“Although open access resulted in some loss of books, the librarians considered the losses to be outweighed by the benefits derived by the students. Others believed open shelves offered only a limited advantage in a medium-sized library and that the advantage would diminish as the collection grew. In a really large library open access was a disadvantage . . . that a large library, in order to give good service, must turn eventually to closed shelves and more efficient shelving.”<sup>3</sup>

Coney told him that Fremont Rider's way of saving space at Wesleyan University was by using a guillotine to cut off the margins of books and about Ralph Ellsworth's new kind of modular building at the University of Iowa. Blackburn also was told about the many inventions of Ralph Shaw (1907-1972). Wikipedia provides a good description of these inventions.



Jean Weihs

I have a very special interest in this book because I was hired by the library in 1953 after graduating from the University of Toronto's Library School and left the library in 1959 to give birth to my son. Blackburn became Chief Librarian in 1954 and I was unaware of him until he assumed this position. I was, however, very aware of Stewart Wallace, the head of the library when I was hired, who seemed a terrifying figure. If a female staff member came to work with bare legs in the hot summer weather to a library with no air conditioning, he sent her home to put on stockings. When his very efficient secretary, Julia Jarvis, went on a holiday, as the youngest member of the staff I was seconded to do her work. This temporary move was intimidating for me and probably very tedious for Wallace because I could not take shorthand and I typed with two fingers.

### Qualifications for Librarians (Chiefs and Lesser Beings)

I was surprised to learn Wallace did not have academic credentials in library science and spent most of his time writing and editing volumes and articles about Canadian history, his academic background and special area

(continued on page 10)

## Interfaces..... A Nonagenarian Remembers

(continued from page 9)

of study. He apparently did not have great interest in the library profession because he reluctantly became a president of the Canadian Library Association in 1951 and sent Blackburn to take his place at an important professional meeting in the United States. In 1947 when the University of Toronto decided the library must have an assistant librarian, the search was limited to assistant professors and only when this search failed did the search committee turn to Blackburn, a candidate with degrees in librarianship. Librarians may not also been held in high esteem in the U.S. in the nineteenth century as Daniel Coit Gilman (1831-1908) resigned his first job at the Yale University library because he was expected to stoke coal.

Before Blackburn took command only Wallace was called "librarian." All other staff members were called "library assistants." Blackburn insisted on the title of "chief librarian" so that qualified or experienced staff could then be "librarians." I was surprised to learn that only one other staff member besides Blackburn and me had a library science degree at that time. In 1953 all staff members except Wallace, Blackburn, the caretaker, and two "stack boys" were women, most of whom were unmarried. When I was three months pregnant, I almost miscarried and was put to bed for a length of time. No one took my place, so I had to return to work to train someone else to assume my duties when my doctor believed the danger had passed. The women in my department were embarrassed by my large stomach and tried not to look below my neck.

Under Wallace's leadership the library had a separate reading room

for women and a separate wicket for women at the loan desk. There were only two telephones in the building—one for the librarian and one in a hallway for staff. After Blackburn assumed the Chief Librarian position, he hired library science graduates, who included some male librarians, and modernized many procedures.

My salary in 1953 was \$2,400 per year, the same salary my fiancé received on graduation with an engineering degree the same year. I was hired as a bibliographer in the Order Department and was assigned the responsibility of procuring books in specific subjects in which I had an academic background. In his U.S. tour, Blackburn found that most of the book selection was done through recommendations from professors, although the librarian was held responsible for errors and omissions. This was theoretically true of the U of T, but this depended on the professor whom a particular faculty had designated as their library liaison. Two professors visited me regularly; I never saw the others despite my repeated efforts to communicate with them, so I used my own judgment for purchases in those subjects.

### Mechanization of Library Procedures

The future does not come as quickly as many specialists expect. Blackburn notes, "At the beginning of the 1960s, many university presidents had been infected by the notion that computers were soon to make books and libraries obsolete, thereby relieving their institutions of the growing burden of library costs."<sup>4</sup> Even today, 60 years later pundits are still predicting the death of books and libraries. The University of Toronto Library (UTL), together

with Yale Medical Library and Florida Atlantic University, designed the first library print-chain for catalogue records. This development led to the Ontario New Universities Library Project which allowed UTL to create catalogues for five new universities in Ontario. Because of this work, UTL was invited to participate in discussions in the U.S. concerning mechanized cataloguing. In January 1985 the Library of Congress established the Automation Planning Committee with Ritvars Bregzis, UTL Associate Librarian for Bibliographic Systems and Technical Services, as one of its members. The ultimate decision by this committee was "for a cooperative scheme using a machine-readable format (MARC) very much like the one Bregzis had designed and used in our five-library project, and it became the world-wide standard."<sup>5</sup>

When the Library of Congress had its new cataloguing scheme ready for testing, UTL and 13 U.S. libraries were invited to participate in a pilot project. "In 1967 the Library of Congress delegate to the International Federation of Library Associations, in Toronto, reported that Toronto had been the most active participant."<sup>6</sup>

In 1969 the library acquired a huge Sigma 7 computer with "rows and rows of large cabinets that required special air conditioning and a false floor to contain their cables. ... As far as I know our library was the first anywhere to have its own computer."<sup>7</sup> (I remember taking my students to see this computer. We had to remove our shoes and walk carefully without making jarring motions.) In 1971 the university separated the administration of the computer and its staff from the Technical Services Division, creating a new

division known as UTLAS. Eventually the computer ran day and night serving customer libraries as far away as Japan. (I also remember talking to cataloguers who had visited Japan trying to develop ways of using the Japanese language in the UTLAS system.)

When the decision was made in 1976 to close the card catalogue, the initial step was to introduce, in addition to the card catalogue, a microfiche catalogue—three sets of microfiche (author, title, and subject) beside each microfiche reader. “Toronto was the first large library system anywhere to have its whole catalogue in machine-readable form.”<sup>8</sup> The chapter ends with a tale about the demise UTLAS and Blackburn’s opposition to the adoption of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* (he did not win that argument).<sup>9</sup>

## Autobiographies by and Biographies about Librarians

A search of both the University of Toronto and the Toronto Public Libraries catalogues revealed many autobiographies by librarians and even more biographies about librarians. Many of these works are less than 100 pages in length and published locally by a library or a small press. Books with more than 100 pages appeared to fall into two categories. The first category consists of substantial works published locally. A good example of this is *Book Guy: A Librarian in the Peace* (288 pages), an autobiography that includes Howard Overend’s 20-year career as a bookmobile librarian in northern British Columbia (by coincidence the author was born the same year as Blackburn).<sup>10</sup> There are also several biographies published by university libraries, such as the

Blackburn book. In the second category are works published by internationally recognized publishers usually about well-known librarians, for example, *Eric Moon: The Life and Library Times* (422 pages) published by McFarlane and Company.<sup>11</sup> Scarecrow Press should also be commended for publishing a number of biographies.

The Blackburn book made me realize even more strongly how important autobiographies are for preserving library history. Such books have the virtue of revealing little known facts and, on the other hand, the possibility of providing a one-sided view of happenings and personalities. Biographies, however well researched, may miss the telling points that might be revealed in an autobiography, but may offer a more balanced appreciation of past events.

Let’s have more of them!

## References and Notes

1. *Wikipedia*, s.v. “University of Toronto Libraries,” (accessed July 27, 2013); Paul McCormick, “Preserving Canada’s Cultural Heritage: University of Toronto Libraries,” *Feliciter* 54, no. 4, (2008): 178.
2. Robert H. Blackburn, *From Barley Field to Academe* (Toronto, University of Toronto Libraries, 2014). Just before this article was ready to send to the *Technicalities*’ editor, the University of Toronto Libraries responded to inquiries it had received about the book’s sale. It is available from the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, 129 St George Street, Toronto, ON M5S 1A5 Canada. ISSN 978-0-7727-6095-1 (cloth) \$35.00 + \$5.00 shipping in Canada and the U.S., \$10.00

elsewhere.

3. *Ibid.*, 169-70.
4. *Ibid.*, 218.
5. *Ibid.*, 222.
6. *Ibid.*, 223.
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Ibid.*, 225.
9. *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules*. Prepared by the American Library Association, the Library of Congress, the Library Association, and the Canadian Library Association. North American text (Chicago: ALA, 1967).
10. Howard Overend, *Book Guy: A Librarian in the Peace* (Victoria, B.C.: TouchWood Editions, 2011). See *Technicalities* 22, no. 6 (Nov./Dec. 2002): 17-18 for my review of this book.
11. Kenneth F. Kister, *Eric Moon: The Life and Library Times* (Jefferson, NC: McFarlane, 2002). See *Technicalities* 22, no. 6 (Nov./Dec. 2002): 17 for my review of this book.

---

*Jean Weihs is a retired library science professor and author of numerous books. She can be reached at [jean.weihs@gmail.com](mailto:jean.weihs@gmail.com).*

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License.



# Continuities .....

## The Debate over Short-Term Loan Pricing

By C. Derrik Hiatt

In May 2014, a letter from the Boston Library Consortium was published in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*.<sup>1</sup> The letter brought attention to the fact that a handful of publishers had recently announced an increase in their prices for the short-term loan of e-books, most of them more than doubling the cost of a one-day short-term loan. Although the publishers' price increases had been announced previously by ProQuest, the letter in the *Chronicle* seemed to catch many by surprise. Some passionate discussion followed on the *Chronicle* website and in e-mail discussion lists.

About a month later, at the 2014 American Library Association Annual Conference, ProQuest hosted a discussion session for librarians and publishers to have a face-to-face dialogue about demand-driven acquisition (DDA). Approximately 50 people attended, including mostly librarians, but also a number of publisher representatives, and several e-book specialists from ProQuest. The discussion, which remained civil throughout, avoided the topic of prices, focusing instead on librarians explaining how their respective institutions are using DDA and short-term loans, and publishers explaining some of the challenges they face in supporting this acquisition model.

Unfortunately (but not surprisingly), no clear answers emerged from the discussion. For my part, I cannot understand how publishers can talk about declining revenue when it was apparent at the meeting that libraries are actually spending more with DDA. I was also disappointed that some of the publisher representatives seemed opposed to

changing their budgeting model. That complaint fell on the frustrated ears of librarians who have already had to change their own budgeting practices in order to accommodate DDA. But one final suggestion seemed to be well-received by all parties; Kari Paulson, ProQuest's Vice President and General Manager of E-books, encouraged everyone to study the data to make informed decisions.

### Difference between DDA and Short-Term Loans

Demand-driven acquisition (also called patron-driven acquisition) has been around since at least the late 1990s, but seems to have gained steam in just the past few years.<sup>2</sup> In June 2014, the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) released a recommended practice for demand-driven acquisition of monographs, indicating that the acquisition model has increased in prominence.<sup>3</sup> Specifically at issue in the letter from the Boston Library Consortium (BLC) is publishers' pricing for short-term loans. Short-term loans (or STLs) are a component of DDA. They allow libraries to pay for a user's limited-time access to an e-book. A typical STL might cover a single user session or a 24-hour lease or sometimes up to a week of access. Usually after a preset number of STLs of a given e-book, that e-book is automatically purchased at the full list price.

The debate at hand centers on what is a fair price to charge for this type of limited use. Initially, the average cost of a one-day STL hovered around 10 to 15 percent of the book's list price,



C. Derrik Hiatt

though the actual percentages have always varied widely by publisher. Among the handful of publishers whose price increases prompted the letter from the BLC, most had raised their price for a one-day loan to 35 percent of list price. I thus have some sympathy with the BLC. I can understand how a sudden doubling of prices would feel like price-gouging and could easily generate an emotional reaction.

### Growing Pains

A colleague of mine, also present at the ProQuest-hosted discussion, observed that librarians have accepted DDA as a stable acquisition model, but publishers still seem to consider it experimental. The main theme that seemed to emerge from the publisher side of the discussion was a difficulty in balancing sales of newly-published front list with older backlist titles. The business of book publishing has historically relied on front list sales, and publishers have based their budget models on projections of their books' likely sales within the first year or two of publication. DDA turns that model on its head, because it means libraries can simply provide access to front list books without actually purchasing them unless or until usage triggers a purchase. By exposing the

publishers' unpurchased backlist titles via the library catalog, DDA increases the likelihood of older books actually generating some revenue.

As stated before, it is difficult to understand how publishers could be seeing a decline in revenue, given that DDA has not decreased library spending. At my institution, DDA has led to an *increase* in monograph spending. If we are still spending the money, then why do some publishers claim that revenue is declining? I do find it very plausible that revenue on front list titles is declining. It seems possible that when a publisher blames STL for falling revenue, the real problem is that they have not yet figured out how to balance the lower front list revenue and higher backlist revenue. STLs also reduce the amount of money exchanged per unit transaction, so the DDA model may simply be too new for the lower average transaction amount to have caught up with the full-price purchase model to which publishers are accustomed.<sup>4</sup> A publisher representative at the ProQuest-hosted discussion said he expected it will take years for publishers to understand this new revenue pattern.

Librarians who have implemented a DDA program know about budget problems. We have had to change budget projections and scrambled when projections were wrong. We have had to form new procedures. We have had to study reading habits to try to learn how our patrons are using this new medium. If a publisher's complaint about the changing business model is meant as a way of asking for patience, we should be sympathetic, because we have been there. But I fear some publishers use this complaint as an attempt to resist change. Yes, it is new. Yes, it is painful. But it can be done.

## What Is Fair?

For years, publishers have profited from libraries' speculative purchasing of books. Libraries have paid full price for print books; some get used frequently, others not at all. Now the technology exists to allow libraries to purchase only those books that are actually used. It seems that some publishers only now understand the implications and are scrambling for a way to cling to the past. In a *Chronicle* article following up on the BLC letter, writer Avi Wolfman-Arent quotes a publisher representative as saying that "A monograph could get used nine times, and a publisher still wouldn't get list price. Nine times? That's huge for a monograph."<sup>5</sup> Nine uses would naturally seem "huge" to a publisher accustomed to receiving full list price for books that never get used. But according to NISO's recommended practice for DDA, most libraries using DDA ultimately use it to *purchase* books.<sup>6</sup> So in the publisher's example, if a purchase is triggered on the tenth use, the library will have paid 10 percent of list price for each STL, plus the full price on the tenth use. Thus the publisher would have received 190 percent of list price, or more (depending on the publisher's STL pricing).<sup>7</sup>

This begs the question of what is fair compensation for short-term use of an e-book. Should a library pay full price for a book that will be read only once? What percent of a book's list price should a library pay for one person to read that book for 10-15 minutes? Should short-term loan pricing be based on the amount of the book actually read or viewed? If a reader scrolls through 10 percent of a book, should the library pay 10 percent of the list price? What if the reader needs only the last chapter, but has to

scroll through the entire book to get there? Should all different types of use of an e-book be counted equally? Of course if the answer were simple, we would have found it by now.

## Speak Up

In conversations about the BLC letter, I have heard both positive and negative views—verbal applause for BLC taking a stand, criticism for their being so public about it. Regardless of what you think of their approach, there is a valuable lesson here. Speak up. Take part in the discussion and let your institution's voice be heard.

The NISO recommended practice for DDA states that "libraries, publishers, and aggregators must be committed to working together to establish long-term sustainable models that highlight mutual benefits."<sup>8</sup> The problem we currently face is that no one seems to know what sustainable DDA looks like. And what is sustainable for a library may not be sustainable for a publisher. An adversarial approach seems unlikely find the answer.

Even if you decide not to participate in the broader discussion, each library should communicate their needs to their content providers. Have a real discussion with your publisher representatives. Historically, libraries have been a passive player in the academic book market, collecting what has been independently produced. But in this era, content providers (publishers and vendors alike) are struggling with changes as much as libraries are. What is more, most content providers seem willing to listen to libraries as customers. Talk to your providers about how your patrons use e-books and how your library uses DDA. If you think

*(continued on page 14)*

## Continuities .....

### The Debate over Short-Term Loan Pricing

(continued from page 13)

they are charging too much for a short-term loan, explain why. The publishers need to know their customers' perspective so that they know how to build and shape their own DDA programs.

#### Gather Data ("Eat Less, Exercise More")

At the 2014 conference of the North American Serials Interest Group (NASIG), the closing "Vision Session" (keynote address) was given by Jenica Rogers, Director of Libraries at the State University of New York at Potsdam, noted for pulling her library out of the American Chemical Society's journal package two years ago.<sup>9</sup> In her address on being prepared to make difficult decisions, Rogers compared gathering data to the advice "Eat less, exercise more" -- we hear it a lot, we often just ignore it, but it really is good for us and will make a difference. Rogers added that data can shout when our words can only whisper.<sup>10</sup>

Maybe because we are librarians, it seems we do a lot of loud whispering, as if repeatedly making the same unsupported assertions will eventually get our point across. Instead, we need to quietly present the data, and let it do the shouting for us. Gather what data you can to tell the story of how e-books are used at your library. How many of your e-books are getting used? How many minutes is the average book used? And so on.

At ALA I had a brief discussion with an e-book publisher concerning their STL prices. Because I had gathered the data beforehand, I was able to tell that publisher that although their e-books accounted for 16 percent of our overall e-book use, they accounted for 21 percent of our overall spend, and their new pricing would have made it 35 percent of our overall spend. That bit

of data got my point across much better than if I had simply said, "Your new STL price seems inordinately high."

Be prepared with data when you talk with publisher representatives. Know how much you spend on their products, and what the value of those products is to you. Corollary to that, become familiar with what data your e-book DDA vendor provides. If something you need is not provided in the administrator module, ask for it. Even if the vendor is unable to provide the needed data at that time, they will at least better understand what information their customers need.

Some librarians may be tempted not to get involved and to wait for the market to take shape on its own. This approach (or lack of approach) will likely lead to customer dissatisfaction. Talk to your publisher sales representatives and tell them about your library's needs. Explain how you are using DDA. Let them know what price point you think is fair and why. Gather your data and use it; let the evidence speak. Get involved and help shape the e-book market into what you think it should look like.

#### References

1. Susan Stearns and John Unsworth, letter to the editor, *Chronicle of Higher Education* (May 27, 2014), <http://chronicle.com/blogs/letters/ebook-pricing-hikes-amount-to-price-gouging> (accessed July 14, 2014).
2. Sue Polanka, "Patron-Driven Acquisition," *Booklist* 105, no. 9/10 (Jan. 1/15, 2009): 121; Dracine Hodges, Cyndi Preston, and Marsha J. Hamilton, "Resolving the Challenge of E-Books," *Collection Management* 35, no. 3/4 (2010): 196-200.
3. *Demand Driven Acquisition of Monographs: A Recommended Practice of the National Information Standards Organization*, approved

- June 24, 2014 NISO RP-20-2014, <http://www.niso.org/publications/rp/rp-20-2014> (accessed July 14, 2014).
4. *Ibid.*, 6.
5. Avi Wolfman-Arent, "College Libraries Push Back as Publishers Raise Some E-Book Prices," *Chronicle of Higher Education* (June 16, 2014), paragraph 16, <http://chronicle.com/article/College-Libraries-Push-Back-as/147085> (accessed July 14, 2014).
6. *Demand Driven Acquisition of Monographs*, 6.
7. Terry Simpkins, comment on *Chronicle* article, <http://chronicle.com/article/College-Libraries-Push-Back-as/147085/#comment-1455566450> (accessed July 14, 2014).
8. *Demand Driven Acquisition of Monographs*, 1.
9. See Jenica Rogers, "Walking Away from the American Chemical Society," Attempting Elegance (blog), Sept. 12, 2012, [www.attemptingelegance.com/?p=1765](http://www.attemptingelegance.com/?p=1765) (accessed July 14, 2014).
10. Jenica P. Rogers, "Reaching New Horizons: Gathering the Resources Librarians Need to Make Hard Decisions," presentation at the 29th Conference of the North American Serials Interest Group, Fort Worth, Texas, May 4, 2014, [www.slideshare.net/NASIG/reaching-new-horizons-gathering-the-resources-librarians-need-to-make-hard-decisions](http://www.slideshare.net/NASIG/reaching-new-horizons-gathering-the-resources-librarians-need-to-make-hard-decisions) (accessed July 14, 2014).

---

*Derrick Hiatt is Electronic Resources Librarian at Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC. He can be reached at [hiattcd@wfu.edu](mailto:hiattcd@wfu.edu).*

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License.



# Book Reviews .....

**Bluh, Pamela, and Cindy Hepfer, eds. *The Institutional Repository: Benefits and Challenges*. ALCTS Papers on Library Technical Services and Collections 18. Chicago: Association for Library Collections and Technical Services, 2013. 131 pp. ISBN: 978-0-8389-8661-5 (softcover) \$58.00; ISBN: 978-0-8389-8662-2 (downloadable PDF) \$34.20.**

The contents of *The Institutional Repository: Benefits and Challenges* grew out of a 2009 symposium that was reframed as a series of four webinars, three of which were adapted as chapters and supplemented by three additional invited papers in the volume under review. These chapters were released separately online as they were completed and are now gathered in a print edition.

The opening chapter by Greg Tananbaum, originating as a keynote address, offers an overview of the promises seen in the institutional repository (IR) movement and how well they have been met so far. Tananbaum sees mixed success. The effect on scholarly publishing has been to open up new channels of communication for scholars and to provide some restraint on the monopolizing tendencies of publishers, but Tananbaum laments the lack of variety in the formats being served in repositories and their limited use for managing dynamic information sources needed in active research. He notes that IRs are providing a locus for representing the range and depth of institutions' activities, but criticizes the underdeveloped and haphazard use of IRs as publishing platforms. He sees the expanding distribution of free content from IRs as an undeniable success for open access, but one offset by the difficulty librarians have

had recruiting content from faculty and finding creative ways to leverage IR content "to advance the institution's mission and create internal efficiencies" (8).

The second chapter, "Approaches to Marketing an Institutional Repository to Campus" by Marisa L. Ramirez and Michael D. Miller, reports on a survey of marketing techniques undertaken by California Polytechnic University—San Luis Obispo. Acknowledging the challenge of getting a campus community to engage fully with an IR, the authors counsel careful market analysis and a diverse set of marketing approaches. The analysis needs to identify key players and partnerships, and solutions that the supplier and consumer bases for the IR will regard as effective and affordable. The marketing effort needs to employ multiple channels and targeted messaging, all subject to constant monitoring and adjustment. One consequence of the complexity of the marketing task is the variety of solutions and a redefinition of roles: "Each institution will have its own unique blend of marketing techniques that resonate with its faculty and students. . . . Effectively marketing the IR opens up new opportunities for libraries to recast their role and utility on campus—as educators, collaborators, and innovators" (35).

"Perpetual Beta: Assessing the Institutional Repository" by Allison Sivak and Leah Vanderjagt discusses the varied ways of measuring the success of an IR, noting that simple item counts are a poor way to judge that success. The authors call instead for a careful consideration of the IR's mission and goals, identification of the factors and contexts which will best coordinate the IR's goals with its accomplishments, and a vision that sees beyond

the library's own goals to what campus users are looking for from technology services.

Marilyn S. Billings' "Institutional Repositories, Libraries, and the Academy" provides another overview of the IR landscape, similar to Tananbaum's in scope and themes, but focusing more on a positive description of what IRs can accomplish. Her article touches on a range of topics—IR goals, functionality, implementation, staffing, sustainability, and marketing—including some covered in greater detail in other chapters. Billings' piece can be read in counterpoint to Tananbaum's more critical account of IRs' achievements.

The fifth chapter, Ellen Finnie Duranceau and Sue Kriegsman's "Implementing Open Access Policies Using Institutional Repositories," narrows the focus again, this time to an examination of how policies premised on the existence of a campus IR can help drive changes in the world of scholarly publishing. The authors report that campus policies that direct faculty to stipulate permission to post to an IR when publishing their work are more effective in promoting the open access agenda than those that passively align with publishers' access policies. Ensuring that policies win acceptance and support is a complex task and benefits particularly from libraries taking an active role in gathering and describing content for the IR and identifying ways to leverage that content for other campus units and functions such as faculty activity reporting.

The last chapter, "Copyright and Institutional Repositories" by Lisa A. Macklin, is an admirably clear and concrete discussion of the various copyright issues that IRs must address.

*(continued on page 16)*

## Book Reviews .....

(continued from page 15)

These fall into two areas of concern. The first is the right of authors and the IR to deposit and distribute various types of content. The second relates to the changing the balance between authors and publishers by providing faculty with a clearer understanding of their rights as authors and of the varying rights demanded by different publishers. The *Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC)* author addendum, similar to the permission-based policies advocated by Duranceau and Kriegsman, is cited as a valuable tool for securing better rights for campus authors and better access for information seekers. Macklin discusses the challenges inherent in this work of changing attitudes and longstanding arrangements.

Overall, this collection provides useful analyses of issues faced by IRs and guidance for IR creation, development, and management. It ranges from generalizing overviews of the IR landscape to comparative discussions of IR implementations and open access policies at specific institutions. One theme that recurs in several of the papers is the need for a clearer consensus on the purpose of an IR. Libraries tend to see IRs as a tool for pursuing their mission of preserving resources and providing access to resources contributed by faculty, while faculty look to IRs as sites for active collaborative workspace, and look to libraries for metadata creation and management. The gap between these two visions of the IR needs to be bridged to ensure that all parties understand the IR's promise and can agree on its success.

*Stephen Hearn, Metadata Strategist, University Libraries, University of Minnesota.*

**Campbell, James W. P. *The Library: A World History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013. 328 pp. ISBN 978-0-226-09281-2 (hardcover; alkaline paper) \$75.00**

This is a wonderful book with gorgeous photographs by Will Pryce. At first glance its glossy heavy paper and large size suggest a coffee table book, but it is much more. Not only does it have glowing pictures on each page, but it tells “the complete story of the development of library buildings from the first libraries in Mesopotamia . . . to the monumental libraries of the modern world” (19). Through the ages libraries have been built with a particular socio-political intent and the changing format of books has effected library design and their shelving requirements. “Libraries have always been designed not only to help readers find the books they want, but also to preserve their collections from the great enemies of books, namely dust, damp, mould, insects, vermin, theft and fires” (29).

Chapter 1, “Lost Beginnings: Libraries in the Ancient World,” covers the years ca. 5400 BCE (the beginning of writing) to 600 CE (the fall of the Roman Empire). It starts with the libraries in Mesopotamia, where the first writing system was developed; moves on to ancient Egypt where papyrus was first made and the library at Alexandria was built; then to ancient Greece where the Phoenician alphabet was adopted; to Turkey and the library at Pergamum (ca. 197-60 BCE); and finally to Roman libraries where the first public libraries were established in 59 BCE.

Chapter 2, “Cloisters, Codices and Chests: Libraries in the Middle Ages,” is devoted to the years from 600 to 1499. Campbell notes “the architectural form of early medieval libraries

is not widely understood, a situation not helped by their exaggerated and frequently erroneous depiction in films and literary fiction” (61). Later in the chapter he states, “One of the finest fictional portrayals of a medieval library can be found in Umberto Eco’s *The Name of the Rose*” (74). The chapter starts with libraries in South-east Asia and Japan and the invention of printing in Korea, followed by a fairly short discussion of Islamic libraries before discussing the medieval library in the West, including monastic libraries, which led to the establishment of university libraries. “Much of what we take for granted in library design appears to have been missing in this period” (87).

The next chapter, “Cupboards, Chains and Stalls: Libraries in the 16th Century,” starts with a discussion of libraries in China and the invention of paper. The libraries of the Italian Renaissance are described as well as libraries in England. Campbell devotes several pages to a description of lecterns, chains, and stalls.

Campbell states “The 17th century marks the beginning of modern library architecture” (121) in Chapter 4, “Wall, Domes and Alcoves: Libraries in the 17th Century.” The declining cost of books led to larger collections and the development of wall systems, which are described in this chapter. “If walls were going to have shelves above the reach of a stepladder then galleries were required” (127). Included in this chapter are descriptions of the first round libraries.

Chapter 5, “Angels, Frescoes and Secret Doors: Libraries in the 18th Century,” the longest chapter in the book, describes Baroque and Rococo libraries, “a period when library architecture was seen as especially important and a great deal of time and money was

lavished on it" (155). Many European libraries are described, such as two royal libraries in Portugal (Biblioteca Joanina and the Mafra Palace library); followed by the Hofbibliothek in Vienna, the Biblioteca Casanatense and the Biblioteca Angelica both in Rome, the Melk Abbey, the Altenburg Abbey library, the Abbey of St Florian all in Austria, and others.

Campbell starts Chapter 6, "Iron Stacks, Gaslights and Card Catalogues: Libraries in the 19th Century," by examining the ostentatious display of private book collections in the 18th and 19th centuries. "No substantial house in Britain could be constructed without its library, designed to show off the patron's collection of books" (209). This chapter includes somewhat brief descriptions of many European and American libraries of importance including some national libraries, such as the Library of Congress, the Bibliothèque nationale, and the National Library of Finland. "The 19th century saw the emergence of a new figure in library design: the professional librarian" (230) and Campbell uses Antonio Panizzi as the example of the emerging profession. There is also a subsection "Catalogues and Library Fittings" and another on "Librarians Versus Architects."

Chapter 7, "Electricity, Concrete and Steel: Libraries in the 20th Century," describes the changing styles of library architecture during this century. Gaslight used in the hundred years before the 20th century "created fumes and heat, which collected at the top of buildings and damaged the books" (255). A few libraries had installed electric lighting in the latter years of the 19th century and Campbell describes the slow general acceptance of electric lighting as the 20th century progressed. The chapter includes

descriptions of libraries in many countries while discussing the architectural challenges presented by changing styles of architecture and developing technology. "The invention of reinforced concrete in the 1890s and the development of mechanical excavators in the late 19th and early 20th centuries opened new architectural possibilities" (283) and he uses the TU Delft Library in the Netherlands to illustrate this.

In the final chapter, "The Future of Libraries in the Electronic Age," Campbell states "It is clearly too early to get any sort of historical perspective on the architecture of the 21st century. This chapter will examine some key libraries built in the first decade of the 21st century and ask whether there is really a future for the library and, if so, what form it might take" (289). The last pictures in this book full of gorgeous libraries is of the Liyuan Library in China built in 2012 with exterior walls of flexed twigs wedged between rusty steel rails.

There are six triple-column pages of notes and four triple-column pages of index both in small print. This book should be in every library and while it is certainly not a book you will take on the subway on your way to work, it would be an attractive addition to your home and a source of interesting information for your understanding of libraries and suggestions for travel.

*Jean Weihs, retired library science professor and book author, Toronto, Canada.*

**El-Sherbini, Magda. *RDA: Resource Description and Access: Strategies for Implementation*. Chicago: ALA Editions, 2013. x, 394 pp.; bibl. ISBN 978-0-8389-1168-6**

**(softcover), \$65.00 (ALA members \$58.50).**

When writing a review it is important to state any factors that might reflect on a personal connection with the book in hand. I was the chair of the Joint Steering Committee that developed and published the 1988 revision of the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR2)*.<sup>1</sup> As a result I have some reservations about *RDA: Resource Description and Access* similar to those stated elsewhere by Michael Gorman, the editor of *AACR2*.<sup>2</sup> These contrary opinions will not form any part of this review. I also write books about cataloguing usually as a co-author with Sheila Intner. The fifth edition of *Standard Cataloging for School and Public Libraries* will be published by Libraries Unlimited in December 2014. This forthcoming book is not in competition with the book to be reviewed. The Intner/Weihs book is a teaching guide that deals not only with descriptive cataloguing but with subject analysis and technical services department management as well, essentially a textbook, while the El-Sherbini book is directed only at the application of *RDA* rules and will be useful to those the cataloguers who have to apply the rules.

Magda El-Sherbini, head of the Ohio State University Libraries' Cataloging Department, describes this book as "an introduction to *RDA*, and is not intended to cover every aspect or discuss every nuance in detail. It is rather a practical handbook addressed to those who have heard about *RDA* but are not sure what to think of it" (ix). "The book describes the status of *RDA* as of January 2012. Many of the issues have not been settled yet, and many are likely to go forward. The

*(continued on page 18)*

## Book Reviews .....

(continued from page 17)

actual *RDA* implementation in the first quarter of 2013, when all the revisions and rewriting of *RDA Toolkit* will be completed” (x). We know, of course, that this final sentence is only partially true. *RDA* was implemented at the end of March 2013, but a meeting of the Joint Steering Committee for Development of *RDA* took place in fall 2013, which effected further rule revisions.

Chapter 1, “From AACR2 to *RDA*,” begins by describing the content and providing a contrast between *AACR2* and *RDA* and makes a case for the need for a new cataloguing code ending with lists of *RDA* objectives, *RDA* principles, and *RDA*’s impact on cataloguing. The title of Chapter 2, “The Differences between *AACR2* and *RDA*,” describes its content with the differences listed in side by side columns. Chapter 3, “*RDA* Implementation Strategies,” includes training tips for cataloguers; decision-making by the cataloguing agency; integrating *RDA* records into an existing catalogue; exporting *RDA* records to a local online public access catalogue; and *RDA*’s effect on these catalogues; strategies for implementing the new MARC 21 fields; and many examples of MARC coding. Chapter 4, “Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records,” is a good place to begin to understand *RDA*’s new terminology. Chapter 5, “Identifying Manifestations and Items,” begins with general principles, followed by a description of the individual elements of the description and specific instructions for electronic resources, serials, integrating resources, sound recording, cartographic materials, and related manifestations. A very useful list of examples of 336 (content type), 337 (media type), and 338 (carrier type) tags—a new *RDA* MARC requirement—is included in

this chapter. The next chapter, “Identifying Works and Expressions and the Entity Responsible for Creating Them,” is a long chapter with many examples of MARC-tagged records for different types of works. It also deals with various types of names, the new MARC 21 tags for name authority files, and relationships. Chapter 7 is devoted to the *RDA Toolkit*, published by the co-publishers of *RDA*, which is available as an online subscription. The chapter provides lessons on how to effectively use the *RDA Toolkit*. The final chapter is very useful. It provides 85 pages of examples of *RDA* MARC-coded records that demonstrate 62 bibliographic records for a variety of book and nonbook materials and 14 examples of authority records. Chapter 9, ten pages in length, consists of three checklists: one for copy cataloguers; one for original cataloguers; and one for authority control.

Each chapter ends with a list of references and the book also has a four-page bibliography and a 16-page double column index.

This is a very useful work that is well-constructed. However, people who catalogue a wide assortment of nonbook materials should be warned that only the most common types of materials are included. Those searching for directions on cataloguing models, toys, microscope slides, charts, flash cards, etc., will need to look elsewhere. I also found the index frustrating to use. I hope the publishers did not farm the index out to an independent firm that did not include a professional cataloguer—as often happens in the publishing world.

### References

1. Michael Gorman and Paul W. Winkler, eds. *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2nd ed., 1988

rev. (Chicago: ALA, 1988).

2. *RDA: Resource Description and Access* (Chicago: American Library Association; Ottawa: Canadian Library Association; London: Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals, 2010-).

*Jean Weihs, retired library science professor and book author, Toronto, Canada.*

**Fosmire, Michael. *Sudden Selector's Guide to Physics Resources*. ALCTS/CMS Sudden Selector's Series. Chicago: American Library Association, 2013. 95 pp. ISBN 978-0-8389-8620-2 (softcover) \$28.50. ISBN 978-0-8389-9586-0 (downloadable PDF) \$13.50.**

Learning physics at any level can be daunting, so a librarian without a physics background who is assigned to select materials and provide support for a physics department understandably may feel intimidated. As indicated in the series title, that is exactly for whom the *Sudden Selector's Guide to Physics Resources* has been written. Many physics librarians are the only one of their kind at a particular institution. Even if they work with other science librarians, the assigned areas of focus and selection are unique to each. This guide is like having a very unintimidating paper mentor. Author Michael Fosmire has undergraduate and master's degrees in physics, an MLIS, plus over a dozen years as a science librarian at Purdue University. That knowledge and experience, matched with his easy writing style, make this a solid addition to the *Sudden Selector's Series*. The book is encouragingly thin at just under 100 pages and is well

laid out for its reader. For such a short resource, it is incredibly dense with useful suggestions and information. Beyond focusing on collection development, Fosmire makes recommendations for how to stay up-to-date with physics topics, gives suggestions for how to interact with physics researchers, and describes issues about which physics librarians need to be aware.

Fosmire's book is not a grocery list that every physics librarian should follow item by item, but instead is a map of the physics librarian's landscape. Fosmire recognizes that his readers will be at various types and sizes of institutions, so he focuses on providing enough information on each resource that the reader can make an informed decision based on the researchers being supported and on the institutional budget. Starting with the first chapter "What is Physics?," Fosmire gives quick summaries of nine branches of physics. Each summary is easy to understand with simple explanations for very big topics and a few recommended monographs. In recommending journals and databases, Fosmire continues to describe for whom or for what research areas each resource might be most useful. In his list of suggested journals, the author stars those that he believes are core for each research topic, but he also includes titles other than "the stars" for those librarians who may have a larger collection budget or may be at an institution that focuses more heavily on a particular area of research. Additionally, Fosmire suggests where a physics librarian might gather more information. He describes formal sources in which to find book reviews or short physics articles, but also mentions informal sources such as physics blogs and wikis as a way to stay aware of the hot topics and new developments in physics.

I appreciate the overall structure of the book. It begins with a focus on physics topics ("What is Physics?") and ends in the librarian world ("Emerging Issues in Physics Librarianship"). The beginning and end are linked through recommendations with everything from how to get to know your particular physics department to why physics librarians need to care about issues such as institutional repositories and alternative publication initiatives such as SCOAP3. Fosmire makes the transition from one side to the other through resource recommendations on materials for both physics researchers and for librarians. For me, as a former secondary school teacher and as a physics librarian working with several faculty members who focus on physics education, I value that Fosmire includes resources for physics education as a field of research. It is an area that is often overlooked and underappreciated.

One unavoidable weakness of the book (and of the series) is that some parts of the book and recommendations will go out of date, some more quickly than others. In this guide, for example, Fosmire writes about issues of open access and e-books. These are important topics that a physics librarian needs to know about and, yet, they are areas in which we will likely see rapid change and development over the next several years. Despite this, the book will be of value to physics librarians for many years from now. Most of the suggested resources and journals have a long history of high quality content and demonstrated importance to the field of physics.

During my reading of this guide, I found myself checking, "Do we own or have access to that?" While I would like to believe that I provide my physics community with a useful collection that meets their

informational needs, I know that there are resources about which I am not aware. So, as a librarian with degrees in physics and library science and with a handful of years under my librarian hat, I found this guide to be a valuable reminder of strong resources, as well as a worthwhile introduction to items for me to consider for my physics library's collection. In that way, this book has value not only for the "sudden selector" but even for those librarians with backgrounds in physics or for the more seasoned physics librarians, who may want a quick reminder of the "hot" topics or an easy way to review their collection.

*Kathleen A. Lehman, Head of the Physics Library at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.*

**Kincy, Chamyia Pompey, with Sara Shatford Layne. *Making the Move to RDA: A Self-Study Primer for Catalogers*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2014. 332 pp. ISBN 978-0-8108-8769-5 (softcover) \$75.00; (e-book) \$74.99.**

The goal of this book is to provide a practical and immediately useable guide for catalogers to creating bibliographic and authority records using *RDA*, even if they have little or no previous training in *RDA*.<sup>1</sup> Kincy and Layne do an admirable job of meeting this goal. Kincy, who passed away before completing the book, was a cataloger at University of California—Los Angeles (UCLA), as well as former chair of the Technical Services Section of the Medical Library Association (MLA). In addition, she served as MLA's liaison to Cataloging

*(continued on page 20)*

## Book Reviews .....

(continued from page 19)

Committee: Access and Description, the body that develops American Library Association's position on *RDA* (I am currently a member of this committee, but did not know Kincy). After Kincy's untimely death, the book was completed by Layne, a cataloger at UCLA and one-time chair of the Cataloging & Classification Section of Association for Library Collections and Technical Services, who retired in 2013.

Part one of the book provides a thorough history of the development of *RDA*, from the early discussions of revising *American Cataloguing Rules*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (*AACR2*) through the release of the *RDA Toolkit* in 2010.<sup>2</sup> It then describes the four principles (Responsiveness to User Needs, Cost Efficiency, Flexibility, and Continuity) and eight objectives (Differentiation, Sufficiency, Relationships, Representation, Attribution, Common Usage or Practice, Uniformity, and Accuracy) that have guided and continue to guide the development and growth of *RDA*. Next, the book discusses the data models that provide the intellectual undergirding of *RDA* (namely, *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR)*, *Functional Requirements for Authority Data (FRAD)*; *Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data (FRSAD)*) and how each of them provides for describing the relationships between various entities that are important in cataloging bibliographic resources.<sup>3</sup> Part one of the book concludes by describing the major differences between *RDA* and *AACR2*. One of the most crucial of these differences is the way the two codes are organized. Whereas *AACR2* rules are organized by format, *RDA* instructions are organized by user task, as defined by *FRBR*. That is to

say, *RDA* is organized by the type of data to be recorded (such as the title or extent of a resource), rather than by the format of the item being cataloged, as in *AACR2*. In this first part of the book, Kincy and Layne provide a very thorough, but easily readable, introduction to the fundamental principles of *RDA*.

Part two is devoted to outlining the basics of *RDA*'s actual rules, or instructions, as *RDA* calls them. The organization of this section is very clever and is designed to make catalogers more familiar with the chapter structure of *RDA*. The section begins with Chapter 4, which covers the attributes of the *FRBR* entities manifestations and items (the instructions that treat with manifestations and items are found in the first four chapters of *RDA*). The book is written primer-style (hence the subtitle), with subheadings for *RDA* instructions (such as *RDA* 2.3 Title) followed by a brief discussion of the important aspects of the instruction. It does not provide a thorough description of each and every nuance and sub-clause of the instruction, but it does provide a basic understanding of the instruction and gives enough guidance for an experienced cataloger who is unfamiliar with *RDA* to begin crafting bibliographic records. Chapter 5 follows the same model and provides an introduction to the attributes of works and expressions, the two remaining *FRBR* entities. Chapter 6 provides information on the creation of authority records using *RDA*, by discussing the attributes of the *FRAD* entities persons, families, corporate bodies, and places. Chapter 7 discusses one of the major differences between *RDA* and *AACR2*, which is *RDA*'s emphasis on recording relationships between the various entities described by the *FRBR*, *FRAD* and *FRSAD* data models. This chapter gives brief

descriptions of the *RDA* instructions related to recording the relationships between bibliographic entities, between persons, families and corporate bodies, and between subjects, and among and between all three groups of entities.

The third and final part of the book provides practical examples of how to apply MARC in the *RDA* environment. Chapter 8 shows how to create bibliographic records for books using *RDA* and provides examples that contrast *AACR2* cataloging with *RDA* cataloging. Chapter 9 gives brief descriptions of how to catalog formats other than books (such as cartographic materials and sound recordings), highlighting a few *RDA* rules of particular interest to cataloging that format. After each discussion of a format, Layne helpfully provides one to three references for sources that provide further information on *RDA* cataloging of that format. Chapter 10 describes how to create authority records using *RDA*, and provides examples that contrast the *RDA* approach with the *AACR2* approach.

All in all, I think that *Making the Move to RDA* is an excellent primer for catalogers who are looking to change over to the new code. The book provides practical guidance for getting started, and has a thorough 13-page index with many entries for specific MARC fields and specific *RDA* instructions that make navigating the chapters for quick reference easy. I recommend the book to any cataloger interested in *RDA*, most especially experienced catalogers who are well-versed in *AACR2*, but are not familiar with *RDA*. The only drawback I can find with this book is that its useful lifespan may be somewhat limited, because the *RDA* code is changing and it has a number of placeholder chapters that have not yet been written. But any book that attempted to

describe a living, changing set of rules would have the same problem.

## References

1. *RDA: Resource Description and Access* (Chicago: American Library Association; Ottawa: Canadian Library Association; London: Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals, 2010- ).
2. *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2nd ed., 2002 rev., 2005 update (Chicago: American Library Association; Ottawa: Canadian Library Association; London: Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals, 2005). *RDA Toolkit* (Chicago: American Library Association, 2010- ).
3. International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records: Final Report* (The Hague: International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions, 2009), [http://archive.ifla.org/VII/s13/frbr/frbr\\_2008.pdf](http://archive.ifla.org/VII/s13/frbr/frbr_2008.pdf); Glenn E. Patton, ed., *Functional Requirements for Authority Data: A Conceptual Model* (Munich: K.G. Saur, 2009); Marcia Lei Zeng, Maja Zumer, and Athen Salaba, eds., *Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data (FRSAD): A Conceptual Model* (The Hague: International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions, 2010), [www.ifla.org/files/classification-and-indexing/functional-requirements-for-subject-authority-data/frsad-final-report.pdf](http://www.ifla.org/files/classification-and-indexing/functional-requirements-for-subject-authority-data/frsad-final-report.pdf).

Steve Kelley, *Head of Continuing Resources and Database Management, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem (NC)*.

**Krier, Laura, and Carly A. Strasser.** *Data Management for Libraries (A LITA Guide)*. Chicago: ALA TechSource, 2014. 112 pp. ISBN 978-1-55570-969-3 (softcover) \$52.50.

As described in the preface of *Data Management for Libraries*, support for data management in academic libraries has increased greatly since early 2011, when the National Science Foundation requirement went into effect for inclusion of a Data Management Plan with every proposal. More recent government demands for expanding public access to the results of federally funded scientific research seems to have accelerated the implementation of library data management services. However, those who have been tapped to provide these services often face multiple challenges. Perhaps they are a one-person operation, solely yet specifically tasked to design and provide services; perhaps they have little experience actually handling scientific research data; more likely than not, budgets to support these services are tight or non-existent. Not least of all, stakes and pressure to succeed are often high because institutional research dollars may hinge on the success or failure to properly manage these digital research outputs. For those looking to create such data management services in their library, Krier and Strasser's book introduces key data management elements to consider and provides guidance, encouragement, and examples to assist in service implementation.

The book is laid out in eight chapters, with three appendices; each chapter contains clear headers to introduce concepts and ends with a notes and references section. The volume has an exhaustive index, should the reader desire to jump to specifics of interest. The first chapters

begin with basics such as common research data types, and provides context for understanding the importance of data management from both researcher and library perspectives. The idea of the research data lifecycle is introduced here and the critical importance of building collaborative services, engaging others both in the library (liaison librarians, outreach and training librarians, those with technical expertise) and with those in the institution's administration (department heads, the information technology department, grants offices etc.) is stressed.

Chapters three and four move toward more practical aspects of supporting data management, covering the data management plan and the data management interview. Not only are five main components of a good plan reviewed, the authors set the stage for the discussion by acknowledging that the preparation of data management plans is "currently poorly incentivized" (19) and then go on to provide talking points for discussing plan development with researchers. Possible service models are reviewed, sources of additional information are provided (websites and online tools), and resource considerations such as personnel and infrastructure are introduced.

In order to assist in data management planning, however, one must understand what data need to be addressed and how researchers work with that data. A common way to gain this understanding is to do a data interview. That process is reviewed briefly and additional resources are cited, but perhaps equally as important is the insight that data interviews are "not only about capturing what the researcher is saying, but also about

(continued on page 22)

## Book Reviews .....

(continued from page 21)

asking the right questions in order to get at the things the researcher is not saying that are nevertheless important for effective data management” (31).

In the remaining four chapters, Krier and Strasser bring their expertise and data-specific perspective to aspects of data management that are more familiar to library professionals: metadata, preservation, access, and governance. Recommendations that “metadata does not necessarily have to be created using an existing schema, as long as it is internally consistent and provides all the information needed to understand the data” (39-40), and that researchers are likely to define preservation and archiving differently than librarians do, provide insight for those who might not have experience working with data or researchers in these areas. Familiar vocabulary for metadata is presented with clearly articulated details relevant to research data. The issue of preservation is covered in greater detail than the others, but given the library’s likely role in this stage of data management, the specialized focus seems appropriate.

Key aspects of access to research data, including identifiers, repositories, open and restricted access issues, and alternatives to sharing data are reviewed. Here and throughout the book, the authors remind readers that librarians already possess skill sets that can contribute to supporting data management. For example, librarians’ abilities to help “researchers understand the difference between preservation and access . . . can help them understand these complex issues and make more informed choices about their own research data” (69). Similarly, librarians’ research skills can be used to find repositories or

metadata standards and their understanding of organizational systems can help researchers think “about organizing disparate information in order to ensure accessibility” (36).

Issues surrounding data governance can be complicated and intimidating, but are introduced here in an easy to understand and straightforward way. Relevant topics such as stakeholders, privacy, and confidentiality, and the legal mechanisms for data usage rights are reviewed. Perspective on the importance of understanding these issues is provided as well, with the wise reminder that researchers can “use solid knowledge of data governance to ensure that they get credit for all of their data by enacting clear licenses and rules for their work” (72).

Finally, to tie together the big picture and make concrete points found throughout the book, the three appendices provide specific resources for repository development, sample job descriptions, and data management plan examples.

This thin, easy to comprehend volume does not purport to satisfy those desiring to master tools or best practices for management of research data. Rather, it serves as an excellent and timely primer for introducing key principles of data management, and provides guidance for those beginning to build out library data services. The book’s well organized, clearly written chapters are equally as appropriate for librarians new to research data as they would be for project data managers looking to pair up with libraries to fill gaps in preservation or access to their data resources. *Data Management for Libraries* provides a perfect balance between general guidance for those beginning to build a data management support framework and

specific details to aid in the execution of services and create successful interactions with researchers.

Wendy A. Kozłowski, *Data Curation Specialist, Cornell University.*

# News From the Field .....

## People

■ **Drew Bordas** has been named Vice President of Management and Customer Operations at OCLC. He will be responsible for OCLC's Customer Support, Project Management, Implementation Programs and Corporate Quality Assurance functions.

■ **Anne Campbell**, who most recently served as E-Processing Manager at Swets, is joining EBSCO Information Services. Campbell will work with the integrated library system vendors utilized by EBSCO customers to enable seamless integration, enhancing services and improving work flows.

■ **Jay Lambrecht**, associate university librarian at the University of Illinois-Chicago (UIC), has retired. Lambrecht first joined the UIC library as catalog librarian in 1986. Lambrecht has been active in the Association of Library Collections and Technical Services, serving on numerous committees within the Cataloging and Classification Section, and published extensively.

■ **Merrilee Proffitt**, senior program officer at OCLC Research, was inducted as a Fellow of the Society of American Archivists (SAA). The distinction of Fellow is the highest honor bestowed on individuals by SAA and is awarded for outstanding contributions to the archives profession.

■ **Tony Stankus**, life sciences subject specialist at the Mullins Library, has become the first librarian to have been promoted to the rank of distinguished professor at the University of Arkansas. Stankus was a regular contributor to *Technicalities* for several years; his columns focused on serials and continuing resources.

## Of Professional Interest

■ The **National Endowment for the Humanities** has awarded **LYRASIS** a grant of \$265,000 to provide preservation programming for organizations in its membership region that hold and provide access to humanities collections and resources. The two-year project will provide education, training, consulting and information resources to raise awareness of preservation issues and improve preservation planning and practices across humanities collections held by libraries and other cultural heritage organizations.

■ **Ithaca S+R** published *Driving with Data: A Roadmap for Evidence-Based Decision Making in Academic Libraries* (<http://j.mp/1mE7cgb>) by Deanna Marcum and Roger C. Schonfeld. This ten-page "roadmap" suggests that environmental scans be conducted at regular intervals by knowledgeable experts, each library has a clear statement about the types of data that are useful for making decisions, and an organizational structure and technical skills and system in place to assemble, manage, and analyze the data.

■ The **National Information Standards Organization (NISO)** published a new recommended practice, *Open Discovery Initiative: Promoting Transparency in Discovery* (NISO RP-19-2014), [www.niso.org/workrooms/odi/publications/rp/rp-19-2014](http://www.niso.org/workrooms/odi/publications/rp/rp-19-2014), which provides specific guidelines on participation in the new generation of library discovery services. This publication includes guidelines to content providers and discovery service providers.

■ On June 10, the **U.S. Second Court of Appeals** handed down its latest decision in the continuing legal battle be-

tween the **HathiTrust** and the **Authors Guild**. A three judge panel largely confirmed the decision handed down in 2012, which found that the HathiTrust's activities of digitizing books from its member libraries and increasing their discoverability by letting users search for key terms within titles are fair use. The court also upheld the earlier finding that the Guild lacks standing to bring cases as an association, though individual members can do so.

■ The **Library of Congress (LC)** has made specific recommendations on the best file formats for preserving access to content of various types: textual works and musical compositions; still images; audio; moving images; software, electronic games, and learning modules; and datasets and databases. *Library of Congress Recommended Format Specification 2014-2015*, is available at [www.loc.gov/preservation/resources/rfs/rfs20142015.pdf](http://www.loc.gov/preservation/resources/rfs/rfs20142015.pdf). LC explains that these recommendations are not meant to replace their 2012 *Best Edition of Published Copyright Works for the Collections of the Library of Congress* ([www.copyright.gov/circs/circ07b](http://www.copyright.gov/circs/circ07b)), but rather builds upon and complements that work.

■ The **Center for Research Libraries** announced the completion of an audit of the **CLOCKSS Archive** and has certified the CLOCKSS Archive as a trustworthy digital repository. CLOCKSS is the only organization to earn a perfect score of 5 in the Technologies, Technical Infrastructure, and Security category.

## Publishers and Vendors

■ **Innovative Interfaces Inc.** acquired **VTLS**, developer of the Virtua integration  
(continued on page 24)

Editor: Peggy Johnson  
Publisher: Media Periodicals Division  
The Kansas City Gardener, Inc.

© 2014 Media Periodicals unless otherwise indicated

**Technicalities™** (ISSN 0272-0884) is published bimonthly by Media Periodicals Division, The Kansas City Gardener, Inc. All correspondence concerning editorial matters should be addressed to: Peggy Johnson, 756 Laurel Avenue, St. Paul, Minn. 55104-7107 or via email: m-john@umn.edu.

Indexed by Library Literature and LISA; Library and Information Science Abstracts. Copies of articles available on 16mm microfilm, 35mm microfilm and 105mm microfiche through University Microfilms, Inc., 300 North Zeeb Rd. Ann Arbor, Mich. 48106.

**Subscription Information:** Six issues per year. One year, \$127; two years, \$225. Foreign subscribers \$144, one year; \$265, two years. Most back issues still available at \$20 per copy.

**Order from:** Media Periodicals Division,  
The Kansas City Gardener, Inc., P.O. Box 8725,  
Prairie Village, KS 66208.  
(913) 648-4728 email: mediaperiodicals@kcgmag.com

## Technicalities

A Publication of Media Periodicals Division  
The Kansas City Gardener, Inc.  
P.O. Box 8725  
Prairie Village, KS 66208

### News From the Field.....▶

(continued from page 23)

ed library system (ILS), VITAL digital asset management system, Chamo Discovery layer, MozGo mobile application, and other library technology solutions. Following Innovative's acquisition of Polaris, the move further consolidates the library automation marketplace.

■ **3M Library Systems** introduced a new standard for e-book and e-audio-book lending with the newest version of its 3M Cloud Library patron app. The new app includes innovative features allowing users to personalize how they browse for content, along with a new look and feel interface.

■ **OverDrive** announced an agreement with **Warner Bros. Digital Distribution** to offer hundreds of popular streaming video titles to public and government library partners in the U.S. and Canada. The model eliminates the need to purchase titles in advance of their use and ensures that they are available instantly to all patrons simultaneously.

■ **Ex Libris Group** announced a collaboration with **YBP Library Services** (YBP) to offer a new, streamlined acquisition process to academic and research libraries that use the Ex Libris Alma and YBP GOBI<sup>3</sup> (Global Online Bibliographic Information) platforms. Leveraging Alma's open architecture, the first deliverable of this project will automatically update Alma in real time with all print and electronic orders placed via the GOBI3 platform.

■ **Simon and Schuster** announced the conclusion of their e-book pilot with more than 20 public library systems in the U.S. All of Simon & Schuster's front list and backlist titles that are available as e-books are now eligible for licensing to all U.S. libraries, with new titles being made available simultaneously with their publication. Titles are acquired via OverDrive, 3M, and Baker & Taylor.

■ **ProQuest** announced the debut of their new **Intota** next-generation Library Services Platform (LSP). The cloud-

based, software as a service (SaaS) suite integrates collection management, assessment, discovery, and automated demand-driven acquisition capabilities into a single solution. Its individual modules, such as the collection analytics service Intota Assessment, are interoperable with a library's existing ILS.

■ **Books at JSTOR** has partnered with **YBP Library Services** to make its 25,000+ e-books available for purchase through GOBI<sup>3</sup>, YBP's collection management interface. The Books at JSTOR program offers: titles from 60 scholarly presses; integration of e-books and journals on the JSTOR platform; unlimited-user, DRM-free access model available for most titles; free OCLC MARC records; and perpetual access rights, with titles preserved in Portico. Libraries can elect to receive new JSTOR title notifications from GOBI or have titles automatically delivered on JSTOR through YBP's eApproval program. See <http://about.jstor.org/content/books-jstor-partners-ybp-library-services> for more information.